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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, next we have a continued public hearing on Block 1002, Lot 7, Waypoint Residential Services, LLC, of 127 Summit Avenue. It's an application for preliminary and final site plan approval with related bulk variances and soil movement.

MS. HUTTER: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Before -- yes.
MS. HUTTER: Can you make the statement about Block 2002, Lot 3, being carried?

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes.
MS. HUTTER: Thank you.
(Board attends to another matter.)
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: With that said, I
am first going to ask Mr. Wolfson to enter his
appearance on behalf of this applicant.
MR. WOLFSON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Peter Wolfson of Day Pitney here on behalf of the applicant, and happy and healthy new year to you all.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you, and to you also. And I do believe I saw Mr. Kurshan here as well.

MR. KURSHAN: Yes, good evening, members of the Planning Board and Mr. Chairman,
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Peter Kurshan. I am here.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay.
MR. KURSHAN: Happy New Year to everybody too, please.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And to you also, and Mr. Kurshan, you are representing the homeowners association or condo association?

MR. KURSHAN: I am here as a trustee and a member of the -- a member of the -- as a trustee and a member of the Board of Trustees of Summit Ridge, yes.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good. Thank you. And Mr. Wolfson, why don't you bring the Board up to speed with where we left this application at our last meeting. I believe the clarification of a threshold question with regard to potential D variances and that we were going to give the objector an opportunity to be able to present evidence on their part. A, correct me if I'm wrong, and if there's anything you'd like to add to that.

MR. WOLFSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Yes. As the Board will recall, prior to the
December 1 meeting, you received a thick package dated November 23, 2020 from Mr. Kurshan on behalf of the condominium association. That was marked
into the record as SR-1 on December 1. Also marked into the record was our letter of November 27, 2020, A-26 marked, and those were before you in advance of December 1.

At the December 1 meeting, I presented testimony from our Professional Planner, Richard Preiss, and from our architect, Dan King, as to the issues that had been raised by Mr. Kurshan. Additionally, Mr. Kurshan took the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Preiss on the issues relative to the jurisdiction, and those are the alleged D variances.

At the end of the proceeding, the Chair requested that he receive, that the Board receive the advice of their professionals and so subsequent to December 1, correspondence was issued, two memos from Darlene Green, one dated December 14 and one dated December 22. There was a memo from your engineer, Mr. Hipolit, dated December 16, and then finally, Mr. Regan weighed in on the adequacy of the public notice by his letter dated December 22.

So if it pleases the Chairman, perhaps we can just put those into the record now so that we have things --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We can. We can;
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however, Mr. Kurshan, did you receive copies of those technical review letters?

MR. KURSHAN: I did, and I would just add, just to bring the Board up to date, in addition to Ms. Green's letter of December 14 and 22nd and Mr. Hipolit's letter of December 16, Mr. Regan's letter of December 22, Summit Ridge also provided the Board with a planning memorandum of Mr. Peter Steck, S-T-E-C-K, dated December 17, 20 --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Kurshan, we're not going to permit that into the record just yet.
Let's deal with the municipal documents first and then I will turn it back over to you. With that said, Mr. Regan, let's mark those exhibits.

MR. REGAN: Okay, I'm going to try and do them in chronological order if I can.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, please.
MR. REGAN: I have a December 14
submission from Mr. Hipolit. I think that would be.
B-7. I have a planning report from Ms. Green also
dated December 14, and we could make that B-8. We have a submission from Mr . Hipolit dated December 16 , and we could make that B-9. We have my letter to the Board dated December 22 , which could be B-10.

And we have a letter from Ms. Green dated December 22 , which would be B-11. I think that encompasses all the Board exhibits; I don't think there's anything else.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. And with that said, Mr. Wolfson, do you have any objections to Peter Steck's letter of December 17 being marked into evidence on behalf of the objector?

MR. WOLFSON: No, Mr. Chairman. I see Mr. Steck is attending the meeting tonight by Zoom, so because of that, I don't.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good. And with that said, Mr. Kurshan, I presume you would like to have this letter marked into evidence and allow Mr. Steck to testify?

MR. KURSHAN: Both are correct, yes. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay.
MR. REGAN: That would be objector

## Summit Ridge 2.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: SR-2.
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. WOLFSON: -- for completeness on the jurisdictional issues --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. WOLFSON: -- there was an issue raised by Mr. Kurshan and there was comment on it by Ms. Green relative to the walking trail that was proposed.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. WOLFSON: Subsequent to receiving
Ms. Green's conclusion that she felt a variance was implicated by the walking trail, although that was not our reading of it, out of respect for her position, we authored a letter dated December 31 of 2020 in which we indicated that if the Board was inclined to not grant the variance, then we would retain the walking path but limited to the use of our residence and eliminate the parking lot that was intended for the public. So I'd like to have that marked, if I might, too, as A-27, I believe.

