

|  | 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0r3 | feet of 188 Broadway and those that did not reside | OTAPM 1 | MR. GLASER: Okay. Thank you. |
|  | feet of Broadway. Actually, we had a | 07:41PM 2 | PRINCIOTTO: Anyone else? |
| 07.398 3 | d list too for anyone who did not reside | 07741PM 3 | We intend to conclude this |
|  | Woodcliff Lake, although nobody signed that sheet. |  | eting tonight. And in order to do so, in order to |
| 07.3991 | Is there anyone here tonight that | 07.41PM 5 | matter expeditiously, my recommendation |
| 07: | to make a comment that did not sign in on any | 07: | board and our Chair is that we limit the comm |
| 07.39 | eets at the last meeting? | 0r:41Pm 7 | than four minutes. I think you can |
| 07.38 | MR. APPELLE: I don't know if I signe | 07.41PM 8 | bly comment in less than four minutes. |
| 07.39PM | in or not. | 07.41PM 9 | ggest, and it's just my |
|  | NCIOTTO: Your name, si | 10 | d suggestion, that you make your comments |
| 073 | MR. APPELLE: Walter Appelle, 23 | 074.4PM 11 | ncise and related to the zoning issues. |
|  | ssfield Court | 12 | heard the testimony, most of |
| $\text { Or:3PM } 13$ | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You live within 20 | 0744PM 13 | expert witnesses, so you should |
| 07.398 14 | feet? | 07.41PM 14 | derstand something about the legal issues involv |
| 077.39\% 15 | MR. APPELLE: Yes. | 15 | in this case. |
| ог:З9p 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Your handwriting could | 07.41PM 16 | ne who has made |
| 077.39\% 17 | be a little bit bette | 07.42PM 17 | ment, it's perfectly acceptable |
| 077399 18 | MR. APPELLE: Good way to start the | 18 | gree with what that person said, you don't |
|  | eting | 07:42PM 19 | peat it in its entirety. I would sugge |
| $\text { Or:39P } 20$ | [LAUGHTER] | 07428M 20 | you not read long pre-prepared statements and |
| 07.389 21 | MR. REYNOLDS: Sir, I might be in that | 07.42 | make concise statements. We have experienced |
| 077.39\% 22 | situation. | 07.42PM 22 | d members here that heard and listened to many |
| 077.389 23 | NCI | 07.42PM 23 | rent types of applications. They come from all |
| 077.39\% 24 | old | 07742PM 24 | ent walks of life with different background and |
| 07.39PM 25 | INCIOTTO: Within 200 feet? | 07.42PM 25 | ent experience, and they heard and listened to |
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|  | 6 |  | 8 |
| 07.39 | R. REYNOLDS: Prospect Avenue. | 07742PM 1 | mony or read the |
| 07.39P1 | Yes, sir. | 074 | tened to the audio of the meeting. So I ask you |
| 077.39\% 3 | Princiotto: No. | 07742PM 3 | please be concise in your statements. |
|  | Do you want to be added to the list? | 07, | Okay. The record will reflect I think |
| 07,408 | R. REYNOLDS: Please. | 07:42P | already heard from Cheryl Dispoto, who made her |
| 074 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry. Your | 07: | mments, and Alvin Star. |
| 07:708P | ress again, sir? | 07,42 | Is there anyone that would like |
| 07:700M | MR. REYNOLDS: 15 Prospect Avenue | 07.42PM 8 | eak next or I'll just call |
| 07:4009 9 | INC | 07.43PM | MR. STAR: May I ask a question |
| 07:70pm 10 | MR. HAYES: I believe there's one more, | 07 | lease? |
| or:apem 11 | Sal. | 07.43PM 1 | comments after 11:15 p.m. |
| 12 | PRINCIOTTO: I'm s | 07743PM 12 | at time, and I would like to quickly summarize, I |
| 077.40PM 13 | Yes. | or.43PM 1 | ill not read a statement, that that location has |
| 07:700PM 14 | MS. PANARETOS: Aspasia Panaretos, 16 | 07743PM 14 | any faults to it. I just wanted to summarize what I |
| 07:70pm 15 | Highview Avenue. | 07.38PM 15 | ad, because I also believe that some of the board |
| 077.40PM 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's within 200 | 07:38¢ 16 | embers may have left during the time period in which |
| 077.409 17 | feet, right? | от:38¢ 17 | was speaking. I would appreciate the time to just |
| 07:4009 18 | NARETOS: | 07:38M 18 | mmarize a couple of key points in this application. |
| 0\%:700 19 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry. Could you | 07:38PM 19 | O: No board members l |
| O77.00¢ 20 | eat your name, please | 07:4 | meeting concluded, No. 1 |
| OT:40PM 21 | MS. PANARETOS: | OT:3PM 21 | No. 2, counsel for the applicant has |
| 07:700 22 | N-A-R-E-T-O-S, Aspasia, 16 Highv | 22 | vided a transcript of the proceedings and that |
| 07.40PM 23 | PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Anyone else? | 07:38PM 23 | nscript has been delivered to all board members. |
| 07:70p 24 | Mr. Glaser, I think you're on the list. | 24 | So my suggested recommendation to the |
| 077.41PM 25 | You're on the list. | 07:38¢ 25 | ard would be that we not do that, and perhaps we |
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can revisit it at the end. Why don't you listen to all the other comments. I'm sure we're going to hear many of the same comments, I'm hoping that we don't, but sometimes I can't prevent that.

MR. STAR: Ms. Hembree, I would appreciate if $I$ can do it now.

MR. NEWMAN: My suggestion, Sal, is that we certainly give the members of the public who haven't gone yet a chance to speak first.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Absolutely.
MR. NEWMAN: And at the conclusion of that, depending on how we do with time, revisit the issue.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
And we also have to give Mr. Delia an opportunity, I'm sure he has something to say to the board this evening.

MR. DELIA: A few minutes' worth of time.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: So we need sometime for the board to deliberate and need to give some instructions to the board to proceed.

All right. I'm going to go down the list. I'm going to start with the people who reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. The first one on
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As I understood, the town government
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MS. GELLERT: Okay. I will slow down.
I moved in aware of the office building next door, glad of the neighborhood businesses to which I could walk for daily errands, whether the bank, post office, laundromat, car rental or supermarket --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Slowly.
MS. GELLERT: -- a few restaurants,
some professional offices, etc., virtually a self-contained small town, complete with a train station, and, up the hill, a bus line both connecting to destinations elsewhere.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am, maybe if you take a seat. Mr. Delia got up, so you can take a seat, make yourself comfortable, and get in a better position to keep the mic close.

COURT REPORTER: You can't put ten minutes worth of comments into four minutes.

MS. GELLERT: No, I am not. I do this. It's not that long.

Anyway, I was concerned with the Broadway corridor study. I tried to get involved in that process, and was very much relieved when it was
realized that those of us in the neighborhood are content as is, we don't want Broadway turned into another Chestnut Ridge Road. Woodcliff Lake already has that. We don't expect our small businesses to be pushed out to be redeveloped into bigger and not better. We know many of the proprietors, who are also our neighbors, if not residents, as vendors and professionals with whom we do business regularly.

Despite allegations here, there are virtually no vacancies. I did notice a couple of new office rental signs up in the past few days, but nothing but the gas station has stayed vacant long, and gas stations have unique and expensive environmental challenges.

Just because a larger business could be accommodated does not mean it should be. That is a private decision by each business owner, as long as it is not more intrusive to a neighborhood than regulations allow.

This new use would be more intrusive. Although the minimal traffic study showed no increase in traffic for four percent of the week, that does not address the other 96 percent of the week, when we residents live in the neighborhood.

We do not come and go from our homes
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only during two rush hours a day, but, just as the proposed apartment residents will do, come and go all day and evening and on weekends, including the many hours when offices are generally closed and not generating traffic.

In addition, many of my housemates walk to the coffee stop, the laundromat, the post office, to Shop Rite. They would have a busier driveway to cross, and residents coming and going to the proposed buildings will need to watch for pedestrians crossing the driveway, even as they potentially enter traffic, possibly making a left turn. This is an accident waiting to happen.

At 210 in particular, we worry about residents cutting across our lawn to get to a train, particularly when running late, and other dangers when people try to cross busy traffic with or against the light.

Basically, this is a dense development project in an area that really doesn't need it.

Thank you.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Peter Bernich, 15 Cressfield Court.

Is he here tonight?
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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$\square$

$\qquad$
of you profusely for your patience and your insightful questions, and for allowing this process to go through very thoroughly, and for the courtesy of listening to us and our serious concerns.

You set a good example for transparency, and we all believe for democracy in action.

As you all know, Woodcliff Lake has successfully met its COAH obligation, without overdeveloping and playing into the hands of outside developers.

If 188 Broadway were approved, it would open the floodgates to building three-story apartment buildings all along Broadway north of Highview, not counting, of course, the property that's owned by the community.

I believe, and hope that you do too, that after listening to all the applicant's experts, the main factors of safety, traffic, and overdevelopment are still unresolved.
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Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Veronica Appelle.
MS. APPELLE: Good evening, everyone, Veronica Appelle, 23 Cressfield Court, A-P-P-E-L-L-E.

Okay. So first I'd like to thank all

201-641-1812

It's also relevant to state that the developers have failed to provide other technical analysis, such as lighting and noise abatement studies, as well as an additional sight line study.

As Mrs. Hembree so eloquently noted, Woodcliff Lake does not exist in a vacuum, as the developers want us to believe. The immutable fact is that the only east/west corridor from one side of town to the other is the serpentine Woodcliff Lake Avenue that crosses over the Causeway, that crosses over the reservoir. And it's a serpentine two-lane road, and it backs up because of the train, the traffic volume, and the light, and it backs up now.

With the addition of affordable rentals on Broadway, the VFW property, and the Coles Crossing property, all of which have already been approved, the backups in traffic can only get much worse.

