


|  | 9 |  | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -02:-47 1 | public. | -02:-45 1 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes. |
| -02:-47 2 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Second? | -02:-45 2 | MR. HAYES: Motion to close to the |
| -02:-47 3 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Second. | -02:-45 3 | public. |
| -02:-47 4 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? | -02:-45 4 | S. EFFRON-MALLEY: Second. |
| -02:-47 $\quad 5$ | (Whereupon, all resent members respond | -02:-45 5 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? |
| -02:-47 6 | affirmative.) | -02:-45 6 | (Whereupon, all resent members respond |
| -02:-47 7 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? | -02:-45 7 | in the affirmative.) |
| -02:-47 8 | No response.) | -02:-45 8 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? |
| -02:-47 9 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. So open. | -02:-45 9 | spon |
| -02:-47 10 | I think we want to know if there are | -02:-45 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Closed to the |
| -02:-47 11 | any members of the public who have a problem with | -02:-45 11 | public. |
| -02:-47 12 | Gary's disclosure? | -02:-45 12 | tab them for you, take a look at page 82, where I put |
| -02:-47 13 | MR. NEWMAN: Or any questions, only | -02:-45 13 |  |
| -02:-47 14 | his particular issue. | -02:-45 14 | an X , there are four common law items, and then on |
| -02:-47 15 | MS. GELLERT: Yes. | -02:-45 15 | 85, under the Local Government Ethics Law, and I'll |
| -02:-47 16 | Sally Gellert, 210 Highview | -02:-45 16 | circle each category, and some of them, you know, go |
| -02:-47 17 | I don't have a problem, I do have a | -02:-44 17 | on for a bit, but in the first paragraph there's some |
| -02:-47 18 | architect who you knew had a current project before | -02:-44 18 | explanation as to the types of conflict. |
| -02:-47 19 |  | -02:-44 19 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. |
| -02:-47 20 | this board? | -02:-44 20 | MR. DELIA: Anyway, here we go. |
| -02:-47 21 | MR. NEWMAN: The reason why I chose him is, as I disclosed probably at the start of this, I | -02:-44 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, I have them. |
| -02:-47 22 |  | -02:-44 22 | I mean, one is a direct pecuniary |
| -02:-46 23 | happen to know him, I'm very good friends with a | -02:-44 23 | interest. You don't have any direct pecuniary |
| -02:-46 24 | gentleman in town named Matt Bruziggi (phonetic), an | -02:-44 24 | interest in this application? |
| -02:-46 25 | he uses him on occasion. I respect his work, and he LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | -02:-44 25 | MR. NEWMAN: In this application, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L. |
|  | 10 |  | 12 |
| -02:-46 1 | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, | -02:-44 | absolutely not. |
| -02:-46 2 | and that's why I asked him if he would do it. | -02:-44 2 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect |
| -02:-46 3 | And my architect, who's really down in | -02:-44 3 | pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that |
| -02:-46 4 | Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful. | -02:-44 4 | financially benefits one closely tied to you. |
| -02:-46 $\quad 5$ | MS. GELLERT: Thank you. | -02:-44 5 |  |
| -02:-46 6 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? | -02:-44 6 | please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I |
| -02:-46 7 | sponse.) | -02:-44 7 | can't hear you. |
| -02:-46 8 | ELIA: If I could follow-up | -02:-44 8 | R. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat tha |
| -02:-46 $\quad 9$ | AIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure | -02:-44 9 | Indirect pecuniary interest is when an |
| -02:-46 10 | MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really | -02:-44 10 | ficial, like the board member here, votes on a |
| -02:-46 11 | going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while | -02:-44 11 | matter that financially benefits one closely tied to |
| -02:-46 12 | since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot. | -02:-43 12 | the board member, such as an employer or a family |
| -02:-46 13 |  | -02:-43 13 | member. |
| -02:-46 14 | I'll hand you this in a moment. | -02:-43 14 | MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here. |
| -02:-46 15 | here's one spot where it talks about four | -02:-43 15 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal |
| -02:-46 16 | circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd | -02:-43 16 | interest, when an official or board member here votes |
| -02:-46 17 | ask you to take a look at that and see if any of | -02:-43 17 | on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close |
| -02:-46 18 | those pertain to you, in your opinion. | -02:-43 18 | friend in a non-financial way. |
| -02:-45 19 | If you could just bear with me for one | -02:-43 19 | MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at |
| -02:-45 20 | more second, I just want to see if there's anything | -02:-43 20 | issue. |
| -02:-45 21 | specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is | -02:-43 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect |
| -02:-45 22 | the other statute I could not remember off the top of | -02:-43 22 | ersonal interest is when the board member here votes |
| -02:-45 23 | my head. | -02:-43 23 | on a matter in which his or her judgment may be |
| -02:-45 24 | MR. NEWMAN: Before we get to that, should we close to the public? | -02:-43 24 |  |
| -02:-45 25 |  | -02:-43 25 | MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | anything else?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Delia, do you have

```
MR. DELIA: I'm satisfied.
```

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any board member have
anything to say on the issue?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Did I ask you, I know you will be fair and impartial, but, for the record, you feel you can decide this case and that won't have any impact on your decision?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other
questions, comments?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Should we move on?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Please.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tonight we
expect to conclude this meeting. We have testimony
to take tonight, including the zoning board's
planner, testimony from the traffic engineer, and I think a little bit of testimony from the engineer for the board.
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I have tonight sign-in sheets for
people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.

So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.

So I'm going to hand these three sheets
out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.

I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.

Okay. All right. I see four hands.
So when you sign in, just put a "T" by your name, and that will indicate to me that you would like to testify or submit some proof. So I'm going to hand out these three sheets right now and
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ask everyone who would like to make a comment or to submit documents or testify to sign this.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Shall we
begin?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I think we should
begin while you're passing the papers around. Is
that okay? We don't want to waste anymore time. We have plenty of time.

MS. BORRELLI: Is there a need for this board to be up?

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Is there a need,
Mr. Delia, for the board behind you?
MR. DELIA: No, not right now.
MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.
MR. DELIA: You are welcome.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Just some recordkeeping here.

In terms of the exhibits, I received an exhibit list from Mr. Delia.

Thank you.
MR. DELIA: You're welcome.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have exhibits that the board previously marked as ZBA-1 and ZBA-2.

I have, for the record, ZBA-3, which is
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a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski \&
Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.

There's a letter from Chief Anthony
Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.
The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.

A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.

This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually
comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree
Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.

And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.

And then we have the settlement
agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record as ZBA-9.

I've also marked, but not in the record, a note that was sent to me by a resident, Veronica Appelle, and attached to it were some e-mails, and it looks like a letter dated December
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13, 2018; an e-mail, I'm not sure of the date, handwritten on it, it says August 7, 2018; and another copy of a letter issued to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Dennis D'Angelis (phonetic), traffic safety supervisor. We're marking that for identification right now.

MR. DELIA: That's fine.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Not into the record, and I'm probably going to ask Mr. Intindola questions about that.

MR. DELIA: Okay.
Again, just for the record, I do object to that. I only received it at noon today, so it came late and it's also, in my opinion, hearsay.

So for those reasons I would object to its entry into evidence at some point here.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Technically the rules of evidence don't apply, but I understand the nature of your objection.

MR. DELIA: But it's a serious hearsay and very late. This has been out for months, and I get it the day of the last hearing. That's just not right.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I understand your objection, but Mr. Intindola might be able to
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shed some light on this.
MR. DELIA: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Perhaps you might not
object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.

MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.
(Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through
ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)
MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start
with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.
In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?

MR. PREISS: I do.
RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor, Suite D, Hoboken, New Jersey 07039, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. I know, Mr. Preiss, you're well known LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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to me and certain members of the board.
We do have new members of the board and
we have members of the public who do not have the
benefit of your background and qualification, so I'm
going to ask you to provide us with your educational background and your professional qualifications.
A. Right.

So, my name is Richard Preiss, spelled P-R-E-I-S-S.

I work for the firm of Phillips Preiss
Grygiel Leheny Hughes, LLC. We're a planning and real estate consultant with offices in Hoboken, New Jersey.

I've been with that firm since 1981. I've been a partner in that firm since 1984.

I have been the municipal planning
consultant in Woodcliff Lake for the past four years, most particularly for the zoning board, for the planning board, and also initially not for the council, but for the purposes of helping the borough figure out its affordable housing obligation. I've, subsequently, also become the council's planner.

By way of background in education, I
have a bachelor's degree in town and regional
planning, and a master's degree in planning. I'm a
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licensed planner in the State of New Jersey. As
indicated, I've been a licensed planner since 1986.
I've testified before boards like this
ever since that period of time, and I've been
involved in most applications or all the applications
that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.

I've also been tasked with helping to
evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the
master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.
Q. You're familiar with the borough's
master plan?
A. Yes.
Q. And reexamination of the master plan?
A. Yes.
Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I know you issued an initial memorandum that I referenced.
A. It's not really a memorandum, it's an outline.

If I can just explain. I do have a
presentation. I'm going to look at all of the
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aspects of the application, particularly the planning testimony.

I was in the process of reviewing the transcripts, which I only got last week on Thursday, so it did take me a while to put the presentation together, but I did have the benefit of hearing Mr. Burgis' testimony, the planner for the applicant, relating to the master plan.

And, so, in light of that, I was able to put together a three-page outline, which has now been marked ZBA-8, and I believe that was distributed to the planning board members. I think we have copies meant for anybody in the public who wants to follow along with it.

This is going to be part of my presentation this evening, but I do want to get it to the members of the board and particularly to the applicant and their planner, so that they would have an opportunity to review it ahead of tonight's hearing. So that will be something that I'm going to reference in my remarks.
Q. Okay. I don't mean to interrupt, but I was referring to your memo --

## A. Oh, I see. Okay.

Q. -- of August 29, 2018. The one we LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
marked that ZBA-6.

## A. Right.

We did an initial review letter prior to the applicant actually having come before the board and started a hearing just to, you know, provide some background and indicate what the variances are and then the planning proofs that were required for the variance.

Yes, I did that.
Q. And then your outline dated June 20, 2019?
A. Correct, which is something I'll be referring to towards the end of my testimony.

So let me start by saying that I was here for all of the hearings. I've reviewed all of the plans. I've seen all transcripts. And I will address the planning testimony last.

I'd like to deal with some of the aspects insofar as they relate to the variances related to civil engineering, the site plan, the architectural plans, and traffic testimony, traffic and parking, and also the testimony of the real estate broker.

So let me first talk a little bit about -30 24 02:-30 25

25 the site plan and the engineering testimony.
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I'd like to do this kind of as an almost hypothetical argument.

I want to put aside the fact that the property needs a use variance. It's useful to do that and just to assume for the purposes of looking at the site plan that this is a use that is permitted in the zone.

So, if you do that, it allows you to focus on the site plan, itself, and see, you know, from a planning and engineering point, whether it makes sense.

And, of course, the use variance is the main issue, and I will be addressing that, but I just want to look at the site plan from a planning point of view, to see if it really makes sense.

So, you have a site which has an existing three-story office building in the front with parking below, a large parking lot behind it, and the site has well established buffers and a preserved steep area to the rear.

So, assuming one were permitted to allow apartments to be developed in this particular development, the first thing that one would do as a developer would be to determine how many apartments you could obtain by converting the office building
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going to comment on the I will say that if the board did see fit to grant the variance, that I would ask that in the resolution they allow our office and the engineer office to work with the architect to perhaps tweak and improve the design.

But, anyway, assuming that you can convert the front building to residential, you'll find that you'd still have excess parking behind it.

So the addition of another building in the parking lot behind it of more or less the same height, and the ability to be able to have the number of units that the remaining parking can support through the RSIS standards, would allow you to add this extra building to the rear.

You would absolutely want to make sure that the rear building, when you add it, does not block the view of residents to the rear, particularly those that have views of the reservoir and also to
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have any impact on residents who live to the side, and, to the extent that it's possible, you'd want to make it less visible to the public on Broadway, and this is what the applicant is proposing.

So from a purely site plan point of view, if you assume that apartments were a permitted use in this particular district and you were converting the office and adding units, to me the site plan does make sense.

So the existence of the front office building and the fact that where you have multifamily residential development permitted in Woodcliff Lake, and I know that in virtually all circumstances where this occurs, it's inclusionary development, meaning that it has a section of the units which are dedicated to low- and moderate-income housing, to provide for the fair share obligation of the borough.

But in that particular context, when you compare it to what the borough has done to meet its affordable housing obligation in other locations, if one were to convert the building and add the building in the way that the applicant is proposing, in this particular context, in the context of what Woodcliff Lake has allowed in other districts, to me it's not overly dense or too close to the front, side LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
or rear yards or too high.
This is borne out by, I think it's A-8, which is a comparison table which the applicant provided, which demonstrate that if this property were rezoned for the use, for example, that it would not be inconsistent with what Woodcliff Lake has permitted elsewhere for this type of development in terms of the bulk standards.

So I think from a site plan point of view, assuming -- of course, and this is a big if, and I'll get to it, assuming that the use were permitted, this is not an unreasonable proposal for the conversion and the addition of apartments.

Let me talk about the testimony of the real estate broker. I do agree with counsel Sal Princiotto, the real estate broker is not an appraiser, does not have an MAI, that he's not able to opine on the impact to the property values, and nor did he do a proper study in this respect.

