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CAATRMAN DePTNTO: Good evening.

MR. DEL VECCHTO: Andy Del Vecchio, member
of thc firm of Beattie Padovano.

Wo're here on continued publio heacings t betieve from September 4 th, our last bearings here.

I have a couple of housekeeping tems that T'd like to address first.

I'd like to mark the utility plan which is labeled Utility Plan 1 , Sheet C-12 prepared by \(1,2 A\) dated \(9 / 14 / 18\) as \(\pi-31\).

By way of background khis Board had requested that we meet with the Fire Departmert, Suez Nater, representatives of Maser to deal with the water main looping issue that arose in prior testimony. That meeting did occur. We think we came to a consensus between the Fire Department, Sue\% and ourselves.

This plan represents a drawing that we believe is that consensus. We are awaiting final sign off from your Fire Department on its acceptability which wo hope to have before the rext meeting. That is why that plan was submitled as a standalone drawing in advance of tonight to give you an update and a report as to our follow through on that item.

Also by way of follow through, I think the

Chair, \(t\) think il was the Chatr who requested a meeting with the Coumty, with Mr. Timsak. I did speak with Mr. Pimsak loday. He is trying to arrange for that meeting to spedirically discuss tho accoss point Erom Grand Avenue into this site. And as soon as that meeding is scheduled, we'll brimg back an updabe on that meeting as weil and what it is the County s looking for, what the Borough desires at inat location; anci, hopefully, we'll reach a consensus of that item as well and bring it back lo you.

So with that said, those are my updates ror this meeting.

I do have our traffic consultant, Botsy Doian here this evening. I sec Mr. Rachad is here.

As I jrdicated, I gave Mr. Hipolit advance notice that it was our intention to have Miss Dolan provide traffic testimony this evening so Mr. Rachad could be present for that.

So with that said, \(I\) would like to have Miss Dolan sworr.

MR. REGAN: I'm going to swear Miss Dolan as well as Mr. Rachad.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you give us this evening will be the truth so holp you Gud?

MR. RACHAD: Yes, 1 do.

MS. DOLAN: Yes.

MR. REGAN: Let the record reflect that Miss Dolan has bcon sworn as the applicant's traffoc engineer and Mr. Rachad the Board's trafitc engineer, bot.h have been qualificd in traffic encineering.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Lhe Chair will accept the recommendation of counsel.

Please continue.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Just to refresh everybody's recollection, Miss Dolan's report, the traffic report, as woll as the shared parking analysis was previously marked in at the september \(A\) in beariog. They were marked as \(A-23\) and \(A-24\) respectively. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHTO:

Q Miss Dolan, those krafrio reports and the shared traffic analysis were prepared by you or your supervision?

A Yes, they were.

Q And you made yourself - \(\quad\) was going to say that you made yourself re-familiar with lhe Mercedes Drive corridor along which this property sits?

A Yes.

Q And the neighborhood and the traffic
noighborhood that this properly will imodot as itt is redeveloped?

A Yes.
Q And, fust again by way of background for the record, you were the trafric consuldant who propared the reports for 'he Shops at Depiero Farms which is located directly across the street from this project?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q And that project shares essentially line same traffic network, rodds and systems that this project will potentially share às i.t. is redeveloped?

A Yes, particularly because of the access along Mercedes Drive.

Q So I'm going lo give you an opportunity to, in life that doesn't always happen, you got to prepare some reports and you oot an opportunity to restudy the same road pattern, with zero projection the last time.

Right.?
A Yes.
Q So your projections met expectations for the site that was developed at The Shops at DePiero Farms?

A I think we actually had an over-projection
at I'he Ghops al. Depiero parms bised on tre trafitc counts.
\(0 \quad\) So you went out and took now counts?
A Yes, we did because the initial traffic study was daled February of 2018 .

So our traffic connts were performed back dt the beginning of the year, actially the end of Decembcr of 2017 into danuary arid February or 2018.

Q So if you could tell the Roard what you did and the conclusions you reached in the road study of this road network anci let's slick with lhe traffic impact analysis. For now we'll deal with the shared parking analysis.

A okay. So suicking with the traffic count program we studied Grand Avenme and Mercedes Drive. They are providing primary access to the subject property. Grand Avenue and Philips Driveway opposite Paragon Drive, Mercedes Drive and Farm View. Farm View is the main access at thc signalized intersection on Mercedes into Wegmans.

And then also at the various unsignalized existing driveways along Mercedes Drive.

As I said, these were all performed in tho beginning of 2018. We counted on both weekday evenings and Saturdays.

Back through 2013, the traitic stucies for The Shops at DePiero Earms had tocused on the weekday overing peak hour only. that was determined lo be the busicst hours where we have a concentration of peak sireet traffic and projected site traific.

But since Wegmans has openec, we warted to see how the Saturaay volumes actuaily were with, compared with the weekday evening to make sure that we need to study the Saturday peak hour. Anc that was actuaily a queslion from Maser, from the original traficic review.

What wo found was that the Saturday traitic volimes through the system during the Saturday peak hour is several hundred vehicles lower, for example, on Grand Avenue meaning that the weekday evening peak hour remains the most important for lhe analysis of the traffic conditions, both existing and proposed.

At the time that we performed these counts back in the beginning of 2018 Wegmans was open, a few olher stores were open, the overall what you called parcel. A, the upper parcel, the majn development parcel at The Shops at Depiero Farms 80 percent was ocoupied. So we had to account for the 20 percent of urocoupied retail space at Parcel A at DePiero's Farm and we also had to account for what's called Parceì B al Depiero Which is the smaller portion accessed on Philips

Drive.