We must take into consideration the unfortunate fact that the towns of Park Ridge, River Vale, and Montvale are being inundated with huge numbers of rentals, and it's just common sense to expect traffic through Woodcliff Lake will increase substantially and dramatically.

On another safety note, why wasn't New Jersey Transit input obtained? Could it be that
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while the train currently stops 26 times a day, if we're adding all these additional commuters, more trains will have to be added to accommodate all the building in the adjacent towns and more cars will have to be added.

Just having the train stop that much longer, a minimum of 26 times a day, this will increase the time for everyone to cross the reservoir, specifically the police, fire, and emergency services.

I believe none of you and none of us really want to make the problem worse, place Woodcliff Lake in a possible litigious situation, and have a negative effect on the health and safety of all the residents of Woodcliff Lake.

In conclusion -- I know you're happy to hear that word -- I would like to reiterate that it is not the responsibility of the taxpayers of Woodcliff Lake to make sure any developer makes a profit from buying property in Woodcliff Lake.

Should the zoning laws be changed and numerous variances be approved to accommodate outside builders, so they can profit on the backs of all of the Woodcliff Lake taxpayers?

The bottom line is that Mr. Kaufman and
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
all of his investors tried to force a square peg in a round hole.

I am very grateful for your courage and commitment to all the citizens of Woodcliff Lake.

We may never know how many accidents you have prevented or lives you have saved.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Time's up.
MS. APPELLE: Really?
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Uh-huh.
MS. APPELLE: We may never know that.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you want to finish your last comment?

MS. APPELLE: But just know that your decision will impact everyone in the community. We are confident that economics and profits for a few will not be placed ahead of safety and quality of life for all.

Thank you for your time.
[APPLAUSE]
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Walter Appelle.
MR. APPELLE: Walter Appelle, 23
Cressfield Court, known as her husband (indicating).
Members of the zoning board and Mr.
Princiotto, I want to thank you for your many, many
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
201-641-1812
hours of hard work that you put in concerning the application for zoning changes on 188 Broadway.

The approval of the application for
variances to the 188 Broadway site would be a great mistake and a horrible injustice done to the residents of Woodcliff Lake. The traffic congestion created by the granting of these variances would create an almost chaotic traffic grid among Highview, Prospect, and Broadway.

Any parents trying to drive their children across the Causeway to and from school would go insane trying to accomplish this feat five days a week. Adding in the inclement weather and long train stops for additional passengers, and it becomes impossible to get to school on time.

Also with the vast increase in traffic
created by the additional buildings in our surrounding towns, how would our residents get to and from work on time?

In conclusion, we are all having to ask ourselves: Why did we choose to buy a home in Woodcliff Lake?

The quality of schools, the quality of life, and as Jackie Geladelta (phonetic) said so aptly, "to enjoy living in Woodcliff Lake."
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Thank you for listening.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I might pronounce this
one wrong, Patricia Keenaghan. Is she here?
MS. KEENAGHAN: Yes.
COURT REPORTER: Would you spell your name, please.

MS. KEENAGHAN: K-E-E-N-A-G-H-A-N, Patricia, 24 Highview Avenue.

As previously stated by our two
speakers, the impact on the neighborhood would be devastating. The one that I feel paramount, that did not get thoroughly investigated, is the traffic situation. I feel any increased number of cars and vehicles would create a situation where safety was put aside.

The fact that developing this area further into looking more urban than suburban definitely takes away from the colorful attributes that we all enjoy in this town. Many people who have been here as long as I have are appreciative that our
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|  | 21 |  | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:59PM 1 | planning board has sustained the quality of life | 08:01PM 1 | going to read it, sir? |
| 07:59PM 2 | here, and I would regret any movement to change that | 08:01PM 2 | MR. REYNOLDS: I read the letter. This |
| :59PM 3 | town appearance and environment | 08:01PM | sented as a certified notarized versio |
| 07:59PM 4 | Thank you very much | 08:01PM | f what was already emailed to you. |
| 07:59PM 5 | [APPLAUSE] | 08:01PM | d you already read it? |
| 07.59PM 6 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Gilbert Reynolds | 08:01PM 6 | MR. REYNOLDS: I did not |
| 07:59PM 7 | MR. REYNOLDS: Yes. Thank you | 08:01PM 7 | MR. NEWMAN: |
| 07.59PM 8 | Gilbert Reynolds, 15 Prospect Avenue. | 08:01PM 8 | RINCIOTTO: Why don't you show |
| 07.59PM 9 | First, I thank you all for what you're | 08:01 | Delia |
| 07:59PM 10 | accomplishing here, and I add an exclamation mark to | 08:01PM 10 | MR. DELIA: I think it needs to be read |
| gpm 11 | what has been al | 08:01PM 11 | aloud. That's my opinion |
| 07:59PM 12 | I feel that would apply to what's about | 08:01PM 12 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I agree with you. |
| 07:59PM 13 | to be said, but this much I know, I agree with that | 08:01PM 13 | MR. DELIA: Read it aloud. |
| 07:59PM 14 | without repeating | 08:01PM 14 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You can sit down, |
| 08:00Рм 15 | I'd like to take a moment to help | 08:02PM 15 | f you want to. |
| 16 | resident at 15 Highview Avenue deliver her comments | 08:02PM 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's a public hearing, |
| м 17 | to members of th | 08:02PM 17 | me people may be watching this on the cable TV, so |
| оорм 18 | illness, she was unable to attend tonight's meeting | 08:02PM 18 | you need to get it in the record also. |
| 08:00Рм 19 | Karen Ardizone sent a letter to each of | 08:02PM 19 | MS. APPELLE: I'd just like to |
| 08:00PM 2 | you via email, but in this envelope I have he | 08:02PM 20 | terate that the comments in this letter does not |
| 2 | or | 08:02PM 21 | flect generally the comments of the people in this |
| $\text { рм } 22$ | S. YETEMIAN: Excuse me. Hold on one | 08:02PM 22 | dience necessarily, so that's why she sent it. |
| $\begin{array}{cc} \text { 08:OOPM } & 23 \\ \text { 08:OOPM } & 24 \\ \text { 08:OOPM } & 25 \end{array}$ | momen | 08:02PM 23 | MR. NEWMAN: Someone apparently has |
|  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Reynolds, you'r | 08:02PM 24 08:02PM 25 | ady read the statement or has certain magical |
| 08:00РМ 25 | 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 |
|  | 22 |  | 24 |
| 08:00PM 1 | S | 08:02PM 1 | MS. APPELLE: Yes. Thank you. She |
| 08:00PM 2 | R. PRINCIOTTO: I mean, you may have | 08:02PM 2 | d me she sent it to all of you with the notarized |
| :00PM 3 | similar thoughts and beliefs and have simila | 08:02PM 3 | opy. This is the original notary and the pictures, |
| 08:00РM 4 | comments, but that person is not here. I understan | 08:02PM | ich she also said she sent |
| 08:00PM 5 | it's not testimony, | 08:02PM 5 | MR. NEWMAN: You're eating into his |
| 08:00Рм 6 | Mr. Delia, do you have any objection to | 08:02PM 6 | me |
| 08:00PM 7 | it? | 08:02PM 7 | S. APPELLE: I am sorry |
| 08:00Рм 8 | MR. DELIA: It's not tes | 08:02PM 8 | I can't verify that, so rather than |
| 08:00Рм 9 | only comment. | 08:02PM 9 | ading it, you can check your emails |
| 08:00pm 10 | UDIENCE VOICE: He's not reading | 08:02PM 10 | MR. DELIA: I will object to any |
| 08:00PM 11 | letter, he's just delivering the notarized version. | 08:02PM 11 | pictures. |
| 08:00pm 1 | MR. NEWMAN: I think the debate about | 08:02PM 12 |  |
| 08:00PM 13 | whether or not we should take it would be longer than |  | board not to check their emails. Please, do not do |
| 08:01pm 14 | MS. YETEMIAN: Can you not put the |  | board not to check their emails. Please, do not do that. |
| 08:01pm 15 |  | 08:02PM 15 | that. |
| 08:01pm 16 | paperwork on the microphone. | 08:02PM 16 | You told us once not to, and I never |
| 08:01PM 17 | MR. REYNOLDS: May I hand this? | 08:02PM 17 | did it again. |
| 08:01pm 18 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, you can finis | 08:03PM 18 | MR. DELIA: I'll object to the entry of |
| 08:01Pm 19 | reading it, not to be considered evidence by th | 08:03Pм 19 | any photographs. This is not the time for |
| 08:01PM 20 | board, it's just co | 08:03Рм 20 | photographs, that was during the evidence period. |
| 08:01рм 21 | MR. REYNOLDS: Her comments express her <br> own opinions, we are just helping to convey these comments to you this evening. And I'd like to hand this to Chairwoman Hembree, if possible. <br> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought you were <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. <br> 201-641-1812 | 08:03PM 21 | I'd like to know the name of the person |
| 08:01PM 22 |  | 08:03PM 22 | who wrote this letter, but, at this point, again, |
| 08:01PM 23 |  | 08:03Рм 23 | this is comment, I have no problem having a letter |
| 08:01PM 24 |  | 08:03Рм 24 |  |
| 08:01Pм 25 |  | 08:03PM 25 | MS. YETEMIAN: She lives at 12 |
|  |  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  |  |  |  |

Highview, which is right in the back parking lot of the property, so she is unable to --

MR. DELIA: I just want to know her name, that's all I'm asking, and then read the letter. That's all I'm asking.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Mr. Reynolds, you may read the letter and that will be it.

Is her address indicated on the letter? MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, it is.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: What's the address on the letter?

MR. REYNOLDS: 12 Highview Avenue, Woodcliff Lake.
"To the Planning Board
"Dear members of the Board:
"My name is Karen Ardizone. I live at 12 Highview Avenue.
"Due to travel, I am not able to present this in person, so I asked that a friend, a neighbor to read this notarized firsthand letter to the board at the July 23rd Zoning Board meeting on my behalf.
"I've been a resident at this address for 16 plus years. The reason I chose Woodcliff Lake
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1 is because of the charm, the school system, the quality of life and the safety of the town. This was important, because I was raising two small children at the time as a single parent. One is still in the school system."