However, I think the board can take 21 note of his testimony in regard to his point of view in terms of whether there is a market demand for 23 apartments like those provided in this proposal at 24 this location, and I think what he indicated is that 25 this location and the type of units that were being
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proposed would serve the needs of people, divorcees, people who are downsizing, millennials who are coming into town.

He did talk about this being a particularly good location, and I think that I do agree that proximity to the train station is a draw; however, I think the Broadway corridor lacks the type of retail and entertainment component, things like coffee shops and movie theaters and gyms and restaurants and bars, that typically attract older and especially younger empty-nesters.

Moreover, the proposed use is not a mixed use, it's solely residential.

But even, you know, putting that aside, is there demand for units like this in the marketplace and would this be a good location, given its proximity to the train station?

I think the answer is yes.
I think there's two aspects about the conversion which was not clear from the testimony that was provided.

The first is, it's really not clear whether the building was purposely emptied of tenants to make way for the project or there was no evidence on the record that the applicant had substantial
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difficulty finding office tenants and allowing this building to continue to be an office. And I think that there was also an absence of testimony, particularly from the architect, to say whether the building was designed in such a way that it would be infeasible to renovate it or modernize it for an office or some other permitted use.

So I think on those two things, I don't know that the applicant has really proved their case in this situation. However, I do understand that this is a suitable and attractive location for the proposed use.

With regard to the traffic testimony, I know Brian Intindola is going to address this, but just generally, from my point of view, the parking does meet the RSIS standard. It seems that the internal circulation can work, particularly for fire access. And I think, as their traffic engineer was able to indicate, the traffic generated for this project will be less than the office use.

So if you look at all of the prior testimony, I think that there are certain benefits or certain things that are evident from the site plan and from the testimony that are provided by those witnesses that indicate that this is an appropriate
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plan within that particular context.
So what I think that the board is facing really comes down to the planning arguments, whether there are special reasons, the negative criteria, and, in particular, what is known as the "Medici reconciliation," whether that has been met.

I know that the board is familiar with these concepts, but before I address the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis, I do want to clarify what the Medici decision basically indicates and what the board has to do.

The Medici decision, which is a Supreme Court decision from the 1980s, said that when you're dealing with a use variance, in addition to, you know, your special reasons and negative criteria, there's an enhanced burden of proof for a use variance.

The first is that as part of your special reasons, you have to show that the site is particularly suited for the proposed use.

We have lots of testimony on that from -- as I've indicated, others, from the engineering, traffic and real estate broker and architecture, and we have some testimony from Mr. Burgis.
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 he's very knowledgeable of the community. So I doThe second part of the Medici criteria, and it's often mischaracterized, is what's known as the "Medici reconciliation." And what it says is the applicant doesn't only have to show that the use would not be inconsistent with the master plan, but the board has to reconcile the grant of the variance with the fact that the council, through its zoning, has prohibited this use in the zone, and it's known as the Medici reconciliation test.

So you have to go beyond the argument saying, oh, well, this use is supported by some of the goals in the master plan; you have to provide a clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.

So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.

Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with regard to the master plan review, those were prepared by his office, and he has a long history here, and
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have a lot of respect for him and his testimony.
In his testimony, he started out by referencing the master plans, the 2002 Master Plan, the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination, and the 2008 Broadway corridor study, with particular focus on the goals and objectives. And I will get to that a little bit later, and I will use the handout ZBA-8 to talk about that. So I'll come back to that last.

With regard to the special reasons, there were five that he mentioned.

The first one he indicated was that there are purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law that would be advanced by this project.

Now, I think what the board has to do is you have to look at these goals, because every project, whether or not they conform to a zoning ordinance, whether they're permitted or not, can be said to further one or more purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law.

So I think the key, in the case of a use variance where the board has to grant a use which the governing body has prohibited in the zone, is to determine whether this proposed use goes above and beyond and does more to further those goals than would a permitted use or the existing use on the
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site. So you can't just say, well, it promotes this goal. The question is: Does it do it better or are there certain things that this use advances to a greater degree in the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law than an office use was in the SO zone, which is the main permitted use.

With regard to the second special reason, he indicated that this project would assist the borough with the unmet need, and I'll also talk a little bit about this because this is part of the discussion about the master plan and the history of the Broadway corridor zoning, but I think what the board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.
THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing
Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.

And during that process of negotiation or mediation with the Fair Share Housing Center, the borough was asked to consider adopting overlay zoning
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over the Broadway corridor, in particular the area south of Highview where this site is located, to allow for mixed use, that would be retail ground level and apartments above.

And in the end, the borough decided not
to go in that direction, and Fair Share Housing Center agreed that that wasn't necessary, and other overlay zoning was adopted. And in that respect, this particular area and this site in particular was not included in overlay zoning.

In terms of the area north of Highview -- and I think one has to distinguish in terms of zoning and master plan the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview -- in the area north of Highview, the borough did agree to rezone or redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent affordable housing, that's known as the "North Broadway" site. It was declared an area in need of redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for a residential development in that particular location.

Also north of Highview, across the street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable
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housing on that side, but I think significantly, in terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the Broadway corridor south of Highview.

So I just think that the board needs to know that history.

Despite having said that, is there a benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?

Yes, there would be certainly a benefit to that. It's certainly not required, and if the borough never granted the zoning, granted this variance, I don't think it would have any problem in terms of its compliance with its affordable housing obligation.

Mr. Burgis also talked about furthering the principle of smart growth. He indicated that having a high density residential development located close to the train station and shopping, referred to as a "transit-oriented development," would follow the principles of smart growth, which is encouraged by the state, that is, compact, walkable, environmentally sustainable, varied housing.

Yes, this project does fall within the
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purview of smart growth.
It would be a lot better if it were mixed use, that would further it to a much greater extent, but essentially a residential development of this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.

The fourth special reason is, he indicated that it furthers the purposes of the state plan. He mentioned that the site is in Planning Area 1 , which is a metropolitan area, where growth is encouraged.

I just want to point out that virtually all of Bergen County, except for two small areas in the Highlands, are in the PA-1. So this site is far from being unique. And I think the state goals and objectives for the PA-1 are virtually synonymous with the smart growth principles cited in the prior special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason; however, it's worth noting it does have the imprimatur of the state plan, it does reinforce the notion of transit-oriented development.

The first special reason is that this project would generate less traffic.

To me, I'm not quite sure that that would rise to the level of being a special reason. I
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think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.

In other words, the grant of the variance would not have a substantial negative impact on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic.

So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I think the SO zoning in place presupposes a certain amount of traffic that would be generated.

The office use has existed at this
location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and they don't seem to be particular problems that would be ameliorated or overcome if this project were converted to residential use.

In other words, it's not solving a
traffic problem. Yes, there's less traffic.
Is there a traffic problem now?
I don't think we've heard evidence that
there is, and I think Mr. Intindola can address this.
The overall levels of service and daily
traffic volumes, the difference between the office and the residential to me may not be substantially
different or create an advantage to this area than
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what presently exists; in other words, if the office remained in place, I'm not sure that one would notice the difference.

In terms of the negative criteria, I'll just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated.

He did indicate to the board, and I do agree with him, that all projects have some impact, but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the negative criteria, under the first prong, that the impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" in order for the board to say that the negative criteria have not been satisfied.

So in terms of the impact on the zone plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it supported five separate goals and objectives of the master plan, he pointed out that the development is only located in the special office and not the R-15 portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear.

He indicated the project is consistent with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that separately.

He relied upon the traffic engineer's LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

38 22 proposed. But accommodating this building within 36
feet, I think that's the key area, and I think
24 because of that, this is relative to the new 25 building, that that's not a substantial impact.
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There were a number of design waivers: The size of stalls, walking grade, things that related to the buffer. I'll let Mr. Jacobs opine on those. Those are more of a technical and engineering issue.

So let me now turn to what I think is the real crux of the matter, which is the application in the context of the master plans and the zoning. I would like to examine truly what the master plan, the master plan reexamination, and the Broadway corridor amendments to the master plan say about mixed use or solely residential use along the Broadway corridor and what recent actions of the borough council have had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning in this regard.

So I now refer to the handout, ZBA-8. So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan, from what I could see, that talks about even mixed use or residential. None of the goals in that master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.

In the discussion on uses at page 58 on the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed use or to apartment development. The same with regard to the discussion on the SO Broadway zone.
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MR. NEWMAN: I'm sorry to interrupt. So you're saying 2002, that document which the board does not have, says nothing about these kind of uses.

Do I have that correct?
THE WITNESS: It does not. It doesn't.
When it discusses the B-1 and the SO zone, it does not talk about mixed use or residential development. It talks about other uses, you know, retail and so forth.

That will change in subsequent documents, but insofar as that document is concerned, there's nothing in the goals or the uses that would support either mixed use or solely residential development.

The next document is the periodic reexamination of the master plan and development regulations, the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, December of 2008, also prepared by Burgis Associates. They did the 2002 Master Plan.

And at page 22, when they are talking about specific changes to the master plan, there's a discussion of differentiating permitted uses in the $B-1, B-2$, and $B-3$ districts. And it says:
"For example, the B-1 district uses
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should be uses appropriate for a traditional downtown area, since the zone is within walking distance of the train station."

It doesn't elaborate and say "mixed use" or "residential" in that particular study.

So, again, in the 2008 Master Plan, there is no reference to mixed use or residential.

There were two Broadway corridor studies that were done, one document which is known as the Broadway Corridor Phase 2 study, which was done in June 2012, again it's a Burgis Associates document, there were no recommendations or findings related to the mix of retail/residential uses or allowing residential uses alone south of Highview.

That particular document focused on three redevelopment sites, Malek, Mayberry, and the post office shopping center were recommended for mixed use, but mixed use as recommended in this particular document meant retail either on the first floor or on two floors or retail on the ground floor and office on the second. So this document didn't talk about residential uses.

Very shortly thereafter, there was a Broadway corridor study master plan amendment, that's August 2012, and this is the first time that this
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notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.
So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a
planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.

Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay
Zone."
It says:
"To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."

And then the second thing it said is:
"2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with commercial space, could foster vitality in the B-1 district, if permitted."

And then finally there was another memorandum from Donna Holmquist to the planning board dated August 6, 2012, and it indicates as follows:
"Implementation of an overlay zone,
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south of Highview, to allow mixed-use development and encourage redevelopments."

So I think when you summarize what's in the earlier documents, there is no recognition, no recommendation for mixed use.

In the Broadway corridor study, the master plan, and some of the follow-up memorandums, there is a reference to mixed use. But I think what's critical is there were no recommendations to permit a mix of uses in the SO zone. It talked about it in the $\mathrm{B}-1$ zone. And there were no recommendations to allow solely multifamily development south of Highview, either in the SO or the $\mathrm{B}-1$ zones.

I just want to bring the zoning board up to speed in terms of some of the more recent -when I say "recent," in the past three years, the zoning history, because the council has taken up this notion of should it allow mixed use or residential development on the Broadway corridor.

And there were two instances, it started when DMR Architects were engaged by the council to look at the Broadway corridor study and come up with some proposed zoning.

They did put a proposal forward late in
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2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.

So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects. What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.

With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just -- and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.

And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.

So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even residential use in the Broadway corridor, I indicated that if this was going to happen, Fair Share Housing Center would insist that if that was done, either by zoning or overlay zoning, that they would have to provide a set aside for low and moderate income housing.
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So the council decided that they would have a community meeting, it was held at the Tice Senior Center in the winter of 2017, and basically the community weighed in. The council, thereafter, did not move forward with any of those recommendations. Essentially, that discussion was tabled.

Based on that discussion, our office went back to Fair Share Housing Center in that negotiation. We told Fair Share Housing Center that the council was not supportive of allowing mixed use or residential development in the Broadway corridor I believe south of Highview.

Fair Share Housing Center agreed with that. We signed a settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center which did not require any overlay zoning over the Broadway corridor.

So as a result, neither mixed use or residential development was allowed either in the B-1 or the SO zones.

In 2018, this was approximately a year later, the council once again took up the discussion with regard to a revised draft of changes for the B-1 zone, wherein mixed uses were put forward.

After some discussion with the council, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.

So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.

I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.

Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.

One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.

So you can look back and you can say, well, the last master plan reexamination was done in 2008. The last time the planning board dealt with the Broadway corridor amendment was in 2012. And
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basically the applicant or the board can say well, look, since that period of time, there's been a change of circumstances, there's been a change in real estate, in market economic conditions, in state law, something which would say to the board, if the planning board were to be doing the master plan at this point, has sufficient change occurred over that period of time such that when the board was considering making a recommendation for the zoning, that those changed circumstances would lead the planning board in its master plan to change their policy or that the governing body would say, yes, there's been sufficient changes in the marketplace, where even though the master plan said, you know, not to permit this kind particular use at this particular location, that they might be persuaded at this point to undertake that.

So, you know, I think it's pretty clear from the Medici reconciliation, the master plan, and the Broadway corridor amendment I think speaks for itself, but I think one of the questions that the board has to ask is, are those projects -- are those documents so out of date to have circumstances change where you can reconcile, you can say, yes, insofar as the master plan and the borough is concerned, this is
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presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. SPIRIG: And talking about
developing it as a residential use.
THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?

And from a planning standpoint, I'm curious to hear that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, so I think when you're talking about most residential developments, you would want to have some kind of open space
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element, and some projects do, they will have a sitting area, if it's, you know, geared towards older empty-nesters, there may be a small playground or play equipment for younger children.

