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| 3 | CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. Now onto the |
| 4 | revised application of 188 Broadway, LP; 188 |
| 5 | Broadway Block: 2701 Lot: 3 R-15 and the S-O |
| 6 | Zone. Use variance to add 53 apartment units and |
| 7 | to permit multi-family residential use in the S-O |
| 8 | Zone, a variance for front yard setback of 34.1 |
| 9 | feet where 35 feet is required, a variance for |
| 10 | rear yard setback of 39 feet where 50 feet is |
| 11 | required, a variance for building setback from the |
| 12 | street centerline of 65.6 feet where 70 feet is |
| 13 | required and a variance for deficient parking lot |
| 14 | area landscaping where 185 square feet is proposed |
| 15 | and 1,320 square feet is required. |
| 16 | Received 3/12/21; Deemed Complete by Board |
| 17 | Engineer 4/5/21. |
| 18 | Time for decision was extended to 8/3/21. |
| 19 | Okay. Mr. Kaufman, do you want to... |
| 20 | MR. KAUFMAN: Good evening, Madam |
| 21 | Chairwoman. |
| 22 | First, before we proceed, I just want to |
| 23 | thank you and the board members for this special |
| 24 | meeting. |
| 25 | Also, before I get into it, I just want to |
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state for the record that your board member, Michael Kaufman, and I are not related and I say that because Neglia Engineering had an engineer whose last name was also Kaufman, I had to state it every time I appeared in Edgewater, make the same statement. Kaufman's a pretty common name, but we're not related so we just want to have the record reflect that.

This is a continuation of an application that started on May 25th when we presented two witnesses. We marked some exhibits into the record and while this exhibit was touched upon and testimony, it was not marked into the record, so I'd just like to - a little housekeeping - I'd
just like to mark into the record as Exhibit A-11, the fire department review letter dated April 29th, 2021.

Now, I would like to make, if it's okay before I call my first witness, I want to just make a very, very brief statement and preserve our rights, which is that we're going to call witnesses as has been mandated by the board and we just want to state for the record that we believe that we have a right to call witnesses in the order in which we think is appropriate, present
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the case as we think is appropriate, and as I said, I'm making this statement not to get into a colloquy, your decision is your decision. We're going to move forward based upon your decision. But I just wanted to preserve the record and preserve our rights by making that statement. It's more set out in the letters that were exchanged.

So with that, I just want to also proceed.
I just got reminded by Danielle that we have to amend one exhibit, A-2. That's the Soil Movement Plan that was prepared by MCB. We had moved it in by stating that it was dated May 8th, 2018, last revised April 25th, 2019. Danielle has reminded me that it was not revised April 25th, 2019. So the record should reflect that A-2, the Soil Movement Plan prepared by MCB Engineering Associates dated May 8th, 2018, consisting of two sheets. So with that correction and that little statement... You know what, Danielle's good at reminding me.

We submitted the Affidavit of Service and Proof of Publication to the board. It was noticed on June 4th, I believe. Meg Smith has acknowledged her receipt of the Proof of

Publication from The Record and a copy of the publication.

So with that on the record, I'd like to call the first witness, Rich LaBarbiera.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Before you do that and I don't want to get into a discussion about it, however, for people that are viewing and listening, they may not know what you were talking about with regard to the witnesses, although this did come up at the last meeting.

You sent a letter directed to Chairwoman Robin Malley and I sent in a letter and she made a decision, so all I'm going to do is read what her decision was. I believe the issues were the order of witnesses and also whether or not comments submitted and/or questions, for that matter, although that wasn't the issue at the time, could be read. And you objected to any comments being read in the record, however, I addressed that in my letter and New Jersey Administrative Code reference. So I'm just going to read Chairwoman Robin Malley's decision so that everyone knows what you're talking about.
"I have reviewed both letters. Mr.
Kaufman shall proceed in the usual manner and call
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his witnesses first and he can ask questions of the board's professionals when they testify. I request that Mr. Kaufman state the witnesses that he intends to call as part of the applicant's presentation and when he expects them to testify so we can properly schedule.

Comments and letters submitted by residents shall be read.

As is our custom, Mr. Princiotto shall swear witnesses and issue subpoenas, if necessary.

Robin Malley, Chairperson, Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board of Adjustment".

Although the email doesn't say that because it wasn't the issue, people can submit questions as well if they would like in addition to comments. Comments will be read at the end of the case, which is when we take comments. But they can send them in writing as well as be a participant via Zoom.

Okay. Mr. Kaufman.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Princiotto, but I would also like to add, for the record, since you left something dangling in the chairwoman's decision.

I did in fact within two days write to the
chairwoman and give her the response that she
requested, specifically, the witnesses in the proposed order. I don't know if I gave the exact order, but I did give her the witnesses that she requested. So the record should reflect that I did comply with her request.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, you did.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes, you did.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And we thank you for that.

MR. KAUFMAN: No thanks necessary, but thank you.

I'd like to call Richard LaBarbiera as my first witness.

RICHARD LA BARBIERA, 281
Dunkerhook Road, Paramus, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, Mr. Kaufman.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KAUFMAN:
Q Could you please tell the board what your educational and professional background is?
A I attended the U.S. Military Academy for a year
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before transferring and then finishing up and receiving a
bachelor of science in civil engineering at NJIT.
I then later went on to get my professional
engineering license. I've now been a professional engineer for 30 years.

I can't believe I just said 30 years, but yes.
Q Your license is still in full force and effect?
A Yes, it is.
Q And Mike Neglia, Neglia Engineering, sat behind you at NJIT?
A That is correct, as well as Matt Clark. And I think Lou was in a couple of classes too.

Q Okay. Mr. LaBarbiera, after you graduated and you became a licensed civil engineer, you became involved with development?
A Correct, yes. After practicing engineering for four years, I joined G Heller Enterprises in 1994 and I was the Vice President of Construction and Planning through 2007. Then 2007 I went into business for myself.

Q Okay. And -- I'm sorry, go ahead. A During that tenure I was responsible for the construction, development, planning for I would guesstimate 10 million square feet of development throughout Newark, New Jersey.

4 Q As a construction manager for other 5 development projects?
6 A That is correct. Construction manager and in that
7 capacity, since 2007, I've probably built a thousand
8 residential units together with millions of square feet
9 of retail mixed use, et cetera.
10 Q And one of your projects is you are a
11 principal of 188 Broadway?
12 A That is correct.
13 Q And in your professional capacity and both
14 as an engineer, as a builder, as a construction manager,
15 you have been involved in plans, construction drawings,
16 Site Plans, architectural plans. You deal with them on a
17 frequent basis if not every day?
18 A Every day, every minute, every hour of the day.
19 Q Okay. Now, you are familiar with the
20 architectural plans that were submitted in this
21 application, aren't you?
22 A That is correct.
23 Q And what was your role in the preparation
24 of the architectural plans?
25 A I actually directed the architect for all aspects
and there's also an 800 plus square foot amenity that is
now provided within Building 1 and, again, Building 1 is
the existing building.

Building 2 is the building that is in the back of the site as you look at it from Broadway, and the footprint, again, is unchanged. As originally proposed it was three stories and it was made up of 24 units and had a flat roof.

The proposed building is now two stories having the same footprint, the same unit layout, and is now instead 16 units with the reduction from three to two stories that eliminated one variance which was previously being sought.

And also, I think it's important to note that on the original application there was a flat roof and on that flat roof there were the condensers in connection with the HVAC, heating units, et cetera, within the 24 -I'm sorry -- within the 24 units that were proposed under the original development.

The current plans not only were they reduced to two stories, but we now have a pitched roof which is much more typical of a residential home, building, et cetera. With that pitched roof there are no longer any condensers that can be seen from above that were previously proposed on the roof.
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That's really a summary of all the changes.
Q I just have one more question. On
Building 1, the existing building, the original
application was for 36 total units, 28 one bedrooms, 8
two bedrooms. The revised, what's pending before the
board today, is actually one unit more, 37, but the one
bedrooms are increased to three, the three bedrooms are
decreased to four. You mentioned the number of bedrooms,
so even though the number of units increased, the number
of bedrooms actually decreased?
A It's decreased by three. Under the original
application it was a total of 44 bedrooms as compared to
41. So there's been a reduction in the overall bedroom count, albeit one more unit.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. I have no further questions, Madam Chairperson.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any board members have questions?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: What was the layout on those bedrooms? How many units have how many bedrooms?

MR. LaBARBIERA: The makeup of the proposed application for Building 1 is 33 one bedroom and four two bedroom. That's a total of 37 units. As compared to on the original
application, 28 one bedroom, eight two bedroom for a total of 36 .

As I previously described, that's 44 total bedrooms in Building 1 under the original application versus 41 today.

With regards to Building 2, Building 2 was previously 24 units; 18 one bedroom and six two bedroom. A floor was simply shaved off and those units or a count was reduced by one third and instead of 18 one bedrooms, it's now reduced to 12 one bedrooms and instead of six two bedrooms, Building 2 now has four two bedrooms.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Weren't some of these units supposed to be affordable housing units?

MR. KAUFMAN: Madam Chair, if the application's approved and the developer elects to build, provide the affordable housing on-site, then this configuration will be changed.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. I was not aware that that was a choice at this point that you can build on-site or buy it elsewhere.

MR. KAUFMAN: You can build it off-site as long as it's within the town, within the borough.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. I wasn't aware that that was a choice at this point. Okay.
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we'll look into that further, but we do have the set aside and we do have a settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing counsel, so.

MR. KAUFMAN: For the record, we'll comply with it. If it requires that the units be built on-site, the configuration will be changed even if it results in a reduction in the number of units. But it will be changed. It will be complied with.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We can go over those requirements with the planners. I think they're well versed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, let's see if we get approved first. If we get approved first, we'll address it. You can certainly make it a condition of approval and, you know, we will comply with the regulations.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We'll let you know what the requirements are.

Okay.
MR. LaBARBIERA: Can I just expand on my last response?

The overall bedroom count now is 61 total bedrooms versus originally 74 proposed and that is reflective of the original 60 and 53 units
currently proposed; the 60 previously and 53 currently proposed.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Any other board members have questions?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, I have a few questions.

Is there a visual of the pitched roof?
MR. LaBARBIERA: Excuse me while I go to the exhibits.

Yes, if you go to drawing A-2.1, you can see the pitched roof in all four elevations: The west, north, south, and east.

And if you were to go back, I don't know if you have the original application at your disposal, but the drawing for Building 2 elevation was A-2.1, where it was a flat roof with a parapet around its perimeter.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry, what page?
You said A, what was it?
MR. LaBARBIERA: 2.1. And that's in both sets, the original set in 2019 and the current set of plans.

I'd also point out that that pitched roof will be a shingled roof very similar to a residential home.
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, with regard to the HVAC units, where will they be located? You said they will no longer be on the rooftop.

MR. LaBARBIERA: That's correct. Each unit instead will have what's called a PTAC. A PTAC is a through the wall unit which is also represented in the elevation.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: So they each have one in their own, below the window is what you're saying?

MR. LaBARBIERA: Correct, as compared to having a system that's called a split system, where you would have your condenser on the roof and your heating unit within the unit itself.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And those through the wall units, they would go out the rear of the buildings?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, they would actually go out on wherever there's an exterior window. So in all likelihood on at least the front and rear elevation, yes.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MR. LaBARBIERA: It's the east and west.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: So one per unit of those or is there one per room? How do those

## work?

MR. LaBARBIERA: Typically there's two for a one bedroom and three for a two bedroom.

MR. KAUFMAN: Madam Chairwoman, would it be helpful if Danielle posted this so everybody can see what Mr. LaBarbiera is referring to?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes, it would.
MS. FEDERICO: Hold on one second.
MR. KAUFMAN: I don't know how to do this.
She's got to do it.
MR. LaBARBIERA: That's actually the original application in 2019, which shows the flat roof and the parapet around.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: And that's Building 2?
MR. LaBARBIERA: Correct, Building 2 is the new building in the rear of the property at the base of the slope.

MS. FEDERICO: Let me just share this. I apologize, I have more than one screen so if I'm looking at different screens...

MR. LaBARBIERA: There you go.
The east elevation shows the pitched roof and you can see clearly on the north and south the peak that runs down the center in a north/south direction. Very similar to a roof you would see
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on a home of many sort.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you familiar with
Cressfield Court?
MR. LaBARBIERA: No, I'm not.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And on that east elevation that we see on the Exhibit A-2.1, what's the date on that, Miss Federico, if I can trouble you for that?

MR. LaBARBIERA: March 1st.
MS. FEDERICO: I have March 1st, 2021.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MS. FEDERICO: It was marked Exhibit A-7.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MS. FEDERICO: At the last hearing.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
Are those dark rectangles, are those indicative of the air conditioning units?

MR. LaBARBIERA: They're called PTAC units and, yes, that is representative of where they would be situated. And what you would be seeing is the grill. The unit itself is within, the PTAC unit itself projects into the unit itself. So the only thing that would be on the outside is a grill that is almost on the same surface, perhaps it projects two inches beyond the adjacent siding.

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

MS. LEHENY: Madam Chairwoman, can I ask a couple of questions?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Go ahead, Liz.
MS. LEHENY: Actually, I think I need to be sworn in.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: If you're going to testify about anything then, yes. If you just have questions...

MS. LEHENY: Okay. I was going to do a little bit of both.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Just in case we'll swear you in.
(Whereupon, Elizabeth Leheny was sworn)

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And just introduce yourself and give us the benefit of your qualifications.

MS. LEHENY: Sure.
I'm Elizabeth Leheny. I'm partner at
Phillips Preiss and I've been reviewing this application as Richard Preiss is heading towards retirement. So I'll be acting on the board's
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behalf in reviewing the application.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: Before she testifies, Mr. Princiotto, am I going to be able to question her?
I mean, you said at the beginning that I would have the right to question her after she testifies.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if she's testifying.

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, she said she was and that's why.

MS. LEHENY: Well, this is the question.
MR. KAUFMAN: A little bit of both and I don't care.

MS. LEHENY: I was going to clarify what the affordable housing requirements are in Woodcliff Lake. I don't know if that's considered testimony or not. I mean, you can certainly cross-examine me on that.

But if it's a --
MR. KAUFMAN: I would question you rather than cross-examine.

MS. LEHENY: Okay. All right. So I guess, Mr. LaBarbiera, do you know if the units would be rental or ownership?

MR. KAUFMAN: Rental.
MR. LaBARBIERA: Rental. Thank you.
MS. LEHENY: Okay. So the affordable housing zoning in Woodcliff Lake requires that for rental properties 15 percent of the units have to be affordable housing. So 15 percent of 53 equals eight units and my math, 20 percent of those, a maximum of 20 percent would be allowed to be one bedroom. So in this instance it would only allow to have one affordable one bedroom. You have to have a minimum of 20 percent three bedrooms. So in this instance there would have to be two three bedroom units and then the remainder can be two bedrooms units.

MR. KAUFMAN: Liz, you know, I mean, that's consistent with the affordable distribution everywhere in the state. But let me ask you this. You're asking rental or for sale. Today it's for rent. What if it's approved and six months later in the middle of construction we decide for sale? When do you have to make that determination? I mean, that determination may not be made until the time you go for construction financing, for instance, depending upon market conditions.