Am I doing okay?
COURT REPORTER: Yes.
MR. REYNOLDS: "Would I have liked to live on the other side of town? Sure, but I had to be realistic and pick the house and endure what were at that time minor issues.
"As time went on, the issues got worse over the last 10 to 15 years. For example, when I first purchased the house, I was told the house next door to me was a retirement home. As the years went on, the residents became younger and more unstable.
It is to the point now that I cannot open my living room or bedroom windows on that side of the house, because of the smoke from the residents sitting outside from morning until night smoking. Besides, the noise of the train, which was initially running Monday through Friday and is now seven days a week, makes it impossible to sleep through the night.
"The only two issues I experienced 5 living next to Wilaneous Willhomsen (phonetic), the
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previous occupants of 188 Broadway, was the garbage pickup was after 3:00 AM every night, which woke me and my family up.
"Remember, this was a 9 to 5 commercial building, so I can't imagine how it will be with two buildings residential and 24/7. Also, in the fall and winter, when there are no leaves on the trees, the lights from the parking lot and buildings will illuminate the entire back of my house.
"Now with the possibility of the apartments being constructed, I am concerned with how many Dumpsters and how many pickups there will be during the week and at what time. If one building that was empty after 5:00 PM would light up the back of my house, how will it be with two buildings running day and night?
"Please see attached exhibit of pictures from February 27, 2019.
"A few years ago, the town decided to put a light at the end of my street. At this point, it is impossible to make a left turn onto Broadway. It is even more difficult and concerning to determine how it will get worse with the 188 apartments and other projects along Broadway. These projects will ruin my quality of life and the safety of my family.
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"I have two new drivers in my house that are scared to pull out of my road. How much more can I endure on this side of town?
"Due to my work schedule and family obligations, I have not been able to attend all of these meetings. However, I have been very vocal to Mayor Rendo and other members of the town about what is happening to our town and the community, and how opposed myself and many of my neighbors are.
"Why, with all the additional land on the other side of the Causeway, does everything have to be on this side of the Causeway and on Broadway?
"Because we aren't on the rich side of town, things are being put where the elite would only see them when they run errands. I am sure nothing like this would go into their background, only ours.
"I have worked really hard to stay in Woodcliff Lake for my kids, but you've essentially taken the equity out of my house. I don't see why I have to pay over $\$ 10,000$ in taxes and to be forced to move out of this town, because of all of the negative decisions to overdevelop here and leave the other side of town untouched.
"Looking at the exhibit of pictures, how do you expect me and my family to live through
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been there, it's in the middle of two streets that have among the highest slope in the entire borough, Highview and Prospect.

The light at Highview, as anyone who's from the area knows, does not now match up in the intersection of Broadway.

So, remember, this property is in the middle. You've got a group home just to the north. You've got other office buildings.

Okay. Now, as somebody mentioned --
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You still have four minutes.

MR. PADOVER: All right.
As anybody mentioned, you cannot make a
left turn when you're leaving 188 Broadway.
Okay. Now think about this, guys.
In order to get to the Garden State
Parkway, Route 17 and all traffic, you have to go south on Broadway. You have to go south on Broadway, otherwise you're going north to Park Ridge to go south. Think about that.

The way the property exists, where it stands now, makes no sense to convert it to a residential property, let alone something this dense. So location, that's No. 1.
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## Two, traffic congestion.

Okay. I've already mentioned about
Broadway being one lane and that you can't make a left turn. The study that said that the egress or the traffic study that compared office egress to residential egress was pathetic. You're going to tell me that an office worker -- when I go into my office, I'm lucky to leave my office once, maybe twice.

Tell me, when you live in a location, you get up in the morning, you go to the supermarket, you go to work, you come home, you've got kids --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I think you have a minute left, so I'd get to 3, 4 and 5.

MR. PADOVER: Thank you.
Third; vision. Okay. Somebody said there's been no ten-year plan for the Broadway corridor, which everybody is so focused on, in over ten years.

Fourth reason, east side residents. To a person, you are getting there almost -- I can't imagine anyone on the east side thinking that this is a good idea, so how any of you could approve it is beyond me.

And, fifth, I won't even go there, but
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the smell test. This property has so many ethical questions that we won't go into here, but many of us are aware of that reason as well.

That's only the top five reasons. So I
hope and pray, you're all volunteers, you all have
Woodcliff Lake's best interests at heart, that you listen to everyone and you make the right decision.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. HAYES: Can you give them a
two-minute or one minute mark, so the speakers can be aware, rather than saying out loud, we can just hold up a piece of paper so they know.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Watch Robin, she's the timekeeper.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Gwenn Levine.
MS. LEVINE: Hi there.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Ms. Levine, you can sit down too, if you want.

MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine, 65 Campbell
Avenue.
I also want to thank you all for hearing all of our comments. We really appreciate it.
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I've lived in Woodcliff Lake for 38 years.

According to Woodcliff Lake's Zoning
Ordinance 18-03, there are five kinds of what is known as (d) variances, most of which relate directly to the proposed development at 188 Broadway.

Variance No. 1 can be granted for the use as a principal structure in the zoning district, which does not permit such use as a principal structure.

That is exactly what the developers of 188 Broadway are asking for, since they want to build a 60-unit apartment complex in an office zone.

This is fairly brief.
Variance No. 2 is required for
expansion of a nonconforming use, and variance No. 4 is required for an increase in the permitted floor area ratio.

The applicant proposes to build a
second building behind the existing building. That's an expansion for sure.

And variance No. 5 is required for an increase in permitted density.

A 60-unit apartment complex definitely goes beyond the current housing density in the area.
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Note that (d) variances may only be granted for special reasons in particular cases. The applicant should demonstrate that the site is not suited for any zoned use, meaning an office building, and that it is peculiarly suited for the proposed use, meaning multiunit housing.

Having attended zoning board meetings for the past few months, I don't think the applicant ever made a strong case as to why 188 Broadway is not suited for office use. Given the fact that there is a large office complex right next door at 172 Broadway, it seems clear to me that this office zone is still an office zone.

Finally, according to the rules about (d) variances, the applicant should demonstrate that 188 Broadway is peculiarly suited to be a 60-unit apartment complex.

It would be impossible to prove this for two reasons.

First, the S-O office zone where 188 Broadway is located is almost completely surrounded by an $\mathrm{R}-15$ single family home zone. So there's no way that a 60-unit apartment complex is peculiarly suited for this location.

Second and final, the Woodcliff Lake
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1 m project would be approved. I really hope there were no assurances given to them in advance by anyone in Woodcliff Lake. If so, that would be extremely disappointing and discouraging.
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MR. GLASER: G-L-A-S-E-R.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

Good evening, everyone.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is your address 52 Woodmont Drive?

MR. GLASER: Correct.
Let me start out by saying that I have quite a bit of experience in town. I was on the planning board for about seven years. I was on the council for about 12 years. So I can appreciate and understand what you folks are going through up there.

But there are certain important things that maybe I can mention, which I haven't heard stressed before.

Probably No. 1 is all of the development that's going on in the surrounding areas, from Montvale, Saddle River, we got Park Ridge. The most injurious, I think, probably is Park Ridge. If you've been reading the newspapers, they're talking the potential for another 900-unit development there, which is a residential/commercial building. This is on top of the building that's currently going up in Park Ridge on the main street; Mercedes Benz, which is going to be going up in Montvale, I believe that's around 200, 300 units. These are residential/commercial typically.