So with the projection of fuinre traffic volumes we used onm updated counters from 2018. We accounted for full build out at The Shops at Depiero farms. We also incorporatcd a background growth ractor which is typical in the projection of fucure lrarric volumes agair to make surc we account for on-going other area development. And, also, our revised traffe study includes traftic from the kPMP expansion over on Chestnut Ridge Road and also the redevelopment at 2 Paragon Drive.

So wo forecast all of lhas known and approved area of development plus the background traffic flow factored certainly project future traffic volumes and then, of course, we have to generate volumes for the Triboro site, the site that we're here lo dalk aboul tonight.

As you heard in prior hearings, the Triboro site is a mixed use development that is proposed lo consist of office space, a hotel, multi-family housing and also rostaurant and relad space.

We go to the ITE Trip Generation Manual to project traffic volumes for these proposed uses and we also, again, to make sure that the evening peak hour was the correct hour for analysis. We did rin the
mumbers for the morning poak hour, the evenirg peak hour as well as the Saturaay peak hour.

The Saturday paak hour came in at 630 trips versus the evening of 602. So that's comparable but, again, recognizing that the volumos, existing volumes Lraveling through the roadway systom are lower on the Soturday peak hour. Our analysis focused on the evening peak hour.

The full projection of trafitc volumes werc developed Eor the various interscetions that I mertioned, the Grand Avenuc and Mercedes, Grand and Philips and then, of course, the different intersections along Mercedes Drive and that consists of, for friboro , a right in, right out driveway towards the Grand Avenue end of the site, a driveway that aligns up with Farm View, that's the signali\%ed driveway, and then another unsignalized driveway opposite the existing Wegmans unsignalized driveway and that's further south at the southern limits of the development parcels.

This revised traftic study also included the existing driveway on Grand Avenue which has a dedicated left tuxn lane existing on Grand Avenue. That driveway historically permitted left in, right in and right out. This was a change in our revised
trafitic study based on the county' a requost where the original study had looked at a right turn in on \(\quad\) on Grand Averue.

Overail, the projections thal iro included in our Latest traffic study which is dated August 17, 2018 showed lower volumes along the Grand Avoruc corridor ance the Mercedes Drive intersertion at Grand Avenue than had been projected and used for tho redesign and upgrade of these roadways and intcrsections at the time we were studying The Shops at Depiero Farms.

So we've counted and made new projections which are very conservative and they actually came out a little bit lower than the volumes that had been originally projected. So \(\quad\) think that the design that has been implemented adjacent to the subject property is sufficient to accommodate the Triboro development but nevertheiess we did go through all of the caiculations, the Level of Service calculations not only at the offsite intersections but at the site driveways to ensure that they would operate at acceptable Levels of Service.

And based on the existing geometry along Mercedes Drive, the existing signal at Farm View, there is sufficiend capacity to accommodate tho
addalanal trips.
We also did count tor some cross-activities between the two sites recognizing that that is likely to occur.

So the overal traffic impact study shows acceptable Levels or Scrvice and lower overali projections and acceptable operations at the driveways for the Triboro. Whether or not that left in off of Grand Avenue ocours or rot, there is sufficicnt capaci.4y to accommodate that volume it that cxisting left turn into Grand Avenue is prohioited and tho movements are made at the signalized intersection of Grand and Mercedes.

So that's an overview of the traffic study.
I can certainly go into more detail if you like or \(I\) can go into the sharcd parking setting.

Q If \(I\) could just ask you a couple questions, Betsy.

The site that we arc studying for purposes of this application commonly known as the Mercedes site is not vacant land?

A That's correct.
Q There arc improvemonts in terms of office buildings thal exist on there, had been occupied heavily by the prior tonant and, obviously, they would
have produccd trips into the roadway network?
A That is correot.
Q What did you do about those tirips relative to your traffic analysis?

Are they accounted for, are brey ignored?

What did you do with those wips?
A We had actually counted lhe driveways that were prodicing traffic volumes umder existing conditioris. There is some office space that's occupicd and gencrating traffic. We prepared that figure that shows those existing volumes entering and cxiting the driveways into khe Mercedes site during evening poak hour. Those were removed before we made our projections.

It's not a substanital amount of traffic. It's maybe about a hundred trips in and out during the evening peak hour so that was counted and then removed bcfore we added all the new traffic from the mixed use development.

Q Now as a property thal's improved with a couple hundred thousand square feet of office space it would be anticipated in its full occapancy mode to generate significant can't traffic into the roadway network would it not?

A YCS.

Q And in terms of anaiyzing impact, your report does not take a credit for that pre-existing t.raffic as a deduct against what you projected as additional traitic into the roadway network?

A No. No. The only thing we credited was the actual volume being produced which is about a hundred whereas you have a few handred with fully occupied promises that have historicaliy been. We did not \(u\) ake any credit for any tratifo that's not happening now.

Q Now, based upon your roviow of the trafitic projection and accounts, is it your opinion that the additional projected Eraffic can be safely and efficiently handicd at the controled access points to and from the sitc including the signalized and unsignalized locations?

A Yes. As I said, with the geometry that's in place on Mercedes Drive and the one lane approaches that we are proposing on our approaches, there is significant capacity, enough capacily to allow all driveway movements to operate at Levels of Service \(A\), \(B\) and \(C\) during the busiest weekday hour.

Q And relative to the intersection of Mercedes and Grand Avenue from a traffic impact standpoint is there any ncea for any further
improvement or modirications to tinat intersection based upon the redevelopment or this site?