MS. LEHENY: Yes, I would just say I do
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not believe you would be able to get a certificate of occupancy if you didn't comply with the affordable housing ordinance.

MR. KAUFMAN: Totally agree with you on that, but a certificate of occupancy would be two years down the road, not today.

MS. LEHENY: I think, I guess maybe perhaps what I should ask Mr. LaBarbiera is would you promise to or would you agree to comply with the affordable housing requirements that are in the Woodcliff Lake code?

MR. LaBARBIERA: We would comply.
MS. LEHENY: Okay. And then the other question I had had to do with the grills.
Sometimes these can be, you know, somewhat unsightly. Would you take any measures, let's say to paint the grills the same colors as the facades that they're affixed to or in some way not to make them as visually obtrusive.

MR. LaBARBIERA: I was going to get into that before. We always paint the grills and we match the adjacent siding so that it blends in and we go as far as to actually get the color of the siding and we send and get a special paint made and you can put the grill next to the siding and
you wouldn't even take note of it.
MR. KAUFMAN: I just want to jump in, Liz, on something. At the last application on
June 25th, 2019, Richard testified to the effect that he would ask the developer to work with your office. He said his office at the time. But your office and the borough engineer to tweak the architectural plan. So I just want to state, for the record, that's something he said and it's something that the developer is very much in agreement with.

MR. LaBARBIERA: We always look for input with regard to materials, color selections, et cetera. We want to be consistent with the neighborhood and the expectation of the municipality.

MS. LEHENY: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Sorry if I stepped in a little too soon. Thank you. Those are all the questions I have right now.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: That's okay, Liz.
Do any of our other professionals have any questions?

Can we get a motion to open to the public for questions?
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BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Robin, I have a question going back before some points of concern from some of the people.

Obviously, the design was changed to help mitigate the visual effects and the other point of I guess concern from the people are the noise level, decibel level. And this is an engineer's, I guess, question. So we're switching the type of unit, we had the old style, I don't have the notes, if anyone is able to pull them up from last time. How many units were on the last building and what was the decibel level because now we're changing it to individual units and what's the decibel rating for this, for these multiple units that are going in because obviously the noise level was a concern with everybody.

MR. KAUFMAN: May I respectfully suggest that Mr. LaBarbiera just talk about the difference in the noise generated by condensers on the roof as opposed to a PTAC?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Sure.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: If he knows.
MR. KAUFMAN: Look, as an engineer and a builder, he should know.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Without knowing with
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certainty the decibels, the switch systems with the condensers on the roof throw off more noise than the PTAC. The PTAC is within the unit and obviously the sound is kept down.

I'd also point out that sound typically travels with line of vision. If you don't see it, you don't hear it as clearly. These PTAC units would be directly facing what is the slope and no adjacent building, where under the original application you had the condensers that could arguably be seen from the higher elevation that were situated on the roof and whatever noise they would make would obviously travel more freely because when you see it, you typically hear it.

But with the PTACs, they are quieter units and they would be facing the slope and I think you would be hard pressed to see them from above. When I say above, the properties located to the east.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: That would be Cressfield Court.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Let me just make sure.
Cressfield Court, correct. That is the dead end that is located at the top of the slope to the east of the property.
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you know the manufacturer of these PTAC units?

MR. LaBARBIERA: PTAC units are sold by multiple manufacturers. What I typically use is GE. It's a GE PTAC. I know Amana makes it. I've installed Amana but for durability and reliability I bet you the hundred percent of the PTACs I installed over the last two to three years have all been GE manufactured.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You may or may not know the answer to this question, but do you know how many decibels they emit at the loudest level?

MR. LaBARBIERA: As I said before, I don't know the exact decibels, but I would equate it to perhaps a window unit, a window air conditioning unit as compared to a condenser that's outside a home. If you ever saw a home or if you've ever gone to a home that has these condensers on the outside with a big fan and so forth, typically, they are much louder than these PTACs for the fact that they are cooling and are greater tonnage.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. So looking at the west elevation, can you tell me how many units there would be that would face Cressfield Court, the PTAC units?

MR. LaBARBIERA: The west elevation, none of those units would face Cressfield Court.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I meant the east elevation.

MR. LaBARBIERA: The east elevation, no problem.

Well, if there are 16 total units in Building 2, there are now eight on the west elevation and eight on the east elevation, four per floor, so it would be a total of eight units that would face east or west elevation.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Eight on each floor or eight altogether.

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, four. Four per floor, eight total.

Your floor plate is made up of eight units; four of which face the front and four of which face the rear and you have two floors for a total of 16 units in Building 2. Half those face east; half of those face the west.

I must also point out that these units don't run all the time. Obviously, during the colder season the heat pump would be going on and obviously, during the warmer season, the cooling cycle would be operating and they would not be
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running 24/7.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: And the heat pump is part of that unit or the heat pump is something separate?

MR. LaBARBIERA: It's all a packaged unit and that's what a PTAC unit is. The heating and cooling is provided by a single unit. It's entirely electric.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay.
Do any of our board members have any other questions?

## Christina?

MS. HEMBREE: I do.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Go ahead.
MS. HEMBREE: You've requested a variance for deficient parking lot area landscaping where you propose 185 square feet where 1,320 square feet is required. And that's no change. Is that correct?

MR. LaBARBIERA: I would defer to the engineer on that. I didn't offer any testimony on that and I assume that's something that our engineer would be better suited to address.

MS. HEMBREE: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Anything else for Mr.

## LaBarbiera?

Motion to open to the public?
MS. HEMBREE: So moved.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Can we get a second?
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Second.
MS. SMITH: Can I just ask who gave the second? I can't see them on the scree.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Myself, Michael
Kaufman.
MS. SMITH: Thank you so much.
All in favor?
Any opposed?
Okay. Can I ask that we not share screen
so I can allow members of the public who have raised their hands.

Thank you.
I have Craig Marson I believe raising his
hand. I'm going to allow him to talk.
MR. MARSON: Thank you. Good evening.
Can everybody hear me?
Thank you, Mr. LaBarbiera, for sharing your time.

I just have a few quick questions. The
first, if I may, is what relevance is it to this
project whether you or the architect drew the
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plans?
MR. KAUFMAN: Relevance to the project?
MR. MARSON: Yes. In other words --
MR. KAUFMAN: It's not relevance to the project. We needed somebody to testify as to the changes in architectural plans. The questioning went to his background and why he's qualified to testify as to the architectural plans.

MR. MARSON: No, that's not my question. My question is you did your very best to apparently minimize the contribution of Mr. Dattoli, the architect that was paid. So my question again is what relevance is it to this project whether Mr. LaBarbiera or Mr. Dattoli drew the plans?

MR. KAUFMAN: Relevance to the project as to who actually drew the plans, that's a legal question. I'd say not --

MR. MARSON: You called Mr. Dattoli, in effect, you were talking a Scribner. So, again --

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm not going to get into an argument with you, Mr. Marson.

MR. MARSON: All right. Fine. Let me go to my second question. Then again it follows up. Why does it appear that you're apparently trying
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to minimize the retained architect's contribution to the plans?

MR. KAUFMAN: He's not going to answer.
MR. MARSON: All right. Last thing to Mr.
LaBarbiera.
Would you consider yourself more of an architect or an investor on this project?

MR. KAUFMAN: He's not going to answer that question either. He's testified who he is.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think he already indicated that he was an investor or principal in this particular ownership of the property. So I think he answered that.

MR. MARSON: I appreciate that but, again, there was an indication 24/7 full availability on the project. So the question is, are you the architect or are you straight a passive investor or an --

MR. KAUFMAN: He's not going to answer the question.

MR. MARSON: Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: You're welcome.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well --
MR. KAUFMAN: He's already testified that he's a principal in a company. He's already
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testified. It's just an argumentative question and intended to be argumentative. Let's move on.

MR. MARSON: No, I respectfully degree.
No, you attempted Scribner. You used a very
specific word to attempt to minimize the contribution of the original architect. So what is it?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Look, I think you asked a different question. You want to know what his role is in this particular project. Is he just an investor or principal in the entity that owns the property or is he going to be involved in construction management of this particular project. Is that your question?

MR. MARSON: Fair enough. I'd like to better understand his role, that is correct.

MR. KAUFMAN: He's a principal and the applicant. He's a builder. He's testified that he's a construction manager. That's his business. He also testified that Mr. Dattoli, through the plans, and he did it at his direction. I think that answers the questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Mr. Marson, do you have any other questions?

MR. MARSON: No, ma'am, thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Thank you.
Meg, do we have anyone else on Zoom?
MS. SMITH: Yes, I'm going to ask Miss Levine to un-mute.

MS. LEVINE: Thank you very much for taking my question.

Mr. LaBarbiera and Mr. Kaufman said that if the project's approved and if there are
affordable housing requirements, which there will be, they would comply, but they would then have to rearrange or reconfigure the bedrooms. My question is since they already know that 15 percent must be affordable and certain numbers of bedrooms, why is it not being planned that way in the first place?

MR. KAUFMAN: Because we want to retain our options on how we're going to comply. We're not required to commit today as to how we're going to do it, although we do have to commit that we will do it.

MS. LEVINE: So you will do it, but you have not arranged the bedrooms to make that happen properly.

MR. KAUFMAN: We want to explore all of our options and all of our possible ways to
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provide the affordable housing and address them at that time when we have to.

MS. LEVINE: What other options would there be?

MR. KAUFMAN: I really don't want to get into it. I don't think it's appropriate. I think what is appropriate is that there's a commitment that it will be addressed. It will be provided as your planner said and we fully agree with her. There will be no T.O.s unless we comply.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think it's fair to say from the testimony and the comments by Mr. Kaufman that they've indicated a willingness to comply with our set aside ordinance, but they have not provided the details about how they will comply.

MS. LEVINE: I was just curious what those options are that Mr. Kaufman is referring to. What options are there when 15 percent is required?

MR. KAUFMAN: There might be 20. There might be 20 percent, which changes everything.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, if they sell the units, although they're telling us as part of this application that they're rental units, if they're selling units.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's today, Sal.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's today, that's your application today. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: Correct.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Rental units require
15 percent. If they were selling the units, it
would be a 20 -percent requirement.
MS. LEVINE: Okay. I see. Thank you for that explanation. I appreciate it.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're welcome.
MS. SMITH: I'm going to ask Ms. Borelli to address the board.

MS. BORELLI: Hi, good evening, everyone. Can you hear me?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes.
MS. BORELLI: Okay. I have a couple of questions for Mr. LaBarbiera. I'm sure they're quick questions and they'll be quick answers, I assume.

The first question is, talking about these PTAC units on the east side of the building which will be facing Cressfield Court. You say that we shouldn't be able to hear them. How can we be assured that after, if you guys are approved and it's built, what happens if we do hear them? What
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happens if we're sitting outside in our yard and we hear the hum of these PTAC units? What happens then?

Also the thing is, you know, we have a lot of birds here and in the morning, you know, there's many, many birds, you know, one bird you hear and then you hear many birds and when you hear many birds it seems much louder. I don't see the birds, but I hear them. So I might not see the PTACs, but I might possibly hear them because it can travel up, you know, towards the street.
So I don't typically understand how you can be so confident that sitting outside in our yards on Cressfield Court that we will not hear the hum of these PTACs.

MR. LaBARBIERA: First of all, I'm going to try and answer.

I want to point out, since Mr. Marson finished, I don't think I heard any of Gwenn's comments or questions. I'm getting a little background noise. Am I the only one? I guess I am.

In any event, can everybody hear me?
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes.
MR. LaBARBIERA: I was getting a lot of
static. I don't know what was going on.
First of all, the PTAC units would not be facing Cressfield Court, instead they would be facing the slope. I just looked up while I was sitting here, each of these PTAC units operates at a maximum of 50 decibels. That is the rating. To equate 50 decibels, there's a chart. It simply says that 50 decibels is the equivalent of conversation, bear with me, which is slightly quieter than normal conversation level. So that's what 50 decibels represents. I would think that you would be hard pressed to hear a quiet conversation from the distance between the rear, the west elevation -- I'm sorry -- the east elevation of Building 2 and the homes on Cressfield Court.

MS. BORELLI: Well, I have to disagree with you, Mr. LaBarbiera.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you can't argue with the witness.

MS. BORELLI: Okay. Sorry.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can make a comment.
Okay. Or you can testify later.
MS. BORELLI: Okay. I do hear
conversations. I mean, I don't hear every word
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they're saying, but I hear the hum of people talking two houses away, so I still don't understand how you can --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. That would come --

MS. BORELLI: I have another question.
Mr. LaBarbiera, are you planning on
building any other rental apartments in Woodcliff Lake?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, not at this time.
MS. BORELLI: Are you planning on building
53 apartments next door to your house?
MR. KAUFMAN: Don't answer the question, Rich. Don't answer it.

MR. LaBARBIERA: I don't live in Woodcliff Lake.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It doesn't have anything to do with this application, so I don't think you should ask that question.

MS. BORELLI: I have no more questions.
MR. LaBARBIERA: For the record, I don't live in Woodcliff Lake.

MS. SMITH: I'm asking Miss Appelle to address the board.

MS. APPELLE: Good evening, everyone.

Thank you for taking my comments and questions.
Is there a lot of feedback here?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, from you.
MS. APPELLE: Let me see if I can fix that. Bear with me one second or take somebody else.

Is that any better? Good. Because I was working off two computers to make sure. I don't know why. Just because it gives you --

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Let's move on with your questions.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. So I have a couple of questions for -- well, I have one quick question for Mr. Kaufman.

Mr. Kaufman, what is the 800-foot amenity mentioned? I've never heard that mentioned before.

MR. LaBARBIERA: I mentioned the 800-square foot amenity.

MS. APPELLE: Oh, I'm sorry, you did.
MR. LaBARBIERA: Yeah. That can be anything from a lounge to a small gym to a business center where people could come and gather for any of those reasons.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. But right now it's
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not planned for either building and the size, if it ever were put in, would be 800 square feet.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Actually, there is an 800-square foot amenity shown on the plans in Building 1, which is the existing building, and that occurs on the first grade above the below ground parking.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you. So obviously these questions are all for you.

You know, some people run their heating and air conditioning 24/7 because it's a very individual decision, you would agree with that. Correct? But how would you know --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is that a question? Do you want an answer to that?

MS. APPELLE: Well, he can answer me.
MR. LaBARBIERA: I think everybody sets a thermostat and depending on what the temperature is outside and the differential, a heater or an air conditioner will have to run until it hits that temperature and then it shuts down. But I don't think everybody arbitrarily runs their heat or their air conditioning 24/7. While they have a set temperature, yes, but I don't think their intention is to run it non-stop.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. Well, that question led to what I was going trying to get at, how do you know that there will be down time, but for you that was a very important thing, why was it so important that you wouldn't hear these things because they would be off or they would be down time. Why was that so important?

MR. LaBARBIERA: I think I was just giving testimony as to the operation of the PTAC unit and I know that as part of the first application there was a sensitivity to any noise that might be coming from Building 2 and, specifically, they had concerns about the condensers that were located on any flat roof, which has since been replaced in its entirety with a pitched roof, no different than a residential home and now instead had through the wall units, PTACs.

MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you.
Now, you mentioned, Mr. LaBarbiera, that this building is consistent with the neighborhood. How do you come to that determination?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm not sure he testified to that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I think he said the roof was consistent.
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MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kaufman.

Thank you, Mr. LaBarbiera.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MS. SMITH: I have Mr. Alex Couto.
MR. COUTO: Hi, good evening.
MR. LaBARBIERA: How are you?
MR. COUTO: Mr. LaBarbiera, I have a few questions for you.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Sure.
MR. COUTO: Are there any changes to the front yard of the building of the Building 1 in between Building 1 and the street?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No. Building 1 is an existing building and with the current application there were no changes to any of the locations of either the existing or the proposed building or the parking, landscaping, drainage, sanitary, water, circulation, et cetera.

MR. COUTO: Are any changes planned to the roof of Building 1?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, there are no changes proposed to Building 1 from the original application.
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MR. COUTO: Are you aware of the Ordinance 19-07, Woodcliff Lake Ordinance 19-07? Have you read through it?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, I have not.
MR. COUTO: From what I understand, you said you were involved in the planning of the building of the plans, organizing the plans?

MR. LaBARBIERA: I'm involved in the planning of all aspects of the building, not just the architecture.

MR. COUTO: So could you tell me, like, details, dates that you met with the residents that live within 200, the homeowners that live within 200 feet of the property with their concerns? When did you meet with them?

MR. LaBARBIERA: Mr. Couto, can you repeat that question? There's a little background noise. I'm sorry.

MR. COUTO: I'm trying to see when you have met with the residents that live within 200 yards of the building for their concerns?

MR. KAUFMAN: For this application?
MR. COUTO: Yes.
MR. LaBARBIERA: I don't think I represented that I have and I have not so, no, I
have not.
MR. COUTO: You have not. So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another So I mean, typically when people come for
zoning board variances they get their neighbors
involved and get okay from the neighbors.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's a comment. You
can make that if you want at the end of the case.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So I have another question.

So relating to Ordinance 19-07. I submitted to the zoning board in case you want to use as an exhibit. There is a requirement for a particular type of roof and for any changes in this part of town. This ordinance applies being this is a new application I think everything in ordinance should apply to you.

MR. LaBARBIERA: I'm not familiar with that ordinance, but I think that anything that is part of that ordinance would have been commented on by the professionals that reviewed the documents, so I'm not aware of the issues.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let's just leave it this way, he's not aware of the ordinance so you can't question him about something he's not aware of.

MR. COUTO: Okay. There's --
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MR. COUTO. Okay. There's --

MR. KAUFMAN: And what was the
Section 19-07?
MR. COUTO: 19-07, yes.
There's a couple of things that
application is not in compliance and it looks like our --

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm going to look it up.
MR. COUTO: So I'm specifically, I have a question about, let me just go there.

If you go to the landscaping and open space part of the ordinance. Item b says,
"Required Open Space dedication on Larger
Projects". It says, "The open space shall be at least 2,000 square feet. It may be of any shape".

So can you tell us where this is addressed on your plans?

MR. KAUFMAN: No, he's not testifying on the Site Plan. He's only testified as to the architectural plan.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Correct.
MR. COUTO: Okay. So on the architectural plan, if we go to the building design, they have the Roof Form and it says that buildings every 50 feet have to be a break in the roof and has to be a mansard form.

```
So if you're doing any changes, I guess Building 1 is to comply to this?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Could you refer to a particular section that you're referring to?
MR. COUTO: Yes, so Ordinance 19-07 and if you go down to Roof Form.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Right.
MR. KAUFMAN: Go back up to the top
because 19-07, it is in the S-O District, but it's
Residentially-Inspired Site Layout. Okay.
MR. COUTO: So if you go down to item 4, which is Roof Form. Then it says if the building is larger, it can't be flat. They need to be mansard. And also there is another section that says the roof has to be broken. Item 3 on Building Design.
MR. KAUFMAN: It says here, "In order to minimize building height on taller buildings and increase the sense of stature on single-story buildings, flat roofs are prohibited."
We don't have a flat roof.
"Instead, a peaked or mansard roof form is required."
MR. LaBARBIERA: Danielle, can you put A-2.1 again?
```
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MR. KAUFMAN: So we have a peaked roof, don't we, Rich?

MR. LaBARBIERA: Yeah, but I also think it's important to point out that there are breaks in the roof so that it is not a long flat roof. I don't have the benefit of the ordinance in front of me.

MR. KAUFMAN: No, I looked it up online while we're talking.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: If you take a look at A-2.1, you can see in the west and east elevation that there are breaks in the roof.

MR. COUTO: But you're talking Building 2; I'm talking Building 1.

MR. KAUFMAN: Building 1 is an existing building.

MR. LaBARBIERA: Building 1 is an existing building.

MR. KAUFMAN: Building 1 exists. There are no Site Plan issues with Building 1. Just use. Use is the only issue. Use is the only issue, not the design and he's not testifying as to the design of Building 1 anyway.

MR. COUTO: Okay. Moving on.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: This could be a good
question for the planners. I mean, when you redevelop the property, do you have to comply with the ordinance. But we'll let the planners weigh in on that.

MR. COUTO: So can the planner weigh in on that? I'll wait to hear from them.

MR. KAUFMAN: I think it's kind of unfair to make her come up with something without having an opportunity to review it.

MR. COUTO: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it could be reviewed for the next meeting. We'll see.

MR. COUTO: I have a couple of more questions, if you don't mind.

Mr. LaBarbiera, are you aware of the zoning areas in Woodcliff Lake?

MR. LaBARBIERA: That there is --
MR. KAUFMAN: He's not testifying as a planner or zoning expert.

MR. COUTO: Okay. Another question then.
Could you tell us what was the apartment density of this market rate apartments if you calculate per acre?

MR. KAUFMAN: The engineer and the planner can testify to that. He's only testifying as to
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the architectural plans, not a planning issue.
MR. COUTO: Okay. From Broadway, are the air conditioning units going to be visible from Broadway?

MR. KAUFMAN: The building's not going to be visible.

MR. LaBARBIERA: There might be a very small sliver as you look down the driveway that you can perhaps see 24 feet of the building, the equivalent width, albeit, at a significant distance and grade differential.

MR. COUTO: Okay. So Building 1 nothing is changing then. Where are the air conditioning units for Building 1 ?

MR. LaBARBIERA: Building 1, the air condition units would be exactly where they are today, on the roof.

MR. COUTO: Okay. Now on the application there you're applying for a couple of variances. Do you have an application for the variance for loading bay?

MR. LaBARBIERA: The only variances I spoke --

MR. KAUFMAN: No, the engineer and the planner will testify about that. He testified
about the architectural plans on Building 2 and that's what he's going to answer.

MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much.
Much appreciated.
MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SMITH: I'm going to lower all hands.
If there's anybody else who would like to make a comment from Zoom, please raise your hand again. And I also want to give the phone number to the public that are on television to call in with any questions. The number's (201) 391-4977, Extension 203.

I do not have any other attendees at the Zoom meeting raising their hand, so Zoom has no more questions.

MS. LEHENY: Can I ask one followup question?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes.
MS. LEHENY: Mr. LaBarbiera.
MR. LaBARBIERA: Please, Rich. Thank you.
MS. LEHENY: Because it's unknown right now what the tenancy of the building would be whether it would be rental or ownership so that obviously dictates how many affordable housing units you'll be required to provide, is there a
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potential that the number of overall units would change depending on their tenancy? You know, would it increase potentially?

MR. LaBARBIERA: The overall number of units, no.

MS. LEHENY: No. Okay. And would the prints of the building change?

MR. LaBARBIERA: No, we're fixed.
MS. LEHENY: Okay. Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: I just want to say that depending upon the number of units, where they are, the configuration if there's any change, we're going to come back to you anyway. We'll come back to the board.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Ms. Malley, I do not have any calls coming in and I do not have any hands raised on Zoom. So if you like we can take a motion to close the meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes, let's get a motion to close.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: To the public.
MS. HEMBREE: So move.
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: All in favor?
Any opposed?

Okay.
Your next witness, is that Matt Clark. MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Madam Chairperson. Thank you.
MR. LaBARBIERA: Thank you, everybody, for your time.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank, Rich.

MATTHEW CLARK, 11 Furler
Street, Totowa, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KAUFMAN:

Q Mr. Clark, could you give the board your educational and professional background and training?
A I have a bachelor degree and a master's degree in civil engineering from NJIT.

I'm a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey, have been since 1996.

I've been qualified as an expert in civil engineering since I've been a PE.

Q And you attended NJIT with Mr. LaBarbiera and Mr. Neglia?
A Yes, I did.
Q Mr. Clark, you've been qualified before as
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an expert, including the Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board.
Isn't that correct?
A That's correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Princiotto, are you
okay? Do you want me to go further on his background? You've accepted him before.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I'll ask the board, new board members if they have any questions on his qualifications they can ask him.

MR. KAUFMAN: Sure.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any questions on the qualifications?

BOARD MEMBER PICINIC: No.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
Q Mr. Clark, you prepared the engineering
Site Plan on this application?
A Yes, I did.
Q Okay. And this is the same engineering
Site Plan that you prepared for the 2019 application for the 60 units?
A Correct.
Q Okay. I'm just going to call it 60-unit application for ease of reference.

So this is the same. Correct?

That's correct.
Q All right. Now, you sent a review letter April 5, 2021, from Neglia Engineering?
A Yes.
Q And this is essentially the same as the August 20, 2018, review letter which reviewed the Site Plan in the context of the 60-unit project. Correct?
A Correct.
Q There are several differences though. I refer you to Section 3.3.4.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Could you hold up one minute. I just want to get that. You're talking about the Neglia review letter?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm talking about the April 5th, 2021 review letter, the most recent one.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Just one second.
Okay. I'm sorry. I have it. Thank you.
Q Mr. Clark, if you take a look at 3.3.4, the change in the 2021 letter is just an observation that the building height variance is no longer applicable and no further action required. Correct?
A Correct, yes.
Q Section 4.15 is new and provides, "The
Applicant shall revise the engineering plans to indicate
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the location of all building doors and access points."
And the applicant will agree to do that. Isn't that correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And Section 5.21 is new. And this section says, "The Applicant indicates that the existing utility service connections and laterals are to be reused. Prior to construction, the Applicant shall demonstrate that all existing utilities to be reused have adequate capacity are in acceptable condition for reuse. The Applicant shall clean and televise all existing sanitary and storm sewer piping to be reused."

That's a new comment. Correct?
A Yes.
Q The applicant agrees to that as a
condition. Correct?
A Correct.
Q Now, have you testified in 2019 as to the remainder of Mr. Jacobs' comments and your testimony at that time was what, just in general?
A We will comply with the technical --
Q You will comply.
Okay. And Mr. Jacobs noted that testimony. Isn't that true? Isn't that correct?
A Yes.

Q And that's, again, that's June 25th, 2019. MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry, what's the question?

MR. KAUFMAN: I said Mr. Jacobs acknowledged the testimony of Mr. Clark that the applicant will comply with the conditions in his letter and stated that it was acceptable. That's what he testified.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now or in the prior application or both?

MR. KAUFMAN: In the prior application. But my point is if the testimony of Mr. Clark was acceptable to Mr. Jacobs in June of the 2019, is there any reason why it's not acceptable to Mr. Jacobs today? It's the same Site Plan.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we have to ask Mr. Jacobs.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, we will. That's exactly why I wanted to call him as a witness, Mr. Princiotto.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we'll get to Mr. Jacobs.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Why don't you stick with Mr. Clark right now.
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```
MR. KAUFMAN: Well, okay. I'm sorry, the fire department approved the Site Plan with conditions which are set forth in the April 29th letter which is A-11.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: The letter speaks for itself.
MR. KAUFMAN: I apologize for giving anybody the impression that the fire department reviews the application itself.
Q Thank you, Mr. Clark.
Please proceed.
A Sure.
There are two design waivers that we're seeking.
One is the maximum main approach grade to walkways. The requirement is four percent max, we're requesting five percent. And there is another design waiver for the minimum swale grade, two percent required, one percent requested.
There are two existing non-conformities associated with Building 1 and that's for the front yard setback to the property line and the front yard setback to the street center line and there are no deviations required from the RSIS.
That's my understanding of the variances and the design waivers to the project.
design waivers to the project.
```

Q And the basis for them in your expert opinion? What's your opinion on it?
A My opinion from a design, from a civil engineering design perspective, there's no issue with the deviations.

The main approach grade, five percent is the requirement for ADA standards so there's no issue with going to five percent at all. It meets all ADA standards and as far as the swale is concerned, it's for a small portion at the rear of Building 2. It's not a long drainage swale that you'd have maybe running along the roadway or a ditch in that regard, so there's no issue as far as any detriment from going two to one percent.

As far as the existing non-conformities, they deal with Building 1, which is a condition that's not being increased, so that's staying as is.

Our planner will talk about the use.
And as you mentioned, the interior landscaping we did have some to the extent where we could provide it but based on the fire department wanting those to be mountable islands, we had to remove those things.

So that's really my understanding of why these variances can be justified.

Q Thank you.
Just so no misunderstandings, all the comments raised in the engineering report will be addressed as a
condition of approval.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: We didn't mark the review letter, so why don't we mark them.

MR. KAUFMAN: Generally, we typically don't, but it's fine with me.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We'll mark it so we know what we're talking about.

MR. KAUFMAN: We'll mark it as A-12.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: We'll mark it WCL-1.
MR. KAUFMAN: I'm okay with A-12.
Whatever you want, WCL-1.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Just for the record, that's an originally dated February 19, '21 and revised April 5th, 2021, as revision number 1. And that was authored by Evan M. Jacobs.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Do we have questions
for Mr. Clark? Any members of the board.
Any of our professionals?
Evan? Yes, I figured you did.
MR. JACOBS: Apologies. Can you hear me now?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Yes.
MR. JACOBS: Good evening, everybody.
Mr. Clark, I have a quick question for
you.
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There was a previous exhibit provided and, I apologize, it was from the previous application which showed a fire truck turning template clipping separate parking stalls on the site. I understand the fire department has approved, for lack of a better term, the Site Plan but has there been any thoughts how they're going to be addressing the traffic conflicts on the site?

MR. CLARK: The traffic conflicts, did you say?

MR. JACOBS: Yeah, there was a truck turning template that was brought through a previous hearing that showed a fire truck turning radius actually clipping several parking stalls, not by much, but they were conflicting with those parking stalls there. Is there any provisions to the plan that may address that?

MS. CLARK: Those exhibits were represented by Lou Luglio at the original hearing and it's my understanding that our Site Plan has incorporated all the mitigation to alleviate that, including the fire department comments.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: If I may? The letter from the fire department dated April 29th says, "The
current Site Plan shows changes that include all our previous turns and comments and reference to the proposed Site Plan."

MR. JACOBS: Well, my comment.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's not minimize Mr. Jacobs' qualifications as to --

MR. KAUFMAN: Oh, I'm not. I don't, I certainly don't minimize the qualifications of Mr. Jacobs at all. However, the issue is with the fire department.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's not. It's a Site Plan issue. I mean...

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. All right.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Highly regard --
MR. KAUFMAN: Listen, I'm not going to get into an argument with you, so let's move on.

Matt, you can answer the question, if you can.

MR. CLARK: Lou, I know he's available. He created those exhibits but like I said, I believe we've incorporated not only the fire department comments, but I believe the concerns that you might have had. I do believe Lou provided all those exhibits. We provided the loading area, the necessary area to back up and
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that. So I think we've taken care of those items.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: I'd like to see those at some point, whether it's tonight or the next meeting. So if we can get those provided, I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Maybe Lou can amend what he did onto the new Site Plan so that we can make sure there's no issue then.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: I see him shaking his head, so I'm assuming there's an agreement.

Thank you.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I mean, Mr. Clark, did you prepare that Site Plan or did Mr. Luglio?

MR. CLARK: I prepared the Site Plan; Mr. Luglio prepared the exhibits showing the turning templates.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. So what we're going to do is take our Site Plan, give him our CAD file. We can superimpose the templates again to confirm that we're not conflicting with any of Neglia's concerns.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: And, Evan, that way you'll get your question answered, which I think is very important.

MR. JACOBS: Yes, between the applicant