MR. REGAN: That would be the letter of December 31?

MR. WOLFSON: Yes, Mr. Regan.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Kurshan, do you
have a copy of that letter as well?
MR. KURSHAN: Yes, I received that.
Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr.

Wolfson, anything else?
MR, WOLFSON: Not at this time.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Mr. Kurshan,
that threshold question that I think has to be addressed because of the fact that this Board is a Board that covers both questions that a Zoning Board of Adjustment as well as a Planning Board would address, and because of that, the two members that are members of the governing body that serve on this Board, if in fact it is determined that there are $D$ variances associated with the application, they would have to recuse themselves from participating. So I'm not quite sure how we could go forward until we address the question of the $D$ and I want to thank you for bringing in your witness, Mr. Steck, and thank Mr. Steck for his submission, and from there, I'll turn it over to you, Mr. Kurshan.

MR. KURSHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Board. Summit Ridge would ask that Mr. Steck be sworn so that he could provide testimony before this Board.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Steck, would you raise your right hand, please?
PETER G. STECK, P.P., first having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
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MR. REGAN: And for the record, state your full name, please, and spell your last name.

MR. STECK: It's Peter G. Steck, S-T-E-C-K, Maplewood, New Jersey.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Steck has previously testified before this Board and I recommend he be deemed qualified as a Professional Planner.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The Chair will accept recommendation of counsel. Please continue.

MR. KURSHAN: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Counsel, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Steck, just very briefly, tell the Board some of your qualifications, and I realize that you've been accepted as an expert as a Professional Planner but just for background, please.

MR. STECK: Yes. By way of education, I have a bachelor's degree in civil engineering and a master's in city and regional planning. I was the planning director for the township --

MR. WOLFSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to Mr. Steck being accepted as an expert either.

MR. REGAN: He's previously been
qualified before the Board.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah, Mr. Kurshan, is it necessary or are you insisting upon him entering this information?

MR. KURSHAN: I will -- I will -thank you. I will move on, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay, thank you. MR. KURSHAN: I'll move on.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. KURSHAN:
Q. Mr. Steck, can you tell the Board what your assignment was or what the request was that was made to you at the invitation of the Chairman?
A. Yes. As the Board is now aware, I was contacted by Mr. Kurshan on behaif of the Summit Ridge Condominium Association, and in discussions, he indicated to me that the issue of a $D$ variance had surfaced and he had raised it at one of the earlier meetings. As I understand it, the Chairman invited the condominium association to support his position, at least in terms of the $D$ variance issue, with a Professional Planner, so I was contacted to respond to that.

By way of background, I looked at the materials that are on the website in connection with this application, I also reviewed the memos that
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were submitted, and particularly Ms. Green's memo, who responded to my December 17 memo. I also reviewed the development ordinance of Montvale as well as the Municipal Land Use Law, and as indicated, I prepared a memo for the Board dated December 17 of last year and I want to just point out that just -- as the Board is aware, they took planner Richard Preiss out of order because the issue of the development variance had arisen. My memo only addresses the issue of the -- whether or not there is one or more $D$ variances and it was not intended to address issues of $C$ variances, which $I$ may return on at another time, but my focus at the moment is just on the D variances and so, again, that's what's explained in my December 17 memo.
Q. Did you also review any testimony of Mr. Preiss's?
A. I did. I reviewed the transcript from the July meeting wherein Mr. Preiss did state his position with respect to the $D$ variances and his position was that no $D$ variance was involved with the application.
Q. And as a -- Mr. Steck, as a result of your review of these materials, did that result in the report which we have marked in evidence as --
which has been marked in evidence as SR-2?
A. That is correct.
Q. And are all of -- are all of your
opinions in this matter set forth to a reasonable degree of certainty?
A. Yes, in that memo, and I will generally describe it in my forthcoming testimony.
Q. Can you please tell the Board your
findings as set forth in your memorandum, SR-2?
A. Yes. I'll just briefly go through the memo, focusing on the items that I think are important. This consists of a total of four pages plus one appendix. Of importance is the language in the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d), that describes six types of variances. What is -what surfaces, in my opinion, as relevant is the $D(1)$ variance and the $D(6)$ variance, and the $D(1)$ variance reads, in part -- and again, this is a type of use variance that only the Board transformed into a Board of Adjustment can handle. It is -- it involves a use or principal structure in a district restricted against such use or principal structure. The emphasis here is that that $D(1)$ provision is not limited to just the use, but if there is a principal structure that is not permitted in the zone, that
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also arises to the level of a variance.
The other provision is $D(6)$ that talks about a height of a principal structure which exceeds by 10 feet or 10 percent the maximum height permitted in the district for a principal structure.