A No.

0 okay. bet.'s swilch gears ir we can into the shared parking report.

A lhe shared parking report is also dated Augnst i7, 2018. It's in its first version. 'Fhis is not a revision.

In the plan set that's been submitted, and Mike is going to pat up the exhibit, we have a color coded parking plan that summarizes the required parking for the residential units based on the Residential site Improvement Standards and for all others based on the ordinance requirement.

I have summarized in my table, on Page 2 of the report, the numbor of required parking for each use. Office 135 , restaurant 135 , retail 142 , hotcl 188 and then 500 plus for the residences based on the bedroom count and the applicable RSIS ratio. So 1,197 parking spaces are required to meet the individual requirements of each of the uses. The phan provides 1,172 parking spaces so we're 25 short.

The Residential Site Improvement Standards state that when housing is in a mixed use selting that shared parking shall apply and your ordinance also
Betsy Dobar - Direct - Mr. Del Vecchio
permits tho shared parking approach.
Shared parking is the idea that one parking space can offer two uses, two land istse. The original shared parking report was published by he arban Land Institute and since then lhe Institute of Transportation Engineers has upriated hour by hour parking demand tables for difrerent land uses.

So the idea behind shared parking is, for example, residential parking is going to have a maximized demand overnight throughout the week and a little bit higher on weekends during the midday. Similarly a hotel experiences peak parking demantís overnight but the retail and the oficices are going to have a peak demand diring the day. Restaurants, depending upon the type they are, are probably going to have a maximized demand midday and then later in the evening wher the offices and general retail have a littie bit less parking demand.

So by lookirg at each of these uses on an hour by hour basis, on local weekday and a saturday, what the shared parking analysis does is take the maximum required parking for each use and run them through an hour by hour analysis to determine, based on the differcnt peaking characteristios of the different land uses what the actuaj parking demand would be.

Retisy Dolan - Dircet - Mir. Del Vecotio

And I have included tables that summarize thosc hour by hour analyses for botin the weekody ard the Saturday. And what we have calculated for a wcokday is 807 parking spaces during tho busiest hour and on a Saturday we calculated, of course, you would expect a higher demand, of 878 spaces.

So this would indicate lhal the plan, even though we'rc deficienl 25 spaces when you look at the use recuirements for each type of 1 ard use, overall, from a shared parking perspective, we have a surplus of about 300 spaces.

So the analysis l think helps to support the deficit of only 25 spaces by conservatively assessing the maximum demand for earh use but looking at it on an hour by hour basis whioh is the shared parking philosophy.

Q Now, Betsy, based upon your work and research in the shared parking calculations, do you feel that the site wi.l. have sut亡icient and adequate parking for each of the proposed uses that are proposed at lhe time when that parking is nocded for those uses?

A I do.

And I think that LクA's parking allocation plan really helps to show that there is an appropriatc
numbcr of parking spaces proximale to the differemt uscs, They are color coded so it wolid help us ail understand the overall parking. Ana this plan does allocate 100 percent of the requirement for all of the Lises but for the 25 we're derieient is taken oul of the orange or the residential spaces.

Q Now a good -- whe parking thet is proposed or the site is a mix of both surface and stiructured parking.

Correct?
A Yes.
Q And based upon lhe allocation that is depicted on Drawing \(C 18\) of L2A's drawings, the allocation betweer structure and surface parking, you remain comfortable with that it will adequately service the derand for the proposed projecl as proposed on C18?

A Yes, particularly because the number of residentjal coded parking spaces malches the mumber of residential units above that parking suructure.

Q So essentially there is enough garage space for each residertial unit to be fully serviced?

A That's correct.
MR. DET, VFCCHIO: All right. I have no further questions of Mjss Dolan at this point and make
ber available to the Bodrd and their professionals for any questions that you may have.

CHATRMAN DEPENTO: Okay. Thank you. i guess i am starting with Mr. Culhane.

Mr. Cuihaner do you have any questions for Miss Dolar?

MR. CULHANE: I notice in the report that. you have projections for Two Paragon Drive and also for the KPMG. I don't soe anyting for Hornrock where the future deve opment both in Montvale and Park Ridge.

THE WITNESS: That would be correct. I dicin't \({ }^{\boldsymbol{i}} \mathrm{nclude}\) that.

MR. CULHANE: Mny particular reason why?
MS. DOLAN: I wasn't aware of it.
Ancl \(I\) had communicated with Maser and actually it lurned out our office had done the other two, KPMG and Two paragon. Those were the two that were mentioned in my dialogue with the representative of Maser regarding the traffic.

MR. CULHANE: I believe, Mr. Chaimman, we will need some more information about the potential for the traffic goneratcd out of the developments both in Montvale and Park Ridge recognizing Park Ridge has other ̇亠ssues.

CHAIRMAN DCPINEO: Mr. Hipolit., did you commuribcate with Miss Dolan?

MR. HIPOLIT: So our office did communicate with her.

Right now, other than the what we have in Montvale, we don't have a dovelopment for Horryock as far as the entire development which \(I\) know has been discussed could be anywhere from 480 unite to a thousand units. We could, as the Borough, be conservative and ostimate a thousand units or you can --

As a development, Montvale is 1 imitied in scope but they could include those nambers. But, obviously, that's not really the scope of development. The scope of development is mostly in Park Ridge.

MR. DEI VECCHJO: l'rom our perspective, from the applicant's perspective they are a project that is behind us. And if they're going to add traffic to the notwork they need to be responsiblc for that traffic and any road improvements that come from.