At this particular location and in being so close to the train station and given the bedroom mix, as I said before, there's going to be very few schoolchildren generated. So to dedicate sort of a playground, that's an amenity which would be nice. I don't think its absence, you know, is something, from a planning point of view, that would render the project totally inappropriate.

It would be nice, you know, if some aspect of the open space was enhanced with a walkway or something like that, maybe a sitting area, that's probably something that could be accommodated.

You know, the applicant has chosen, in this particular situation, not to provide one. I think it's an attractive feature and it would be nice to have it, but I don't think it's an absolutely essential part of the project.

MR. SPIRIG: So if I can just now continue, because you did make a point that I was tempted to only hit on at one point.

With regard to determining whether or
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not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from
the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?

And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an
office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.

If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.

THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I didn't hear other evidence that the building couldn't be used for an office or it was absolutely impossible to convert it for an office use. They said there would be some difficulty. I don't know that we had LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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sufficient testimony on the record to prove that point, and the reason why I think they did not is because they're not saying that this is a hardship, that this property and this use by virtue of the zoning cannot, you know, sustain a reasonable rate of return.

What they are saying is that they believe that a residential development in this context provides substantial benefit, special reasons that would enhance the community.

I don't think a hardship case was made, so I do agree with you in that respect.

MR. SPIRIG: Thank you.
MR. NEWMAN: Let me ask you a question.
If I remember the testimony, there was a lot of discussion about empty-nesters, meaning people who already live in the community, that their children are going to go off to school and they're going to downsize, so to speak.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. NEWMAN: How do you reconcile the average-sized home in Woodcliff Lake and the square footage of those homes with people moving into a one-bedroom apartment?

I mean, does that sound consistent, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.

THE WITNESS: Right.
So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.

What they did say --
MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I
thought.
THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.

So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities and I think --

MR. NEWMAN: But --
THE WITNESS: -- I think their is evidence, for example, in 62 Broadway, where there
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were 14 apartments and retail space, we know that the retail space, there's trouble, you know, there's been difficulty renting those out. The 14 apartments are rented.

So, clearly -- and I'm not saying the source of demand, you know, is a couple who is downsizing and would go from a 3,000-square-foot single-family home into a one-bedroom unit, but I do believe it does fulfill a housing need, and I think there's ample indication in the marketplace that that is something that would add to the variety of housing options in the community.

MR. NEWMAN: But do you think that's more designed for existing residents in the community who are downsizing or for somebody new who would seeking?

This is where I'm having a difficult time reconciling that, because I could be wrong, I'm not wrong a lot, my wife tells me all the time, but if I remember the testimony correctly, it was for empty-nesters, which was referred to a lot.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. NEWMAN: And I still don't
understand how an empty-nester is going to go from a 3,000 -- I mean the average house in Woodcliff Lake

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

THE WITNESS: I think you're right.
MR. NEWMAN: -- to an 800-square-foot
apartment.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.

There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.

MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation --

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. NEWMAN: -- you would agree with
me?
THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this community that don't qualify as low and moderate and may want to live in the community, and I think this kind of housing does address those needs.
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I think 62 Broadway is evidence of
that, those are all smaller apartment units and those have all been rented, so I think there is a demand.

As I've indicated, there's not a
specific obligation on the part of Woodcliff Lake, through its fair share obligation to rezone or to grant the variance, but, you know, as a point, is there a market demand for these kinds of units?

I think the evidence is clear that there probably is.

MR. NEWMAN: But that's not how it -and again you'll correct me if I'm wrong, that's not how it was, for lack of a better term, "sold" to this board.

I think the evidence -- and you were here, but I think the evidence was this is a good place for empty-nesters. I seem to remember "empty-nesters."

THE WITNESS: Empty-nesters doesn't mean somebody whose kids have left the home and would suddenly transition.

MR. NEWMAN: When there was testimony
as to that, it was more of a referral to
"empty-nesters," yes, but perhaps not people who already lived in the community.
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THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.

From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.

MR. NEWMAN: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?

MR. HAYES: No.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for
you.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. In the CBA and in your testimony, you
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| -01:-24 1 | literally people working in there right now today, | -01:-21 1 | the DMR report, I will give you a copy of our plan, |
| -01:-24 2 | and we presented our case in the manner in which we | -01:-21 2 | and I would ask you to let us know. |
| -01:-24 3 | did where we've attempted, at least in our opinion, | -01:-21 3 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's something your |
| -01:-24 4 | to demonstrate particular suitability, do you agree | -01:-21 | expert should have done, if you wanted to do it. |
| -01:-24 5 | that this property is particularly well suited? | -01:-21 5 | asking him |
| -01:-24 6 | A. I would say that, you know, given the | -01:-21 6 | MR. DELIA: He brought up the DMR |
| -01:-23 7 | property's location and the way that you're proposing | -01:-21 7 | port, okay. |
| -01:-23 8 | to convert it, if it were zoned for the use, it would | -01:-21 8 | MR. NEWMAN: Your expert testified |
| -01:-23 9 | be an appropriate plan for doing so. | -01:-21 9 | about all sorts of reports, none of which we've seen. |
| -01:-23 10 | Q. So whether or not the office vacancy | -01:-21 10 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: He's here for cross |
| -01:-23 11 | occurred by attrition, whether it occurred | -01:-21 11 | examination, not to prepare an analysis for you that |
| -01:-23 12 | deliberately really doesn't make a difference, does | -01:-21 12 | maybe you wanted to do as part of your application. |
| -01:-23 13 | it? | -01:-21 13 | THE WITNESS: Let me just -- |
| -01:-23 14 | A. Well, as I've indicated, there's no | -01:-21 14 | MR. NEWMAN: I would ask that you limit |
| -01:-23 15 | evidence on the record and you haven't made the | -01:-20 15 | your questions to cross, as to what he testified to |
| -01:-23 16 | argument that this is a hardship case, and it's up to | -01:-20 16 | on direct |
| -01:-23 17 | the board to make a determination. | -01:-20 17 | THE WITNESS: Let me just reinforce |
| -01:-23 18 | I've cited the factors and I've | -01:-20 18 | what I said earlier on. |
| -01:-23 19 | evaluated the testimony of all the witnesses. It's | -01:-20 19 | The DMR zoning proposal was a proposal |
| -01:-23 20 | up to the board to make a determination whether the | -01:-20 20 | made by an architectural firm that was hired by the |
| -01:-23 21 | applicant has shown that this site is particularly | -01:-20 21 | council to put forward proposed changes. |
| -01:-23 22 | suited for the proposed use | -01:-20 22 | It was never endorsed. It was never |
| -01:-23 23 | Q. Okay, but what I'm saying, and I think | -01:-20 23 | part of an amendment. The zoning that was proposed |
| $-01:-2324$ | I've answered it, which is, this dialogue as to | $\text { -01:-20 } 24$ | was never put in place. So all it was, it was a |
| -01:-23 25 | whether the building is rented, whether there's a LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | -01:-20 25 | proposal. <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| -01:-23 1 | demand, that has nothing to do with -- really deals | -01:-20 1 | So, yes, there may be standards that |
| -01:-22 2 | with the positive criteria in the context of our | -01:-20 2 | ey put -- |
| -01:-22 3 | presentation, does it? | -01:-20 3 | MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected |
| -01:-22 4 | A. All I was indicating is that it could, | -01:-20 4 | proposal? |
| -01:-22 5 | but in your case you've not made that argument. And | -01:-20 5 | THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon? |
| -01:-22 6 | I don't want the board to be led to believe that this | -01:-20 6 | MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal |
| -01:-22 7 | is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we | -01:-20 7 | and not adopted? |
| -01:-22 8 | agree on that. | -01:-20 8 | THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a |
| -01:-22 9 | Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears | -01:-20 9 | rejected proposal. They put it forward on two |
| -01:-22 10 | here now a little bit | -01:-20 10 | occasions, and on both occasions the borough could |
| -01:-22 11 | The DMR report that you've cited, along | -01:-20 11 | not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning |
| -01--22 12 | with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the | -01:-20 12 | in concert with that report, and so that discussion |
| -01:-22 13 | re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, | -01:-20 13 | has been tabled. That's the best way for me to |
| -01:-21 14 | there is a list of zoning specifications and it's | -01:-19 14 | characterize it. |
| -01:-21 15 | essentially identical to the one of DMR | -01:-19 15 | There was not an outright resolution on |
| -01:-21 16 | Are you familiar with that? | -01:-19 16 | the council to say we're not going to make the |
| -01:-21 17 | A. I did not notice that or make that | -01:-19 17 | changes, but there was also a decision from the |
| -01:-21 18 | comparison. | -01:-19 18 | council that we're not going to move forward with |
| -01:-21 19 | Q. But you have looked at the DMR? | -01:-19 19 | these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an |
| -01:-21 20 | A. Yes. | -01:-19 20 | official statement from the planning board or master |
| -01:-21 21 | Q. And, obviously, have you compared that | -01:-19 21 | plan or anything else. |
| -01:-21 22 | to our list of zoning parameters? | -01:-19 22 | BY MR. DELIA: |
| -01:-21 23 | A. I have not. | -01:-19 23 | Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's move on. |
| -01:-21 24 | Q. Would you? | -01:-19 24 | We'll talk about the '08 reexamination. |
| -01:-21 25 | Just give me a second, I will give you | -01:-19 25 | This is the one really where you say that we didn't |
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affordable housing to meet your unmet need.
And, basically, the settlement was negotiated, was done without that change.

So Fair Share Housing Center accepted
that, the borough could meet its unmet need
obligation as well as its prospective unmet need obligation without undertaking that result.
Q. Yet that same document also does require set aside, yes? A set aside of affordable housing in the event of a multiunit project such as ours?

## A. Right.

So, to be clear, both that document and an ordinance that was adopted and which has just been readopted, which changes the affordable housing regulations in Woodcliff Lake, basically says where you have a rezoning or a grant of variance or do a redevelopment and you produce more than five units, an inclusionary element is required.

So all it's saying is the zoning board is not obligated under the terms of that requirement to grant the variance; however, if it does grant the variance, it has to require that set aside. That's all it says.
Q. Okay. And it's obviously contemplated LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
-01:-13 1 in the context of this application, the set aside,
you brought it up at the first hearing I was at and you mentioned it many times.

Is that correct?
A. I don't think it was contemplated. All I said is that when the application was made, $I$ alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.
Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.

From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?
A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.

So that area, which is north of Highview, currently there's only one retail use, which is right on the corner, the rest of those properties, aside from the VFW, are single-family residential or vacant properties. So it has a
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completely different character and it has different zoning than the area south of Highview.
Q. It's similar in terms of its distance, essentially, to the train station, more or less, right?
A. It's probably closer, but not a substantial. I'm not disputing that the distance of this property to the train station does make it what I would characterize as a transit-oriented development, yes.
Q. But that small distance difference is what makes --
A. It doesn't make a difference.
Q. So there really is no major character distinction between these two properties, is there?
A. No, there's a very substantial difference. The property has been rezoned specifically for, you know, affordable housing in both of those instances. There is only one small retail use on the corner of Highview and Broadway, and the rest of the properties are residential, or, in the case of the VFW, it's a small institutional use or are vacant.

So the zoning history, the intent of the borough in terms of utilizing it for a
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residential project, it's in the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. There's a redevelopment plan in progress in which that is going to be developed for residential use.

Whereas, the area south of Broadway is not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.

So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done,

## Mr. Delia?

MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.

MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give everybody here an opportunity to speak, and that's a problem. That's a problem.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's not argue about
that.
MR. DELIA: If I may, I've been on my
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
and we came back here --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: No. No summation
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feet here now for six months. All right. And for many reasons, we've gone home, it had nothing to do with me.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's finish.
MR. DELIA: I'm really trying my
hardest to get it done. But, with all due respect, I need the liberty to properly --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I asked the question, okay.

MR. DELIA: Let me finish it with this.
BY MR. DELIA:
Q. We know that affordable housing is deemed by the courts to be an inherently beneficial use, correct?
A. I think you have to distinguish it.

An inclusionary affordable housing
development is not considered to be an inherently beneficial use. If you're a 100-percent affordable housing project, it is.

So your project is not an inherently beneficial use.
Q. Understood.

If there was a change in circumstances

86
right now. Okay. A question, okay?
BY MR. DELIA:
Q. Question: If we were to have a fully affordable project applied for here, let's say 100 units, is that something that you think we would, $A$, meet the positive criteria?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Objection. That's not your application.

MR. NEWMAN: Actually I'd like him to answer that, because that's not this application, that would be a completely different application, and I actually think that in the event that this was an application to satisfy our affordable housing in this application, it might make a difference.

THE WITNESS: So it's a hypothetical question. Obviously, just throwing it out and saying would you, I mean, it would depend on so many circumstances.

What I would say is that the burden of proof would change substantially if this was a 100-percent affordable housing project and the proofs would be different. We wouldn't be talking about an enhanced burden of proof under Medici, for example.

MR. DELIA: Well, again, do you -- I withdraw the question. I am concluded with this
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 her a break after he takes his question.

MR. HAYES: I just have a question. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Speak into the mic.

MR. HAYES: Is the idea that there are changed circumstances since the last reexamination mitigated in any respect by the fact that the council has considered mixed use in the Broadway corridor and purposely chosen not take any action?

THE WITNESS: I think one has to look
at all the changed circumstances in the past, you
know, 10-and-a-half, 11 years, so I think the applicant is correct, there has been a change, there's a greater awareness of TOD, there's been a change in the real estate market, but, at the same time, there have been actions that have been undertaken by the council with regard to consideration of zoning.