Typically, municipalities and, in fact,
Montvale measure height in two fashions, one is
height in stories and the other is height in linearfeet measurement. The $D(6)$ provision is only the linear feet, so if this building happens to be more than two stories, that would constitute a $C$ variance and the Planning Board would retain jurisdiction, but if the linear height exceeds the maximum by 10 feet or 10 percent, that becomes another $D(6)$ variance, and again, that means that only the Board transformed into a Board of Adjustment can handle this application.

The starting point for determining whether a $D$ variance or not is invoked is what $I$ just went through; first of all, what the Municipal Land Use Law says, because it has six types of $D$ variances, and anything that's not a $D$ variance is, by default, classified as a $C$ variance. So the second point of focus is on the local ordinances in Montvale, and in Section 400-40, Subparagraph $\mathrm{D}_{\text {, }}$
there is discussion about land use intensity, area, yard and bulk regulations. That's part of the title of Subparagraph D. So under $D$ are things that are both $D$ and $C$ variances, so one must read further to find out, you know, what the specific language is and one of the focuses is on Section D-2 that talks about maximum building height and it has two provisions that need to be complied with. One is a linear height of $\mathbf{3 5}$ feet and the second is a building height of two stories, and then the ordinance reads, "Exclusive of basement and cellar areas that may only be used for parking, storage, utilities, and the placement of mechanical equipment to service the principal building." It's my contention that that exclusion of basement areas applies to the stories measurement and not the linear height measurement simply because of how that wording is structured in the ordinance, and it's also my contention that the lowest level of this building is not exclusively used for parking.

Another provision -- this is D2(h) under the heading "Maximum Length of the Buildings" in Subsection 3, first talks about the linear length of a building, "cannot exceed 160 feet," and then it tacks on an additional provision that says "and
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shall contain no more than 12 dwelling units." In my opinion, what the ordinance is looking for on its face is a development that consists of one or more buildings that have up to 12 units in them and not more than two stories. That certainly suggests that the development described in the ordinance anticipated multiple buildings rather than a single building.

Also in my memo, I reproduce the definitions of "building height" and "story, ${ }_{f}$ " and the building height, as the Board is aware, is measured from the average ground elevation around the building to the midpoint of a sloped roof, which is the case here. There is also a definition of "story," which is on Page 3 of my December 17 memo. It says, in part, "The on-grade level and all cellar levels of building devoted to the use of parking, including aisles, ramps and maneuvering space, shall also be excluded" -- "excluded from the definition of a story." So there are also definitions of a basement and cellar and they basically have to do with where the grade level meets the building. If that lowest level has a midpoint that is below the average grade, it becomes a cellar. If it's above that, it becomes a basement.

So with that background in mind, I looked at the plans and the plans that were -- that I used at were dated October 16 of 2020, and as the Board is aware, the labeling of the plan and some of the descriptions on the plan changed over time, but clearly, there is a building with three levels of residential use, but in order to get to that residential use, there's a lobby area that is below some of those three levels. That lobby area is essentially on grade. I understand that it was labeled as like a parking lobby, but the answer is it's the only way to get into the building, and I understand that the applicant's architect removed some of the, I'll call it the furniture in that level, but the only way to get into this building to the residential uses is by that, I'll call it a lobby, and that lobby gives access to a stairway and it gives access to elevators. So if there's no one in the lobby, someone can enter this building and go up to any of the three floors and enter those floors with no limitations on security, et cetera. In my opinion, regardless of how you label it, it clearly has a function of access to the residential floors that are above it and it's my opinion that because of that obvious function and the fact that it is at

19
grade level, the building is technically a four-
story building and the first floor or the lowest
level should not be excluded from the measurement of building height and stories, and secondly, it should not be excluded from the linear height. It should not be excluded from the linear height for two reasons. Number one, it's not exclusively used for parking, and number two, reading the definition of "building height" in that the exemption of basement areas, in my opinion, plain reading, English language, of the ordinance is that it -- if it was exclusively used for parking, it would be excluded from the measurement of building height in stories but would not be excluded from the building height in linear feet, and as a consequence, this -- and I don't know what the average grade level is, but as a consequence of including that lobby, in my opinion, the building has a height of approximately 42.5 feet, which is $\mathbf{2 1 . 4}$ percent of the maximum height of 35 feet. So as a consequence, there are, in my opinion, $\mathrm{D}(1)$ variances that are needed. There's a D(1) variance having to do with a principal building that's not permitted and there's a $D(1)$ variance having to do $-\mathbf{D}(6)$ variance having to do with the linear height.