Mixed in with all that is affordable
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|  | 41 |  | 43 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08:22PM 1 | units, which we all love, right? | 08:25PM 1 | a former mayor, you still only have four minutes, |
| 08:22PM 2 | To the south of us, I'm not too sure | 08:25PM 2 |  |
| 08:22PM 3 | with everything that's going on, they already have a | 08:25PM 3 | [LAUGHTER] |
| 08:22PM 4 | dense situation with their construction. | 08:25PM 4 | MR. LaPAGLIA: Thank you. I'll be |
| 08:22PM 5 | It's just changed the entire character | 08:25PM 5 | brief |
| 08:22PM 6 | of the area, the region, the region that we live in. | 08:25PM 6 | I've attended most of these hearings, |
| 08:22PM 7 | I moved here 45 years ago, 45 years | 08:25PM 7 | I must say, this is the most troubling |
| 08:22PM 8 | ago. And in those days -- I live up in Chestnut | 08:25PM 8 | application that I've seen come before any of our |
| 08:23PM 9 | Ridge Road, that's the elite side of town, as someone | 08:25PM 9 | boards or the mayor and council. |
| 08:23PM 10 | mentioned it, but it turned out that it was much more | 08:25PM 10 | I am totally opposed to this |
| 08:23PM 11 | family oriented, it had great character. | 08:25PM 11 | application and fear, as many of the residents do, |
| 08:23PM 12 | That's all changed. That's all changed | 08:25PM 12 | that approval of this would be opening the door for a |
| 08:23PM 13 | because of all the commercial development | 08:268M 13 | major change in the Borough of Woodcliff Lake. |
| 08:23PM 14 | That's a big factor. We have just | 08:268M 14 | m opposed to it. |
| 08:23PM 15 | begun to see the change in the past 5 to 10 years, | 08:268 15 | hank you. |
| 08:23PM 16 | how the entire area is changing. It's not the same | 08:26PM 16 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you, Joe. |
| 08:23PM 17 | place that I moved in, nor probably what you moved | 08:26PM 17 | [APPLAUSE] |
| 08:23PM 18 | into, and certainly not what you want. | 08:26PM 18 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Laura Jeffas. |
| 08:23PM 19 | Okay. So you have to consider that. | 08:26PM 19 | MS. JEFFAS: Laura Jeffas, 39 Kenwood, |
| 08:23PM 20 | And with all of the development, what's | 08:26PM 20 | Woodcliff Lake. |
| 08:23PM 21 | going to happen is traffic. I can tell you, and you | 08:26PM 21 | You took the wind out of my sails when |
| 08:23PM 22 | noticed it yourself, the way the traffic has been | 08:26PM 22 | you said I couldn't read my prepared statement, so |
| 08:23PM 23 | increasing. | 08:26PM 23 | I'm just going to skip around a little bit here and |
| 08:23PM 24 | I go down the main road in Park Ridge | 08:26PM 24 | ke some key points or things that I think are key |
| 08:23PM 25 | -- it's Park Avenue, I think -- it's impossible. All | 08:26PM 25 | points. |
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| 08:23PM 1 | the traffic that when you go down that street, it | 08:26PM 1 | First of all, I want to start with the |
| 08:23PM 2 | $r$ used to be that way. That's what | 08:268M 2 | es that are being paid or will be paid on th |
| 08:24PM 3 | overdevelopment does. And so what we have to be | 08:2689 3 | building. They're not going to cover the expenses |
| 08:24PM 4 | eful of | 08:26PM 4 | that are going to be incurred in the town for |
| 08:24PM 5 | . PRINCIOTTO: You have about one | 08:26PM 5 | schools, for garbage pickup, for recycling, etc. |
| 08:24PM 6 | minute left. You want to say anything about this | 08:268M 6 | When I say "garbage pickup," you know, |
| 08:24PM 7 | application? You have one minute left | 08:26PM 7 | applicant wants to change this to a residential |
| 08:24PM 8 | MR. MARSON: I feel this is pertinent | 08:27PM 8 | property, and we do pick up for residential. So, you |
| 08:24PM 9 | consideration in evaluating the application | 08:27PM 9 | know, are we going to incur additional charges for |
| 08:24PM 10 | So in this situation, you need to be | 08:27PM 10 | new equipment, and new DPW workers, etc., to |
| 08:24PM 11 | more pointed. We've got a situation where I don't | 08:27PM 11 | accommodate this new building? |
| 08:24PM 12 | think we can accommodate a growing area of | 08:27PM 12 | The other thing I want to note is that |
| 08:24PM 13 | development which will have a very, very significant | 08:27PM 13 | we have met our current low income requirement, so |
| 08:24PM 14 | safety issue, as was mentioned by a previous | 08:27PM 14 | that really shouldn't be an issue here. |
| 08:24PM 15 | resident. A lot of traffic, and it's just going to | 08:27PM 15 | et me see what else. |
| 08:24PM 16 | change the character. I wouldn't say it's going to | 08:27PM 16 | We do need to look at the big picture |
| 08:24PM 17 | destroy the character of the area, but it's going to | 08:27PM 17 | here with the traffic. Our traffic is not getting |
| 08:24PM 18 | be a very, very heavy negative impact on the area. | 08:27PM 18 | any better. It takes double the time to get from one |
| 08:24PM 19 | And, by the way, as you probably know, | 08:27PM 19 | end of Bergen County to the other. You know, God |
| 08:24PM 20 | not one person that I spoke to has approved or wishes | 08:27PM 20 | forbid you need to get into Paramus or any of those |
| 08:25PM 21 | to see this application approved in town | 08:27PM 21 | areas between rush hour, it's virtually impossible to |
| 08:25PM 22 | ank you. | 08:27PM 22 | ove around. |
| 08.25PM 23 | [APPLAUSE] | 08:27PM 23 | There are additional expenses. You |
| 08:25PM 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Joseph LaPaglia | 08:27PM 24 | know, according to the retired police chief, he said |
| 08:25PM 25 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Even though you're | 08:27PM 25 | we'll have to hire another police officer, so that's |
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another salary and pension.

And the Pascack Valley Line is already overcrowded.

And I want to read something that was in The Record and I'll quote.

It says: "Five months after the crowded Pascack Valley Line, a train injured more than 100 people when it crashed through a platform in Hoboken terminal, many of whom were standing in packed rail cars. Commuters say crowding problems haven't improved on the line. Overcrowding has continued in the months following the crash, including Train 1614, Spring Valley to Hoboken," which is the train that we're talking about here.

Another thing that I just wanted to note is that New Jersey Transit states on their website that there's limited space in the Spring Valley yard to deal with service malfunctions, causing trains to be pulled out of service, causing additional overcrowding.

So I also want to mention that although, you know, the developer is looking at this as a proposed commuter building, if you take a look at 62 Broadway, and I've been there many times at 11:00 at night and at 10:00 in the morning, 21 cars
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,
parked in the parking lot become five. So that's, you know, a 75 percent reduction in the parking over at that building.

So if we take 120 spots, and say 75 percent of those people leave, that's not 24 people, as we're being told, that's 90 cars that are leaving and further congesting that area.

So, anyway, I think that I pretty much covered everything.

I think that this property will be a burden and will be an eyesore, and it will be detrimental to the charm of our community.

Thank you.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ulises Cabrera.
MR. CABRERA: Hi. Ulises Cabrera, 14 Dorchester Road, Woodcliff Lake.

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

The case presented by this applicant provides no benefit to our small town. From the very first hearing, their attorneys state that the wooded lot behind the proposed second building will remain wooded for now. He stated "for now" on the record.
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In the beginning of this process, the applicant was not including affordable houses, even though the town's ordinance requires set asides for affordable units for these types of development.

As the process went on, the applicant's attorney changed his tune and started to mention how there would be affordable units, the applicant is helping the town meet the state mandate.

The facts are that Woodcliff Lake has a fair share housing agreement with the state, protecting the town from builder's remedy lawsuits, because Woodcliff Lake has complied with the state's mandate.

The applicant's engineer, during his first presentation, discussed knocking several trees down and replacing them with only one tree. Additionally, he suggested planting burning bush shrubs to absorb the downspout water.

For the record, burning bush shrubs do not like saturated grounds, and the town's tree ordinance is $1: 1$, you cut one tree, you plant one tree.

The engineer was oblivious to all of these laws.

The applicant's architect, who is a LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
resident of Woodcliff Lake, told the mayor and council back on December 5, 2016, when he spoke against the Broadway corridor being proposed at that time that 18 units per acre is excessive. Yet today he designed 18 units per acre for 188 Broadway.

Greed changes people. Greed changes people.

The applicant's real estate expert, with no proven study to reference, made an argument that young millennials and empty-nesters will move to this location, and he compared the Broadway area to Ridgewood's downtown area.

First of all, how can you accurately predict the demographics of potential renters, and Broadway looks nothing like Ridgewood's abundance of restaurants and bars in their downtown area.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You got about a minute and a half.

MR. CABRERA: The applicant's traffic expert purposely omitted street traffic from his study to bring credence to his argument, and when the zoning board Chairwoman asked why certain streets were omitted, the applicant's attorney said the report is final and they will not include additional streets.
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|  | 49 |  | 51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08:32PM 1 | When I asked the applicant's traffic | 08:3PM | schools. |
| 08:32PM 2 | expert if his study was based on assumption, he said | 08:34PM | I ask the zoning board members to vot |
| 08:32PM 3 | as | 08:34P | s application, because the applicant has |
| 08:32PM 4 | When I asked if the ITE study based a | 08.34PN | is application does not provide any benefit |
| 08:33PM 5 | lot of their figures on assumption, he said yes, they | 08:34P | whatsoever to our beloved town. Please vote no. |
| 08:33PM 6 | do. | 08:35P |  |
| 08:33PM 7 | When I asked the applicant's traffic | 08:35PM | PPLAUSE] |
| 08:33PM 8 | expert if his study can be wrong, he agreed his | 08:35PM | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Josephine Higgins. |
| 08:33PM 9 | assumption on his report could be wrong. He said | 08:35PM 9 | Is she here? |
| 08:33РМ 10 | that on the record. | 08:35PM 10 | Not present. |
| 08:33РМ 11 | Last year I met with the new police | 08:35PM 11 | Marley Malee (phonetic), 126 Bro |
| 08:33PM 12 | chief at Woodcliff Lake, and I asked him if Broadway | 08:35PM 12 | ot present. |
| 08:33РМ 13 | gets developed with more apartments, what impact will | 08:355M 13 | nn Marie Borrelli. |
| 08:33РМ 14 | that have to -- | 08:35PM 14 | MS. BORRELLI: Ann Marie Borrelli, |
| 08:33Р¢ 15 | MR. DELIA: I got to object to anything | 08:355M 15 | Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake. |
| 08:33Рм 16 | that was said outside the record of this case as it | 08:35PM 16 | Thank you to all the members of the |
| 08:33РМ 17 | pertains to conversations with police officers |  | for your patience and understanding |
| 08:33РМ 18 | other things that have happened that are not related |  | during our questions these past few months. Please |
| 08:33РМ 19 | to this application. You know, I've given a lot of |  | understand that the overdevelopment of Broadway is |
| 08:33РМ 20 | latitude to sit here and listen, but facts that have | 08:35PM 20 | ical issue, especially for the residents that |
| 08:33Р¢ 21 | nothing to do with this presentation should not be | 08:36PM 21 | ust navigate through the often high congestion of |
| 08:3 | heard whatsoever, not even as |  | Causeway/Broadway, Highview/Prospect |
| 08:33PM 23 | R. NEWMAN: Please don't tell us what | 08:368¢ 23 | intersections. |
| 08:33PM 24 <br> 08:33PM 25 | the police officer told you, you can say what you told him. | $\begin{gathered} \text { 08:36PM } 24 \\ 08: 36 \mathrm{PM} \end{gathered} 25$ | Over the past few months, we sat somewhat patiently -- well, sometimes -- and while |
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| 08:33PM 1 | R. CABRERA: I asked him if this would | 08:3 | ns, |
| 08:33PM 2 | impact his police department, and there seems to be | 08:368 | ad opinions, sometimes expertly and |
| 08:33PM 3 | pact to the police department. | 08.36R | etimes subjectively, they did their job for the |
| 08:34PM 4 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Cabrera, you can | 08:368 | estors of 188 Broadway |
| 08:34PM 5 | ke comments. The time for testimony has passed and | 08:368 | URT REPORTER: Please, you have to |
| 08:34PM 6 | to make comments. | 08:3 | down. I can only take 300 words per minute |
| 08:34PM 7 | MR. CABRERA: And I thought that's what | 08:36PM | UGHTER] |
| 08:34PM 8 | I was doing, just making honest comments. | 08:3689 8 | MS. BORRELLI: They aimed at convincing |
| 08:34PM 9 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: But you can't | 08:368 9 | the benefit of their development. But ask |
| 08:34PM 10 | introduce testimony, especially hearsay-typ | 08:3689 10 | urself, where does the benefit lie? |
| 08:34PM 11 | testimony, what anyone else told you | 08:3689 11 | Before you vote, ask yourself, do th |
| 08:34PM 12 | MR. NEWMAN: They have to be your | 08:36 | are about our town, care about preserving |
| 08:34PM 13 | comments, not what somebody else told you. | 08:368m 13 | e character of our town, care about the quality of |
| 08:34PM 14 | MR. HAYES: The idea is Mr. Delia | 08:36PM 14 | life for all the residents? |
| 08:34PM 15 | cannot question the police chief | 08:3689 15 | They didn't care about the quality of |
| 08:34PM 16 | ABRERA: Okay. | 08:36PM 16 | for the Leonia residents living on the boarder |
| 08:34PM 17 | FRON-MALLEY: You got 30 seconds. | 08:37PM 17 | Fort Lee when they torn down a historical home to |
| 08:34PM 18 | MR. CABRERA: All right. | 08:37>м 18 | ake way for a 60-unit -- |
| 08:34PM 19 | This application is filled with | 08:37>м 19 | MR. DELIA: I'm going to object. This |
| 08:34PM 20 | political insider connections and gives us an idea | 08:37PM 20 | s nothing to do with this town or this application. |
| 08:34PM 21 | how a greedy predatory developer operates in Bergen | 08:37P⿳ 21 | is is just pulling stuff out of the air from other |
| 08:34PM 22 | County. They rake in millions, get favorable tax | 08:37PM 22 | aces that has no business being here. |
| 08:34PM 23 | assessments through their political connections, | 08:37PM 23 | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. So before you |
| 08:34PM 24 | destroy our town forever, leave taxpayers with huge | 08:37PM 24 |  |
| 08:34PM 25 | tax bills in the long run and congested roads and | 08:37PM 25 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You should really talk |
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 can't keep up. decide to relocate. parking lot. second.
because you want to get all your words in, but she