So I think the zoning board needs to
take all of those into consideration to determine whether the change in circumstances are sufficient in
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REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. But the mayor and council looked at the Broadway corridor at least three times, two in 2017, once towards the settlement for the affordable housing issue.

## A. Right.

Q. They were aware of any changed circumstances, and, in 2017, when they also looked at it, they were aware of any changed circumstances, as well as in 2018.

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, I would say so. I mean, you know, the presentations and the consideration were done within the context of those changed circumstances. You know, TOD, revitalizing the downtown, creating more retail space, those were all circumstances which had been changed in which the council was aware of when they weighed those considerations.

MR. DELIA: But it was not done in the context of a master plan reexamination?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812


CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: For Mr. Preiss? MR. NEWMAN: Nope, only Mr. Preiss. Mr. Couto, don't be afraid if you don't have one. MR. COUTO: No, no.
The zoning laws that apply would be the
zoning laws active in May 2018, is that of the application time?

THE WITNESS: There's something known
as time of application, which means that the application is bound by the zoning that existed at the time that the application was deemed complete, not at the time when the application was decided.

MR. COUTO: Was deemed complete.
So the zoning laws could encompass a
year?
THE WITNESS: Yes, if after that period of time the zoning law had changed, it would not apply to this property in terms of the use variance, unless it made it a permitted use, and, under those circumstances, there would be an acknowledgment that the new laws would apply.

But if there were changes which, you
know, which created further inconsistencies or variances, that would not apply to this particular project.
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CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?

MR. HAYES: Mr. --
MR. COUTO: My question is --
MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.

Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?

MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.

So I'm just trying to get a
clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's
your point?
THE WITNESS: The master plan
reexamination was still valid at the time the
application was made. It's no longer that's the case.

MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess that counsel will have to decide.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next question.
MR. COUTO: I have another question.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

Are you familiar with the size of north
of Highview, the properties that were assigned for affordable housing, the size of those properties in relation to 188 , are they similar, slightly larger or smaller, from your point of view?

THE WITNESS: When you say
"properties," what are you referring to?
MR. COUTO: The ones that are being set aside for affordable housing.

THE WITNESS: The three properties that are being set aside?

MR. COUTO: Yes, the three together.
THE WITNESS: It's 2.45 acres, the
three properties together.
MR. COUTO: So it's a little smaller, slightly smaller than this application.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. COUTO: Okay. Were you at the last
council meeting where they had the proposals for those affordable housing was reviewed?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. COUTO: So from what I recall, and you tell me if I'm incorrect, was three applications --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We're talking
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about this testimony tonight.
MR. COUTO: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened
at another meeting.
MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.

So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24 , and one for 25 .

MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.

MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.
MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they
propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?

THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this
application.
MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much.
Thank you.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.
I just have two questions for the
planner.
Has the applicant clearly demonstrated
that 188 Broadway is not suited for office use?
THE WITNESS: I think I've made my
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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testimony clear, and it's up to the board to make

MS. LEVINE: Okay. So that question would be for all of you.

Last question.
Has the applicant demonstrated that 188
Broadway is peculiarly suited to be a 60-unit apartment complex?

THE WITNESS: Again, that's a decision

I presented, you know, my opinion with regard to certain aspects of the plan, the board has to take that into consideration to determine whether this site is particularly suited.

MS. LEVINE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. CABRERA: Hi. Ulises Cabrera, 14 Dorchester Road, Woodcliff Lake.

Before I start, I just want to thank the members of the zoning board for their dedicated service to the borough.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You can thank us
by asking him a question right now.
(Laughter.)
MR. CABRERA: You're adding time too.
Excuse me for repeating this question,
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because I know you've probably answered it, but does the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?

THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.

MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?

THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.

And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions that the borough has taken, and you could look at changed circumstances. At the end of the day, the board is going to have to make that call.

MR. CABRERA: Thank you.
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Does the addition of 60 units that this applicant is proposing increase Woodcliff Lake's population due to the units that are being rented, and does that have an impact on the borough's requirement of affordable housing with the State of New Jersey? In other words, does it increase our overall avocation once this settlement with fair share housing has expired?

THE WITNESS: The answer is, it will increase the population and it has no impact on the obligation.

MR. CABRERA: Does it have an impact on affordable housing units --

THE WITNESS: No.
MR. CABRERA: -- that were required, by increasing the population.

THE WITNESS: So let me see if I can put it in context.

There was a period of time when the Council on Affordable Housing adopted rules that basically said the amount of affordable housing that would have to be provided is proportional to the growth that's induced. That's no longer the situation. The factors which determine the numbers of affordable housing is not generally or
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specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.

MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.

I just have a few questions for Richard.

With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?

MR. NEWMAN: If you know.
THE WITNESS: During my tenure?
MS. DISPOTO: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Twice.
MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?
THE WITNESS: So let me just say,
basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't consider, it is also something that they said this is not something that we would consider, they said we can't make a decision, there's no consensus and so they pushed it off. So the point is that the zoning
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has remained in place where this use is prohibited.
MS. DISPOTO: But the Broadway corridor ordinance was actually introduced before the mayor and council in November of 2016, and then it had a second introduction in December of 2017 and it was --

MR. DELIA: Objection.
MS. DISPOTO: Do you recall that?
THE WITNESS: No.
MS. DISPOTO: Okay. I'll withdraw it. You talked about the density on this project at the beginning. Can you tell me what the density is for this particular project?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall what it is.

MS. DISPOTO: Do you know how many units per acre?

THE WITNESS: Like 16.9, if I recall. MS. DISPOTO: And do you know if Woodcliff Lake has any other projects in play or any other existing complexes with this density that are not affordable housing related, are you aware?

THE WITNESS: No.
MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware of anything

```
MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware -- for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?
THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.
MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?
THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's --
MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7
per acre.
MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet
need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you
called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."
```

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: Can you explain to the board and to the public what that means, that it's "aspirational"?

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

THE WITNESS: Yes -- well, to some extent.

So when a community is obligated to meet its fair share housing, it has to take certain actions to meet what's called its "perspective of future affordable housing obligation." So it has to undertake direct action, such as rezoning in Woodcliff Lake's case, extending affordable controls; it may be obligated, as Woodcliff Lake has in this particular situation, obligated itself to build 16 units of affordable housing. Those are all direct actions.

You know, in regard to the unmet need, the way that is done is that is not something that is necessary going to occur, but mechanisms are put in place so that if circumstances allow it, that development will go forward.

So let's take two examples. One is the Teaber (phonetic) office building. At the time that we mediated the fair share agreement, that building was vacant.

There was a proposal that was floated by a developer to convert that into senior housing.
So at that particular time, we thought that the borough thought that that was a possibility, it
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wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.

Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.

So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.

So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.

MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?

THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share Housing is concerned, they're satisfied.

At the fairness hearing, the court
indicated that the plan was fair, and we have to go
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back to the judge for, you know, a compliance hearing.

But my understanding is that the borough doesn't have to undertake any further rezonings, grant any variances or do any redevelopment outside of what is in the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan in order to be compliant with its unmet need.

MS. DISPOTO: Okay.
And counsel for the applicant asked you about the mandatory set aside that this borough now has for future multifamily development, and you're aware of that and you talked about that.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: The borough recently passed an ordinance with the planning board and a first introduction at the mayor and council that you worked on, 19-05, which is that affordable housing control ordinance that counsel referred to.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: Is there a provision in that ordinance that states that the set aside requirement does not give developers the right to any such rezoning variances or other relief or establishes any obligation on the part of the
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Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.

Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?

THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.

MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?

THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.

MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other
questions for Mr. Preiss?
Okay.
MR. NEWMAN: If anybody else has any
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questions, perhaps form a line to speed it up.
MS. APPELLE: Veronica Appelle, 23
Cressfield Court.
Mr. Preiss, I must be mistaken, but I prepared questions for the beautification of Broadway corridor that you were tasked with from this board to come before the board as the planner. Am I wrong?

THE WITNESS: Okay, so that is a separate matter. Our firm prepared design standards for the Broadway corridor, which would be additional regulations that would be added to the site plan standards for any development within the Broadway corridor. So that was introduced by the council, it's going to come back, not to the zoning board, but to the planning board for consistency review in July, and then it will be considered for adoption by the council thereafter. So that's the status of that.

This application, because it was deemed complete back in 2018, even if it were adopted and the board had made its decision, would not be subject to those requirements.

MS. APPELLE: And vice versa? I mean, how does --

THE WITNESS: The merits of this application rests on what the application has
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proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.

So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is
considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.
MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming
up.
MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins, Woodcliff Lake.

Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?

THE WITNESS: They have done so now. There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so, not that I recall.

MS. HIGGINS: Was there a discussion in 2018?

THE WITNESS: There has been some discussion in the borough about perhaps doing a new
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| 00:-36 1 | master plan, but there was no direction given out to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:-36 2 | our firm, nor did we commit to doing a master plan |
| 00:-36 3 | update or reexamination. |
| 00:-36 4 | MS. HIGGINS: Okay. So nothing was |
| 00:-36 5 | requested of your firm during 2018? |
| 00:-36 6 | THE WITNESS: That's correct. |
| 00:-36 7 | MS. HIGGINS: On the planning board? |
| 00:-36 8 | THE WITNESS: That's correct. |
| 00:-36 9 | MS. HIGGINS: Because there's only one |
| 00:-36 10 | meeting in 2018 of the planning board. |
| 00:-36 11 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 00:-36 12 | MS. HIGGINS: Okay. Thank you. |
| 00:-36 13 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You remember that |
| 00:-36 14 | one meeting. |
| 00:-36 15 | THE WITNESS: I do remember that one |
| 00:-36 16 | meeting. |
| 00:-36 17 | MS. HIGGINS: I remember. |
| 00:-36 18 | MR. NEWMAN: Again, seeing no one in |
| 00:-36 19 | line, I would like to make a motion to close to the |
| 00:-36 20 | public. |
| 00:-36 21 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. |
| 00:-36 22 | MR. HAYES: Second. |
| 00:-36 23 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? |
| 00:-36 24 | (Whereupon, all resent members respond |
| 00:-36 25 | in the affirmative.) |
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CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little
bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you
have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.

So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.

And I can tell you that if we hear
imony, I'm going to ask you not to do repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do
it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And if the testimony takes too long, doesn't get right to the point, it may impact the amount of time that the public has to make comments. So just be aware of
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that, those who are testifying, that you could cut into the comment portion, we might have to limit the comment times and divide it up.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No! MS. BORRELLI: Wait. For
clarification, are you saying that not everyone will be able to even comment, is that what you're saying?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I didn't say that. MS. BORRELLI: Okay. Just for clarification, so everyone will get a chance to comment?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We might have to
divide up the time. You know, we have to see how things go.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Is that a zoning board rule?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Pardon me? AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Is that a zoning board rule or your rule? To maybe limit it -MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's a statutory rule, okay.

MR. COUTO: Let me ask you a question.
What documents do you want to share with council? I didn't understand exactly what you wanted to give in, what you said?
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-
want to share?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I

MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.

MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any
handouts.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I
don't know what they are.
MR. COUTO: So when we give the
handouts?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.

MR. COUTO: Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to
move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.
We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to get to a resolution.

So I'm not suggesting that anyone not be given an opportunity, I'm suggesting that you
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should use the time valuably and not to repeat the same questions or the same comments, when we get to that point.

So let's get to testimony. And as I said, the priority would be those who reside within 200 feet.

Sally Gellert, you indicated that you wanted to testify.

MR. PREISS: Sorry. Brian just arrived and Evan has to testify before the public.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We were going to go out of order.

MR. PREISS: I think the public should hear that testimony before they comment. I hate to say it but...

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You did.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Brian, come on in.
(Mr. Intindola is now present at 10:00
p.m.)

MR. INTINDOLA: Hello, everyone.
MR. DELIA: Don't sit down.
MR. INTINDOLA: You had a long day so
MR. NEWMAN: You don't know the half of

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, we're going to put you right to work.

MR. INTINDOLA: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: So raise your right
hand.
Do you swear or affirm to tell the
truth under penalties of law?
MR. INTINDOLA: Yes, I do.
BRIAN A. INTINDOLA, P.E., c/o Neglia
Engineering Associates, 34 Park Avenue, Lyndhurst, New Jersey 07071, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:

MR. PRINCIOTTO: State your full name.
MR. INTINDOLA: Yes.
Brian A Intindola. Spelling of my last name, I-N-T-I-N-D-O-L-A.

I'm a principal at Neglia Engineering
Associates and serve as their principal traffic
engineer.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. Okay. Can you give us quickly the benefit of your educational background and qualifications.
A. Yes.
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I'm a graduate of NJIT, with a
bachelor's and also a master's. I'm a licensed professional engineer, and I've been serving 20 such years as a municipal traffic engineer for this scale type of project and also traffic signals and reviewing engineering and an engineer for applicants in similar scale.

So this is basically my niche in terms of traffic engineering.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any questions on the qualifications?

MR. DELIA: None. Thank you.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. Your position with the zoning board in the Borough of Woodcliff Lake?
A. Yes.