Just to circle back, there is a
limitation of $\mathbf{1 2}$ dwelling units per building and that is not an issue of density. There's a separate standard in the ordinance for density. This is the type of building that can be placed on the property, and I'll refer later to testimony that Mr. Preiss offered, which I think confirms my observation that the ordinance anticipated multiple buildings, no one building having more than 12 units in it. Because this is one building with 157 units in it, in my opinion, it is a principal structure which is not permitted in this AH6 zone.

The issue of the height in linear feet, in my opinion, turns out to be a $\mathrm{D}(6)$ variance because it exceeds the maximum of $\mathbf{3 5}$ feet by more than 10 percent. Either one of them or both of them together means that only this Board transformed into a Board of Adjustment has jurisdiction to hear the application.

There is a -- and the other issue is that while it is acknowledged that the building needs a C variance, so far the Board has been leaning toward the position of classifying it as a three-story building, which still needs a C variance. In my opinion, it's a four-story
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building.
One way to look at this and not parsing every single word is that a plain reading of the AH-6 zone is that you're going to see a three-story building with no more than 12 units, and presumably, to reach a density, you're going to see multiple buildings. That, in my opinion, is the clear intent of the ordinance. No one is going to look at this building, either through the plans or when it's built, and say that this type of structure is permitted in the zone. It is a structure that is many times over the 12-unit per building. As a consequence, it has a height that's clearly more than two stories. It has a scale clearly well beyond what the ordinance was looking for.

There's a companion observation that the ordinance was put together in terms of buffering and setbacks and other provisions, anticipating, in my opinion, multiple two-story buildings. When the applicant comes in with a structure that is not a permitted structure that is greatly outsized, simply saying "Oh, I comply with the setbacks, I comply with the buffer requirements," does not necessarily justify the $C$ variances because, again, the standards in the ordinance were intended for a
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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: All right. Please
continue, Mr. Steck, and again, remain focused on
the requirement of the $D$ variance or the
determination of whether or not $a \mathrm{D}$ is required. I
think both the Board, the Board professionals and
the applicant's planner agree that what is proposed was not contemplated by the ordinance. The question
is: Does it rise to the level of being at that much
of a variance that it's classified as a D? I
presume it is your opinion that that is the case, Mr. Steck. So I want you to finish making that argument on your direct.

MR. STECK: Okay. The reason I touched on Mr. Preiss's characterization of both the age of the ordinance and whether it was contemplated is that he used those arguments in arriving at his conclusion that a D variance was not required.
That's why I addressed it.
I also reviewed the December 22
memorandum of Darlene Green which reviewed my December 17 memorandum. She says that the AH-6 zone permits townhouses, townhouse/duplex combinations and apartment buildings as permitted uses and I -- I agree with that, that's not a question at the
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moment, but she does not address the part of the
$D(1)$ variance that has to do with a principal
structure that is not permitted in the zone and I
would contend that a limitation of 12 units per building, in comparison with a building that has 157 units, puts it in a whole new classification. A two-story building, according to the RSIS standards, is a lowrise building; all of a sudden, anything over two stories becomes a midrise building. There's a state recognition of a jump in classification, but the issue is, as I review Planner Green's memo, she did not address the issue of whether or not this constituted a prohibited principal building, principal structure.

On the issue of -- in Ms. Green's memo having to do with the height, she simply indicated that the applicant removed the furnishings from the first level. That -- first of all, I suppose the applicant could just put the desks back in, but from a land-use point of view, that makes no difference. The only way to get to these residential units, by either stairway or elevator, is to enter the building at the lobby level; the lobby level is at grade and below three floors of the building. In my opinion, because that lobby level is not -- while
you can also access the parking garage, it is not exclusively a parking area. It is an area that is integral to the residential development and, in my opinion, is not exempted from the measurement of height in linear feet, which means a $D$ variance is invoked, and it's not -- it happens to also reflect on the height in stories. In my opinion, it is -it magnifies the C variance that would come out of it.