I can't envision us anticipating traffic from every project that may come and then be responsible for mitigating it. So 1 just want to \(n\) nderstand where we're going.

CHAIRMAN DCPINHO: I understand what
you're saying, Mr. Dol Vcochio. But with the improvements that have boen made, you're rot proposing l.o make any olher improvements because I believe the report and the festimony says that tho roads as curaently improved win bo able to withstand the traffic being generated off the Mercedes site. MR. DET, VECCHTO: Correct.

CHATRMAN DEPINTO: I think the question
is, we do know how many vehicles are proposed or parxing spaces \(I\) should say are proposed with the Hornrock project, lhat portion of the project is, that is in Montvale.

I think your calculations should minimally include that becalse that was part of the settlement agreement and it's the inevitable that eventually it will be built.

MR. HIPOLIT: We now have preliminary, we now have a submission for that. Originally we didr't. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: We could review, in an effort to adjust your numbers. MR. HIPOLIT: We can. MR. DEI VECCHIO: I have no objection to providing the Board with the information, I want to be clear about that, from an information standpoint. I have no problem giving the Board that information.

The thing thal differs, KPMP and Two Paragor from Horrrock is they are approved projects that have been through the Planning Board process so there is greater definitiveness to thom.

To the extenl --

MR. HTPOTTP: Wel 1, hold on, hold on.
Hofnrock is now complete. We deemed them complete.

MR. DET, VFCCHTO: But they're not
approved. And we àl know, partioularly \(I\) know all too well. standing on thes side of the podinm what you put in isn't necessarily what you see come out on the other side. It ends up being massaged. So we don't know what that procoss bcars for Hornrock.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Del Vecchio, we have two traffic experts here.

If we were to add the parking requirements that we believe will result from the plan that has been submitted which is consistent with the settlement agreemert in Montvale, if we add that into the mix and we take a projection that Mr. Hipolit has said, between 400 and 1,000 , if you take the total, is the road network, as it has been improved, capable of supporting that traffic?

MR, DEL VECCHIO: And I'm saying we can give you that information. Thoro's no question. But
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I'm taking it one more ster just to bo absolutely certair that the apolicant's position is clear, that Hormrock's traffic is Hornrock's rosponsibility to deal with and miligate.

CHALRMAN DePINTO: But if wo have a watcr mark, ifi we have a benchmark --

MR. DEL VFCCHIO: SHre.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- From you, wher we hear the Hornrock applicalion, and it would bo, and it would be in Park Ridge's best interest and our best interest that as they hear their applacation for site plan approvai we share with them the traffic information that we receive both from Betsy and Maurice.

Can you provide thal?
MR. DEL VFCCHIO: We can provide a
'supplemental. letter just saying if you were to consider Hornrock the result would bc \(X\), Y or Z, sure. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Hipolit.

MR. HIPOITT: So, Betsy, we'll send you
what we have for Hornrock. In Montvale it's 185 units and then we don't know what Park Ridge is going to be. CHAIRMAN DePTNTO: Unless someore has a better feel on the park Ridge development than we do --

MR. HTPOTII': it's in couxt.

CHATRMAN DePDNRO: - it's, nothing is
coming out of the court at this lime.
MR. DEF, VHCCHLO: T assume they submitted a traffic report with hheir application. It would be helpful if we could gei l.hai.

MR. REGAN: That. would aid Betsy in doing her work.

MR. HLEOLIT: Give me a few seconds and I'11 tell you that.

CHALRMAN De?TNTO: Everytining we have on that we'll share willh you.

MR. Drt, VECCHIO: Thank you.
CHATRMAN DePTNTO: Maurice, what are your thoughts on what you have heard from Ms. Dolan?

MR. RACHAD: Good evering, everyone. Mr. Chairman, I think the Board is making a good point. However, \(I\) also wanl to remind the Board that this traffic study also included a 1.5 percent background growth for three years. So when you compound that number you would say that the trarfic study is accounting for a 5 percent increase in traffic volumes.

And we do that to account for what we refer to as the background growth. So that gives us a little
bil. of a buffer in our analysis.
But if the applicant agrees to consider tho l. raffic from Hornrook, I L.hink thal would give the Bonrd a very good assessment. as to how the intersections woulc operate once all these developments arc producing trafric.

But I also would like to add to just give the Board more comfort in this application, the fact that When \(I\) looked at the numbers I felt: the numbers were conservative and hore is why.

This is a mixed use development. And it's being developed across the street from another mixed use development. And the applicant's engineer, to bo conservativc, oniy applied the trip capture to one side but not both sides.

Let me explain what I mean by that. I'al give you a simplistic example.

Let's say that the, this development will generate certain stores. Let's say onc of them is a nail salon and in the fiture, once that nail salon is open, it's going to atiract trips. Some of these trips are already on Mercedes Drive coming to Wegmans or coming to the fuice shop or other places and then they come to this development. We refer to that as trip capture. That was not accounted for, which is a
good thing by the way, in the sludy.
So we will see in the future that the actual trip demand from this development will be lower than what is projected in this txafio study.

I'm saying this to gave the Board a likue bit of comfort with these numbers. They look high but in reality they will be lower than that.

But \(I\) do have some onner questions when the time is appropriate \(I\) would jike to ask the applicant.

CHAIRMAN DEPTNAO: Well, I think now would be the appropriate time.

MR. RACHAD: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIE: I jusl wart yot to know I sent all three of you the report.