```
    agreeing to address our letter and that addresses
    my concerns at this time.
        Thank you.
        MR. CLARK: Thank you.
        CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Any other questions?
        Sal?
    Members of the board?
    Professionals?
    Okay. Do we want to open to the public at
this point?
    MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
    CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Motion?
    MS. HEMBREE: So moved.
    CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Second?
    MR. DHAWAN: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Meg, can we get a...
    MS. SMITH: All in favor?
    Any opposed?
    Okay. I'll provide the number for anybody
watching on TV. The phone number to call in is
(201) 391-4977, Extension 203. And if there are
any of the members of the public watching on Zoom
they can raise their hand to question Mr. Clark on
his testimony.
    I have Mr. Alex Couto on Zoom. I'm going
```
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to un-mute so he can address the board.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay.
MR. COUTO: Hi, how are you? It's me again. I'm sorry to bother you.

So I was told that some of the questions I had previously should be to the engineer. So I have a couple of questions.

So on Building 1 to rent, to make
apartments, were they requiring construction or will be as it is?

MR. CLARK: As far as the building's concerned, we do the site design, we don't get involved in the design of the building, the units, the renting, anything along those lines. We deal with the grading, the drainage, utilities outside the building.

MR. COUTO: So my question is a generic question. You can tell me yes or no. So to rent apartments, does any construction have to happen inside the building or not?

MR. CLARK: Are you asking me to rent the units does any construction inside the building have to take place?

MR. COUTO: Yeah, to convert from offices to rental apartments, is there any construction
happening in Building 1?
MR. CLARK: First, I didn't testify to any of that.

And number two, I can't answer your question.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let me answer it. Yes, the building is right now configured as an office building. It's got to be retrofitted to create the apartments. You have to add in the kitchens and the bathrooms to make it habitable.

MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much for your answers.

MR. KAUFMAN: So there is construction, yes.

MR. COUTO: The only reason I ask is because on Ordinance 19-07 Site Plan is like on item A Site Planning and they have all ordinances like eight pages.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's Site Planning. The site is not changing. These plans for the construction within the existing building are subject to the Uniform Construction Code. That's what they're reviewed by. It's all interior, there's nothing exterior except the facade and what it looks like.
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MR. COUTO: So the question is, so what zoning laws, Woodcliff Lake zoning laws, is this subject to?

MR. KAUFMAN: None, other than the use.
Other than the use, the Woodcliff Lake zoning laws
don't apply to the existing building.
MR. COUTO: And the construction laws don't apply either?

MR. KAUFMAN: No, the construction, the Uniform Construction Code applies. It's a statewide code that's enforced by the Building Department and the Department of Community Affairs.

MR. COUTO: So from your understanding, the ordinance do not apply to this project, Ordinance 19-07.

MR. KAUFMAN: Look, the building exists.
It's not a Site Plan application for that building. If we didn't propose the second building, we would be able to come in, here's the Site Plan of what exists a hundred percent and all we would want to do is change the use. We would give the architectural plans and the floor, the existing building but construction drawings. Construction drawings go to the Building

Department. They're reviewed by the sub code officials. They're ultimately reviewed by the construction code officials, but not the planning board or the zoning board.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Couto, we don't have a market rate multiple dwelling zone, so that's part of the issue here. So it's not a particular specific ordinance that applies to market rate multiple dwellings because we don't have a zone in this town for that.

MR. COUTO: Okay. I have another question.

So are you familiar with the bay requirements, the loading bay requirements?

MR. CLARK: We are providing the loading bay. We do provide one.

MR. COUTO: So you provide one.
From what I understand, I think you misread the ordinance. It's supposed to provide one. Maybe you have to change the plans a little bit. You want me to refresh what ordinance?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can you clarify your question? Is your question whether or not the loading bay's in compliance?

MR. COUTO: Yes, I'm questioning from the
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loading bays the Borough Code 292-27, Off Street Loading Requirements. And it says for apartment buildings, if you have 20,000 square feet you're required one berth. If you get a hundred thousand, you're required two berths. And then it says the Comments, anything halfway, if you read, the second one applies on the star.

So, I mean, whoever read the zoning didn't read it properly. It's at least one and a half will apply, two might apply if you read it properly.

Would you like me to provide this so you can read or somebody can?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Could you give us the section again, Mr. Couto?

MR. COUTO: Section 292-27. It's called Off Street Loading Requirements.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And which paragraph?

MR. COUTO: Then if you go down to apartment buildings, Table VI-6, if you go down to apartment buildings, first berth 20,000 square feet; second berth a hundred thousand square feet. And then they have an asterisk on second berth.
If you read the asterisk it says an additional
berth shall be required for each additional month as square feet as indicated in between the two.

So the project is about 56,000 square feet, so at least one and a half berths are required.

MR. KAUFMAN: What's the section again, 292-27?

MR. COUTO: 292-27.
MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. It's a design
standard. The planner, Mr. Burgis, will testify
as to the standards for a waiver of a design standard.

MR. COUTO: I mean, it's a waiver of berths.

MR. KAUFMAN: This is not a zoning ordinance; it's not a variance. 292 is a Site Plan ordinance, Article 6 is design standards. This is not a variance. No variance is required. It's a waiver. The enforcement, the standard is impracticality of the ordinance section. The planner can -- I'll ask Mr. Clark.

How many apartment buildings have you been the engineer for in the last ten years?

MR. CLARK: Gosh, hundreds.
MR. KAUFMAN: Hundreds of apartment
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buildings. Did it have loading docks like this?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were they in Woodcliff Lake? I mean, we have our own ordinance.

MR. KAUFMAN: No, listen -- excuse me.
Let him answer the question first and then you can go.

But it's a design standard. The impracticality of a design standard's the same no matter where you are.

Mr. Clark --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can ask him.
MR. KAUFMAN: -- do apartment buildings generally have loading docks?

He's an expert.
Mr. Clark, do apartment buildings generally have loading docks?

MR. CLARK: My experience, no, they do not have dedicated loading docks.

MR. KAUFMAN: And why is that?
MR. CLARK: Typically, you know, the move ins are not the tractor trailers that you see. They're usually smaller vans. They're regulated, if anything, a space is provided for like a UPS truck or a Fed Ex truck to come in so they take up a parking stall. But to have a dedicated 50 -foot
loading bay for tractor trailer size trucks, not in my experience. Definitely not in the last ten years. And your ordinance is very similar to other ordinances that we dealt with in Bergen County.

MR. KAUFMAN: Go ahead.
MR. CLARK: My understanding of the read of the ordinance was that one was required, I don't believe it was commented in any of the professionals' letters that two were required. So we're confident in that.

The other reason that that loading space is required, if you remember from the first application, it also provides a backup for vehicles to get out of the site. So it provides a little additional for that and it provides access to the refuse enclosure in the back. But as far as the --

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Clark, 53-unit building, how many move ins, once the building is occupied, after the first six months, how many move ins do you generally experience per year?

MR. CLARK: You know, to be honest, maybe Lou can answer better than I could.

MR. KAUFMAN: Ten?
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MR. CLARK: I do not think it's that
frequent, to be honest. After the first six months, my experience involved in applications it's done during that time.

MR. KAUFMAN: If every unit turns over in the first year, 53 units would be four and a half units turning over every month which would be four and a half people coming in and four and a half people going out. Correct?

MR. CLARK: Correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: So it makes sense to build a loading dock for nine move ins and move outs?

MR. CLARK: No.
MR. KAUFMAN: And you know and we all know that it's never going to happen.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're saying "loading docks".

MR. KAUFMAN: It's never going to happen.
Loading berths.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, loading area the way our ordinance says.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Princiotto, you know, let me ask my questions and he'll answer it. You want clarification, you can ask him.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I object to your
questions. I mean, you're asking him about loading docks. I think it should be clear our ordinance doesn't say loading docks. Okay. And it's not like a loading dock for a tractor trailer. It's a loading area.

MR. KAUFMAN: It says "a berth". "A berth". That's the word it used. It uses "a berth".

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it says "off street".

MR. KAUFMAN: All right. It also says each "loading space", uses the word "loading space", uses the word "berth". Bottom line, it makes no sense because you're not getting turnover like that. It's not like an industrial building.

Any other questions?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll let the
professionals weigh in on that at the appropriate time.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm happy if they weigh in.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
Mr. Couto, are you still there?
MR. COUTO: Yes, I'm still here. I'm just trying to figure out what ordinances will apply to this project. It looks like nothing applies to
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this project. Could you tell what ordinances apply?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You raised a valid point, which is a loading area. They say that they're requesting a waiver from that and we may hear some more testimony about that.

MR. COUTO: And the other question is the Ordinance 19-07 I mean suddenly doesn't apply because if I change a bathroom in my house, I'm going to have to apply to any ordinance.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: At the appropriate time I'll have our planner weigh in on it because it does say design standards and it does mention special office district. So I would think that this ordinance has some application and you raise a point and the planners will weigh in on that on the application of this Ordinance 19-07.

MR. COUTO: So we're going to hear from the planners later on in this hearing?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. I just wanted to make sure.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're welcome.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Thank you.
MS. SMITH: I have no nobody else on Zoom
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raising their hand with the question and the phone has not rang from the public who's watching on TV. CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. Can we get a motion then to close to the public? BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Motion to close to the public.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Can we get a second? MR. DHAWAN: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: All in favor?
MS. SMITH: Any opposed?
Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: All right. Thank you. I'd like to call Joseph Burgis.

JOSEPH BURGIS, 25 Westwood Avenue, Westwood, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Well, I think you're known to a number of members of the board but not all the members of the board so, Mr. Kaufman, I will turn it over to you.

MR. KAUFMAN: All right.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KAUFMAN:

Q Mr. Burgis, can you please give the board your educational and professional training and background?
A I have a master's degree in city and regional planning from Rutgers University.

I've been licensed as a professional planner in the state since 1980 or ' 81.

My firm represents about 50 municipalities
throughout the state and we represent a lot of developers making these kind of applications.

In addition to that, we do a lot of affordable housing work, including the fact that I'm a Special Master for a number of judges on affordable housing issues. So I know there were a few questions about that issue so I, hopefully, will be able to answer that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Anybody have any
questions on the --
MR. KAUFMAN: I just want to ask him -- I
just want to ask him.
Q Your license is still valid and in full force and effect?
A My license is valid and current.
Q And was there a point in time when you were the planner for the Borough of Woodcliff Lake?
A Yes, there was, back in the early 2000s I believe

## it was.

Q Okay. And you were replaced by Richard
Preiss, I believe?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: And, you know, we're obviously offering Mr. Burgis as an expert.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So now I'll
ask the question, any questions on Mr. Burgis's qualifications as the planner?

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: No. I think we can accept him. I think most of us have seen him, know him.

MR. BURGIS: Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Joe.
MR. BURGIS: What I'd like to do is focus
on three or four particular issues. I think everybody knows the property that is being proposed, so I'll go right into the issue of some of the Master Plan documents of the municipality and I want to do that because that goes to the heart of one prong of the negative criteria, which I'll get into later, then I'll talk a little bit
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about the zoning regulations that apply here and then the basis, identify the statutory criteria under which we are operating and then talk about how we meet that criteria.

So there are quite a number of Master Plan documents that have been adopted over the years that I think apply. The last comprehensive Master Plan of the municipality actually goes back to 2002 and it identifies the site, the westerly part of the site is in the special office land use designation; the easterly half of the site is in the medium density residential land use category.

Now, there are a quite a number of goals and objectives which form the basis for land use recommendations. There are five here that I think merit attention.

The first one that I'd like to talk a little bit about is the one that says the goal is to preserve and protect existing residential by restricting incompatible land uses from established residential areas. And I believe we are consistent and compatible with that goal for a very simple reason. We are placing, the residential buildings are entirely in the office zone portion of the site and we are establishing
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Just -MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any attempt to relitigate an application that would depend on the board's determination.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let him finish.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I will, I will. I just want --

MR. KAUFMAN: It might be a little different than you think.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I said I would allow it. I'm putting my objection and reservation on the record.

MR. KAUFMAN: And I said fine.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. All right.
MR. KAUFMAN: We disagree with your objection and that's on the record too.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MR. BURGIS: Sal, this is the first time we disagreed, but because we have a number of new board members I think it's important to give some little background for them and that's principally why I'm doing this.

But also there's a fact given that there are 11 percent fewer units being proposed in
contrast to the prior application, I don't think
the issue of res judicata applies anymore. I think that represents a significant modification to the plans in and of itself.

But I would like to continue with the discussion about the Master Plan so the newer board members can understand what the Master Plan says and particularly when we get into the issue of the negative criteria of the statute, because we still have to touch upon that, and then this gives them the context to understand what the negative criteria is all about.

And when we talk about the negative criteria, one of the issues is is there a substantial impairment to the intent of the plan. So I hate to use the word older board members, but the board members who have been around a little longer than the newer ones understand that, but I think it's very important for the newer board members to understand it as well.