So in summary, I do believe there are two D variances inevitably tied to this plan. It is a structure that is not permitted in the zone, and number two, it has a height of a principal building that exceeds by more than 10 percent the 35 -foot height limit. Either one of those would trigger a D variance and would mean that only the Board reconfigured as a Board of Adjustment can entertain the application. It also brings into question whether the public notice is adequate, in that $D$ variances were invoked and they were not referenced in the public notice.

MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Chair --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Steck, do you have anything further?

MR. STECK: I do not.
MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Chairman, that concludes Mr. Steck's direct presentation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And before I open
it up to the Board for questions of Mr. Steck of his testimony as well as his technical review or report, SR-2, I'm going to give Mr. Wolfson an opportunity to question Mr. Steck with respect to the comments that were made both in writing and on the record verbally.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, respectfully, if I could --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry, Peter, you're breaking up.

MR. WOLFSON: I'm sorry, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah, that's better.

MR. WOLFSON: Okay, I'm sorry.
Respectfully, I'd request that I hold any possible cross-examination till I hear the questions from the Board and your professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good. Thank you. And with that said, I'm first going to
go to Ms. Green. And Ms. Green, Mr. Steck
referenced your review letter of December 22, which has been marked into evidence, and Mr. Regan, what is the labeling on this document?

MR. REGAN: Ms. Green's is --
MR. KURSHAN: 11.
MR. REGAN: That's right, B-11.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: B-11. And Ms.
Green, I think Mr. Steck brought up some questions that should be first addressed by you. Number one, the principal structure question. He defined what our ordinance sets forth, and further, he defined his understanding of the application, that being 157 units in one structure. Could you share with us your opinion? Do you agree with Mr. Steck or do you disagree with him with respect to that question of a principal structure?

MS. GREEN: Could I be sworn in first? CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I believe --
weren't you at our last meeting?
MS. GREEN: Well, I guess does that
continue, Bob, with the new year?
MR. REGAN: Yes, it does.
MS. GREEN: Okay.
MR. REGAN: You've been sworn since
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the commencement of the application.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah.
MS. GREEN: So I did, in fact, address
principal structure in my December 22 review letter,
I discuss that on Page 2. I think this is a matter of where there is a disagreement. Our ordinance, I think, is clear, although it is in different sections, which does make it a little bit like a bouncing ball to follow along, but the AH-6 zone is dealt with in Section 400-28, and in fact, that's -many of our AH zones are under that particular section, and that section allows planned residential developments as permitted uses and then it refers to Section 400-28(a) for the more specifics. Under 400 -- excuse me, 400-40(a), the -- here we go. Under 400-40(a), it specifically is entitled "Permitted Uses" and there are three permitted uses:
Townhomes, townhouse/duplex combination, and apartment buildings. Not only do I believe that those are uses, those are actually structures that can be built in the AH-6 zone. The section that Mr. Steck refers to regarding the number of units in a building and the building length is also in 400-40, but that does not occur until Subsection C2, which is entitled "Area, Yard and Bulk Requirements For

The AH-6 Zone." It is under that section that then we are giving various parameters that include building coverage, lot coverage, as well as the maximum building length and the maximum number of units per building. And so that's where I believe there's a huge difference between the structure and the bulk standards that guide the structures built in the zone. So that's why I had said in my letter dated December 22 that the apartment building is not only a permitted use in this zone but it is also a structure type, just like the permitted townhomes, and the limitation of 12 units per building is a bulk standard that regulates the permitted structure types.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. And let's move from principal structure to Mr. Steck's position with regard to the lobby and that that level is not exclusively used for parking which would be permitted and that the inclusion of a lobby in that area does not comply with borough requirement. What is your position on that?

MS. GREEN: So as the Board may recall, our -- the initial submission from the applicant did include several rooms and uses on that first level where the parking garage is. There was 33
a storage area, maintenance and equipment rooms, a
fire and water room, there was office space, including a reception area, a copy room, a mailroom, a package area, a refrigerated locker system and a pet spa all on that first level. Our review letter from February 28 of 2020 questioned how they were measuring height, and indeed, if all those uses were on the first floor, it would change how they measured height.