Right now I serve as the traffic engineer on behalf of the zoning board of Woodcliff Lake.
Q. You're familiar with the property that is the subject of this application?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And can you describe for us the closest intersection to the site?
A. Well, there is the actual intersection, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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Broadway, Woodcliff Lake that is just to the north of
us and also serves as access to the New Jersey
Transit station as well as what we'll call the
"Causeway" to get to the other side of Woodcliff
Lake.
Q. Now, it's a difficult intersection to describe, but it is not what you would call a typical intersection.

## Is that correct?

A. Correct.
Q. What aspects of it are not typical?
A. Well, one is that the train does cause a regular interruption of flow, and in that you get a traffic signal that calls for red to avoid, you know, vehicles going across the railroad crossing. So one element is that it's a skewed intersection. It also has the geometric interruption of the railroad tracks, which also furthers askew and has its own demands of itself.
Q. Can you describe for someone who would read this transcript the alignment of the Causeway at Highview, and explain how they relate to one another?
A. Well, basically, if you were to

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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negotiate going from Highview across, you'd have to chicane through the intersection, and that is what is your through movement.

And because it is a connector, because
you have the rest of the auto body in your way, it's
not like one of few connection points that you can avail yourself to get to the other side of Woodcliff Lake, so it has that function as well.

So it is a hard-working intersection and it's slightly geometrically unique.
Q. Now, how many traffic lights are there at that intersection?
A. Well, in its totality, it is a signal. If I were to count the heads, it would be more than ordinary. Typically, you would have two to three traffic indicators.

In this instance, you probably have 50 percent more, just to account for in giving the motorists the adequate read they need to know whether to go forward, that they have a green light to go through.
Q. Now, the Causeway, when you approach a train station, the Causeway --

MR. DELIA: Excuse me. I have to interject here. We're talking about off-site
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conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of
-- existing off-site conditions. To the degree that
impacts were discussed, they were discussed by
Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we
narrow the focus to the impact of this project and
not continue to have this talk of existing conditions
that are off-site, especially in the context of the
county approval that we received.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress
to this property, the applicant's property, is within
the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think
it's on the record of this particular intersection
and that there is, I think, issues and the record
should have a description of this particular
intersection which --
MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection.
You can continue.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. What direction does the Causeway head
as you approach the train station; does it take a
bend to the right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. And if that Causeway
went straight, would it align with Highview?
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions county approval that we received.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record intersection which --

MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection.
You can continue.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a bend to the right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. And if that Causeway

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
A. If it was able to, but right now the geometry prevents that from happening.
Q. Well, that's because there's a building there, correct?
A. Right, right.
Q. The way it was built, correct?
A. Right.
Q. Does that particular configuration of this, you know, intersection pose any traffic issues or concerns to you?
A. Well, other than the train station or the commuter line taking green time away from the intersection, it is not a totally unusual intersection in Bergen County, because we have a lot of skew intersections, because, you know, if you go back and you want to hear the whole story of Bergen County, there was property lines along property lines, that's where the roads forms, and sometimes the property lines and the roads didn't really line-up, so sometimes you'll have offset intersections or at least you're going through a skew.

So excepting the train station
facility, the geometry is not unusual in Bergen
County, and it's typically because it is managed by a
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traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.
Sometimes when you have a stop sign,
it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.
Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.

Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?
A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17 th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less, but, specifically, if you were looked at that traffic movement in the morning, the way it was presented by the applicant, there would be seven more left turns that would not be there if it remained an office use.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

So the differential in that one
critical turn, in my mind, would be seven more over the peak hour. You have 60 minutes, you have seven additional cars.

The other turn that is different would
be in the PM, which would be the southbound left into
the site, and in that instance, people are returning home from work. And the way the applicant has presented, and I don't disagree with it, would be eight additional left turns that would be more than what the office presents.

So that is the specific differential in the project, but in the context of the total trip generation being less than the resumption of the office space, but, you know, at full occupancy. And to put that into context, I'm just going to look at the trip generation as presented. And so for the office, it would have 66 total AM trips and 50 total PM trips, single peak hour each, compared to 29 residential trips in the morning and 37 residential trips in the evening.

So globally the trips are less, the vehicle trips are less, but, locally, with those two specific movements, the left turn out, there's an increase of seven, and the left turn in in the
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afternoon is an increase of eight.
So that is the difference of the two uses.
Q. Do you have any recommendations to the board --
A. Well, the difficulty is that --
Q. -- from a traffic standpoint?
A. Yeah.

The difficulty is that we have the
queue of the traffic signal that we just discussed.
When it's green -- I mean when it's red, it backwashes across the subject site in the context of any use would experience that queue.

So what I've done in the past, and I don't know if the applicant would be amenable to it, is to bring this to the attention of the county, regardless of whether they're approved or not, and see if they can put a do not block the box striping at the driveway that takes care of a couple of things.

If it's respected, and it is after a while, people get used to it, if it's respected, then those left turns that need to get out can get out, because there's a gap made, some traffic engineers will testify that people can get out anyway because a
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courtesy gap is provided in the flow of traffic, and what I'm finding in driving behavior, the courtesy gaps are less and less. You're at the driveway, someone waives you on or like no, I'm not letting you go. What I'm saying is if there is a do not block the box painted and there's any number of signage that we can put as do not block the box or whatever, that can be under the county purview, then that takes care of two things.

> One, the left turns in can access the site, which would be the southbound turns, and also the left turns out in the morning can get out if there is a traffic signal or the train is holding up traffic, then they can have the courtesy gap, which is pretty much memorialized by painting the do not block the box, and the reason why I say that is because the alternative is if you do a right in, right out. You know, I'm thinking about this as I heard the testimony in the hearings, I think it presents more issues than it solves. So you have, you know, you say if you want to make a left, but you made the right turn out and come back around, you really have to come back around, it's not like one block around, it's a while. So we're trying to avoid that. So the applicant's traffic should stay where
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it belongs, and that's on Washington. And if we provide the do not block the box striping, I think that solves that problem. You know, and not to go on and on --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Broadway?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Broadway.
Broadway. Sorry.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. We all knew what you meant.
A. Broadway, and I was thinking about Colonial times and Washington, that's what happens to me, I get a little cross wired sometimes.

So that being said, and then I think that solves the problem or the issue where it belongs where it should be at the location.
Q. I'm going to ask one question.

If you have this do not block the box
and people don't honor it, then there is potential for traffic to backup on Broadway?
A. Well, it is as it exists, and we heard from their traffic engineer that it certainly does go past the driveway. And I think that do we have the opportunity to correct that here, and I have implemented it, people do respect it and they'll be times when people don't respect it, but, overall, it LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
seems to be a plausible solution for an inconvenience that the site experiences now under the existing condition.
Q. Any other comments on the traffic?
A. I think that the applicant had testified that they are going to provide a sidewalk down the driveway. And if this is positioned as a transportation or transit-oriented development or somewhere in that shade of development, that certainly should be provided, because that would be conducive for people that live there to walk down the driveway and be on the sidewalk, as opposed to in the driveway, and I think that would be a good recommendation to move forward.
(Veronica Appelle letter is marked as exhibit O-1 for identification.) BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. I'm going to show you what we marked as O-1, which is a letter to me from Veronica Appelle, which certain attachments.

Mr. Delia has a copy of it.
MR. DELIA: And once again for the record, I object to parts of that, which were received at noon today.

THE WITNESS: And it is a cover letter,
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handwritten cover letter. I'm sure it was entered into the record. I don't want to belabor that. BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. All right. Just very quickly, I submitted this to you, you've reviewed this before.
A. I had the opportunity to read through it, yes.
Q. And the information on what was the handwritten date of August 7, 2018, the data there with regard to trips and 60 dwellings and 600 trips for a 24 -hour period, are you familiar where that data came from?
A. Yeah, the plausible source of that would be from the Residential Site Improvement Standards, which reports per a dwelling, I believe it's a single-family detached, it would be 10 trips on a 24-hour basis, and it doesn't say this explicitly, but I'm just drawing from what I know, that probably came from RSIS, which is a typical calculation to figure out the number of trips when you're designing the type of road that a residential project would host.
Q. Okay. So the Residential Site

Improvement Standards would have this particular data?
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```
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. All right. It's not inconsistent with
A. No, it's not inconsistent and I'm just surmising based on the number of \(\mathbf{1 0}\) trips per day.
Q. And the next exhibit is something issued by the traffic bureau, Woodcliff Lake Police Department, dated December 13, 2018, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Avenue. Let's just focus on the Broadway.
```

A. Okay.
Q. Are you familiar with these statistics
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and traffic counts?
A. Yes.

In the read through, it reports
approximately 4,500 trips on December 4th, going Broadway southbound for a 24 -hour period.

And then Broadway northbound, approximately 5,500 vehicles, not trips, on December 6th.
Q. These are traffic counts, right?
A. These are 24-hour, it looks like they are tube counts that they did, $I$ don't know the exact LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
methodology that they did, but it looks that way.
And then what I can say about this is
not that I did the data myself, but it is consistent
with what the applicant's traffic engineer has reported in his previous testimony.

So it's kind of like another data point
to confirm both the peak hour and the 24 hours that
have been previously reported by the expert's [sic] traffic engineer.

So like when I look at the data, I see Broadway southbound and Broadway northbound, and if I just rule of thumb heuristically look at this, it's about 450 peak hour trips southbound and 550 peak hour trips northbound, which is in the order or the scale of magnitude as reported by the applicant's traffic engineer, so it kind of converges on that same data, so it seems to be consistent.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I don't have any other questions.

MR. HAYES: I have two quick questions related to trip generation.

So the trip generation, you stated, per
the applicant's expert witness is less, but that only
relates to the designated peak hours, correct?
THE WITNESS: Less with the reported
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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| $00:-13$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | peak hours, yes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $00:-13$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | MR. HAYES: So, in your opinion, which |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | use do you think generates more trips in the 22 other |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | off-peak hours? |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | THE WITNESS: Well, that's what we |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | design. So, then, there are like, say, to answer |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | your question -- |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | MR. HAYES: I understand you studied |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | it, how you gear the study to measure the peak hours. |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | For these two particular uses we're |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | talking about, a residential use or a commercial use, |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | for the remainder of the day that is not that peak |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | hour, including weekends, which use generates more |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | total trips? $\quad$ THE WITNESS: I would think that it |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | would be comparable. Like in terms of order of |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | wor |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | magnitude over 24 hours, like it would be a similar |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | trip generation with a little bit more on the |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | weekends when people are home, because typical |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | offices are 9 to 5 and closed on Saturday, depending |
| $00:-12$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | on the office. So then specific to a Saturday, the |
| $00:-11$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | Saturday peak hours for a residential use are similar |
| $00:-11$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | to -- |
| $00:-11$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | MR. HAYES: I'm not talking about peak |
| $00:-11$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | hours, I'm talking about all other times. |
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00:-11 1 question. board.

THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.

MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?

THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.

I'm not prepared to answer your

MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you

THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.

MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.

THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the

MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.
THE WITNESS: There's actual data from
the ITE that shows you and takes you through the 24-hour bell curve of trip generation or the sinusoid through trip generation for both the residential use and for the commercial use.

Unfortunately, I don't have that data
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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with me right now, because I was focusing on the peak hour.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other questions?

MR. SPIRIG: Yeah, I have one.
You were given a copy of the
conditional approval by the Bergen County Planning
Board. Have you seen a copy of that?
THE WITNESS: I haven't.
MR. SPIRIG: Then I won't ask.
Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to open to the
public?
MR. HAYES: Motion to open to the
public.
MR. SPIRIG: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?
(Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. If you have
a question for this witness, yes, for this witness.
MR. COUTO: I just have a quick question.
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MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.
(Laughter.)
MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.
Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?

THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.

MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?

THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.
MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint"


THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.
It is a joint effort with Bergen
County, New Jersey Transit, and NJ DOT.
MR. COUTO: That our town can initiate?
THE WITNESS: They can always initiate
that, and I'd be glad to talk to Bergen County to see
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812


| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | not received resolution on was regarding vehicle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | circulation throughout the site. I had some |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | questions and concerns about the fire truck turning |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | throughout the site and we've requested electronic |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | files with the turning templates to review, and to |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | date I have not received that. I reached out |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | multiple times, I have not received those. |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | Q. And what is your concern about those? |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | A. The exhibit that the applicant's |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | traffic engineer brought to the meeting showed the |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | fire truck in conflict with a parking space, meaning |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | that the fire truck, in order to make a turning |
| $00:-05$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | maneuver, would be clipping or impacting potentially |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | something in that parking space there. It's a |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | relatively minor conflict that I think could be |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | resolved, but I have not seen a resolution of that. |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | And, additionally, the fire truck |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | pictured in the turning template does not appear to |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | visually match the fire truck that the fire |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | department has required them to analyze. |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | It could just be a graphical issue, |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | which is why I asked for the electronic files, to |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | verify it, but without anything to verify it, that's |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | still a concern of ours. |
| $00:-04$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Any other comments or recommendations |

00:-04 1
to the board?
A. Just that the conditions in my letter, if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?

Motion to open -- oh, sorry.
MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.
Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county --

THE WITNESS: I did.
MR. SPIRIG: -- document?
So there's a number of references. The
reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.

In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way? THE WITNESS: No.
Generally summarizing, a lot of those requirements are for improvements to existing county infrastructure for the application, which is very typical on jobs that require county approval, like
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upgrading the handicapped curb ramps at the intersections, replacing curbs that may be broken or deficient to county standards; nothing in the county's conditional approval that would significantly impact the design or the plans that have been presented, in my opinion.

MR. SPIRIG: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Anybody
else?

Motion to open to the public?
MR. KAUFMAN: So moved.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Second? MR. HAYES: Second. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? (Whereupon, all resent members respond
in the affirmative.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody from the public who wishes to ask the engineer a question?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not seeing anybody
standing in line, motion to close for the public?
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Motion to close.
MR. NEWMAN: Second.
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CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
(No response.)
MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.
THE WITNESS: I got off easy.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.

Sally Gellert is the first person.
MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a
motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Extend to what? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, past 10:30. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: As long as it
takes?
11:30, okay.
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to extend?
MR. HAYES: So moved.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Second?
MR. SPIRIG: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?
(Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
MR. NEWMAN: Opposed.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: He flew from
somewhere else today, that's why it's the next day for him.

Okay. Ms. Gellert.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I need to swear you
in.
Raise your right hand.
Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?

MS. GELLERT: I do.
SALLY GELLERT,
210 Broadway, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey,
having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
MS. GELLERT: Okay. I have taken some pictures of our property. I heard that there will be no impact to my view, and, yet, when I sit behind my
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driveway looking across at 188, I can see a corner of the building now.

Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?

MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?

MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?

MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.

So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview, looking across, and then I looked up the street, up to the Highview property to locate it.

And I've got also a view from across the front of our property on the street, where I am sure that's a desire path from people who are rushing LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

00:00 1
to get the train. I've rush to get the train. You
run out the last possible minute, and through our front yard is the quickest way to get there. There is a bit of a grade question, but I don't know. And there are steps right now on the side by our house. So, you know, so I've got a bunch of pictures.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to mark that for identification, O-2.
(One page double-sided photographs is marked as exhibit 0-2 for identification.)

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is there writing on there?

MS. GELLERT: It's just my descriptions of what I was photographing, you know, how can someone say the southern view would not change --

COURT REPORTER: Sorry. Speak slower. MS. GELLERT: Okay.
Above left side steps of building on north side, and so forth descriptors.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can you please show it to Mr. Delia.

MS. GELLERT: Okay.
MR. DELIA: Okay. No objection.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You wish to submit that to the board as evidence?
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```
MS. GELLERT: Sure.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other
testimony?
MS. GELLERT: Let's see.
Okay. So I've got the -- okay.
I understand that the traffic studies
are done in a manner consistent with others
throughout the community, state and country --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment
or --
MS. GELLERT: I don't know.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay.
I don't think you're a traffic expert.
MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic
expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you.
MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You
know, this is new.
Yeah, and also I heard this described
as a catalyst to further development.
Well, you know, we've got --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That sounds like a
comment.
```
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MS. GELLERT: That's a comment, add it to the end. Okay.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
MS. GELLERT: Where do I leave this, right here?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can leave that right there.