Typically, the focus is the roles and objectives of the Master Plan. So I mentioned that one and I mention how we're establishing this 210-foot deep landscaped feature and that actually encompasses 44 percent of the three and a half
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acre site and that is significant in that I can only tell you and I hope Elizabeth would say the same thing later, I don't know that I've ever seen a 210 -foot landscape buffer physically separating one form of residential from another. Actually, I can think of one municipality in all my travels and I've testified in probably 150 municipalities throughout New Jersey and New York State. I can't think of one that had a 200-foot buffer and that was it.

The second goal talks about guiding the appropriate use of land and here we have a site that's directly across the street from a train station and consistent with the State Plan, some planning criteria would always suggest that providing multi-family housing near a train station represents good planning. I believe Mr. Preiss supported that position at the previous hearing.

Thirdly is the issue of a goal that provides for light air and open space. We already talked about the one feature, which is a significant open space feature but in addition to that is the fact that we are in fact complying to all the setback requirements to the code, so we
are providing the required setbacks.
When you look at the proposed development, it's 19 percent building coverage less than -it's 19 percent building coverage that's significantly less than the 30 percent that's permitted by code and when we talk about impervious coverage, we are proposing a project that's 43 percent impervious versus permitted by code, which is 60 percent impervious. So consequently, we feel that we meet these goals and objectives.

Other goals that the Master Plan talks about is encouraging linkage to the train station and within that context we talk about the State Plan and the State Plan very clearly says that a goal of the state is to encourage higher density development near a train station and the Master Plan supports the State Plan. It says it in I believe the 2008 reexamination report which reaffirmed all of the goals that I just mentioned but it also recommended one additional goal and that goal was to discourage development from intruding into steep slope areas. So they became a little more environmentally aware and sensitive and that particularly focuses when this site,
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because that sloped area that I was talking about, that landscaped feature is steep and it is a steep slope, causing a steep slope category and reaffirming the ability to protect that steep slope.

Now, the results the 2008 Broadway Study, the Corridor Study, now, that was never a Master Plan document but it's often been referred to and one of the things it talks about is recognizing this Corridor potential to accommodate changing market conditions.

You heard a lot from our real estate person at the previous meeting where he talked about the declining office market. I'll talk about that more in a moment. While, on the other hand, multi-family housing market has been increasing in demand. So we feel that although it's not a Master Plan document, we are generally consistent with the philosophy behind that 2008 Broadway Corridor Study.

Now, separate and apart from all of that is the municipality's housing plan. Now, someone, I forget who mentioned it, it might have been you, Sal, that you do in fact have your judgment of compliance and repose from the Courts, but that
doesn't mean you're off scot-free, so to speak.
You have an obligation of 19 units, which you're dealing with. You had a prior obligation of 170 units. And a third round obligation of 386 units. You are addressing a portion of that because you're a fully developed municipality and you just don't have enough land to address entirety of that obligation. But settlement agreements typically talk about addressing the portion of your obligation that you can, which you're doing, but then there's this unmet need that you're not addressing but you should be able to give a fair effort to try to address at least a portion of that unmet need and this project can help you do that and you have significant unmet need between your prior round vacant land adjustment and your third round vacant land adjustment, you have a 439 -unit unmet need. Now, this is just a small shift in that total. But it helps you meet a portion of that unmet need obligation.

Now, more recently the planning board adopted a new reexamination report in 2019 and it continues with the same designation for this site, but it also continues to talk about supporting the
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State Plan, which I just mentioned a moment ago, places you in what's called a planning area one, which specifically promotes diversity of housing choice and housing type. That's what this adds to your housing stock, additional housing choice for people. So within the context of all of that, I mean it's safe to conclude that the prime of the negative criteria that says there shouldn't be a substantial impairment to the intent of the Master Plan, we clearly affirm that prong of the statute.

Now, we are in a split zone. The S-O Zone in the westerly portion of the site; the R-15 Zone on the easterly portion of the site and you heard I think it was Mr. Clark went through the variances that we are required to address. Now, the statutory criteria is very straightforward. The positive criteria says we have to show special reasons. What makes the site either particularly suitable for the use or what's the hardship that doesn't enable us to comply. And then the negative criteria talked about the one prong. The other prong is is there a substantial detriment to the public good.

So in our assessment we find that there's six special reasons to support this application.

Five of them relate to issues of particular suitability. One, an overriding one, talks about hardship. The first one talks about the fact that we further a number of the purposes of the state's Municipal Land Use Law and all zoning technically is predicated on the MLUL and the purposes of the Act. One of the purposes of the Act talks about encouraging municipal action which will guide the appropriate use of land. As I said earlier, placing multi-family near a train station from my perspective and the State Plan's perspective is consistent and complimentary to that purpose. Not only have I said that, your own planner, Mr. Preiss, said that at the last go around.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You know, I don't want you to --

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't want you to quote.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Princiotto, let him finish his testimony.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, no --
MR. KAUFMAN: If you want to question him about it when he's finished, question him. But -MR. PRINCIOTTO: No.
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be an adversary and not to question and interrupt the witness and prevent him from testifying because you don't understand what he's saying.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I understand what he's saying.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Burgis, will you please continue.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And this is --
MR. KAUFMAN: Are you going to prevent me from putting on my case? Let's put that on the record too.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Why don't you keep interrupting me?

MR. KAUFMAN: Are you going to prevent me from putting on my case? You've already objected to the way I want to call a witness. You dictated to me how I'm supposed to present the case. I'm presenting Mr. Burgis now and now you're interrupting him and you're not letting him testify.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Mr. Kaufman, this is the way we run our meetings. This is the way I want it run. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: Madam Chairperson, I have a right to present my case. It's as simple as that.
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MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I just want to make it abundantly clear that this testimony is with reservation of our rights and appears to be re-litigation of issues that weren't decided. Although, it will be taken conditionally, because the board has to make a determination and at the beginning of this case there was a motion and that carried that it would be heard for the basis of determining whether res judicata applies.

I just want to make that clear.
I'll let you continue, Mr. Kaufman.
MR. KAUFMAN: With all due respect, thank you, but with all due respect, you don't take testimony conditionally. You take testimony and you can either accept it and if you have a valid basis, not to accept it. But you can't take it conditionally, so let's just finish.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I disagree with you because there's an issue as to whether or not res judicata applies, okay, and that, you know, you're being given some latitude with regard to the testimony --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: -- in which the application is, but not to relitigate what was
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already heard and decided.
MR. KAUFMAN: If you let him finish instead of interrupting him, it's not the same.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well --
MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Burgis, will you please continue.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We'll hear what he has to say how it's not the same.

MR. BURGIS: Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: Will you please continue, Mr. Burgis, with your testimony?

MR. BURGIS: This is a changed application because of a reduction of number units. I said that earlier. It's an 11-percent reduction in number of units.

You also heard that the volume of traffic at peak hour is reduced by at least 14 percent and one of the peak hours it was closer to, I think it was 18 percent. This represents significant changes to a project that I believe indicates that res judicata would not apply from my planning perspective and enables this application to go forward.

I would also say that given the change in nature of the composition of this board, it's
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imperative to identify what the special reasons are for this project because without that, particularly, the new board members will really be operating in a vacuum and they need to understand what this case has been all about in order to make an informed decision.

So as I was saying, and previously I talked about five special reasons and now I'm talking about six, having an issue of hardship. But before I get into that I just want to finish the discussion about how we are furthering the number of purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. I talked about one.

The second one is similar to one of the goals of the municipality's own Master Plan, it talks about light air and open space. And as I said, there's been a significant reduction in impervious coverage, from 60 percent -- excuse me -- there's a significant difference between the impervious coverage that's proposed at 42 percent versus the 60 percent that's permitted and the building coverage, which is at 19 percent in contrast to 30 percent, which is permitted.

So this project in some respects represents a much less intense use of this
property than the ordinance contemplates.
The third purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law talks about promoting the establishment of appropriate population densities.

Now, originally, this application came in at 16.97, basically 17 units to the acre. We are now at 14.9 units to the acre. I did not figure out that percentage decline. But when I look at other multi-family zones in the municipality, I find that what we are proposing is generally consistent with other multi-family zones that we have here. For example, the AH-2 Zone just to the north of us on Broadway allow a maximum of 16 units in a 100 percent affordable project on a . 9 acre property. And if you do the math, that indicates a density of 17.7 to the acre.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: That's fully affordable housing is what you are saying?

MR. BURGIS: Your multi-families, you are correct, are basically affordable housing zones. So the veterans affordable housing overlay zone is 12 units to the acre or 14.9 to the acre. The ARAHO Zone is 12 units to the acres. The ARHO-2 Zone is at 20 units to the acre. That's the Teva site --
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MR. KAUFMAN: Joe, can I ask you a fast question?

MR. BURGIS: Sure.
MR. KAUFMAN: In an affordable housing zone, the use is multi-family residential, isn't it?

MR. BURGIS: Correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: The only difference between affordable housing multi-family use and a market rate use is the economics of the residents.

MR. BURGIS: I'm sorry, I lost the last part.

MR. KAUFMAN: Is that a fair statement?
I said the only difference between a multi-family affordable housing use and a multi-family market rate use are the economics of the residents and what they can afford to pay. Is that correct?

MR. BURGIS: Correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: So it's the same use, whether it's affordable or market rate, it's still a multi-family residential use.

MR. BURGIS: Yes, that's entirely correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MR. BURGIS: Another purpose of the

Municipal Land Use Law talks about promoting a desirable visual environment to create a development technique.

We're here taking a vacated office building and aesthetically enhancing the design of the site by virtue of what the architect can testify to and I guess what was touched on earlier this evening.

And then, finally, another purpose of the
Municipal Land Use Law is to promote the conservation of open space. And, again, we're taking 44 percent of this property and retaining it as open space.

Now, in addition to that, we also feel that we're furthering the purposes of smart growth. The Smart Growth Principles of the state are ten in number, but I just want to focus on the handful of them just to touch base on this issue. One talks about encouraging compact building design, particularly, around train stations.
That's exactly what we're doing here. One talks about preserving critical environmental areas. That's exactly what we're doing here. One talks about encouraging diversity of housing opportunity and choice. That is what we are doing here. All
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around the train station, which the State Plan talks about, is the appropriate location for a multi-family housing.

So in many respects, I think there's a
number of purposes as the Municipal Land Use Law
and other special reasons that support this application.

Now, in terms of the issue of economic hardship. You heard from our real estate consultant at the previous meeting and he talked about how in northern New Jersey there is a 19.6 percent vacancy rate of office buildings. 26 million square feet of office space in the state; 19.6 percent of it is vacant. And then he focused on the Montvale, Woodcliff Lake, Park Ridge community and found that within that area, and the grade A office space that we have, 41 percent of office space is vacant. Extraordinarily high.

We're the planners out for may municipalities in Morris County, including Parsippany. Even Parsippany's numbers, they have a lot of office space and a lot of vacancy. I don't think they're at 41 percent. I know they're not at 41 percent.

So within that context, I think there is
strong support to say that this application and the change from an office zoning to a multi-family residential use can be addressed because there is this hardship issue.

What's also interesting is we only have one use that's permitted on this site for your zoning and that is business professional and executive office use.

Now, somebody had suggested, well, how about a medical office, because we see Urgent Care facilities popping up all over the place. Well, we have a pretty significant size building that no medical facility would take this size building, but beyond that, when you look at your ordinance, that's not even a permitted use here. When you look at your ordinance you'll find that there are a number of zoned districts that specifically identify office use and then separate and distinct from that they identify medical office uses permitted in certain zones. That's not done in this zone and the fact that your ordinance identifies medical office in certain zones but not here clearly suggests that that use is not permitted.

So we are down to one and only one and our
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real estate expert seems to have proven the case, at least in my view, that there is no office market for this kind of facility.

MR. KAUFMAN: Can you just address that in terms of the Medici case which provides that if a property is not reasonably adopted to form a use it would require the requirement of special reasons of the results and the Medici words is "economic and utility".

MR. BURGIS: Well, that is precisely the conclusion to be drawn. That testimony indicated the magnitude of the problem of the office market today and then tied into that is the fact that office use is the only permitted use allowed in this zone. And there's no market for it. And if there's no market for it and it's the only use they're allowed, you basically zoned the site into economic and utility.

MR. KAUFMAN: And do you recall Mr.
Preiss's testimony June 25, 2019, that the
application that was before them in 2019 was not a hardship case?

MR. BURGIS: Correct.
MR. KAUFMAN: You do recall that
testimony?

MR. BURGIS: Right, I do recall that.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
I'm looking up the exact quote to satisfy Mr. Princiotto.