MS. BORRELLI: I will no longer find the peace and joy seeing sunshine on the lake. No longer will I have the same selling point, if we

The proposed second building will not be inconspicuously hidden behind a mountain, as testified by the architect.

The current view from the residents up the hill is not just the top of the existing building but down to the painted parking spot lines in the

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Why don't you finish the sentence and then you're done.

MS. BORRELLI: You know, hold on a

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Come on. I'm trying to be fair and kind

MS. BORRELLI: No, I understand that, but when we were originally told, we were told five minutes, so I based mine on five minutes.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: And I stopped the timer for anyone's comments, so you got extra too.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is Alex Couto here?
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MS. BORRELLI: He's not here. He can't make it tonight.

AUDIENCE VOICE: Let her finish.
MS. BORRELLI: Can I take his time? He couldn't be here, so can I take his time?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. He's not going to be here.

MS. BORRELLI: Can I take his time?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's the last
person, so we'll give you another minute.
MS. BORRELLI: I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. NEWMAN: If he shows up, you took his time and I'm going to tell him.

Please continue.
[LAUGHTER]
MS. BORRELLI: The same parking lot where the proposed second building would stand. If this apartment building is allowed for six months of the year, the residents in close proximity will have a clear view of apartments. You will not only see the tops of the buildings and all of the 60 HVAC units, but we'll also have a clear view into apartment windows.

The residents in close proximity will
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have apartments in their backyards.
At a planning board meeting last year regarding the proposed Teva affordable housing, it was brought up that the residents of Claremont Drive did not want their western horizon view obstructed by an increase in building height.

Claremont Drive is not 200 feet from the Teva building, as you are aware, it's on the other side of the Parkway.

At a Montvale zoning board meeting regarding the Hard Rock (phonetic) application --

MR. DELIA: I'll object to that.
MR. NEWMAN: He's going to object to Montvale, although I will say there is a difference between the town of Montvale and Fort Lee, in that they do share the high school.

MR. DELIA: This has nothing to do with this application. We're talking about what was said at another's town meeting? I don't get it. It's not before them.

MS. BORRELLI: No, it's just to say --
MR. NEWMAN: Don't say what someone
else said.
MS. BORRELLI: I am just trying to say that that is 400 feet away, and I just want to ask
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you, before you vote, ask yourself who's representing
the residents that live within 200 feet of this proposal at 188 Broadway? Ask yourself, shouldn't all Woodcliff Lake residents receive the same consideration?

Our views will not be across the Garden State Parkway. Our views will not be across the parking lot 400 feet away. Our views will be that of apartments and HVAC units at most 200 feet. We will not only lose our clear views of the lake, we will have to listen to the garbage pickup for 60 apartments, we will hear the hum of 60 HVAC units, cars coming home late, tenants hanging out in the parking lot late at night. Perhaps, someone will explore the woods behind our home. We will live in fear of a fire blowing out of control and we will experience increased urban density and we will lose the character of Woodcliff Lake.

As Mr. Burgis stated in his response to a question regarding the need for this development, his answer was that it would bring more development.

Is that what we want? Is that what we need?

Before you vote -- and this is in conclusion -- before you vote, ask yourselves what is

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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in the best interests of the future of this town?
What legacy do you want to leave? Are you serving your fellow residents or the interests of the developer, investors or anyone else who has monetary gain from this project?

Before you vote, please consider that you can be a beacon of hope for other towns to stop these developers and investors from raking our town. Remember, they do not care about our town, only their profits.

Before you vote, please consider our comments and concerns. Some of us will speak calmly, some of us will speak with emotion, and some of us will speak fast, but we all have one thing in common, and that is to preserve the town we love.

I pray that you do the right thing. I pray that you consider the residents and vote no to this application.

Thank you very much.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Michael Fritz, did he come? We called his name at the beginning of the meeting.

All right. So we called his name twice. He's not present.
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that wish to make a comment.
MR. STAR: I had asked at the beginning of the meeting if I could make a statement.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Star, I'm going to say something.

Everybody, up until the last -- well, everybody tried very hard to be very specific and short, and that's what we hear. We don't listen to somebody who's trying to talk so fast. We don't hear it.

So tell us specifically what your concerns are very quickly and we'll listen to that, but no more five page statement.

MR. STAR: It's very quick.
My view is that the applicant's
consultant --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can you please come forward and speak into the microphone.

MR. STAR: I'll be very quick about
this.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We want to hear you, but we don't want to zone out, and we do.

MR. STAR: Very simply this.
The applicant's consultants, in my
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view, are full of misrepresentations and omissions, and their work is devoid of good engineering practice. On this basis alone --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She had trouble with you the last time. You're talking too fast.

MR. STAR: Very simple.
The applicant's consultants, in my view, are guilty of misrepresentations and omissions and their work is devoid of good engineering practice.

MR. NEWMAN: Ms. Hembree, in light of the fact that this person spoke last time, I would like to limit his comments to two minutes.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: That's all right
with me.
MR. STAR: Okay with me.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: It would be better if you didn't read and just tell us what's on your mind.

MR. NEWMAN: You got two minutes.
MR. STAR: On this basis alone, plus what has been said to the residents, this project should be denied.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You're welcome.
[APPLAUSE]
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. That concludes the public comment. I don't have any other names on the list.

MR. SPIRIG: I make a motion to close to the public.

MR. NEWMAN: I'll second that.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No one.
So ordered.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Mr. Delia, how much time do you need?

MR. DELIA: A little more than four minutes, but not much more. I have a nine page prepared statement, which I will read verbatim to the record. There might be a couple of flourishes here and there. It took a lot longer to write it than it will be to deliver it, I'll say that.

This is my time to thank all of you for your time and attention. This has been, I'll call it a robust hearing. There have been a lot of questions asked and a lot of answers given.

I'll take my glasses off so I can
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actually read.

1

You've devoted a lot of time to attending the many hearings and appreciate that you will consider this application objectively based upon the law and the facts presented to you.

We have conducted a total of seven hearings, during which we have produced substantial evidence in support of our application for use variance, variance, site plan, and waiver approvals.

In making your decision, we would expect that you'll be guided by the following well settled principles of law.

In the Kaufmann case, not this Kaufman, but Richard and Laura Kaufmann vs. Planning Board, a 1988 New Jersey Supreme Court case, "the key to sound municipal decision-making is a clear statement of reasons for the grant or denial of a variance."

In the Commercial Realty \& Residential Corp. case against First Atlantic Properties, our Supreme Court said that "Local boards and their counsel should take pains to memorialize their decisions in resolutions that explain fully the basis on which the board has acted, with ample reference to the record and the pertinent statutory standards."

In the New York SMSA vs. Board of
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comment when he had a valid objection to make. It's not appropriate to make any statement or comment during his presentation, so thank you.

MR. DELIA: Thank you.
Additionally, your own traffic
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engineer, Mr. Intindola, endorses our traffic engineer's methodology and is satisfied with the interior design of our parking, ingress and egress. Mr. Preiss commented on this as well favorably.

The record is, without any doubt or contest, that traffic is simply not an issue in this case. It's clearcut.

Fire safety. In all the years that our firm and the principals of the applicant have been involved in land use matters, whether as professionals or principals, not once in more than 100 years of collective experience has a municipal fire chief or deputy chief been compelled to testify to justify their opinions or have a member of the public attempt to impugn their integrity by suggesting that they have a business relationship with the applicant.