MR. RACHAD: So, Mr. Chairman, being that this is a mixed use development and is going to have retail, office use and devclopment we will see quite a bit of interaction between this development and the other one across the swreet which is the DePiero development site. And, \(I\) woild recommend that the applicant provides some bellex connectivity between the two to enhance pedestrian mobjulity and pedestrian safety between the two which would inciude crosswalks, maybe some lighting which would include a well-designed system so people can walk from one site
to the other wilhout having to take thoir vehiches. And that would further actwaty help in decreasing future tiop demand.

And ? woula like lo hear from the applicant's engineer what hhey can offer in that regara to enhance pedestrian mobility and pedestrian safety.

CHATRMAN DEPINTO: I think that's a fair question.

Mr. Del Vecchio.
MR. DFE VECCHJO: Yes. Miss Dolan, if you could.

MS. DOLAN: Yes. We had taiked about tho pedestrian crosswalks that are at that main signalized intersection. They're faded. They're not realiy highly visible and there's a lot of different technigues that car be used with either textured pavement or acturi cobole stones or different color schemes that can \(b o\) used to enhance the pedestrian crosswalks through that very important intersection. Also the entire intersection can be raised into a raised table with the crosswalks again on all four corners as they have been designed with the signal but with higher visibility to promote that podestrian crossing.

And thal can be carried to the pedestrian
crossings that are currentiy shown on lhe pan at the unsignalized four \(\mathbf{L e q}\) intersection on Mercedes Drive between the two sites because, obviously, we don't watt them crossing in between.

And on the DePicro side there's really no pedestrian penetration until you get lo those driveways because of grades and the buildings. So we want them to cross at highly visibie localions.

And something along those lines is what the applicant has been talking about is possible enhancements to Merccdos Drive.

MR. RACHAD: So you're not proposing any mid block crossing for example?

MS. DOLAN: There is one shown on the plan that we may want to talk about a little bit but it is shown as a four part crossing at that lower southern unsignalized location.

MR. RACHAD: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I am okay with the answer we received today. It would be, I think, nice for the Board and the professionals to receive a pedcstrian circulalion plan, nothing complicated, could be on one sheet to show us what do they cnvision in terms of pedestrian generation from one site to the next and how lhese pedestrians would navigatc two sitcs and cross the street.

I think that wousd help us and atso help the applicant in providing a pedestriani circulation that is safe and cfficient.

CHAIRMAN DePINIO: Well, Mr. Rachad, she mentioned a raiscd table as an alternal ive or markings or change in matcrials.

What would be your recommendation to conncct the two sites for podestrian passayeway?

MR. RACHAD: 1 definitely think that the different material would be very desirabie from an esthelide perspective and also from a furnctional perspective.

Raising the intersection, T'm not sure we need to go that far. This becomes moxe like a speed hump in the roadway and there are people that like speed humps and ones thal don't. Speed humps could be used to calm traffic down bul also they have othcr issues in terms of noise pollution, in terms of interference with the venicles.

It's really sornething up to the Board whether or not you want to create that verlical elevation, the roadway.

But in my opinion, \(F\) think at least usinc different material, nice signage, good connectivity, very nicely dosigned ADA compatible ramps and a path

Lhat makes common sense that peovle walk from Point \(A\) t:o Point \(B\) following that path.

CHALRMAN DePINTO: And you would do a similar typc of pathway interchange at the unsignalized access poinl?

MR. RACHAD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEPTNTO: And, Mr. Hipolit, you're in aorecmont with Ghat as well?

MR. HIPOLI': So l am. I just, as I said before, getting pedestrians between ihe two sites is very important.

And I, I have a concern that pedestrians can cross freely between the two sites, specificaily bocause they have residents across the street and if I'm on the, say the southern side of the bigger residertial building whal's going to stop me from just walking straight aross an unsignaiized intersection, just walking across to a signalized? Not much. I want to just go shopping, I' İ walk across my back.

So, I think getting a pedestrian plan, showing how it can work, showing whal the positive and negatives arc, evaluating all the options we have, thore's a lot of oplions.

CHALRMAN DePENTO: Does anyone recall if we hoara any tostimony from Mr. Preiss with respect to
S. Maurice Rachad -

Uhis pedestrian crossover, to what extent we could articipato that? I don't recall.

MS. O'NEILL: We spent the vast majorily of his fostimony last time on the concept of a boulevare.

MR. HIPOLIT: Coxrect.
MS. O'NEILL: WC didn't qet really much past thal.

MS. RUSSO: And a crossing bridge.
MR. HIPOLIT: He didn't like the boulevard idea or the bridgo.

COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: why was the boulevard
discontinued?
MR. HIPOLIT: \(I\) don't believe it's discontinued.

COUNCILTOMAN CURRY: So certainly keep people from just doing what they do on Kinderkamack Road, just crossing the stieet because they want to go to the bank, not that \(I^{\prime}\) ve ever done that.

But the boupcvard, we would have areas where it woule be availabie for people to cross.

Right?
If you had the loveiy floral and fauna, hence beautiful island going down the center of mercedes.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: The one thing we haven't
S. Maurloe Rachad -
gotere lo that impests that decision, and you'li hear it when Mr. Dipple gets Dack to testifying, js you have to recal the setting in which the roadway sit.s.

TE the Roard allows me I'll approsch the drawing here for a second.

If you look al tho Depiero side of the streeu you have ine Cyclefar buirding and the Starbucks building. if you remember, essentially the back of those buildings are lhe wall that holds up Mercedes Drive.
'lhe area that forms that outdoor seating area between the two buildings is probably set 10 feet down.