MR. NEWMAN: What did we mark that?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: O-2.
O-1 was the Appelle letter.
Next on the list, Veronica Appelle. I think I covered your exhibit, which I marked O-1, that Mr. Intindola testified about.

MS. APPELLE: Only if you gave all of that same information to everyone else on this board and the public.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we have --
MS. APPELLE: But I haven't.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I think --
MS. APPELLE: I don't think they've
seen it. They've commented and talked in the ether about it, and people remember more when they're visual learner. You've never seen that.

MR. NEWMAN: I got a great idea, why don't you pass them all here?

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and
 MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { MR. DELIA: Thank you. }\end{aligned}$ MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
 MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad$ MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.
Sorry about that.
MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?
MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have
copies for the entire public too, of what the police
chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the
planning board knows.
MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to
Mr. Delia. $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { MR. DELIA: Thank you. } \\ & \text { MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like }\end{aligned}$
to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because --

MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't -- no arguments.

MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first.
MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the
00:03 21 MR. DELIA. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm
$00: 0322$ Chair. I'm
00:03 23 not trying to be antagonistic. I'm simply making a
00:03 24 legal position, which is that all these documents
00:03 25 have no foundation. We heard from Mr. Intindola on
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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00:04 1
one of them that his best guess is where his source is, and he doesn't know. This is all hearsay.

So, for all of those reasons, again,
primarily starting with no foundation, let's start
there, and the hearsay. The two together in my
opinion are objectionable.
That's all I have to say.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think
Mr. Intindola did provide some foundation. They're consistent with what's in the RSIS.

MR. DELIA: He said as best he could guess under the circumstances, that's what he said. He does not know where these numbers come from, he can only guess. There is no foundation. We don't have a source. We don't have a citation.

MR. NEWMAN: Is this one document or several documents?

MS. APPELLE: They're numbered 1, 2, 3.
The first one is the police chief's, goes to the police chief --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: There's an attachment that's not evidence.

Don't look at the last page.
MS. APPELLE: Oh, the last page is just pictures.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MR. NEWMAN: The last page.
MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.

If you want to make comment. I marked as $0-1$ is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.

MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?

MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.

MR. SPIRIG: It's from --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a
sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.

MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018
is the date of the letter. And this is a business
record of the Woodcliff Lake Police Department.
MR. DELIA: There is no foundation on
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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 00:07 25 of one letter.

00:07 1
00:07 2
00:07 3
00:07 4
00:07 5 00:07 6 00:08 7 00:08 8 00:08 9 00:08 10 00:08 11 00:08 12 00:08 13 00:08 14 00:08 15 00:08 16 00:08 17 00:08 18 00:08 19 00:08 20 00:08 21 00:08 22 00:08 23 00:08 24 00:08 25
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

150

MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.

MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.

MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?

MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you
should have had this to review, because that's why I
gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff
and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.

MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did
was --
MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible
information.
MS. APPELLE: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know.
MS. APPELLE: Well, Mr. Intindola
didn't even mention Woodcliff Avenue with the 4,041 vehicles.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It was open to the
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
201-641-1812
public. If you wanted to ask him a question about it, you could. He indicated traffic counts.

MS. APPELLE: He only did half.
MR. NEWMAN: In defense of the
applicant, how is the applicant responsible for the number of vehicles on Woodcliff Avenue?

MS. APPELLE: They're not, but these counts were done when their 60 units weren't built and when no one was in the office building.

So these high numbers will only get much higher.

MR. NEWMAN: How do you know that?
MS. APPELLE: Well, doesn't it stand,
600 trips --
MR. NEWMAN: Whoa. One second. Okay.
It's a letter dated 2018, but it doesn't say when these counts were done.

MS. APPELLE: Yes, it does, November 28th, December 12th, December 4th, and December 6, 2018.

MR. NEWMAN: Okay. For what they're worth.

MS. APPELLE: Well, before anyone built anything and when the office building had no people in it going to and from, that was my point.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
201-641-1812

00:08 1

| 00:10 1 | would go back to the planning board, you would see |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:10 2 | what he said in here is accurate. It's been given by |
| 00:10 3 | the traffic experts to the planning board, which |
| 00:10 4 | states really -- |
| 00:10 5 | MR. DELIA: For the record, this is the |
| 00:10 6 | zoning board. |
| 00:10 7 | MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but they all work |
| 00:10 8 | together. |
| 00:10 9 | MR. DELIA: No, they're independent |
| 00:10 10 | bodies. |
| 00:10 11 | MS. APPELLE: Okay. |
| 00:10 12 | MR. DELIA: Independent quasi-judicial |
| 00:10 13 | bodies that should not have an interrelationship in |
| 00:10 14 | terms of sharing information, evidence that's out of |
| 00:10 15 | context. |
| 00:10 16 | MS. APPELLE: In your opinion it's out |
| 00:10 17 | of context. |
| 00:10 18 | MR. DELIA: In my opinion, there's no |
| 00:10 19 | foundation for these documents. In my opinion, they |
| 00:10 20 | are hearsay. That is my opinion. |
| 00:10 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I think |
| 00:10 22 | Mr. Intindola indicated that these traffic counts are |
| 00:10 23 | not any different than the traffic counts that your |
| 00:10 24 | expert came up with. |
| 00:10 25 | MR. DELIA: He said they were close. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well --

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MS. APPELLE: Common sense.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm not certain that you're qualified to do that.

MS. APPELLE: Well, I think everyone is
kind of qualified to do that. That makes sense. It
would be common sense to expect that the traffic
through Woodcliff Lake will be substantially increased.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like you want to make a comment that you are concerned about the traffic conditions, and if you want to make that comment --

MS. APPELLE: And safety, yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: -- then you can make that when we get to comments. You see, this is what I mean, you're not testifying about anything that you have personal knowledge about, and it's going to cut into the time that people have to make comments.

MS. APPELLE: Well, it's not going to do, because we're going to be here until we've all had our five minutes of comments. I didn't know the procedure, I did the best I could with it, and we'll see how it goes.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
I can't read the name, it looks like
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

00:12 1 it's Walter Appelle.
MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody
else or do I have to go?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the
list. Then we're going to move to people who don't
live within 200 feet.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.

MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.
MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.

MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.
MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak
again?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We heard from you
for six months.
MR. DELIA: That's totally
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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MR. MARSON: I'm happy to do it as commentary, if you like, your decision. I'm happy to do it as commentary.

MR. NEWMAN: All right. Let them figure it out.

MR. DELIA: You know, three pages plus
exhibits, so for me to sit here now and say yes or no, I can't do it. I don't know. All I can tell you is what is alleged are conflicts of interest which are factual in nature to start with.

So mere documentation to prove such an allegation I think is inappropriate, without direct personal knowledge attached to that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. All right. This is what I'm going to do on this. I'm going to defer on this. It looks more like comments to me, so let me see what else we have, and then we'll come back to this. Okay?

MR. MARSON: I should sit?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And then I'll come back to you.

MR. NEWMAN: Let's see if there are some simpler issues.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ann Marie Borrelli, you said you have a handout. I don't know what the

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?
MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures
from my front window and I took a picture from the
deck of the house across the street from me at 15
Cressfield Court.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.

You're going to testify. Okay.
You have photographs, correct?
MS. BORRELLI: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?

MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.
Yes.
ANN MARIE BORRELLI,
18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your
name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?
MS. BORRELLI: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You took these
photographs. When did you take the photographs?
MS. BORRELLI: I took these in the
beginning of April.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