As a reminder, your Fire Chief Schuster and Deputy Chief Fusco both testified that they have over 50 combined years of experience and collectively have been to several thousand fire calls; have previously responded to calls at the site without any problem; and that the applicant "worked everything out to their [Fire Department's] satisfaction," regarding the proposed site plan. And in response to LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
a question from board member Newman, they were 100
percent confident in their ability to put out a fire.
Chief Schuster testified that everything they felt they needed was agreed to by the applicant.

This is summed up in the following exchange on Page 29 of the May 21st hearing.
"MR. NEWMAN: So you, as the experts, are satisfied?
"MR. FUSCO: Yes.
"MR. SHUSTER: Right."
Affordable housing. While the applicant believes that a strong argument can be made on the time of application law -- there was no inclusionary ordinance in effect when this application was filed -- the applicant has agreed with the 15 percent settlement between the borough and Fair Share Housing Center.

This is something addressed early on in the proceedings and is something the applicant stays committed to provide to help Woodcliff Lake meet its unmet need, which exceeds 400 affordable units.

Site plan. The testimony is uncontroverted that there are no site plan issues. The applicant met all site issues, drainage requirements, lighting, landscaping, refuse/trash,
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
201-641-1812
parking is fully compliant with RSIS requirements, professionals.
truck (deliveries/trash/fire) access, all acceptable; light poles, roof mechanicals, all addressed during the hearings to the satisfaction of your

At the June 25th hearing, your planner, Richard Preiss testified, "So from a purely site plan point of view, if you assume the 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."

Overdevelopment. The project reduces traffic from the site and reduces the existing impervious coverage. These are classic evidence that this proposal represents the opposite of overdevelopment. Everything fits well on site and the plan is safe and efficient. Keep in mind that the proposed density is consistent with the density recommended for the Broadway corridor through Highview, including this property, by the planning board and DMR for at least several years before the applicant purchased the property.

Furthermore, at the board's request, we provided a zoning comparison chart. The purpose of the chart, as requested by the board, was to study
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the bulk parameters of other multifamily zones. The evidence is compelling that we are not overdeveloping. We fall squarely within the averages of: Density, setbacks, and coverage.

Mr. Preiss had this to say about that: "In the context of what Woodcliff Lake has allowed in other districts, to me it is not overly dense or too close to the front, side or rear yards or too high."

Transit-oriented development. Again, we look to Mr. Preiss' testimony. "Is there a 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."

While Mr. Preiss questions whether there's any evidence of a substantial difficulty in attracting office tenants, I would note that there was testimony regarding the market by Mr. Charles Oppler, and observations by the Chair that there was no office market.

Mr. Preiss, in this regard, agreed with Mr. Oppler that this proposal "would serve the needs of people, divorcees, people who are downsizing, millennials who are coming to town," and also 4 testified that office use is predominantly along 5 Chestnut Ridge Road.
2
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be of no consequence as the issue is whether the
property is specially situated for the proposed use.
Again, I would refer to Mr. Preiss, who testified:
"However, I do understand that this is a suitable and
attractive location for the proposed use."

Use variance. As per Mr. Preiss noted, Use variance. As per Mr. Preiss noted, specially suited for the use and what Mr. Preiss termed the "Medici Reconciliation Test."

I'd like to address the Medici Reconciliation Test first.

In Medici, the Supreme Court said: "Such proofs and findings must satisfactorily reconcile the grant of a use variance with the ordinance's continued omission of the proposed use from those permitted in the zone and thereby provide a more substantive basis for the typically conclusory determination that the use variance "will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance."

The answer is simply that Woodcliff Lake has failed to adopt a master plan reexamination within the required ten years following its prior reexamination and pursuant to the Municipal Land Use LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
As a legal matter, we think this would be of no consequence as the issue is whether the property is specially situated for the proposed use. "However, I do understand that this is a suitable and attractive location for the proposed use."

Law at Section 40:55D-89.1 states that the failure results in the rebuttable presumption that the borough's zoning ordinance is no longer valid. As the Supreme Court said in Medici, the purpose of mandating reexamination is to inform the governing body of significant changes in the community since the last such reexamination.

At Page 46 of his testimony, Mr. Preiss states and we agree, "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."

You, as a board, cannot and must not rely on the inaction of the governing body to amend the zoning order to permit multifamily residential use in the Broadway corridor as a basis for concluding that we have not met the reconciliation test.

On Page 63 of the transcript, Mr. Preiss agreed that there were "a lot of changed circumstances."

So even if we look at the
reconciliation and the passage of all this time without an effective master plan readopted in time,
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without the presumption of validity on an ordinance, we still have changed circumstances, a lot of them, and Mr. Preiss agrees.

He agrees as an aged population and he agrees as a trend towards developing transit-oriented developments, among others.

This begs the question as to what has changed in the nearly two decades since Woodcliff Lake's 2002 master plan and ultimately the '08 reexamination.

A lot has changed. We've seen it with the advances in technology and this term "millennial," which describes a whole younger generation with trends towards renting vs. purchasing a property.

Mr. Preiss' argument fails because the governing body was never informed on the changes in Woodcliff Lake, as required under the Municipal Land Use Law. This is by master plan reexamination, and the Woodcliff Lake Zoning Ordinance is presumed to no longer be valid.

We caution that the mere conversation about the preparation of a current reexamination is not of any evidential value before this bored and fails to satisfy the requirements of the Municipal
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Land Use Law. You either have to have a reexamination or you're out.

Regarding the use itself, Mr. Preiss testified as follows:
"Is this a benefit to the borough, where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation. Yes, there would certainly be a benefit to that."
"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 purview of smart growth."

Mr. Preiss agreed with Mr. Burgis that
the project furthers the purposes of the state plan.
Mr. Preiss observed that the
transit-oriented design is a public policy with the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Preiss testified that office use in Woodcliff Lake is predominantly along Chestnut Ridge
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provide adequate light, air, and open space; 4. We
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Road corridor.
Mr. Preiss also testified that, other
than the Medici Reconciliation Test, he believed that the negative criteria has been met and he has no problem with the height and bulk variance. That's at Page 38 of his testimony.

Mr. Preiss testified that the absence of mixed-use detracted from the special reasons under Medici. We would note, (i), this is an existing office building with no ability to include retail along the Broadway corridor because of its height from the road; and (ii), Mr. Preiss offers no facts upon which he makes this opinion. We'd say it's a net opinion.

Advancement of land use purposes: As
just stated, Mr. Preiss agrees that we advance at least two purposes of the state law, through our Transit-Oriented Design and by providing the 15 percent affordable units.

In addition to advancing these two
goals, we also: 1. Preserve residential areas
surrounding us; 2. Appropriately use the land in a manner that complements the community as a whole (via our proximity to the train station); 3. We do
do preserve natural features; 5 . We do encourage improvements to the Broadway business district and linkage to the train station; and 6. We do preserve steep slopes.

You need one of these purposes to satisfy this element of the positive criteria. We have 6, 7, you only need to choose one; Mr. Preiss agrees with two.

I would also note that parenthetically we believe a case can be made for the use variance based upon a hardship and special reasons, that is the office use is no longer suitable or viable. This would be based on the testimony of Mr. Oppler, the comments of the Chair, and Mr. Preiss.

In addition, Mr. Preiss acknowledged that the design of the office building was from the '70s and '80s and no longer competitive. The most that Mr. Preiss was able to say on this issue was that he did not hear testimony that it was "absolutely impossible to convert it for an office use." Respectfully, absolute impossibility is not the Medici hardship test.

Lastly, we ask you to turn your attention to the multifamily affordable housing project comprised of portions of Block 2501 and Block
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2602, which I will call the "affordable housing property" for ease of reference, separated from 188 Broadway by one block and Highview Avenue. Although 188 Broadway is closer to the train station than the affordable housing property, Mr. Preiss differentiates the properties on two bases.

The first is that the affordable housing was zoned for the governing body for multifamily use. This is a circular argument, and, in any event, has been refuted above.

The second differentiation is that the affordable housing property is 100 percent affordable housing and part of the Fair Share Plan.

While Mr. Preiss states that a 100
percent affordable housing project would be
inherently beneficial, nowhere in this entire testimony does he differentiate the affordable housing property from 188 Broadway based on location or use of the respective properties. The differentiation is based solely on the income level of the occupants.

In Mr. Preiss' area in need of redevelopment study dated June 20, 2018, which he commented on, he wrote "The site's location adjacent to the train station and its potential inclusion in
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1 an overall plan for transit-oriented development
although the Broadway corridor established the
designation of this area as consistent with smart growth principles; i.e., creating a walkable neighborhood with connections to transit choices and building within established community areas."

That's exactly what we have, we have the identical thing.

That statement addresses the use and 10 the location as is as true today for 188 Broadway as 22 own set of facts -- if you stick to the facts of this 23 case, you will come to the conclusion that this project meets the Medici criteria for a use variance 5 and furthers the appropriate development of the
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Broadway corridor.
I thank you for your time, and I would
respectfully request a vote in the affirmative.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I have some
comments and instructions to the board.
MR. NEWMAN: I have a couple of questions.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia? MR. DELIA: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Are you seeking the variances under the hardship standard or not? MR. DELIA: We are reserving that. We are keeping all of our elements open. That's not a primary argument but it's a secondary argument.

MR. NEWMAN: So tell me and point to the record who testified that the existing use as an office building is no longer feasible? Because I don't recall any of that testimony.

MR. DELIA: Well, we have, actually, even Chairwoman Hembree mentioned it and I'm going to

MR. HAYES: I recall opinions, but I don't recall actual evidence.

MR. NEWMAN: Let me tell you
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specifically.
MR. DELIA: All right.
MR. NEWMAN: I remember at the
beginning of this application that there was no testimony that the building was actually vacant, and I don't recall any testimony from anybody that we've tried to rent this building, we've tried to put people in the building and it hasn't worked.

MR. DELIA: We don't have any of that in front of you.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, also, I know you commented on Mr. Preiss' testimony, but I believe his testimony was that you did not establish any hardship by way of the testimony and his testimony was that he did not believe there was a hardship established.