So the likelinood of anybody coming out of the DePiero site in that segment wouid require them to scaie a wall in order to get to the sidewalk to cross mid block.

I don't know about you but I find pedestrians to be generally iazy. They're not going to climb the wall. They're going to take a mach easier path.

And the part of the testimony you haven't heard yet is that this portion that lies between the signalized interscction of the proposed site and the northerly most driveway here is also set down. It has a retaining wal on this side of the street as well.


\section*{S. Maurdoe Rachad -}
up with a plan for pedostrians that works. whether ft's people coming from the west, the south qoing norih or gotng eist to west across both sites how is il going to happen; and, irstead of showing it just on one colored drawing on one side, we want to sec a plan Irom Gramd Avenue all the way down Mercedes to show how this is going to be happen.
fi's the two largest developments ever developed across rrom each other ir Montvale and that connectivity is important.

Pedestrians are going to come here. They go there now just on the one side. And, you know, \(\bar{i}\) had some concerns with respect to the retail, the life style area versus megmans because when you park on one side you can do it but...

CHATRMAN DEPINTO: Here, here is my concern. From an esthetic point of view the bouievard is very níce. It's vory interesting. I have seer ther. They're, they're very attractive.

However, we have a unique or somewhat unique situation. We have the DePiero development. We have a pretty good idea what it's going to generate in terms of traffic. And, we're protty comeortabie with what we design to handle that trafixic albeit not all or the stores have tenants in them.

Then we have line unknown which we merely could project is the med use developmont from Mercedes-Benz.
if it were just limited to thosc two major developments, then \(T\) 'd say a bolilevard might make a Lot of serise because we can improve thc ovcrall connectivily between the two developments.

Bui fhere's another huge element and that hage clement, 立my opinion, As Lifetime. And \(I\) know when I come down Mercedes Drive to make a lett-hand turn onto Philips, the trarfic coming out ot Lifctime trying to go north on Moreedes Drive is pretty horremdous.

Now if you create a fancy boulevard where you convert Mercedes to this fancy boulevard, how is it going to accommodate the podestrian traffic that we're so concermed about recognizing that we have all that pass through iffetime traffic going north and south on Mercedes? I don't know if you could do that.

MR. HIPOLIT: You know, Maurice and T
looked at it, we drove there today and looked at this whole concept and the point Maurice brought across was is we're so iimited by width on Mercedes. It's not like we have an 80 foot wide road there where we can create these great ispands. We don't have 80 feet.

Wc have turning lares that fall inside of it. Wo have rostriction to the Borough hall and the corner site. So it may mot. make semso but we still think they should provide a diagram, sketches and how they plan to aciress pedestrian lraffic around there with or without a boulevird.

I think the width does pose a problem.
CHATRMAN DEPTNTO: POSc a problem for the creation of a boulevard --

MR. HTPOLIT: Correct.
CHATRMAN DEPTNTO: -- that could safcly
handle the vehicles from Mercedes Benz, DePiero's and Lifetime.

MR. HIPOLTT: Correct. Because when you're started the turning lane, they're long enough where they take so much of the boulevard out, that it. makes no sense. You are just creating another problem to take care of. It does not accomplish...

CHATRMAN DePINTO: And, Miss Dolan you are recommending this specd table over say pedestrian walkways or vice-versa?

MS. DOTAN: Well, the pedestrian walkways are already a parl of the plan and they were designed into the traffic signal that controls the driveways. So, the crosswalks are there. It's a matter of
enhancirg l.hat with different materials to croatc a Visual ©ide and to mako a highly visiblo location for the pedestrians to uross.

And, you know, in speaking tonight with Mr. Rachad, talking about the problems with the table, the table actualiy might work botter at that southorn intersection liat.'s uns gnalized.