|  | 161 |  | 163 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:17 1 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Of? | 00:19 1 | MS. BORRELLI: I don't know. It was in |
| 00:17 2 | MS. BORRELLI: Of 2019. | 00:19 2 | April. |
| 00:17 3 | And I took these pictures to prove, | 00:19 3 | So, as you can see, though, and so |
| 00:17 4 | contrary to testimony that no one's view would be | 00:19 4 | there was testimony that there's trees there, so we |
| 00:17 5 | obstructed, so I took these pictures to show that | 00:20 5 | don't see the lake. |
| 00:17 6 | indeed there would be an obstruction of view. | 00:20 6 | MR. NEWMAN: This is a picture that you |
| 00:18 7 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: How many pictures did | 00:20 7 | took on or about April 20th? Sometime in April? |
| 00:18 8 | you take? | 00:20 8 | MS. BORRELLI: Sometime before -- |
| 00:18 9 | MS. BORRELLI: There's two pictures, | 00:20 9 | MR. NEWMAN: And you took that |
| 00:18 10 | and I have copies. | 00:20 10 | photograph? |
| 00:18 11 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You gave two to | 00:20 11 | MS. BORRELLI: I took it, yes. |
| 00:18 12 | Mr. Delia just now? | 00:20 12 | MR. NEWMAN: And where were you |
| 00:18 13 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes. | 00:20 13 | standing when you took that photograph? |
| 00:18 14 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. | 00:20 14 | MS. BORRELLI: I was standing looking |
| 00:18 15 | MS. BORRELLI: And I have them marked | 00:20 15 | out my front window. |
| 00:18 16 | to show the area of the lake, and I have it marked to | 00:20 16 | MR. NEWMAN: And that photograph |
| 00:18 17 | show that from the deck of the homes on where the | 00:20 17 | standing outside your front window is a photograph of |
| 00:18 18 | backyards overlook the proposed apartment, that they | 00:20 18 | your view of the lake? |
| 00:18 19 | will have full view of the back of the apartment | 00:20 19 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes, yes. |
| 00:18 20 | building, because from their view they can look down | 00:20 20 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I mean, I |
| 00:18 21 | and see the parking lot and actually see the painted | 00:20 21 | can't see it from here, but can you see the building |
| 00:18 22 | stripes of the parking spaces, so they will have full | 00:20 22 | at 188 Broadway? |
| 00:18 23 | view. | 00:20 23 | MS. BORRELLI: The top of 188 obstructs |
| 00:18 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. We have to | 00:20 24 | part of the lake, but you can see that I have this |
| 00:18 25 | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:20 25 | sliver here. <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| 00:18 1 | going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed | 00:20 1 | Now, the second building is going to be |
| 00:18 2 | things up. On the first photograph, can you mark | 00:20 2 | higher and it's going -- |
| 00:19 3 | that O-3. Okay. | 00:20 3 | MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going |
| 00:19 4 | (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 | 00:20 4 | to be higher, slightly higher in context but -- |
| 00:19 5 | for identification.) | 00:20 5 | MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an |
| 00:19 6 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, | 00:20 6 | objection to the photograph itself? |
| 00:19 7 | you took O-3, correct? | 00:20 7 | MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection. |
| 00:19 8 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes. | 00:20 8 | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you. |
| 00:19 9 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when | 00:20 9 | MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph -- |
| 00:19 10 | you took O-3? | 00:20 10 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, |
| 00:19 11 | MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on -- | 00:20 11 | that's O-3. |
| 00:19 12 | this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a | 00:21 12 | MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of |
| 00:19 13 | zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can | 00:21 13 | the second building, and we saw on the architect's |
| 00:19 14 | see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny | 00:21 14 | plans that the second building will have higher, and |
| 00:19 15 | when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the | 00:21 15 | it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I |
| 00:19 16 | sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I | 00:21 16 | will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so... |
| 00:19 17 | do see it. | 00:21 17 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind |
| 00:19 18 | Now -- | 00:21 18 | you, right? |
| 00:19 19 | MR. HAYES: What date did you take the | 00:21 19 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it |
| 00:19 20 | photograph? | 00:21 20 | is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because |
| 00:19 21 | MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The | 00:21 21 | it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It |
| 00:19 22 | actual date I don't have. It was in April. | 00:21 22 | is very visible, as you can see from these pictures, |
| 00:19 23 | MR. HAYES: Approximate date, April? | 00:21 23 | and it is higher. |
| 00:19 24 | MS. BORRELLI: I don't remember. | 00:21 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: That building is not |
| 00:19 25 | MR. COUTO: I'm not sure. | 00:21 25 | there yet. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
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|  | 165 |  | 167 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:21 1 | MS. BORRELLI: This building, right, | 00:23 1 | objection to 0-3 and 0-4, can you put those on the |
| 00:21 2 | this building. | 00:23 2 | her photographs that we marked. |
| 00:21 3 | We all can see the top of this building | 00:23 3 | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. |
| 00:21 | very clearly, and we can also see down to the parking | 00:23 4 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Put them on top of the |
| 00:21 5 | lot. | 00:23 | four green photographs. |
| 00:21 6 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And the next | 00:23 6 | ORRELLI: Okay. Do you want me to |
| 00:21 | otograph you have, mark that O-4. | 00:23 | nd these out to anybody? |
| 00:21 8 | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. | 00:23 8 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you gave two to |
| 00:21 9 | (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-4 | 00:23 9 | Mr. Delia? |
| 00:21 10 | for identification.) | 00:23 10 | MR. DELIA: Yes, I have them. |
| 00:21 11 | MS. BORRELLI: This picture was taken | 00:23 11 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: If you want to leave |
| 00:21 12 | from the deck of the home at 15 Cressfield Court, | 00:23 12 | some extra copies. |
| 00:21 13 | which their backyard overlooks 188 Broadway. And as | 00:23 13 | MS. BORRELLI: Okay, I'll leave these |
| 00:21 14 | -- | 00:23 14 | here like that. |
| 00:22 15 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Who lives there? | 00:23 15 | I also have an article that was in the |
| 00:22 16 | MS. BORRELLI: Who lives there are the | 00:23 16 | rthjersey.com. It's an article about the owners of |
| 00:22 17 | Burnidges (phonetic) | 00:23 17 | 8, and it's just an article about the type of |
| 00:22 18 | MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I do | 00:23 18 | racter that they have, and it's an article -- |
| 00:22 19 | MR. NEWMAN: You took that picture? | 00:23 19 | MR. DELIA: Objection. That's a |
| 00:22 20 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes. I went over to his | 00:23 20 | ent, not testimony. |
| 00:22 21 | house. He was very kind to let me stand on his deck, | 00:23 21 | R. HAYES: Ma'am, this is comment, not |
| 00:22 22 | because they're kind neighbors. | 00:23 22 | timony |
| 00:22 23 | MR. NEWMAN: And that photograph truly | 00:23 23 | MS. BORRELLI: I just want to present |
| 00:22 24 | and accurately depicts the view from his house of the | 00:23 24 | this as well. It's an article about |
| 00:22 25 | site as it currently exists today? <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:23 25 | MR. NEWMAN: You want to submit a LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| 00:22 1 | MS. BORRELLI: Yes, and you can see | 00:23 1 | article that was written -- |
| 00:22 2 | that he can clearly see a good view of the parking | 00:23 2 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: By somebody else? |
| 00:22 3 | lot where the proposed second building will stand. | 00:24 3 | MR. NEWMAN: -- by somebody else? |
| 00:22 4 | MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, any objection | 00:24 4 | MR. DELIA: About someone's character? |
| 00:22 5 | to that particular photograph? | 00:24 5 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, here's a problem |
| 00:22 6 | MR. DELIA: Just a question. Did you | 00:24 6 | th that, okay. Don't give it to me. We can mark |
| 00:22 7 | use a zoom lens on that one? | 00:24 7 | for identification, if you want only, but the |
| 00:22 8 | MS. BORRELLI: This one I did not use a | 00:24 8 | roblem with it is that somebody wrote something, and |
| 00:22 9 | zoom lens | 00:24 9 | hoever wrote it is entitled to their opinion, |
| 00:22 10 | MR. DELIA: So how close is that to the | 00:24 10 | wever, Mr. Delia also has the right to |
| 00:22 11 | property? | 00:24 11 | oss-examine that person who wrote that and to check |
| 00:22 12 | MS. BORRELLI: This was taken with the | 00:24 12 | e veracity of it and ask him questions, but just |
| 00:22 13 | regular lens. | 00:24 13 | ving that piece of paper, he can't do it. |
| 00:22 14 | MR. DELIA: How far away would you say | 00:24 14 | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I'll leave it |
| 00:22 15 | you | 00:24 15 | here. |
| 00:22 16 | MS. BORRELLI: From the property? | 00:24 16 | R. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. |
| 00:22 17 | Whatever you have in your documentation | 00:24 17 | MR. NEWMAN: So you're two out of three |
| 00:22 18 | as far as what the distance is. | 00:24 18 | so far. |
| 00:22 19 | MR. DELIA: Let me say, where on this | 00:24 19 | MS. BORRELLI: But it's there, if |
| 00:22 20 | gentleman's property were you standing? | 00:24 20 | ybody needs a little reading. |
| 00:22 21 | MS. BORRELLI: I'm standing on this | 00:24 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. |
| 00:23 22 | deck. | 00:24 22 | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you. |
| 00:23 23 | MR. DELIA: Okay. I have no further | 00:24 23 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Alex Couto. |
| 00:23 24 | questions. | 00:24 24 | MR. DELIA: Wait, wait, wait. I have a |
| 00:23 25 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And no | 00:24 25 | question. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:24 1 | MS. BORRELLI: To who? To me? | 00:26 1 | property was purchased? |
| 00:24 2 | MR. DELIA: Yes, to you. | 00:26 2 | MR. COUTO: Not the deed, the date the |
| 00:24 3 | You took photographs, did you do any | 00:26 3 | deed was recorded. |
| 00:25 4 | line-of-sight studies? | 00:26 4 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Why is that important? |
| 00:25 5 | MS. BORRELLI: Well, that's my view | 00:26 | MR. COUTO: Because I'm going to make |
| 00:25 6 | when I look out my window, my line of sight is what I | 00:26 6 | some comments of the date of deed versus the date of |
| 00:25 7 | see. | 00:26 | the application. |
| 00:25 8 | MR. DELIA: Did you do any | 00:26 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I know you're going to |
| 00:25 9 | line-of-sight studies, yes or no? | 00:26 9 | make a comment, but why is it relevant? They signed |
| 00:25 10 | MS. BORRELLI: (Shakes head.) | 00:26 10 | the certification they don't own the property when |
| 00:25 11 | No. | 00:26 11 | they filed the application. |
| 00:25 12 | MR. DELIA: I'll take that as a no. | 00:26 12 | Is that correct? |
| 00:25 13 | sight? MS. BORRELLI: Why would I do a line of | 00:26 13 | MR. DELIA: I haven't looked at that |
| 00:25 14 |  | 00:26 14 | application in some time. I know it was signed by |
| 00:25 15 | MR. NEWMAN: The witness is nodding her | 00:26 15 | the owner. I have to look at it to see who exactly |
| 00:25 16 | head that you didn't do a line of sight. | 00:26 16 | signed it. |
| 00:25 17 | MS. BORRELLI: No, I didn't do a line | 00:26 17 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you saying they |
| 00:25 18 | of site, but that's my view. You can't disagree with | 00:26 18 | didn't own the property? |
| 00:25 19 |  | 00:26 19 | MR. COUTO: No, I'm not saying nothing |
| 00:25 20 | answered. Okay. | 00:26 20 | like that. It's related to the use that the comment |
| 00:25 21 |  | 00:27 21 | that was made by some experts that they couldn't make |
| 00:25 22 | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you. | 00:27 22 | a living as a rental office. So related to the time |
| 00:25 23 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. | 00:27 23 | they added as a rental office versus the time they |
| 00:25 24 | Mr. Couto, do you have any evidence or | 00:27 24 | made an application. |
| 00:25 25 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:27 25 | MR. HAYES: I don't think that's in LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| 00:25 1 | MR. COUTO: It's third-party exhibits, | 00:27 | dispute. |
| 00:25 2 | I don't know if I hand it now or hand it under the | 00:27 2 | MR. DELIA: I think timing of ownership |
| 00:25 3 | comments. | 00:27 3 | is absolutely irrelevant to this land use proceeding. |
| 00:25 4 | MR. NEWMAN: What do you mean by | 00:27 4 | MR. NEWMAN: I would say that, |
| 00:25 5 | "third-party exhibits"? | 00:27 5 | Mr. Couto, we haven't heard a lot of evidence about |
| 00:25 6 | MR. COUTO: One is, I did some research | 00:27 6 | them leasing it out as an office building and that |
| 00:25 7 | on the date the deed was recorded. I've done -- | 00:27 7 | it's not possible. I don't recall much of that at |
| 00:25 8 | MR. NEWMAN: This is a copy of the | 00:27 8 | all. |
| 00:25 9 | public document -- | 00:27 9 | MR. COUTO: Okay. I can leave it for |
| 00:25 10 | MR. COUTO: Yes. | 00:27 10 | comment. |
| 00:25 11 | the deed? MR. NEWMAN: -- from the recording of | 00:27 11 | MR. NEWMAN: All right. Why don't we |
| 00:26 12 |  | 00:27 12 | leave that for comment? |
| 00:26 13 | MR. COUTO: From what I assume is | 00:27 13 | MR. COUTO: I will leave it for |
| 00:26 14 | correct, but counselor can say if it is correct or | 00:27 14 | comments. |
| 00:26 15 | not. | 00:27 15 | Thank you. |
| 00:26 16 | And the other that I have is a copy of | 00:27 16 | MR. NEWMAN: Moving right along. |
| 00:26 17 |  | 00:27 17 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So we're |
| 00:26 18 | is affordable housing settlement, so I took it from | 00:27 18 | done with everyone who wanted to testify. All right. |
| 00:26 19 | the Woodcliff Lake website. | 00:27 19 | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No. No. |
| 00:26 20 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Why is this | 00:27 20 | MR. COUTO: Can we take this down |
| 00:26 21 | relevant to this application? | 00:27 21 | (indicating)? |
| 00:26 22 | MR. COUTO: I have some comments to | 00:27 22 | MR. DELIA: Sure. Sorry about that. |
| 00:26 23 | make related to that. | 00:27 23 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Except for |
| 00:26 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm asking you now why | 00:28 24 | Mr. Marson. |
| 00:26 25 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | 00:28 25 | MR. DELIA: These are comments now |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:28 | versus testimony? | 00:32 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay. |
| 00:28 2 | MR. NEWMAN: Well, this is -- | 00:32 | MR. MARSON: He failed to disclose to |
| 00:28 3 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I'm just reviewing | 00:32 | nning board attorney supposedly. |
| 00:28 | what he handed up to me and he handed to you. | 00:33 4 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay, but this is before |
| 00:28 5 | MR. DELIA: Okay. I have not. | 00:33 | the zoning board. |
| 00:28 6 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. | 00:33 | MR. MARSON: No, no, no, it is before |
| 00:28 7 | MR. MARSON: Do you need a copy? Does | 00:33 | the zoning board, but the zoning board is now faced |
| 00:28 | anyone need a copy? | 00:33 | ith the result of a conflicted transaction. |
| 00:28 9 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We need to take a look | 00:33 9 | And the problem is in this case the |
| 00:28 10 | at it and I'll take a look at it. | 00:33 10 | ts, so to speak, of this transaction is you are |
| 00:28 11 | MR. DELIA: I'll stipulate that this | 00:33 11 | being asked to make adjustments or approvals of (d) |
| 00:30 12 | document, at least in part, purports to be or alleges | 00:33 12 | variances to a property that was subject to a series |
| 00:31 13 | a conflict of interest by our architect, who was a | 00:33 13 | of conflicted transactions between law partners -- |
| 00:31 14 | planner board member, not a zoning board member. We | 00:33 14 | let me finish -- law partners and people that were |
| 00:31 15 | had testimony on this. | 00:33 15 | supposed to be directly supervised that had duty to |
| 00:31 16 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes. | 00:33 16 | disclose not only to themselves but to Woodcliff |
| 00:31 17 | MR. DELIA: It's irrelevant and | 00:33 17 | Lake, the planning board, and anybody else that may |
| 00:31 18 | unfounded, and | 00:33 18 | have been affected. |
| 00:31 19 | And No. 2, as it relates to again some | 00:33 19 | MR. NEWMAN: Let me ask you a question. |
| 00:31 20 | purported impropriety on the part of the owner, one | 00:33 20 | The people that are sitting here on |
| 00:31 21 | of the managers, it's an allegatio | 00:33 21 | oard |
| 00:31 22 | really fully under | 00:33 22 | R. MARSON: Yes, si |
| 00:31 23 | I do know that the deed is attached | 00:33 23 | MR. NEWMAN: -- are any of them |
| 00:31 24 | and it was dated and recorded right around the time | 00:33 24 | volved? |
| 00:31 25 | we filed this application. <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:33 25 | MR. MARSON: Absolutely not. No. LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| 00:31 | So, yes, we did own the property. And | 00:33 | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is |
| 00:31 2 | I don't know what more to get from that. If we're | 00:33 2 | sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are |
| 00:31 3 | going to sit here and have allegations on someone's | 00:34 3 | imately making the decisions, and these are other |
| 00:31 4 | credibility, on their ethics, I think it's | 00:34 4 | people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that |
| 00:31 5 | inappropriate. | 00:34 5 | directly relate to the decision of this board? |
| 00:31 6 | MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations | 00:34 6 | MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, |
| 00:31 7 | refer to anybody who's on this board? | 00:34 7 | e facts that I am attempting to present show a |
| 00:31 8 | MR. DELIA: | 00:34 8 | pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary |
| 00:32 9 | There's no allegations whatsoever as it | 00:34 9 | capacity -- let me finish now. You're asking. |
| 00:32 10 | pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with | 00:34 10 | R. NEWMAN: Okay |
| 00:32 11 | this board or in any way impacts any member of this | 00:34 11 | MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing |
| 00:32 12 | board. | 00:34 12 | so infected the transaction that whether it's between |
| 00:32 13 | R. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson? | 00:34 13 | law partners, planning board partners, or people who |
| 00:32 14 | MR. MARSON: Yes, sir. | 00:34 14 | were serving in a capacity has now tainted this |
| 00:32 15 | MR. NEWMAN: Without telling | 00:34 15 | ansaction so that the zoning application is |
| 00:32 16 | content -- | 00:34 16 | tainted. |
| 00:32 17 | RSON: Okay | 00:34 17 | R. NEWMAN: Okay. |
| 00:32 18 | MR. NEWMAN: -- what is your proffer, | 00:34 18 | MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a |
| 00:32 19 | what is it that you want to show by these documents? | 00:34 19 | legal issue independent from us. |
| 00:32 20 | MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose | 00:34 20 | MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the |
| 00:32 21 | economic and work relationships have so sullied -- | 00:34 21 | sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge |
| 00:32 22 | MR. NEWMAN: By whom? | 00:34 22 | financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on |
| 00:32 23 | MR. MARSON: By whom. | 00:35 23 | this board is involved in that. And while that may |
| 00:32 24 | The general or managing partner of the | 00:35 24 | have a legal ramification, and when I say the |
| 00:32 25 | tity that purchased the building. | 00:35 25 | "mayor," I am just using that as an example. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |

MR. MARSON: I understand. Believe me, we're not going to call Mr. Rendo. Sorry, Carlos, you're not getting the call, you're still standing.

Thank you.
MR. NEWMAN: It's a hypothetical.
MR. MARSON: All right. Fair enough. I'm with you.

MR. NEWMAN: So I don't see how it would be relevant to the decision of this board, unless there was an allegation that somebody who's sitting here who's ultimately going to make this decision is involved and has a financial interest, which is the same reason why, when we started this meeting, I disclosed that I may hire Mr. Dattoli for an unrelated project.

MR. MARSON: Well, I appreciate that

MR. NEWMAN: At this point I'm going to turn it over to our actual attorney, who gets paid to make these calls.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: After you slandered the mayor, Gary.

MR. NEWMAN: I did not slander the mayor. It's not the actual mayor.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm reading your
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

| 00:36 | summary and it says, after you give us all this |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:36 | information, that you're asking us to halt the |
| 00:36 | administrative procedures and engage in full |
| 00:36 | conflicts investigation where warranted. |
| 00:36 | You know, this board is not charged |
| 00:36 | with conducting these types of investigations. Their |
| 00:36 | authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. |
| 00:36 | If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not |
| 00:36 | before this board, this board doesn't have |
| 00:36 10 | jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the |
| 00:36 11 | people that you seem to be complaining about didn't |
| 00:36 12 | even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even |
| 00:36 13 | argue whatever you want to argue of their |
| 00:36 14 | credibility, because they did not testify in this |
| 00:37 15 | case. And it's very late in the day to say that we |
| 00:37 16 | should halt this application on the day we're trying |
| 00:37 17 | to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the |
| 00:37 18 | board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the |
| 00:37 19 | type of investigations that you're talking about. It |
| 00:37 20 | looks like you might have asked the mayor and council |
| 00:37 21 | or other people to look at it. |
| 00:37 22 | So you do have some comments in here, |
| 00:37 23 | which you can make during the comments portion, but |
| 00:37 24 | if you're asking this board to conduct an |
| 00:37 25 | investigation with regard to certain actions taken by |
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individuals before they filed the application, the board is not going to conduct an investigation.

MR. NEWMAN: You may have a valid
basis, again, I haven't read it --
MR. MARSON: I understand.
MR. NEWMAN: -- investigating somebody
or something, but this is not the place.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where is? MR. NEWMAN: Well --
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Ethics board. MR. NEWMAN: You need to see one of the 80,000 lawyers licensed to practice law within the State of New Jersey.

MR. MARSON: Am I allowed to this during the comment section?

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.
MR. DELIA: I will object.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I would say not about the individuals that didn't testify, but comments about the application, you may. You know, you can comment about anyone who testified before this board during this application.

MR. MARSON: Some of the writing is, yes.

MR. DELIA: He's speaking of
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want this board to conduct. So, if those are comments, you can
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You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for $X, Y$, and $Z$ reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.

MR. MARSON: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.
Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.
MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.
Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.
I actually have several comments about plan does not talk about or contemplate mixed use or residential in this zone.

I think that I've established, through Richard Preiss' testimony tonight, that we have no high-density development of this kind and certainly not 16 or 17 units per acre in our borough, and we
wicked witch, but we have 20 minutes that we've authorized, so let's move it.

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not fair. We sat here for the same six months.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: What do you want us to do, ma'am?

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Keep going until we are heard.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Then let's reschedule.

MR. DELIA: Look, we're not getting done by $11: 30$. Go to $11: 30$ and take it from there.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. MR. MARSON: May I ask one question? CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.
MR. MARSON: So during comments, do I try to parse what I'm reading and limit it?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, I don't want you to make any comments about any individuals who did not testify before this board.

MR. MARSON: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I don't want you to make any comments about investigations that you
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have strictly adhered to our longstanding zoning codes in this borough.

In 2017, our mayor and council, and
this is where I beg to differ with Richard, rejected an idea to rezone the Broadway corridor. It was rejected. It was presented before the mayor and council in 2016 at meetings in November and December, and it was pulled from the agenda.

In 2017, there was a town hall meeting.
Broadway corridor was discussed ad nauseam, and there was extraordinary public outcry, so much so that the mayor and council and this borough as a whole on a policy basis decided that apartment housing was not a suitable use along Broadway and that's not what was wanted here. So much so, that when I was appointed in the spring of 2017 to the fair share housing committee, as Richard testified today, as part of our settlement agreement, we decided not to present the Broadway corridor as part of our fair share housing settlement. And Fair Share Housing was okay with that, provided we presented other things as part of our settlement.

This application is for a use variance, because the proposed use is not permitted in this zone.
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I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.

This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.

That's where I strongly disagree. And
I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.

In fact, our planning board just passed
an ordinance that revised our set aside to comply with our settlement agreement, which Richard testified to. And in that ordinance it states specifically, this set aside requirement does not give developers the right to any such rezoning, variances or other relief or establishes any
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obligation on the part of the Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief. In other words, you have no obligation and no requirement to grant the applicant's variance based on our Fair Share Housing settlement.

Throughout the Pascack Valley, we've seen predatory developers using affordable housing requirements to overdevelop every inch of this area. Woodcliff Lake, as a borough, has done an excellent job of preventing that from happening here. We solved our affordable housing problem in a concise and measured way, and we are not overdeveloping in this town.

We do not need these additional units, and Fair Share Housing was satisfied with us not putting an overlay zone before the Broadway corridor. Residents are tired from developers in the state and now in this region in the Pascack Valley and now tonight before this board in our own town that using the affordable housing argument to overdevelop.

This applicant is disingenuous with their affordable housing argument, because when they initially submitted their application, they weren't
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even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.

I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.

This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.

For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this application. I urge this board to think long and hard about everything that I've said and remember this is Woodcliff Lake, a community that
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prides itself on open space and its sprawling single-family residential homes, and vote no to this apartment complex that we just don't need and we are not required to approve.

I also want to say that I did agree with Mr. Preiss, and I'm just backtracking a little bit. I did agree that the applicant's real estate broker, I thought his opinion was absolutely -- he was very unqualified, it was a net opinion, and I also disagree, though, with Mr. Preiss that this will have no impact on our J rated school district. I think that the real estate brokers testimony demonstrated that he knows nothing about Woodcliff Lake and what makes Woodcliff Lake a great place to live in.

Thank you.
(Applause.)
MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, you closed, right? I know you have commentary at the end.

MR. DELIA: Yes, but I have a closing argument.

MR. NEWMAN: You have a closing argument?

MR. DELIA: Uh-huh.
MR. STAR: And Alvin Star, a resident
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of Woodcliff Lake.
MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.

MR. DELIA: Agreed.
I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.

MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.

Thank you for the time. I'd rather
read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So...

MR. STAR: She's a marvel.
Local roadways, including the Broadway
corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.

Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.

Traffic is severely backed up at rush hours at Broadway/Woodcliff, Broadway/Prospect, Broadway/Highview and on the Causeway, the only east/west connector of Woodcliff Lake.
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New Jersey Transit trains at Woodcliff Lake station further and severely aggravate and otherwise backup traffic --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Slow down. She has to get it down.

MR. STAR: Okay. You're right.
All three parking lots with complex geometries are full with no expansion planned. There are blocked views with dangerous ingress/egress, all traffic is stopped when the train enters the station. A car had driven into the station a few years ago, due to the dangerous curve in the road.

Okay. Now I'll talk about traffic, about this thing right now.

It is pretty much universally recognized that the current traffic situation is bad at the location of the applicant's project. The applicant believes that too heavily --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Slowly.
MR. STAR: The applicant believes that too heavily occupied apartment buildings will result in a decrease in vehicular ingress and egress during rush hours compared to the existing single commercial building with a recent history of no occupancy.

Do not believe this! It's my view that LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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00:50 1 the applicant has manipulated the data through
questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.

Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.

## In reality, it is very likely that

future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.

Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.

## There is one point of ingress and

 egress to serve the apartment dwellers. Cars will exist into an overcapacity queued Broadway during rush hours, with uncontrolled left turns into and out
## LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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of the site.
And this was discussed by Mr. -CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: The traffic engineer.

MR. STAR: The traffic engineer from Neglia.

This is an impossible situation. Just imagine the traffic mess --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, how many pages do you have?

MR. STAR: It's three. It's fast.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: But you're not even done with one page.

MR. STAR: Well, I'm at the bottom of the page.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to have to
limit the time, and I don't like to do it, but we just don't have time to hear everybody.

MR. STAR: Well, just bear with me. I want my five minutes, please.

Other high-density developments in Park Ridge and Montvale will add to the traffic flows, and a great incidence of traffic accidents will result.

New Jersey Transit may schedule more frequent trains and propose a train bypass in town to
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serve the ever increasing needs of computation into New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.

The applicant has refused to assess
cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry. Don't believe otherwise.

The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station. People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.

Broadway is a county road, and New
Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.

The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.

In my opinion, it gives every
appearance of trying to avoid further analysis, knowing the results may not be supportive to a positive outcome, to a positive vote on the
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application by the zoning board.
This is indeed very unfortunate, and, in my view, counter to good engineering practice.

The zoning board recognizes the additional risk to public safety from additional traffic flows as a result of this application, and that town does not need to be sued for negligence in the event of traffic accidents or injuries or fatalities.

Now circulation.
The applicant, with the involvement of
Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has presented a rudimentary study illustrating how a large fire truck could enter and exit the site during a fire emergency.

The most glaring and obvious omission is that the applicant assumes no cars in the parking lot, nor tenants, including children, scurrying in the night as the realistic worst case scenario trying to leave the site.

Consider the imagery. One point of ingress/egress, and it will remain as such.

How is the flow of emergency response vehicles and residents to be managed in a chaotic situation that is all too certain to occur?
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Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.

The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.

Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.

The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.

However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.

The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.

The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department also hasn't addressed how a fire on the steep slope immediately east of the new building leading to the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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nearby houses could be properly fought. Again, the basic phrase, "trust my judgment."

The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has indicated, following questioning, that a vegetation management plan for the steep slope prepared as a component of an emergency response plan is unnecessary.

I find it hard to believe.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
MR. STAR: Okay. I have this much and
I'm done.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. You're going to have to cut it short. Okay. Just sum up, please. You're well over five minutes. Okay. We're going to have to limit the time.

MR. STAR: Okay.
Plain and simple, this project will result in a fire trap, and that's my opinion. And the zoning board of Woodcliff Lake, knowing these conditions, leaves the town liable to litigation for negligence in the case of a fire.

Now I'm going to address the sight line issues that was brought up by other people.

The applicant has performed but one sight line analysis, resulting in his position that
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the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.

The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.

MR. STAR: It is nonsense.
Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.

We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.

Thank you, all.
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Well said.
(Applause.)
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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