MR. BURGIS: Well, that's another factor that distinguishes this application from that application. It's called changed circumstance. And that's another way they address the issue of res judicata if there's changed circumstance. That was pre-COVID, pre-pandemic, and the world has significantly changed. I mean, the office market was bad to begin with but, you know --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You know what, this is going beyond his expertise and it's not even consistent with the testimony of your real estate witness.

MR. BURGIS: I disagree with that.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I disagree with you.
Okay. And you're not being called --
MR. KAUFMAN: Well, first of all, how do you know his expertise?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: He's a planner.
MR. KAUFMAN: You said it's beyond his expertise.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: He's appeared before this
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board many times.
MR. KAUFMAN: You don't know what he
knows. Ask him questions about his expertise before coming to a conclusion.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You qualified him as an expert, an expert in the planning not in the real estate market.

MR. BURGIS: But I'm entitled --
MR. KAUFMAN: Why don't you ask him if planning also includes knowledge of market conditions.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, when you're done with your direct examination, I'll ask him questions that are more appropriate.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. So then that's fine. Then let me finish.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think if he stayed within his area of expertise.

MR. KAUFMAN: Now you're telling him what he can't testify to.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I think that's fair --

MR. KAUFMAN: You've made a conclusion. You've made a conclusion as to what his area of expertise is without asking him any questions on
his expertise.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Did you find Mr. Preiss --

MR. KAUFMAN: Just like you said that Mr. Bernhaut, who has 34 years in the office building market business and is Executive Vice Chairman of a 40,000 person company had - quote - very limited experience.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll clarify that later.
Let's stick to this subject.
Do you have Mr. Preiss's testimony?
MR. KAUFMAN: Let him finish.
MR. BURGIS: I am finished on the issue of use.

I believe I've addressed the issue of special reasons.

I believe I've addressed the issue of negative criteria, that there is no substantial impairment of the intent of the Master Plan.

And I believe I've addressed the issue of that prong of the criteria that talks about no substantial detriment to the public good. In this instance, one is entitled to rely on the expertise of others to draw certain conclusions and in terms of negative criteria, that prong of the negative
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real estate expert and my recollection is that there has been no testimony that refuted his expert testimony and opinion and a planner can rely on other testimony to draw certain conclusions relative to the manner in which an application may or may not have affirmed statutory burden.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. But my question is, it's now a different case than 2019, isn't it, because the whole basis of the case is different?

MR. BURGIS: Correct.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Objection.
MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.
MR. BURGIS: You're welcome.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Do board members have questions?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Mr. Burgis, just a couple of points of review with regards to the real estate expert that spoke at the last meeting that you referenced to and the statistics that were referenced are generalities there in Woodcliff Lake. Is that correct?

MR. BURGIS: That is correct --
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: And they are based on Class A office buildings?
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MR. BURGIS: -- as per Mr. Kaufman at best he focused on the tri-town region that I mentioned Montvale, Woodcliff Lake, Park Ridge.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: And you did say
Class A office buildings. Correct?
MR. BURGIS: Pardon me?
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: You mentioned Class
A properties, that's the statistics that you were
quoting.
MR. BURGIS: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: And I believe your expert did not classify this building as a Class A building. Correct?

MR. BURGIS: That is correct. He did offer some testimony about that type of building and particularly this location and its ability to survive in today's market.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. BURGIS: Thank you.
MR. DHAWAN: I have a question. The last portion of your testimony you made a statement about hardship and if your case is being presented with new arguments for the same or very similar project, you're saying that it's a new
presentation. Does that make it a new case, because you're adding new arguments? You're adding statements that were not made earlier, is that what you're saying?

MR. BURGIS: Yeah, but not in and of itself. There's the issue of the reduction in number of units and then the associated reduction in traffic volume that have been discussed and in addition to that there's the issue of changed circumstances and that relates to, you know, the bottom is really falling out of the office market since we were last before the board.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Can you state that again? I missed that. You cut out.

MR. BURGIS: The changed circumstance also relates to the fact that the office market has really fallen apart since we were here back in 2019, as had been testified to by our real estate expert.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: I'm not sure that's what he testified. I'm sorry, because what I was just looking for in his testimony, I thought he said his statistics were prior to the pandemic. I don't know if somebody else had picked up on that, but I thought his numbers were prior to the start
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of the pandemic.
MR. BURGIS: He offered some numbers prior
to, but then also talked about since February
of 2020 .
BOARD MEMBER PICINIC: I thought the
numbers hadn't specifically changed that
significantly after the pandemic was his testimony.

MR. BURGIS: What I took from his testimony was that things might have been difficult before, they become much more difficult today and it's a function of a couple of different things. One, office workers are not going to the office any longer, so it's another indication that that space is no longer needed. I know many people who are looking or have been looking to reduce the amount of office space they have because they understand that a lot of employees, I notice it's in my office as well, a lot of the employees have become very comfortable working from home and I'm scratching my head wondering why do I need all the office space that I have for my staff because it's working well with people working from home and that's a dilemma for these spaces.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Mr. Burgis, I'm curious if you're testifying to that or...
Because I know I looked at the building next door and they are full. They have no space right now.

MR. BURGIS: But that may be for a variety of reasons. There may be long-term leases. I don't know if you looked into that. And, you know, sometimes, you know, finding one or two examples doesn't solidify a conclusion. And I know there had been a lot of questions to him about the fact that he indicated that certain office buildings did in fact sell or had gained some occupancy, but that doesn't affect or inform the overall trend in the industry today.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: We're just talking one building and I'm just specifically asking you, you know, the neighboring building is full. I'm curious why this building couldn't be full.

MR. BURGIS: What I understand, the quality of the building is not quite the same. I don't know what else to say to you on that front.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. Chris, question? Take your mute off. I'm sorry, it's getting late.

MS. HEMBREE: Okay. Mr. Burgis, you

## JOSEPH BURGIS

114
referenced an increase in open space on this property by 44 percent. Is that what you testified to?

MR. BURGIS: It's not an increase because the open space exists, but what I'm saying is 44 percent of the site is vacant and this project ensures that that will continue to be the case. That we're not intruding at all into that 44 percent of the site that's characterized by, you know, heavily wooded features.

MS. HEMBREE: But it's a parking lot that's the open space. Correct?

MR. BURGIS: No.
MS. HEMBREE: Where's the open space? You still have a variance for deficient parking lot area landscaping. Where's that?

MR. BURGIS: Well, that's different from what I'm talking about. Your ordinance requires that within the interior of the parking lot it requires open -- excuse me -- landscape amenities, basically, landscaped islands at the end of rows of parking, which is typical.

We're not providing that. And then as you heard from the engineer, while we've been conformed to begin with, the fire department asked
that the limited amount of landscape island space that was being proposed, the fire department asked it be removed to facilitate their access to the property.

MS. HEMBREE: I still don't understand the 44 percent increase. I don't understand that. What is that?

MR. BURGIS: I never said it's increasing. 44 percent of the site in the eastern most part of the property, there's an area of 210-foot depth by 435 feet in length I think it is that's wooded today. It's woodland. It's that 44 percent of the property that is not being touched. So --

MS. HEMBREE: Don't touch it.
MR. BURGIS: I'm not saying we're creating new additional open space, but through this site design we're ensuring that none of it is being intruded into.

BOARD MEMBER HEMBREE: In other words, it stays the same?

MR. BURGIS: Yes, and serves as a very good solid protective feature for the residents to the east of that.

MS. HEMBREE: It doesn't give the
residents of your two-story building any space to
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be outside in a green space or in a flower or in a landscaped space?

MR. BURGIS: Correct. That's not atypical in a small multi-family residential project such as this. You don't see significant recreation amenities on smaller projects. Usually you'll start to see such features when a project is roughly 80 to 100 units, then you're going to start to see that kind of feature, but not for a project of this size.

MS. HEMBREE: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: You spoke about the Master Plan and how this is, I'm going to say good for the Master Plan for lack of a better term. Master Plan hasn't been changed since, I should not say it that way, the Master Plan has been looked at a number of times. There have been revisions to it. It is being totally redone now.

MR. BURGIS: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: But this area that we're talking about has not been changed. The mayor and council has kept it the same all along. Doesn't that suggest something to you that they don't want to make a change to that area.

MR. BURGIS: Not necessarily, because the
bottom line to the whole discussion on the Master Plan, you have an old Master Plan. Goes back to 2002. Now, back then you're obligated to prepare a new reexamination report every six years and then the law was changed to make it every ten years. So you did one in 2008, a reexamination in 2008 and then in 2019. You really are due for a new Master Plan.

Going back to 2002, you know, a lot has changed. The residential market has changed. The interest in multi-family occupancy has changed --

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: But they reexamined in 2019 that was --

MR. BURGIS: -- in 2002, and consequently that has represented a wholesale change in terms of, you know, any retail corridors that we have here in Woodcliff Lake.

So dramatic change has taken place. So you're due. Doing a Master Plan reexamination report is not a Master Plan.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Agreed.
MR. BURGIS: You're just looking at an old document and seeing if it represents a current contemporary plan that needs change.

In 2019 I think the bottom conclusion was
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I think there's a lot that needs changing and as you just said, they're about to embark on that.

But that's all you have so that's the only thing that we can look at and some of the goals are still pertinent. You know, I said I get five in particular, you have a lot more in the plan. I thought five were pretty much spot on in terms of this application.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Sanjeev, did you have a question or were you just waving?

No. Okay.
Sal, I know you had a question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any board members have any other questions? No. Okay.

Yeah, I have some questions.
Your testimony with regard to what the market conditions are or I should say your conclusions about the market conditions, that's based upon the testimony of the real estate expert that testified for the applicant. Is that correct?

MR. BURGIS: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. You didn't do any independent research on your own. Isn't that correct?

MR. BURGIS: No, what he said has been corroborated in a number of other municipalities where -that.

MR. BURGIS: Let me finish answering.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're not answering my question. I want you to answer my question.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let him answer the question. I mean, you asked him a question. He's giving you the best answer he can and you interrupt him.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I want a responsive answer to the question.

MR. BURGIS: I'm giving you a responsive answer. MR. KAUFMAN: Sir, this is not a trial. This is not a trial. Don't treat it as a trial. Let him answer it.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Am I entitled to have an answer to my question, not something else?

MR. KAUFMAN: He's answering the question to the best of his ability. When he finishes his answer, if you don't like it, ask him again.
Phrase it differently.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: No.
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## MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm not asking you

MR. BURGIS: I'm giving you a responsive

MR. BURGIS: As I said, based on his testimony, which I'm entitled to do as an expert but I also in response to your question was letting you know that I've heard similar conclusions about the office market in many other instances throughout northern and central Jersey, you know, in my practice.

So it just seems to be if so many experts are all saying the same thing and living in this area and knowing the office market, not as an expert, per se, but knowing what's happening with the office market, I think it's a safe conclusion for me to make.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, do you know that the real estate expert said that there were no forecasts for the office market based upon the pandemic? Did you hear that testimony?

MR. BURGIS: Yes, I did.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yeah. So you're not going to make a decision or should the board make a decision on some temporary situation potentially?

MR. BURGIS: No, I would agree with you. But you're saying it's temporary, because the reality is, he had indicated that even
pre-pandemic, you know, the statistics that he gave were only slightly higher than when it occurred prior to.

This has been a depressed office market for some time. So he said I'm not making forecasts because it's difficult to make forecasts given the unusual nature of the pandemic and its impact. But the trend has been very consistent from well before the pandemic.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: But you were here at the last application, right, for all the testimony?

MR. BURGIS: Yes, I think so. Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. And you heard the testimony of Mr. Oppler, another real estate --

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Oppler's testimony is not germane.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, that's what you say.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm not --
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let me do my cross-examination, Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: It's not germane. It was two years ago. It was two years ago. It doesn't reflect conditions today. The issue is conditions
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today, not two years ago. And as Mr. Preiss himself said on page 73 of his testimony that there is no evidence on the record. You haven't made the argument that this is a hardship case so, therefore, Mr. Oppler, whatever he testified to, is irrelevant.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you may not have proven your hardship case. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's your opinion.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: The last time. Let me conduct my cross-examination. Don't interrupt me. Let me do my cross-examination. You had your testimony.

MR. KAUFMAN: We have different positions here, Mr. Princiotto.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Right.
MR. KAUFMAN: You're legal counsel to the board. You're not supposed to be an adversary.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm supposed to try to create an accurate record, okay, for everyone's benefit. Accurate record, okay, is what I'm after. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, there are some issues --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Burgis, do you recall