MR. DELIA: And I haven't said that. I haven't put those words in his mouth.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Well, I thought you made some comment.

MR. DELIA: No, I made my own argument.
I didn't put those words in his mouth.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
So I have a few comments.
The master plan reexamination was done
December 2008. When this application was filed in
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the spring of 2018, that master plan reexamination was not ten years old. It wasn't mentioned during any of the testimony, and it came up during the cross examination of Mr. Preiss.

While Mr. Delia's comments can be considered by the board, it's not testimony. His recollection of the facts and testimony may be different from what you recall hearing. You should go by what you recall being said, especially if it differs from what Mr. Delia said, particularly with regard to the testimony of Richard Preiss.

Although I'm not going to comment about a lot of the testimony, Mr. Preiss did comment on Page 85 of his testimony that he did not consider this use and the affordable housing component to be an inherently beneficial use.

To quote him: "So your project is not an inherently beneficial use."

So, again, I'm not going to go over all of the testimony, but some of those are outstanding points.

There's no mention of our master plan goals, which includes preserving the residential character of the community and preventing urban sprawl.
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You heard Mr. Preiss' testimony last. He talked -- and I'm not going to say what Mr. Delia said was all inaccurate, he did not have issues with regard to the bulk requirements, but he did testify extensively with regard to the mayor and council and their review of the Broadway corridor and what the law is under the Medici standard with regard to a situation like this when there's a use variance.

I'm going to discuss with you what the requirements are and what the burden is of an applicant when they're seeking a use variance, because planning is better done by ordinance rather than by variance, and that's why, unless an applicant can meet all of the burdens that are set forth in the statutes and according to case law, then the board can act favorably.

If the board feels as though the applicant has met all of the proofs required for the granting of the variance, the board can grant them.

Now, there are in this application, what we call (c) variances, which are the bulk variances that include the height and the setback requirement, the front yards, etc.

And then we have what we call the (d) variances, and those are just referenced in the
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paragraphs in the Municipal Land Use Law, so we lawyers say (c) variances and (d) variances, because they're under different paragraphs.

Mr. Preiss spoke extensively about the requirement, the Medici reconciliation; in other words, one of the requirements of applicant is to show and explain that this use is prohibited in the zone and the mayor and council has omitted this use from this zone. And he went over, and I'm not going to go over all his testimony, but all of the instances where the mayor and council reviewed Broadway. And he went back to 2002, the master plan, he went over the 2008 reexamination, the Broadway corridor studies, the affordable housing settlement where an overlay was considered and was not included in the Broadway area, as well as review and discussions about whether to rezone on Broadway. So I'm generalizing, you can recall his specific testimony with regard to that.

And he referred to that as the Medici reconciliation. And that's what this board would have to reconcile, that the mayor and council did not include it in the zoning ordinance and had looked at it.

And in that light, Mr. Preiss tells you
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you have to look and see, you know, what the mayor and council had done and whether there are changed circumstances that could warrant that. And that's at the discretion of the board to determine whether you can reconcile that the mayor and council has not provided for this use in that zone.

Now, that being said --
MR. NEWMAN: I do have one more
question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Go right ahead.
MR. NEWMAN: Because I know Mr. Burgis
testified a lot about these reports and allegedly what was contained in these reports, but I don't think these reports were ever entered into evidence.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, what do you
mean?
MR. NEWMAN: The reports themselves.
MR. DELIA: They're all public record.
They're all adopted and they're on your website.
MR. NEWMAN: But we don't have them.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: But he testified about
them. You have his testimony.
MR. DELIA: You don't have the
ordinance in front of you either.
MR. NEWMAN: Right, but isn't it
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hearsay?
If we don't have the reports as part of this application, then Mr. Burgis is testifying about the content of the reports and quoting from the reports, and the reason why I bring it up is, and, Mr. Delia, you'll correct me if I'm wrong, I remember hearing something about what was being evaluated in the reexamination of the master plan was like we have down the street, where we have commercial on the bottom and then apartments on top, and I'm confused by that, because I haven't read it anywhere in any of the reports, and that's different than strictly residential housing, Mr. Delia.

MR. DELIA: Yes, if I can just comment on this.

Everything that was commented on was not only commented on by Mr. Burgis but by Mr. Preiss. They made reference to the master plan, the master plan reexamination, and the different studies. Not report necessarily but studies. These were documents that were before the mayor and council or in the case of the master plan reexamination and the master plan, before the planning board, they voted on them. They became public record, public policy of the borough. They're readily available online, and
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 201-641-1812                                    ex exceptional practical difficulty or exceptional undue hardship arising out of -- this is not the use of the property -- exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting the property, or by reason of extraordinary and exceptional situation affecting the specific piece of property or the structures lawfully existing thereon.
    The hardship must relate to a specific piece of property, not personal hardship or financial hardship.

Most (c) variances such as this involve properties that have front or rear setbacks that can't be met or odd shaped lots or unusual topography they make for practical difficulty.

In addition to that, for the (c)
variances, I'm not talking about (d) yet, the applicant bears the burden of proving both the positive and the negative criteria.

The positive criteria is the benefit or benefits to a municipality, and the benefits should outweigh any negatives.

The negative criteria provides that
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relief cannot be granted unless it can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and unless it will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance.

Now, those are for the (c) variances.
MR. DELIA: Mr. Princiotto, can I just weigh in for one second?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
MR. DELIA: There is actually a third way to get a (c) variance approved, and that is as Mr. Burgis testified here, it can be subsumed into the grant of the use variance. So there's a third element or third way to proof out a (c) variance, and it's through being subsumed by the use. I just want to get that out at this point.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
I'll go over the variances specifically that are being requested in this application, and, Mr. Delia, you can hear me on that too, make sure that I got that right.

Now, a (d) variance is different. The proofs are different.

For a (d) variance, the statute provides for additional proofs, including, and you've
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heard some testimony about this, special reasons.
The reason for this additional
requirement is that there is a strong legislative policy favoring land use planning by ordinance rather than by variance.

And special reasons include uses that are inherently beneficial.

One again, you heard Mr. Preiss' testimony with regard to his opinion on whether or not the affordable housing component or element was inherently beneficial in this application.

Special reasons can include a proposed project that carries out a purpose of zoning, which is set forth in Municipal Land Use Law, and may include that a site is particularly suited for the use.

Again, it's up to the board to make its own determination.

In order to grant a variance under paragraph (d), including this use variance, an applicant must show with an enhanced quality of proof that the variance sought is not inconsistent with the incident and the purposes of the master plan and zoning ordinance.

And, for a use variance, must
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1 reconcile, this is the Medici reconciliation, must reconcile the proposed use with the zoning ordinance is omission of a use of that permitted in the district. In addition, for a (d) variance there must be five affirmative votes.

Now I'm going to go over what the variances or briefly what the application is about. The application is for 60 multiple dwelling units in building \#1, 36 residential units, originally as proposed 28 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom. And in building \#2, 24 units, 18 one-bedroom and 6 two-bedroom. However, as noted by Richard Preiss, with our set aside ordinance and pursuant to our settlement agreement, Fair Share Housing, they would have to provide nine affordable housing units and two of those nine must be three bedroom units. The applicant has stated, although not originally, that they will abide by the terms of the set aside ordinance and the affordable housing settlement.

Okay. Now the variances. The use
variance, which is a (d) variance, is for a new multifamily residential building, to convert an existing building in an S-O zone. That's a special office district zone. That's the zone that this property is located in.
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The second variance is a height variance to permit three stories for building \#2, and the limit is $21 / 2$ stories, so they need that height variance.

An interior parking lot landscaping variance. They are required to have 1,320 square feet, and they are proposing 185 square feet.

MR. DELIA: That was reduced to zero after the FD-1 exhibit was submitted.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Reduced to zero?
MR. DELIA: Correct.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have some comments on the site plan too, but I'll get to that later.

MR. NEWMAN: The height variance, is it more or less than ten percent?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's a story, it's not a height variance.

MR. NEWMAN: The height they're okay?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes. It's three
stories.
And another variance they're seeking is to confirm the preexisting nonconforming front yard with the (c) variance setback. For building \#1, they are required to have 35 feet, they only have 34.1 , so it's a . 9 -foot variance that they're seeking. And
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also to confirm the setback from the street
centerline -- these are preexisting conditions -- 70
feet is required from the center street line, the existing is 65.6 feet, they need a variance for 4.4 feet, that's for building \#1.

There are also waivers that are being requested, and these are standards in our site plan review ordinance. And they are seeking the waiver for our parking stall dimensions. They are providing 9 'x18', and our standard is 10 ' $\times 20$ '.

They're asking for a waiver of the main approach, the walkways to the building, the grade, they are proposing a five percent slope as opposed to the ordinance, which requires only a four percent grade.

And then there is also, and, Evan, correct me if I'm wrong on any of this, there was a waiver requested with regard to swales along the southerly portion of the property with a grade of one percent; the permitted slope along swales is two percent.

There may be some other open items in the Neglia review letter. If they are and the board is to grant the application, it will be subject to any other open comments.
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council and the planning board have taken this issue up, and not actually this issue specifically, because they haven't even discussed residential use the Broadway corridor, they've discussed mixed use on the Broadway corridor and specifically decided not to take action. So I can't reconcile that with us taking action to essentially further any type of a broader expanse of Broadway development that was specifically not addressed by the council and planning board.

As far as changed circumstances are concerned, I don't know how much has changed in the last two years since the council and the planning board have taken this up and decided not to do anything with it. So I would agree with you, Chairwoman Hembree.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you. MR. NEWMAN: Chairwoman Hembree, I would add that I really didn't hear any testimony throughout the course of this hearing that the existing use is a challenge. I haven't heard that they've tried to rent it and they can't. In fact, my recollection, and I could be wrong, is that at the beginning of this application, there was actually portions of it were rented. I don't think that's the
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1 living in Woodcliff Lake and have nothing like that, 2 is beyond me. So to me, just the whole concept of 23 putting in that second building for the purposes of just getting something built in every piece of open available space just doesn't jive with me at all.
only basis that the applicant is seeking the variances under, but I think at least under that standard, I don't think there's been satisfactory proof that the purpose for which this property is zoned is obsolete. Just because on Chestnut Ridge Road they have office space, doesn't mean that this building, which has been occupied, at least in my opinion, until at least the start of the application, can't be occupied for its existing use. And I agree that it's zoned differently.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: John? MR. SPIRIG: So I would say there's a lot of issues. I'm sure everybody is going to have issues that are more important to them than others, but there's two things in particular that hit me.