In response to our letter, the applicant submitted revised architectural plans, which were dated February 6 of 2020, which eliminated the office space, the copy room, the mailroom with the package area, the locker -- excuse me, the refrigerated locker system, the pet spa and the reception area. So it was more than just moving or removing furniture; they changed the wall layout, they removed multiple rooms, all of those uses I just described were removed from the plans we received, and now it was a parking lobby. Based on those changes or I should say those eliminated uses, it then complied with the provision in the code that exempted garages and/or basements that were for parking, storage and utilities. So this was much more than just the moving or the -- or the
disappearance of furniture in the changes that the Board has received.

What I think Mr. Steck may be going to or alluding to is that the labeling is misleading and I guess one of the questions that I would have for the applicant tonight is, you know, what they're labeling as a parking lobby is truly only going to be used for a parking lobby. If that is the case and it is just a parking lobby, then it fits within the exclusion provision of our code and would not be counted as a story or in the height measurement.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Ms. Green, with the revised plans that eliminated the uses that you just referred to, were they replaced elsewhere in the principal structure or totally eliminated?

MS. GREEN: Some of the items, like the pet spa, was completely eliminated, others were reduced; for example, the number of offices for their staff were reduced and then relocated to the -- what I'll call the first floor, not the parking floor, so it was a combination of elimination or moving elsewhere.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. And then another point that was brought up by Mr. Steck was the public notice, and actually, I should ask that

## 35

of Bob. Bob, you reviewed the notices and I believe
Mr. Steck was inferring that because it is his
opinion that there were $D$ variances, that this project or this development and the appearance before this Board may not have been properly noticed. What is your opinion on this?

MR. REGAN: Well, that argument could be made. I don't think a $D$ variance is required, either a $D(1)$ or a $D(6)$. I think the notice -- the multiple notices that the applicant provided were exceptionally comprehensive and one of the more detailed notices I've seen in my practice as a Planning Board attorney dating back to 1985. I don't think a D variance is required.

I'd just like to focus on something that Darlene indicated regarding the $D(1)$ use variance. If you look at the ordinance, 400-40(a), Permitted Uses, and as Darlene indicated, the permitted uses include townhouses, townhouse/duplex, and apartment buildings, but then if you go to 400(d) -- and again, Mr. Steck's basis for contending that a $D(1)$ use variance is required is based on the number of units in the building. His opinion is that if you go over 12 units in a building, and here we have a building with 157
proposed, it triggers a $D(1)$ use variance, but that, in my opinion, is a bulk standard because of the very language in 400-40(d). It talks about land use intensity, area, yard, and bulk regulations. The word "bulk regulations" has to mean something, and 12 units in a building is a bulk standard. It's not a use standard. The use standards are townhouses, townhouse/duplex, and apartment buildings. This is an apartment building by any definition. So I think -- that might sound simplistic, but 400-40(d) talks about bulk regulations and then it has a plethora of bulk regulations, including 12 units in -- 12 units in a building, and that's a -- in my opinion, that's a C variance.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Ms. Green, do you have anything else to say based on the testimony of Mr. Steck?

MS. GREEN: Not at this time.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And how about you, Mr. Regan?

MR. REGAN: No, I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, and Mr. Dour, do you want to $\log$ in on this?

MR. DOUR: I just would like to
reiterate, the original plans, as everybody knows,
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included a significant number of amenities on that ground level that have been removed, Darlene mentioned the pet spa, so really, the only things that are on that first floor are simply storage, mechanicals, an open area that you have to enter and the -- and the parking garage. So there really is nothing there that would constitute a story by the Borough's definition.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good. Thank you. I'm now going to go to Board members, and Chris, Chris Gruber --

MR. GRUBER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- you're first on my list. Do you have any questions of Mr. Steck based on his testimony or do you have any questions of either Ms. Green or Mr. Regan?

MR. GRUBER: No, not at this time.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you. And Ms. Curry.