So I think we have treatmonts that will help Eo kecp the pedestrian crossings where wo want them and with other things like benefits of landscaping, ir addition to all the obstacles that exist on the Degiero's side, \(I\) think wo can come up with a plan that, that will allow that connectivity that the Board and your professionals are looking for.
```

                        MR. RACHAD: Just to be clear, Mr.
    ```

Chairman, I did not have an opportunity to fully review the idea of a speed table. There are drainage issues, sometimes speed tables are actually very convenient to pedestrian activity because now the road is at the same level as the sidcwalk. So there are a lot of plases and maybe some minuses so wo need to look at the details to figure out if overail it's a good idea or not.

But going back to the boulevard, while I Love the idea of a boulevard, just to follow-up on what

Andy said, the width for every side needs to be most likely 19 reel.; that's an 8 foot shoulder and a 12 foot lare.

And the reason for that is, if a car breass down you don't wart that side of the boulovard to be blocked. So you need free passago of vehicies around a car that is disabled.

Now you add 19,19 and the center of the roadway we don't have that space, in my opirion. MR. HTPOLIT: No.

CHADRMAN DepTNTO: Now couid, Mr. Hipolit, we ask the applicant, instead of a boulevard, to mako improverents to the sides of the Mercedes with respect to things like ornamental lighting or boliard type lighting and landscaping and interesting walkways and things of that nature so it gives the appearance of a boulevard absert an island?

Would that improve conncetivity between the two sites Cor pedestrinn and venicle movement?

Could it be designed that way?
MR. HIPOITT: So you make may get two different arnswers. I can tell you that if thoy were to add street enhancements such as a street print -me, personally, I'm nol a fan of raising the intersections, \(1 \times 1\) say enhance the intersection with


MR. RACHAD: Okay. Hlank you.
MR. HepoLTT: So, Betsy, on thal drawing start on Morcedes -- on Grand Avenwe coming east and taik me through all the driveways and what their access is in and out.

MS. DOLAN: Okay. Sure. So I'm starting at the, at the north end of the Mercedes Drive.

MR, HIPOLD': I think, Andy, maybe - okay. Poirit therc, please. Start on Grans Avenme. MS. DOLAN: Start on Grand Avenue.

Okay. What's shown on Grand Avenue is a, a rew right in right out driveway.

MR. HIPOLTT: And that driveway is going to be wost of where il currently exists?

MS. DOLAN: That's at the western 1 imits of the site, west of the existirg -- wail. I'm sorry. I'm Looking at the wrong plan.

That is the existing driveway- This is the cxisting driveway that had served the of iice buildings. This is located so that it provides right turn ingress, right turn egress and there is a striped I25 foot long left turn lane on Grand Avenue that had permitted left turn movements directly from Grand Averiue.

MR. HIPOLIT: So from the Board's
perapeotivo, stopping ir that driveway, that soirg to be, for all intcnte and purposes, dit the exaci: hocation it exists today and the only movement that's prohibitod is lett turns out?

MS. DOLAN: That's correct. That's lie exisuing conficuration.

MR. HIPOLIT: okay. Go to the second --
MR. TERGNO: Can I interrupt?
Whose jurisdiction is that to decide whether you can, jf you're headed wost on Grand Avenue, if you can make a left turn into tho site.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: 'rhe County.
MR. HIPOIIT: Mhat's why we're -- we haven't met with the county, that's why we're going to meet them.

MR. TEAGNO: I jusi want to say right now I'm totally opposed to that because there's loo mach trafific thore.

MS. DOLAN: The first traffic study did not include that. We all thought it was going away. J.t was the county who asked us to study it. So that meeting will determine what actually happers there.

MR. HIPOLIT: I'll make a mote for the County meeting.

MR. TEAGNO: when there was a lefi, there
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & S. Maurice Rachad - 44 \\
\hline 1 & whs a left in and a lefl out there as I recall when it \\
\hline 2 & was the Mcrecdes site an@ I can't bolieve how many \\
\hline 3 & calls therc were. \\
\hline 4 & MS. DOIAN: i agree with you. And I \\
\hline 5 & didn't know that there wis any way to turn loft out of \\
\hline 6 & treta. \\
\hline 7 & MR. TEAGNO: Weli, it was allowed. The \\
\hline 8 & slutiping and everything was there rox it. It's \\
\hline 9 & ridiculous. \\
\hline 10 & MS. DOLAN: The first amalysis without \\
\hline 1 & thatt showed the intersection, the sighalized \\
\hline 12 & intersection can accommodate those turning movements \\
\hline 13 & should that all go zway. \\
\hline 14 & NR. TEAGNO: I am totally in favor of \\
\hline 15 & right in right out and that's it. \\
\hline 16 & MS. DOLAN: And moving eastward on Grand \\
\hline 17 & Avenue we have a right turn ingress only between \\
\hline 18 & Buildings 4 and 5 and that would be the extent of \\
\hline 19 & access on Granc Avence. \\
\hline 20 & MR. HTPOLIT: So why would we need that \\
\hline 21 & driveway with one right next to it? Why? \\
\hline 22 & MS. DOLAN: I don't really think you do. \\
\hline 23 & I think this plan iteration, this access modification \\
\hline 24 & was at the request of the County because when you go \\
\hline 25 & back to the first plan that \(I\) analyzed, we had one \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
right in right out on Grand Avenue. And I didr't even thirik that the right out would be approved by the County because it's on a right hurn Lane ondo Mercedes Drivo. So I anaiyzed it as a right in orly because, from a traffic porspective, \(?\) thoughl that was the onvy linime that was needed and because the ual.bound moverfent would oe along that right lurn iane.

So from my porspective, right in wouid surfice.
And even when you look at this, it's a driveway and in's existing configuration, you gol to vone in for aly of the uses so someone new lo the area might just bypass that driveway altogether.

Do you wart me to continue now going down
Mercedes?

MR. HIPOLIT: Keep going.
MS. DOLAN: So the northern driveway is right in right out and that was purposely designed because we are on the approach to the Grand Avonue signalized intersection so that's righl in right out. And the main --

MR. HIPOEIT: Well, 1 have a question on thiss onc, too.

So if you look at the driveway my concern -and, Maurice, maybe you can help me with this -- T'm coming off of Grand on to Mercedes and just by using
that a lot, it's whal. I do a lot, hore speed isi pretty high. Cars aren't. going 50 miles an hour but thoy're coming around the comer pretly quiokly and that drivoway is going lo come up on you fast.

MS. DOLAN: \(\quad\) agree with you.
And, again, tor someone who shops liere on a requiar basis, someone who lives here, t. bink lhat they may bo attracted lo that driveway bul someone who is coming herc for the first time, they may miss it. just as they might miss a driveway if ju's placed at the western limits of the site on Grand Avenue.