Mr. Oppler -- Mr. Kaufman, don't cut me off, it's rude. I'm trying to ask a question.

Mr. Burgis, do you recall Mr. Oppler's testimony when he testified in 2019 that he could rent it as office space? Do you recall that?

MR. BURGIS: No, there was one meeting that I missed and I hate -- that might have been the meeting I missed.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: That's convenient. Thank you. But I just want to object on the record to the whole line of questioning about Mr. Oppler's testimony. It's irrelevant to this application.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well...
MR. KAUFMAN: But, go ahead. Ask your question. What else? He doesn't recall the testimony.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Did you look at any specific data with regard to Woodcliff Lake, Montvale, or Park Ridge with regard to market conditions?

MR. BURGIS: No, I relied on the expert testimony.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, you understand there's a difference between Class A office
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buildings and Class C office buildings. Correct?
MR. BURGIS: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: So we're not talking about a Class A office building.

MR. BURGIS: That is correct.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And do you know the prior uses for that building at 188 Broadway?

MR. BURGIS: You mean the occupants?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
MR. BURGIS: No.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: No.
Now, we don't have a market rate multiple dwelling zone, apartment zone in Woodcliff Lake. Isn't that true?

MR. BURGIS: I believe that's correct. I think all your, based on all your multi-families are inclusionary zoning and one hundred percent affordable housing, maybe two.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Bear with me one second.
MR. BURGIS: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, I believe you have
-- are you there, Mr. Burgis?
I believe in your prior testimony you
acknowledged that after extensive public hearings
in 2017, the mayor and council and the planning
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board decided to scrap the Broadway Corridor Ordinance proposed because it was decided that Woodcliff Lake was not an apartment town or multi-family town and it did not favor residential and the Broadway Corridor. Do you remember giving that testimony?

MR. BURGIS: Something to that effect, yes.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And this isn't a transit oriented development. Right? It's really transit related. Correct?

MR. BURGIS: To a certain extent that's splitting hairs. The reality is we are across the street from a train station and the fact that the council may have abandoned the zoning of an entire corridor doesn't preclude the fact that a zoning board is entitled to grant a use variance if they conclude that special reasons exist and the negative criteria have been met. And here we've shown not only the previously testified to special reasons, but we now talked about a whole new issue, i.e., hardship. That's just the argument and you've heard how we meet the negative criteria, so I'm not going to repeat that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, Mr. Kaufman --
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MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: -- mentioned the Medici
case.
MR. KAUFMAN: I thought you were
questioning me, Mr. Princiotto. I'm sorry, I
didn't mean to interrupt you. You started with "Mr. Kaufman", I was like, okay, yes.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Doesn't the Medici case
stand for the proposition that it's better to zone
by ordinance rather than variance?
MR. BURGIS: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes. And --
MR. BURGIS: It doesn't preclude a board from granting a variance; hearing the case and granting it.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you understand that the borough is in the process of updating its Master Plan. Correct?

MR. BURGIS: I've been told that, yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. And that's a better form of planning, doing it by way of an updated Master Plan rather than by variance, wouldn't you agree?

MR. BURGIS: Well, actually I would, however --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.
MR. BURGIS: No, let me finish giving my thought.

It, you know, an applicant is always entitled to make an application and a zoning board is always obligated to hear it and make a decision.

I've been involved in Master Plans that has taken as much as three years to come to its conclusion and adoption. You cannot be suggesting that all applications just get put on hold for an extended period of time. Knowing the quality of the work that Phillips Preiss firm, they're going to go through it in-depth and I'll be shocked if it takes less than a year. And the Courts have never upheld the idea that a zoning board can shut down for a year while a Master Plan goes through the entire process of getting adopted.

I trust Elizabeth understood that that was a compliment.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we'll see if the time estimates hold true.

Okay. I don't have any further questions.
I think we should try to finish this
witness and open to the public.
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Liz?
MS. LEHENY: Yeah, I do, actually.
I know, you know, we talked about this a little bit, a few other people asked questions but, you know, I understand that the real estate expert when I read his transcript he admitted, I mean, as we've all admitted tonight, that the office vacancy rate has been in the vicinity of 18 to 20 percent for awhile in northern New Jersey. And, you know, you talked about changed circumstances and I believe that the real estate expert admitted that we don't really know what the effect is of the changed circumstances is on the real estate market at this time, meaning, we're still coming out of the pandemic and there's still a question I'm not sure any of us can answer. And I guess I'm trying to lead to a question to you because I know I'm supposed to be asking you a question. But can you say for certain that this type of office space that would be impossible in this type of building doesn't have a market under these changed circumstances?

MR. BURGIS: It appears, you know, you've
heard me give my answer on that already. I like to think that given the nature of this building, the way it was initially described, and given the nature of the changes that we have seen in the office market, that coupled with the fact that having a site directly across the street from a train station represents a golden opportunity for the municipality to affirmatively address a portion of its unmet affordable housing obligation. The site makes sense for that use. It's in a good location for that use and you have a whopping 430-something unit unmet need and you're hard pressed to address that anywhere else. Here's an opportunity.

And when you talk about on a scale of 1 to 10, what's important in terms of the State Plan, case law, and the constitution where you have a use that's been identified as a constitutional obligation to address, this is about as good as you're going to get to address that.

MR. KAUFMAN: Hey, Joe, do you have a
crystal ball?
MR. BURGIS: I think I left it at the office.

MR. KAUFMAN: Do you? None of us can say
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for certainty about anything in the future, can we?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: That sounds like a summation comment, Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: No, it's a question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's finish this
witness.
MS. LEHENY: Hold on. I have a couple of followup questions and the first actually is. I agree with Mr. Kaufman. None of us really know. We don't know. Do you have any evidence or has there been any testimony that given these changed circumstances that the owner has tried to market the building or lease the building as office space in this new environment?

MR. BURGIS: You should have asked him that when he was testifying. I know in my own conversations with him --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's hearsay, but go ahead.

MR. BURGIS: He had said he can't market it. I forget if he said that on the record.

MS. LEHENY: Okay. The followup question I have is, as I'm sure you're well aware because you're a Special Master that the unmet need is
usually addressed by overlay zones and almost never, except maybe in one town that I've worked in did the potential units, affordable units on these overlay sites equal what the unmet need was.
Meaning, you know, yes, we do have an unmet need in excess between 300 and 400 units. But Fair Share Housing Center and the Court have signed off on the mechanisms that we have in place, including overlay zones on several sites. And so, I mean, I understand what you're saying, yes, the more, kind of the more the merrier, but there's really no constitutional obligation for us especially given the Courts signing off and Fair Share signing off on us providing affordable units on this site.

MR. BURGIS: Let me answer that two ways.
One, I think having a site that meets the criteria for affordable housing site and given how the property is currently zoned, I think the applicant has affirmatively addressed the statutory burden for the use. And I don't think it's appropriate for the board to turn around and simply say, we don't need affordable housing because we have our judgment of compliance in the code, so good-bye. That's not planning. There's an opportunity for the borough to plan.
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Recognize, this is going to sound terrible, but unless the state legislature changes the rules of the game come 2025, your unmet need is going to become your prior realm obligation and that's going to be a very, very bitter gill to swallow if you're told you have to address the entirety of that unmet need, because now prior obligation and in some way if you could help chip away at that, that might go a long way towards letting the Courts know that you at least made an effort because I've been in enough courts as Special Master and it's just representing that municipalities on this issue that the Courts become a bit more lenient with you when you show you've done something. And Fair Share Housing Center becomes a little more lenient with you when you show you've made some effort.

I mean, you are right. You are under no obligation to address the entire of your unmet need. You're under no obligation to do more than what your settlement agreement now says. You identified two overlay zones and you have a mandatory set aside ordinance and a few other things. But this is an opportunity to get probably more units than you'll ever have an
opportunity to do so again. And knowing Fair Share Housing Center as I know them they will be taking notes on all these municipalities as to how they treat sites during this period from now up until 2025. And I know that for a fact because I've spoken to some who tell me for fun they just, because of Zoom hearings, they're just listening in to hearings all over the state seeing what's going on. I know that doesn't sound nice and I certainly don't mean to suggest it as a threat, but I think that's a reality. And I don't think the legislature has the nerve to really come up with a new set of regulations between now and 2025 to help better address this whole issue.

MS. LEHENY: Madam Chairwoman, I have no other questions at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Okay. Anyone else? Anyone from the board? It's getting late.

All right. We'll get a motion to open to the public.

Chris?
board member hembree: No.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Can we hold off on the public until next?

MS. HEMBREE: I think so. I mean, I'm
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getting a little cranky after 10:00.
MR. KAUFMAN: I think we all are.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'd like to finish it tonight, if we could.

MR. KAUFMAN: I defer to Mr. -- I'm tired too, but I'll defer to Mr. Princiotto on this.

MS. HEMBREE: Okay. So I'll make the motion to open the meeting.

MR. KAUFMAN: Listen, I'm perfectly fine with, you know, as long as Joe is, but the problem is if I recall that he wasn't available on the 22nd. That's why we had the meeting tonight, if I recall correctly.

MR. BURGIS: Let me see if my calendar's changed. I just don't know.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: We have somebody on the agenda already.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I know, but that's not going to take the whole meeting.

MR. BURGIS: I can be available. Somebody else in the office had a cancellation, so I can send them to my other matter.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Meg, is there any way to tell how many hands are raised or can we ask participants that have any questions to raise
their hands to see how many we have? I mean, if we only have three, we can probably do it. If we have 20, then maybe we can't do it.

MS. HEMBREE: I see three.
MS. SMITH: Right now on Zoom we have 14 attendees and three of them are raising their hands. That doesn't account for any phone calls I that may come in. I have four now.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We haven't had any phone calls all night.

MS. SMITH: Correct.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: So four hands.
MS. SMITH: Four hands right now out of 14 attendees.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Robin?
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: And our questions were taking a half hour each. My preference is to hold them until the next meeting.

MS. HEMBREE: I agree with you.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: It's been a long day.
Sal --
MS. SMITH: I have five hands now.
MR. KAUFMAN: I agree with you, Madam
Chairperson. I agree with you, it's been a long day for all of us.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I thought if it was only three hands, but now as we talk the number of hands are getting greater.

MR. KAUFMAN: As the evening goes on, we get crankier and crankier.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's not my call and we've heard from Chairwoman Robin Malley.

CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: Let's hold that off until the next meeting. Do we have to do anything on scheduling for the next meeting?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We'll make a notification now. Testimony will be continued at the next meeting, which is June 22nd.

We do have another application.
CHAIRWOMAN MALLEY: That's correct, yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: But we'll spend some time on that one and we'll spend some time on this one.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We'll see you next week.

MR. KAUFMAN: We appreciate everybody's time and if anybody's interested, the Yankees won 3 to 2. I know Danielle's interested.

MS. FEDERICO: I just want to make sure that notice is preserved, Mr. Princiotto.
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| ```disagree [5] - 39:17, 84:16, 94:18, 103:17, 103:18 disagreed [1] - 84:20 discourage [1] - 87:22 discussed [1] - 111:8 discussion [4]-7:6, 85:6, 96:11, 117:1 disposal [1]-17:15 distance [2] - 39:13, 52:11 distinct [1]-101:18 distinguishes [1] - 103:6 distribution [1] - 23:16 District [1] - 49:9 district [1] - 78:14 districts [1]-101:17 ditch [1] - 62:11 diversity [2]-90:3, 99:24 dock [2] - 76:12, 77:4 docks [6] - 74:1, 74:13, 74:16, 74:18, 77:2, 77:3 docks" [1] - 76:17 document [3]-88:8, 88:18, 117:23 documents [3] - 47:21, 81:22, 82:6 done [4] - 76:4, 101:20, 104:12, 132:15 door [2]-40:12, 113:3 doors [1] - 58:1 down [15] - 19:24, 24:6, 27:4, 42:21, 43:3, 43:6, 49:6, 49:11, 52:8, 60:16, 72:20, 72:21, 101:25, 106:14, 127:17 draftsman [2] - 12:6, 12:7 draftsmen [1] - 12:8 DRAGONE [3] - 1:22, 138:5, 138:18 drainage [3] - 45:19, 62:10, 68:15 dramatic [1] - 117:18 draw [2]-105:24, 109:4 drawing [2]-17:10, 17:15 drawings [3]-11:15, 70:24, 70:25 drawn [1] - 102:11 drew [3] - 31:25, 32:14, 32:17``` | ```driveway [1] - 52:8 dropped [2]-106:22, 106:25 due [4]-94:12, 94:13, 117:7, 117:19 duly [3]-9:18, 55:10, 79:16 Dunkerhook [1] - 9:17 durability [1] - 28:6 during [5] - 10:22, 29:22, 29:24, 76:4, 133:4 dwelling [2] - 71:6, 124:13 dwellings [1] - 71:9```E <br> early $[1]-80: 25$ <br> ease $[1]-56: 24$ <br> east $[15]-17: 12$, <br> 18:23, 19:22, 20:5, <br> $27: 19,27: 25,29: 4$, <br> 29:5, 29:9, 29:11, <br> 29:20, 37:21, 39:14, <br> $50: 11,115: 23$ <br> easterly $[3]-82: 11$, <br> 83:2, 90:13 <br> eastern $[1]-115: 9$ <br> economic $[3]-100: 8$, <br> $102: 9,102: 18$ <br> economics $[2]-$ <br> $98: 10,98: 16$ <br> Edgewater $[1]-5: 5$ <br> educational $[3]-9: 24$, <br> $55: 15,80: 2$ <br> effect $[6]-10: 8,25: 4$, <br> $32: 20,80: 21,125: 7$, <br> $128: 15$ <br> effectively $[1]-83: 4$ <br> effects $[1]-26: 5$ <br> effort $[3]-89: 13$, <br> $132: 10,132: 17$ <br> eight $[10]-15: 1,23: 7$, <br> $29: 8,29: 9,29: 10$, <br> $29: 12,29: 13,29: 15$, <br> $29: 16,69: 18$ <br> either $[6]-33: 9,42: 1$, <br> $45: 18,70: 8,90: 18$, <br> $94: 15$ <br> electric $[1]-30: 8$ <br> elects $[1]-15: 16$ <br> elevation $[16]-17: 15$, <br> $18: 7,18: 21,19: 22$, <br> $20: 6,27: 11,28: 23$, <br> $29: 1,29: 4,29: 5$, <br> $29: 9,29: 11,39: 14$, <br> $39: 15,50: 11$ <br> elevations $[1]-17: 11$ <br> eliminated $[1]-13: 12$ | ```Elizabeth [4]-21:16, 21:22, 86:2, 127:19 elsewhere [1] - 15:21 email [1]-8:13 embark [1] - 118:2 EMILIA [1] - 1:16 emit [1] - 28:12 employed [2] - 138:11, 138:14 employee [1] - 138:13 employees [2] - 112:18, 112:20 enable [1] - 90:20 enables [2]-95:22, 107:19 enclosure [1] - 75:17 encompasses [1] - 85:25 encourage [1] - 87:16 encouraging [4]- 87:13, 91:8, 99:19, 99:24 end [4] - 8:16, 27:24, 47:7, 114:21 enforced [1] - 70:11 enforcement [1] - 73:19 Engineer [2]-2:5, 4:17 engineer [14]-5:3, 10:5, 10:15, 11:14, 25:7, 26:23, 30:21, 30:23, 51:24, 52:24, 55:18, 68:6, 73:23, 114:24 engineer's [1]-26:7 engineering [10] - 10:2, 10:4, 10:17, 55:17, 55:21, 56:16, 56:19, 57:25, 62:3, 62:25 Engineering [4]-5:3, 6:17, 10:10, 57:3 enhancing [1] - 99:5 enrollments [3] - 106:11, 106:13, 106:15 ensures [1] - 114:7 ensuring [1] - 115:17 Enterprises [1] - 10:18 entire [3]-125:15, 127:18, 132:19 entirely [5] - 12:20, 30:8, 82:24, 98:23, 108:10 entirety [3]-43:15, 89:8, 132:6 entitled \([7]\) - 92:23, 104:8, 105:23,``` | ```119:19, 120:2, 125:17, 127:5 entity [1] - 34:11 environment [2] - 99:2, 130:15 environmental [1] - 99:22 environmentally [1] - 87:24 equal [1] - 131:4 equals [1]-23:6 equate [2]-28:14, 39:7 equivalent [2] - 39:8, 52:10 especially \([1]\) - 131:12 ESQ [3]-2:3, 2:7, 2:8 essentially [1] - \(57: 5\) established [1] - 82:21 establishing [2] - 82:25, 85:23 establishment [1] - 97:3 estate [14]-88:12, 100:9, 102:1, 103:15, 104:7, 109:1, 109:19, 111:18, 118:19, 120:15, 121:15, 128:7, 128:13, 128:16 estimates [1]-127:22 et \([6]\) - 11:9, 13:17, 13:22, 25:13, 44:14, 45:20 Evan [3]-63:15, 63:19, 66:22 EVAN \({ }_{[1]}-2: 5\) evening [8]-4:20, 31:19, 37:13, 40:25, 45:7, 63:23, 99:8, 136:4 event [1] - 38:23 everywhere [1] - 23:17 evidence [4] - 108:1, 108:14, 122:3, 130:11 Ex [1] - 74:24 exact [3] - 9:3, 28:14, 103:3 exactly [4]-52:16, 59:19, 99:21, 99:23 examination [4] - 104:13, 121:22, 122:11, 122:12 EXAMINATION [3] - 9:22, 55:13, 79:25 examine [2]-22:19,``` | ```22:22 example [2]-97:12, 106:12 examples [1]-113:9 except [2]-69:24, 131:2 excess [1] - 131:6 exchanged [1] - 6:8 excuse [5] - 17:8, 74:4, 83:1, 96:18, 114:20 executive \([1]\) - 101:8 Executive [1] - 105:6 exhibit [4]-5:12, 6:11, 47:12, 64:1 Exhibit [3]-5:15, 20:6, 20:12 exhibits [6] - 5:11, 17:9, 64:18, 65:20, 65:24, 66:15 exist [1] - 125:18 existing [17]-12:19, 13:3, 14:3, 42:5, 45:16, 45:18, 50:15, 50:17, 58:6, 58:9, 58:11, 61:19, 62:13, 69:21, 70:6, 70:24, 82:19 exists [5] - 12:23, 50:19, 70:17, 70:21, 114:5 expand [1] - 16:21 expectation [1] - 25:15 expected [1]-83:18 expects [1]-8:5 experience [5] - 74:17, 75:2, 75:22, 76:3, 105:8 expert [21]-51:19, 55:20, 56:1, 62:1, 74:14, 81:7, 102:1, 104:6, 109:1, 109:3, 109:19, 110:12, 111:19, 118:19, 120:2, 120:11, 120:15, 123:22, 128:8, 128:14 expertise [8]-103:14, 103:21, 103:24, 104:3, 104:18, 104:25, 105:1, 105:23 experts [1]-120:8 explanation [1]-37:9 explore \({ }_{[1]}\) - 35:24 extended [2]-4:18, 127:12 Extension [2]-53:11, 67:21``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| extensive [1] - 124:24 | 16:7 | 62:7, 82:15, 91:1 | 17, 113:18 | 99:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { extent [2] - } 62: 18 \text {, } \\ & 125: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { February }[2]-63: 13, \\ & 112: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 8,106: 19,118: 5, \\ & 118: 7,135: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fully }[3]-36: 9,89: 6, \\ & 97: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Growth [1] - 99:16 guess [8]-22:24, |
| exterior [4]-18:19 | di] - 74:24 | fix [1] - 41 | [1]-133:6 | 7, 26:6, 26:8, |
| :12, 44:13, 69:24 | Federico [1] - 20:7 | fixed [1]-54:8 | nction [1] - 112:12 | 38:21, 49:1, 99:7, |
| extraordinarily ${ }_{[1]}$ - 100:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FEDERICO } 9]-2: 8, \\ & \text { 19:8, 19:18, 20:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { flat [10] - 13:8, 13:15, } \\ 13: 16,17: 16,19: 12 \end{gathered}$ | Furler [1]-55:9 <br> furthering [2]-96:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:19 } \\ & \text { guesstimate }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 24,137: 4,137: 7 \\ & \text { feedback }[1]-41: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 49:21, 50:5 } \\ \text { floor }[6]-15: 8 \end{gathered}$ | future [1] - 130 | guidance [1] - 92:25 |
| facade $[1]-69: 24$facades $[1]-24: 17$face $[7]-28: 24,29: 2$,$29: 11,29: 17,29: 18$,29:19, 29:20facilitate $[1]-115: 3$facilities $[1]-101: 11$facility $[2]-101: 13$,102:3facing $[5]-27: 8$,$27: 16,37: 22,39: 3$,$39: 4$fact $[18]-8: 25,28: 20$,$80: 12,84: 24,86: 24$,$88: 24,91: 3,101: 21$,$102: 13,107: 20$,$111: 16,113: 11$,$113: 12,125: 14$,$125: 16,129: 5,133: 5$factor $[1]-103: 5$fair $[6]-12: 8,34: 15$,$36: 11,89: 13,98: 13$,$104: 22$Fair $[5]-16: 3,131: 6$,$131: 13,132: 15$,$133: 1$fallen $[1]-111: 17$falling $[1]-111: 11$familiar $[4]-11: 19$,$20: 2,47: 17,71: 13$families $[2]-97: 19$,$124: 16$family $[16]-4: 7$,$86: 16,88: 16,91: 10$,$97: 9,97: 11,98: 5$,$98: 9,98: 15,98: 16$,$98: 22,100: 3,101: 2$,$116: 4,117: 11,125: 4$fan $[1]-28: 19$far $[6]-24: 23,62: 8$,$62: 12,62: 13,68: 11$,$75: 17$fast $[1]-98: 1$favor $[6]-31: 11$,$54: 24,67: 17,79: 9$,$125: 4,137: 12$feature $[6]-85: 24$,$86: 22,86: 23,88: 2$,$115: 22,116: 9$features $[2]-114: 10$, | $\text { feet }[28]-4: 9,4: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 12,29: 15,29: 16, \\ & 70: 23 \end{aligned}$ | G | guiding [1] - 86:11 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 24,11: 8,30: 17, \\ & 30: 18,42: 2,46: 14, \\ & 48: 14,48: 24,52: 9, \end{aligned}$ | floors [1] - 29:18 <br> flow [1] - 106:2 <br> flower [1]-116:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gained }[1]-113: 12 \\ & \text { game }[1]-132: 3 \\ & \text { gather }{ }_{[1]}-41: 23 \end{aligned}$ | Gwenn's [1] - 38:19 gym [1] - 41:22 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 9,60: 10,60: 11 \\ & 72: 3,72: 23,73: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { focus }[3]-81: 18, \\ 85: 21,99: 17 \end{gathered}$ | GE [3] - 28:5, $28: 9$ general [3]-58:20, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 4,83: 2,100: 13, \\ & 115: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { focused [2] - 100:14, } \\ & 110: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 92:5, 92:7 } \\ \text { generalities } \end{gathered}$ | habitable [1] - 69:10 hairs [1]-125:13 |
|  | FENDIAN ${ }_{[1]}-1: 16$ | focuses [1]-87:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:21 } \\ & \text { generally }[6]-63: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { half [10] - 29:19, } \\ 29: 20,72: 9,73: \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 1, 45:9, 60:13 | 32:24, 55:11, 79:17, | 74:13, 74:16, 75:22, | 76:6, 76:8, 82:11 |
|  | 80:14, 128:6, 132:23 | 4, 108:1 | 88:18, 97:10 | 135:" |
|  | figure [2] - 77:24, 97:7 | $130: 9,130: 23$ | generic [1] - 68:17 | hand [6]-31:18, 53:8, |
|  | figured ${ }_{[1]}-63: 19$ | foot $[3]-13: 1,41: 19$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { germane }[2]-121: 17, \\ & 121: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 14,67: 23,79: 1, \\ & 88: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | finally [1] - 99:9 | footprint $[3]-12: 17$ | gill [1] - 132: | handful [2]-99:18, |
|  | financially [1] - 138:14 | 13:6, 13:10 | given [9]-84:24 | 107:2 |
|  | financing [1]-23:23 fine $[5]-32: 23,63: 5$, | footprints [1] - 12:20 force [2]-10:7, 80: | 129:2, 129:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hands [11]-31:15, } \\ & 53: 6,54: 17,134: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $84: 14,104: 15,134: 9$ | forecasts [3]-120:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 12,131: 12 \\ & 131: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:1, 135:7, } \\ & \text { 135:12, 135:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { finish [14]-84:6, } \\ & 91: 21,92: 2,92: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 121:6 <br> forego | $\text { goal }[7]-82: 18,82: 22$ | $135: 22,136: 2,136: 3$ |
|  | 94:17, 95:2, 96:10, | forget [2] - 88:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 11,86: 20,87: 16, \\ & 87: 21,87: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { happy }[1]-77: 20 \\ & \text { hard }[3]-27: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:16, 105:12, } \\ & \text { 119:6, 127:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 130:22 <br> Form [3]-48:23, 49 | goals [6] - 82:13 | $39: 12,129: 13$ |
|  | 127:24, 130:6, 134:3 | 49:12 | $87: 10,87: 12,87: 20$ | hardship [12] - 90:19, 91.3, $96 \cdot 9,100 \cdot 9$ |
|  | finished [3]-38:19, 91:24, 105:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { form [6] - 48:25, } \\ & 49: 22.82: 14.86: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 96:15, 118:4 } \\ \text { golden }[1]-129: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:3, 96:9, 100:9, } \\ & \text { 101:4, 102:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | finishes [3] - 44:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:22, 82:14, } 86: 5 \\ & 102: 6,126: 21 \end{aligned}$ | good-bye [1]-131:24 | $108: 15,108: 25$ |
|  | $44: 17,119: 2$ | forth [3]-28:19, 61:3, | gosh [1] - 73:24 | 110:23, 122:4, |
|  | finishing [1]-10:1 |  | grade [6]-42:6, | 122:8, 125:22 <br> hate [2]-85:16, 1 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { fire }[17]-5: 16,60: 12, \\ 60: 18,60: 21,60: 24, \end{gathered}$ | forward [2] - 6:4 | 52:11, 61:14, 61: 62:5, 100:17 | head [2]-66:10, |
|  | 61:2, 61:8, 62:19, | four [18]-10:18, 14:8, | grading $[1]-68: 15$ | 112:21 |
|  | $64: 3,64: 5,64: 13$ | 14:24, 15:12, 17:11, | graduated [1] - 10:14 <br> grant [1]-125:17 | heading [1]-21:24 <br> hear [26]-27:7, 27:14, |
|  | :25, 65:10, | :14, 29:17 | granting [2] - 126:1 | $31: 20,37: 14,37: 23,$ |
|  | firm [2] - 80:8, 127:13 | $: 8,81: 19,135: 8$ | 126 | 37:25, 38:2, 38:7, |
|  | first [27] - 4:22, 5:19, | $135: 12,135: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { great [2]-137:5, } \\ & 137: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 8,38: 9,38: 10 \\ & 38: 14,38: 23,39: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | free [1] - 89:1 <br> freely [1]-27: | $\text { greater }[2]-28:$ | 39:24, 39:25, 40:1, |
|  | 20, 38:16, 39:2, | frequent [2]-11:17 | 136:3 | 43:5, 51:6, 63:20, |
|  | 42:6, 43:10, 69:2, | 76:2 | green [1] - 116:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 5,78: 18,95: 7, \\ & 120: 17,127: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 22,74: 5,75: 13, \\ & 75: 21,76: 2,76: 6, \end{aligned}$ | front [8]-4:8, 18:20, | grill [4]-20:21, 20:23, $24: 25,44: 12$ | heard [14]-38:19, |
|  | 82:17, 84:19, 91:3, | 1, 113:21 | grills [3] - 24:14, | 41:16, 88:12, 90:13, |
|  | 103:20, 130:9 | full [6] - 10:7, 33:15, | 24:17, 24:21 | $94: 8,95: 1,95: 16$ |


| 120:4, 121:13, | hopefully ${ }_{[1]}-80: 15$ | in-depth [1] - 127:14 | tion [1] - 42:25 | $J$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HEARING [1] - 1:5 | 5:17, 106:2, 135:17 | include [1]-651 | rested [3] | JACOBS [7] |
| hearing [9]-20:14, | hours [1]-95:18 | includes [1]-104:10 | 136:22, 136:23 | 6:20, 63:23, 64:11, |
| 64:13, 64:19, 78:19 | house [2] - 40:12 | including [5] - 56 | 38:1 | :23, 65:4, 66:25 |
| 86:19, 108:13, | 78:9 | 64:22, 80:12, | interesting [2]-101:5, | Jacobs [8]-58:23, |
| 126:14, 138:8, | housekeeping [1] | 00:20, 131:8 | 06:1 | 59:4, 59:13, 59:15, |
| 138:12 | 5:1 | inclusionary | interior [4]-60:8 | 59:17, 59:22, 63:15, |
| hearings [3]-124:24, | houses [1]-40 | 124:17 | 62:17, 69:23, 114:19 | 65:9 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 133:7, } 133: 8 \\ \text { hearsay }[1]-130: 19 \end{gathered}$ | housing [31] - 15:14, 15:17, 22:16, 23:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { incompatible }[1] \text { - } \\ & 82: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interrupt }[5]-83: 8, \\ & 93: 1,119: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jacobs' }[2]-58: 19, \\ & 65: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| heart [1] - 81:24 | 6, 24:3, 24:10 | incorporated | 122:11, 126 | Jersey [11] - 7:20, |
| heat [4]-29:23, 30:2, | 5:9, 36:1, 53:24 | 64:21, 65:21 | interrupted [1]-92:3 | 9:17, 10:25, 55:10, |
| 30:3, 42:22 | 12, 80:13, 86:16 | increase [6] - 12 | interrupting | 55:19, 79:16, 86:8, |
| heater [1] - 42:19 | :16, 88:22, 90:3, | 49:19, 54:3, 114: | 93:13, 93:19, 95:3 | 100:11, 120:6, |
| heating [4]-13:17, | :4, 90:5, 97:18, | 114:4, 115:6 | INTINDOLA [1] - 2 | 128:11, 138:7 |
| 18:14, 30:6, 42:10 | 20, 97:21, 98:4 | increased [3] - 14 | introduce [1]-2 | JERSEY [1]-1:24 |
| heavily [1] - 114:10 | :9, 98:15, 99:24 | 14:9, 62:15 | intruded [1]-115:18 | Joe [4]-81:17, 98:1, |
| height [3] - 49:18, $57 \cdot 21 \quad 60 \cdot 6$ | 100:3, 124:18, | increasing [2] - 88:17, | intruding [2] - 87:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:21, } 134: 10 \\ & \text { joe }[1]-92: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Heller }[1]-10: 18 \\ & \text { help }[4]-26: 4,89: 15, \\ & \text { 132:8, 133:14 } \\ & \text { helpful }[1]-19: 5 \\ & \text { helps }[1]-89: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 131:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { independent [1] - } \\ & \text { 118:24 } \end{aligned}$ <br> indicate [1]-57:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { investor [4]-33:7, } \\ & 33: 11,33: 17,34: 11 \end{aligned}$ | joined [1]-10:18 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Housing [4]-16:4, } \\ & \text { 131:7, 132:15, 133:2 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | JOSEPH [1] - 3:8 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { involved [10]-10:16, } \\ 11: 1,11: 15,34: 12 \end{gathered}$ | Joseph [1] - 79:13 |
|  | hum [3] - 38:2, 38:14 | indicate [1] - 57:25 <br> indicated [8]-33:11, |  | judges [1] - 80:13 <br> judgment [2]-88:24, |
|  | 40:1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { indicated }[8]-33: 11, \\ 36: 13,73: 2,102: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 1,11: 15,34: 12, \\ & 46: 6,46: 8,47: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| HEMBREE [21]-1:17, | hundred [5] - 28:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:25, 108:13, } \\ & \text { 113:11, 120:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $68: 13,76: 3,127: 8$ | 131:23 |
| 30:13, 30:15, 30:24, | 21, 72:4, 72:23 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { irrelevant [2]-122:6, } \\ & 123: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { judicata }[8]-83: 12, \\ 83: 15,85: 2,92: 20, \end{gathered}$ |
| 31:3, 54:22, 67:13, | 124:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { indicates [4]-58:6, } \\ & 95: 20,97: 16,107: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 113:25, 114:11, | hundreds [2]-73:24 |  | 123:13 irrespective [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 15,85: 2,92: 20, \\ & 94: 9,94: 20,95: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:14, 115:5, | 73:25 | indication [2] - 33:15, | irrespective ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 103:9 |
| 115:14, 115:19, | HVAC [2] - 13:17, 18:2 | 112:14 |  | $\text { jump }[1]-25: 2$ |
| 115:24, 116:11, |  | indicative [1]-20:17 | island [1] - 115:1 <br> islands [4]-60:13, | $\begin{gathered} \text { June [10] - 1:8, 6:24, } \\ 25: 4,59: 1,59: 13, \end{gathered}$ |
| 133:22, 133:25, |  | individual [2]-26:13, | 60:14, 62:20, 114:21 | 102:20, 107:23, |
| 134:7, 135:4, 135:19, 137:10 | i.e [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:12 } \\ & \text { industrial }{ }_{[1]}-77: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { issue }[39]-7: 17,8: 10, \\ 8: 14,50: 21,50: 22, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| hereinbefore [1] - | idea [1] - 127:16 | industry [1] - 113:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 14,50: 21,50: 22, \\ & 52: 1,62: 4,62: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 137:2 justified [1] - 62:22 |
| 138:9 | identified ${ }^{[2]}$ - 129:18, $132: 22$ | inform [1] - 113:13 | $62: 11,65: 9,65: 12,$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { hi }[3]-37: 13,45: 7, \\ & 68: 3 \end{aligned}$ | identifies [2]-82:9 | informed [1] - 96:6 input [2]-25:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 8,71: 7,80: 15, \\ & 81: 21,83: 11,85: 2, \end{aligned}$ | K |
| high [1] - 100:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:22 } \\ & \text { identify }[4]-82: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $44: 13$ | 85:8, 86:20, 94:19, |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { higher }[3]-27: 11, \\ 87: 16,121: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { identify }[4]-82: 2, \\ & 96: 1,101: 18,101: 19 \end{aligned}$ | inside [2] - 68:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 9,99: 18,100: 8, \\ & 101: 4,103: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 1:17, 2:7, 2:7, 3:5,$3: 7,3: 9,4: 20,8: 21,$ |
| highly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 65:14 | impact [2]-106:10, | insofar [1] - 83:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 4,10: 8, \\ & 5: 13,105: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Hills [1] - 106:15 | 121:8 | Inspired [1] - 49:10 | 105:17, 105:20, | 9:11, 9:22, 14:15, |
| himself [1]-122:2 | impairment [3] 85:15, 90:9, 10 | installed [2]-28:6, | 106:6, 106:10 | 16:13, 19:4, 19:9, |
| hits [1]-42:20 | imperative [1] - 96 | 28:8 <br> instance [4]-23:9, | 111:6, 111:9, | 22:3, 22:10, 22:13, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { hold }[8]-19: 8,57: 11, \\ \text { 127:11, 127:22, } \end{gathered}$ | impervious [5]-87:7, |  | $121: 25,125: 22,$ | 22:21, 23:1, 23:15, |
| 130:8, 133:23, | 87:8, 87:9, 96:18, | instances [2]-106:9, | 132:13, 133:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:4, 25:2, 26:1, } \\ & \text { 26:17, 26:23, 31:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $135: 17,136: 8$ | 96:20 | instances [2] - 106.9, | issues [9]-7:14, <br> $47 \cdot 21,50 \cdot 20,80 \cdot 14$ |  |
| home [9]-13:22, | important [9]-13:14, | instead [9]-13:11 |  | 32:16, 32:21, 33:3, |
| 17:25, 20:1, 28:17, | 4, 66:24, 84:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 10,15: 11,18: 5, \\ & 39: 3,43: 16,49: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 81:19, 85:14, 91:1, | 33:24, 34:17, 35:16, |
| 28:18, $43: 16$, $112 \cdot 21,112 \cdot 24$ | $85: 19,129: 16$ |  | $\text { item }[4]-48: 11,49: 11$ |  |
| 112:21, 112:24 homeowners [1] | impossible [1] | intended [2]-34:2, | 49:15, 69:17 | 35:24, 36:5, 36:20, |
| homeowners [1] 46:13 | 128:22 |  |  | 41:3, 43:24, 44:25, 45:5, 46:22, 47:22, 48:1, 48:7, 48:17, 49:8, 49:17, 50:1, 50:8, 50:15, 50:19, |
| homes [1] - 39:15 | im | intends [1] - 8:4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { itself }[8]-18: 14, \\ 20: 21,20: 22,61: 6, \\ 61: 9,85: 4,111: 6 \end{gathered}$ |  |
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