MS. CURRY: No questions.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr.
Teagno?
MR. TEAGNO: Nothing at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lintner. |  | Stefanelli. |
| 2 | (Pause) |  | (Pause) |
| 3 | MR. LINTNER: I'm sorry, no questions | 3 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry. |
| 4 | at this time, Mr. Chairman. | 4 | Mr. Stefanelli: I got it. No |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mayor | 5 | estions. |
| 6 | Ghassali? | 6 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. |
| 7 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, | 7 | Culhane. |
| 8 | maybe a question for Bob Regan and Darlene Green. | 8 | MR. CULHANE: Well, one question I |
| 9 | From the town side, I mentioned at the beginning of | 9 | have is: Does the state code have a definition for |
| 10 | this meeting that there are projects across the | 10 | apartment building. |
| 11 | border that we have no control over, it's going to | 11 | MR. REGAN: "State code" meaning the |
| 12 | increase, you know, the traffic on Summit Avenue, | 12 | MLUL? |
| 13 | specifically because the schools will be using the | 13 | MR. CULHANE: New Jersey state code |
| 14 | Parkway for the buses, probably a hundred to a | 14 | for land use. |
| 15 | hundred and fifty school buses every day will be | 15 | MR. REGAN: I don't think the MLUL has |
|  | used. It's not in our plan, we did not depend on | 16 | a definition. |
| 17 | this. As you go through this process, how do we | 17 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Darlene -- |
| 18 | include all this into this to lesser the density and | 18 | MR. REGAN: I will check. I have it |
| 19 | maybe, you know, bring that into this project, the | 19 | right here. |
| 20 | additional, you know, the traffic, the add | 20 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Does anyone have |
| 21 | you know, the pressure on our roads? | 21 | thing on that? |
| 22 | MR. REGAN: Well, Mayor, a traffic | 22 | MR. REGAN: I mean, it's possible |
| 23 | report can consider future development within the | 23 | there may be a Building Code definition but it |
| 24 | area and make recommendations as to whether any | 24 | dn't be in the MLUL. |
| 25 | improvements to the roadway network would be | 25 | MR. STECK: The MLUL does not have a |
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|  | essary, but I don't think the fact that a | 1 | finition of "apartment building." |
| 2 | development is proposed on Montvale's border could | 2 | R. REGAN: I didn't think so. |
| 3 | constitute a basis to deny an application. | 3 | R. CULHANE: And I guess the second |
| 4 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. All right, so | 4 | question is: Under the Americans With Disabilities |
| 5 | the resources -- I'm trying to, you know, find as, | 5 | , does the garage level have to be an accessible |
| 6 | you know, point of the process, is this the right | 6 | facility to disabled? |
| 7 | time for this [s | 7 | R. STECK: That's not my area of |
| 8 | MR. REGAN: I believe, Mayor, the | 8 | pertise, but I'm sure it has to have access. |
| 9 | applicant may have a traffic engineer, I think. | 9 | MR. CULHANE: No other questions, Mr. |
| 10 | WOLFSON: Yes, we do. | 10 | Chairman. |
| 11 | MR. REGAN: It might be appropriate at | 11 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Ms. |
| 12 | that time to have him address and maybe even provide | 12 | Cudequest. |
|  | the applicant with information that the Borough may | 13 | MS. CUDEQUEST: I have no questions at |
| 14 | ve concerning the extent of this development, how | 14 | is time, Mr. Chairman. |
| 15 | many units, how many square feet, et cetera. | 15 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. |
| 16 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. That's all I | 16 | Huseynov. |
|  | e. Thank you. | 17 | MR. HUSEYNOV: I have no further |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. | 18 | questions. |
| 19 | Zitelli | 19 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you. |
| 20 | MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman, I, you | 20 | And I believe that is all of the Board members and |
| 21 | ad Ms. -- Ms. Green's and Mr. Regan's | 21 | I'll hold my question. |
| 22 | assessments here. I'm no lawyer but I agree with | 22 | Mr. Wolfson, you've heard -- you've |
| 23 | what they have been saying so far, so I have no | 23 | eard the comments by the Board professionals and |
|  | questions. | 24 | you've heard questions from Board members and you |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. | 25 | wanted that opportunity before you cross-examine Mr. |

Steck. Now's your opportunity to do 50.
MR. WOLFSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I have no questions for Mr. Steck, I would just like to make a few observations.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Please.
MR. WOLFSON: Thank you very much.
First of all, Mr. Steck ignores Mr. Preiss's
testimony from December 1, which was specifically on
the use variance questions. Secondly, he ignores a
plain reading standard for interpreting zoning ordinances, he ignores the fact that apartment buildings are specifically permitted in the ordinance. He also similarly ignores the fact that the building length and number of unit standards are contained in a section entitled "Bulk Requirements," and finally, he suggests that there's something about the elevators leading out of the parking area that should undercut the fact and the conclusion that it's clearly substantiated under your ordinance that that level is excepted out, so just a few observations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. And Mr.
Steck, were you looking to be recognized?
MR. STECK: I was.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes, please.
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MR. STECK: I just want to respond
that while the section of the ordinance that
contains, let's say, the exemption for stories, the exemption of a parking level, that section, just because a regulation is in that section, Subsection
D, does not automatically say it's a C or D
variance. Keep in mind that the title of that section also talks about the intensity of land use. Typically, that's like density or floor-area ratio. But my point is that within the same section that includes the provisions exempting, say, parking levels, it talks about building height, and so a building height of over 10 percent, regardless of how you measure it, is a D variance, although it's in the same Subsection D. So the point I'm raising is that the location of the standard in your local zoning ordinance does not automatically make it a C -- excuse me, a $C$ variance, it could also be a D once you interpret it in terms of the Municipal Land Use Law.