I think it does have a benefit, fhough, of distributing traffic. We have a very long sitc so I think that it's beneficial in providing circuation around the different buildings because, otherwise, you're not going to get another opportunity until you're --

MR. HIPOITT: Let me ask you a question. At least me, \(I\) 'm okay wilh the right in, \(I\) come off, \(I\) know it, \(I\) live in the area, \(I\) make the right in and I'm in the site. The right out just seems like a dangerous move because sight distance is going to be very limited because of the corner.

MS. DOHAN: Righi. And the good thing is, if you want to go south on Mercedes you can be drawn
down to other circulation aisies.

Whe volume on any of these individual drivoways is mot very high bascd on our projections. So if it's relocated it con?d bo absorbed into the signalizcd intersection, for exampio. Or if there was an ability to indroduce an egress poxheps fust south of Building 3 it, but then you're going to maybe have to sit at the i ight at. Farm view.

MR. HIPOTTT: So I think you need, i think on thal driveway, mayke it's my purview, I think wo need lo look at the site distance for that driveway based on actual speeds because the speeds arc actually a littie bje higher than actual posted specds.

So iuse five above the posted speed and then come up with a sicht triangle.

MS. DOLAN: Okay. So, as I said, you know, we might be able to look at introducing anoluer right turn egress on the south side but that's somelhing the team will work with and Mike will probably have more to say about that.

The main access is that the signalized location opposite Farm View, the drivoway into the Wegmans/DePiero's site and then at the bottom or southern limits of the site we would be aligning a new driveway opposide the existing driveway at the
southern limits of the Depiero shopping contor.
MR. CUEHAN: Mr. Chairman, this might be an appropriate time.

CHALRMAN DePINTO: Yeah. Let Me just run quickty through Board Members. Questionsi slideting with Mr. Culhane.

Any quostions of ejuher Miss Dolan or Mr. Rachad ox Mr. Hipolit?

MR, CULHANE: The only other question \(T\) would like to raise is in the site, is there any accommodations for a biker, bicycle use?

MS. DOLAN: i believe there iss. Mr. Dipple can confirm that.

MR. DEI VECCHTO: We have a significant number of bicycle racks. Mr. Dipple will give you tho details when he finishes his tostimony.

CHAIRNAN DEFINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Fette.
MR. FEHPE: Just one question.
Mr. Rachad, you asked about adjusting the trip figures based on the Hornrock property. And then you also had -- in Miss Dolan's report sho had the 1.5 percent per year for background growth.

MS. DOLAN: Correct.
MR. FETTE: Do you want both of those or
is it one or the other?
MR. RACHAD: Actually, the Board asked for the fornrock property to bo adicd and I mentioned the 1.5 percent. typicaliy you do both.

MR. HIPORIT: \(\quad\) know it's kind of off the cuff but real. quick. Maurice hasi't got.ten it yet.

The Hoxnrock on olix piece, the 185 units is only producing 16 urips in the peak hour. Kcoping in mind it's residential and keeping in mind that Sony was a 16,000 square root building thal gemerated a lot. So I can take a look at it, you guys. They'ro saying they have no impact at all is what thoy're saying. I'm not. saying they're right but that's what they'ro saying.

MS. DOTAAN: We'll look at it.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: No comment.
MR. EETTE: NO other questions, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. Ms. Russo.

MS. RUSSO: I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
Miss Curry.
COUNCIIWOMAN CURRY: Yes. On Mr.
Culhane's question about accommodating bicyclists, you
said you have bike --

MS. DOLAN: Bike racks.
COUNClEWONAN CURTY: Bike racks, bike
ianes?
MS. DOLAN: Not bike lanes, no.
COUNCILTOMAN CURRY: Because young people will be living there, hop on their bikes and go over to wegmans.

MS. DOLAN: I'li let Mr. Dipple confirm
but I dor't think bikc paths are included. We have a substantiad sidewalk podostrian system and that same crossing for bikcs would apply. We would like them to cross at tho same location.

COUNCILWOMAN CURRY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Eintner.
MR. LINTNER: No questions, Mr. Chairman. ChAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.

Ms. O'Neill. MS. O'NEILE: I have one question and a comment.

The commont is just \(I\) lhink we can achieve the visual aspect of what the Board seems to want on a boulevard through landscaping which will also
accomplish traffic coming for issues on the stireel
that everyono seoms to think there are going to be problems with.

Second, we talked a lot about tho podestrian side For tho Mercedes. I'm not honcstly familiar with if there are sidewaiks on the Grand Avenue side. But are there, are there plans for them?

I know it's a county road. I know the courty will be fuvolved in that. We seem to have conversations with the county about this coming Le. I linink that wound be a reaily good integration considerjng thal the park and ride bus stop is a very close distance. And I would imagine that there would be people who are living there who will be using that park and ride bus stop.

MS. DOLAN: You reminded me the County only wanted us to have a sidewalk on Grand Nvenue up to the access point. I know our access point is likely to be redefined but we can certainly consult with the county. Therc's eventually going to be a meeting with everyone involved so that would be something to just confirm with regard to the park and ride.

MS. O'NEILL: Okay.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: ALl right. Thank you.

MR. TEAGNO: Just a commont, arything you can do on the nor signalized intersection to slow traffic dowr for pedestriars is a çood idea whethor it's cobole stoncs, a raised bed or whatcver you want to do. But, that's got to bc done. Otherwise, people aro going to accelerate trom thc signalized, heading solith on Mercedes. It's going to be a hazara.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Very good.
We're going to have to carry this meeting. I belicve we are going to carry it to october leth.

And, members of the public that are here that have an interest in this application, please be advised of such.

Sir, did you have questions or comments? MALE SPEAKER: NO. ChAIRMAN DePINTO: That, the meeting will \(b c\) carried to that date, no further notice will be provided other than this anomonement. And \(I\) presume Counscl for the applicant will grant the extension needed to the Board to carry it to that date.

Is that correct?
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes. We will carry it to the October 16 th meeting.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Very good.
Thank you.

Have a cood evenimg.
MR. DFI, VECCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairnarn.
(The hearing adjourns.)
C
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