No. 1, the construction of the second building is a complete nonstarter for me. How you can construct residential facilities for people to live in and have no open space, green space or anything provided for the people who are going to be
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That's No. 1.
No. 2, my recollection of what Richard Preiss said last week is a little different than what was summarized by Mr. Delia. And my recollection was that it sounded to me like he, as the planner for the planning board and for the council, has been working diligently to try to come to some conclusion on what to do with the Broadway corridor.

And it was very clear to me that one of the things that he did not plan to do is to put in residential units like this. They talk about mixed use, they talk about restaurants, they talk about a variety of different things, but they never talk about residential units like this. So I think it's completely off the path of what the plans are for the borough. For us to make that decision is a huge decision to kind of lead the way as to what comes next over on Broadway, which, quite frankly, I don't agree that we should be doing that.

MR. HAYES: Just to kind of reiterate, I agree with Mr. Spirig, this is a decision that's right for the council and the planning board and not the zoning board. This isn't the first time we've been confronted with an issue like this.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Right.
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Mr. Hayes said is true. You know, there have been a lot of different studies that have gone on Broadway corridor. The looking at overlay zoning on Broadway, which didn't happen. It's currently inconsistent with ordinances. I don't see where things are changing. The mayor and council considered uses, did not approve multifamily. I don't think that change is necessarily bad, but I don't think this is the right change that we want to see.

I think planning is better done by the mayor and council and by the planning board. We need to go in that direction, instead of making major changes to the town by ordinance.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: By variance.
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: By variance. I'm
sorry.
MR. NEWMAN: Madam Chairwoman, I was
commenting on the issue that you had raised. When it comes to the application itself I have some other comments, but I just want to give other people a chance to speak first.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Anybody else like to speak and state some thoughts?

MS. YETEMIAN: As an alternate, I agree
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with what has been said so far.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I think the other issue for me is that it it's not just about the Broadway corridor, that's not a separate part of Woodcliff Lake, it's part of an entire community, and if you could discuss the issues of zoning on a much broader scale and include everybody in this town, not just one section of the town, because one side or one street has an impact on everybody else.

MR. NEWMAN: So --
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Go ahead, Gary.
MR. NEWMAN: No one having volunteered,
going once, going twice, sold.
I have some issues with this particular project, and for the purpose of this, let's just assume for the sake of this discussion, I mean, it is surrounded by a residential district. There are people there. There are homes. The use proposed is residential use.

The bigger issue that I have has to do with the density that's proposed and the number of units that's proposed, and I really have a very difficult time reconciling Mr. Burgis' testimony with, for lack of a better term, what I perceive to be the community that we live in.
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102 22 generally. I think there's a large distinction between what has been talked about in the town for a long period of time of putting apartments over commercial, over businesses, and making it more of a
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downtown feel, versus simply building a whole bunch of apartment units outside the zone for which it's permitted, which doesn't seem to be fueling in the zone. And I can tell you that while there's really no guidance from an ordinance for this kind of zone within town, other towns have such ordinances. For example, I know Lincoln Park permits a minimum of five acres, 10 units per acre, if you want to build these kinds of units.

There's no guidance. There's no minimum lot size. There's no units that the council has recommended. I mean, frankly, I don't think somebody who sells their 4,000-square foot house, while they certainly want to downsize, I don't think it means downsizing into an 800-square foot apartment. I just don't see the number of units with this particular use being compatible with the testimony of Mr. Burgis, who's trying to sell this, for lack of a better term, as you live in Woodcliff Lake, it's going to provide a benefit to the community, you're going to stay in Woodcliff Lake and you're going to downsize.

I don't see that.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?
What is your recommendation? Do people
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have to have a positive resolution or a negative resolution?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Whatever motion anyone wants to make. First determine whether or not anyone has any additional comments about the application. Gary made a lot of comments.

MS. FENDIAN: I have a comment. And my comment is not very scientific, but my comment is more, we're here to support and talk for all of the community of Woodcliff Lake, for all the residents, and to support them, to see if what's proposed is in our advantage.

From all the testimony that I heard, I didn't hear anything that was almost even neutral about this project. And I'm thinking to grant a variance to make something different from the master plan, which is this is our plan, this is the basis of what we doing, like a community and a town, and this plan is not for nothing, it's there, we should bring something that's so beneficial for this community, substantially beneficial, and I think this was one of the considerations of the Medici reconciliation plan, that substantial improvement saw we can make a difference and it came straight from the master plan.

And I think that being here to support
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our residents and being residents of this town, we should listen to what they feel. And that's, for me, one of the main points. It's very important. Nothing proved to me that they're not right for what they want.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: So your feeling is
it's not a benefit to the community with this application?

MS. FENDIAN: It's not a negative thing, but at the same time it's not something that you really improve the quality of our community. That's what I think. I might be wrong, this is a personal opinion.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else have anything to say?

MR. NEWMAN: I'm just going to say one more thing and then I've said everything I have to say.

Also, I mean, Woodcliff Lake is not in a vacuum. We have a triboro ambulance corps, we share a school system, and I know that there are a large number of units that have gone up in some of these neighboring towns. And it's relevant to me to the extent that, you know, to the extent that the
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applicant argues that we don't have this and we need it, I do take into consideration the fact that there are so many other units going up within our school district, within our kind of tri, Park Ridge, Montvale and Woodcliff Lake all have a very close relationship. I think the courts are even combined. And so I don't feel that this is a use that's lacking within the community and therefore we need it.

I don't know if we need it, and, again, I just want to reiterate that I don't think that the use itself would be so terrible, but I think that it's the number of units and square footage for the units, that's really for me the crux of it. It's too many units, not enough property, not enough space. It just makes it, frankly, incompatible with the borough.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Just to piggyback on what Gary was saying, there are no amenities, there's nothing there. I mean, I look every so often to downsize. There is no reason for me to downsize there. You know, I go from four bedrooms to 1 or 2 and not have my backyard and not have the things that I have in my own home. Why would I as a resident see that as a benefit? So it's lacking.

MR. HAYES: And I think, just to add to
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,
,

Gary's point on the amount of the units and the density. I think one problem that was spoken about at length here which we haven't yet discussed right now, is its immediate proximity to the intersection which, anyone who lives in town, understands that that intersection can be time-consuming and troubling as it is.

Now, I understand we had expert testimony on the peak hours of traffic, but I think we're just looking at it from a superficial viewpoint when we do that, because a residential only development is going to encompass a 24 -hour a day seven-day a week traffic flow and not just a normal working hours traffic flow. And I think that compounds the issue that Gary is pointing out with the number of units.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Would somebody like to propose a motion?

MR. SPIRIG: Well, I was just going to
say, I don't want to speak for anybody that hasn't
spoken yet, but for the people that have spoken so
far, I don't have one positive thing that comes out
of this development project. Clearly the negatives outweigh any positives that there may be. There has to be something said for the people who live in the
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area, the people who are directly affected by this and their concerns for that.

So because of that, I'll be happy to
make the motion that we deny the application. Based on --

MR. NEWMAN: I would just like to give anybody else --

MR. SPIRIG: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: -- a chance, before I
accept it.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Not to put you on the
spot, you don't have to say anything if you don't want to, but it's up to you.

MR. DHAWAN: I could say a lot, but I've heard my colleagues, and, you know, one of the things that hit me immediately through this process is the fact that this project, we haven't heard any proof, like Gary started out by saying that the office project is not feasible. We didn't hear anything about that. I didn't see any compelling argument by this to go forward as a residential or not to make office.

The other thing that really bothered me about this project is, and it came to be expressed many times tonight is this is the worst intersection
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in town. I dread going that way. I have friends on that side, and I go all the way around the other way to avoid this intersection. I don't know what would come of this project in reality, but I would think that the testimony for traffic was fair to really what's going to be coming. I think that it was a little bit sugar-coated, to say the least. I think that the percentages of traffic that were displayed for certain periods of time maybe true, but it's very true that in a residential complex like this you're going to have constant traffic. I experience it where I work and a project was put up similar, across from offices, and the residential aspect is much more than the office aspect.

So, I mean, I can keep going on. I think everyone else has said a lot of what I'm also feeling, so I think, you know, again, this high density project is not indicative of what I don't think anyone in this town wants. That's another aspect that I'm hearing. And I don't see a positive from anyone that I've heard speak.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MR. DHAWAN: There's a couple of highlighted points that stick with me right now.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.
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MR. NEWMAN: I consider the traffic to be off-site condition. It's not the applicant's responsibility. So while it doesn't change my opinion in any way, in my analysis that doesn't come into account.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. We have a motion on the floor to deny.

May I have a second?
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: I'll second that.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Roll call, please.
Now, this is a motion to deny, so a yes
vote means you vote to deny, correct?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is for the variances that I went over with the board and the related site plan approval. And so if you vote yes, that's to deny the application. So there was a motion and there was a second.

MS. SMITH: Chairwoman Hembree?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Dhawan?
MR. DHAWAN: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Ms. Fendian?
MS. FENDIAN: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Hayes?
MR. HAYES: Yes.
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MS. SMITH: Ms. Malley?
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Newman?
MR. NEWMAN: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Spirig?
MR. SPIRIG: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: The motion is
denied. The application is denied.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: The motion is approved, the application is denied.
[APPLAUSE]
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do we have any other business on the agenda tonight?

MR. DELIA: Good night.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Good night, Mr. Delia.
(Time noted: 10:01 p.m.)
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