The other point I'd like to raise, regardless of what was removed from the first level of the building, it's the only -- it is a level that is at grade and it's -- it's the only way to get into the building, presumably there'll be some
security there, it's the only way to get into the residential units, and whether you have a desk there or not, it clearly has an essential function attached to the residential units, and any person walking up to this building, if you ask them how many stories, it's a four-story building, which means it has the same land-use impact, the same visual impact, the same linear height, and I think that it takes common sense to conclude that both a $D(1)$ and a $D(6)$ use are permitted.

One other example is, in a singlefamily zone, you would permit single-family houses, detached houses. That's not the end of the story. If someone came in with two single-family houses on one lot, you would use -- potentially, Ms. Green was giving the argument, "Oh, look, single-family houses are permitted," but the answer is: That would be a second principal structure in a zone that only permits one principal structure. So I don't think the issue has been addressed and I still hold the opinion that a $D(1)$ variance is required for a structure that's not permitted, a principal structure that's not permitted, and a $D(6)$ variance is needed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Wolfson, is Mr. Preiss here this evening? I'm not finding him on my screen.

MR. WOLFSON: No, Mr. Chairman, as he indicated at the conclusion of his testimony, he didn't expect that he would be able to and, in fact, he is not able to be here due to a conflict.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. I find it difficult to move forward without hearing once again from Mr. Preiss and my reason, simply put, is we all know that Mr. Preiss participated in the crafting of this ordinance. He was the Borough planner at that time and he had a lot of input on it. And I think there's been enough doubt placed upon whether or not we fall into a D category or C that I would like to hear from him, someone who I've respected for many, many years in his opinions and having been responsible for actually hiring Richard for that position a number of years ago. I do have questions for him and hopefully he will return at a future date so that we could get answers from him with respect to this.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, if I might.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. WOLFSON: Yeah, respectfully, he
testified on exactly these issues, he was crossexamined by Mr. Kurshan on the $D$ issues. (Audio freeze) and I think, most importantly, the Board's own experts, not the applicant's experts alone but the Board's own experts unanimously and vigorously defended the fact that there are no $D$ variances implicated, and frankly, we are coming up on a oneyear anniversary here. Mr. Kurshan was present at the first March 3 first hearing of last year and asked questions, Mr. Kurshan then waited until eight months in to raise this issue, and respectfully, I would ask that we get a decision from the Board that no D variances are necessary, as your Board professionals have opined, and that we be allowed to move forward here.

MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. I respect that. Mr. Kurshan?

MR. KURSHAN: I just had a couple of questions for Mr. Steck, if I may.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman,
respectfully, Mr. Steck testified, his testimony was closed, people were given an opportunity to crossexamine.

47
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well -MR. WOLFSON: We have to end this at some point, sir.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I do. And I do want to open it to the public as well, but Mr. Kurshan, please limit the number and the amount of time you're doing these follow-up questions.

MR. KURSHAN: I will. Thank you. Mr. Steck, there's been a comment by Mr. Wolfson that you ignored the definition of "apartment building" and you ignored the bulk requirements in the Montvale zoning ordinance. What is your response to that statement?

```
MR. STECK: That the -- in
```

interpreting the $D(1)$ variance -- well, first of all, I have not ignored them. In determining a $D(1)$ variance, one must read the language of the Municipal Land Use Law carefully and it says it involves a use that's not permitted and a principal structure that's not permitted. Planner Green is saying, "Oh, they're both the same thing." Well, the answer is, they're two different things in terms of the Municipal Land Use Law, and in my opinion, a 157-unit building is not the same type of principal structure as a 12 -unit building and that makes
common sense and it's also plain reading of the state Municipal Land Use Law.

MR. KURSHAN: Thank you. And last question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Steck, in the Montvale zoning ordinance's definition, in Section 400-8, of "building height," is there any exclusion in that definition for a ground-level or basement story?

MR. STECK: I don't have that section in front of me. If you want to -- let's see if I can pull it up.

MR. KURSHAN: You've cited to it in Exhibit SR-2, if you have that in front of you.

MR. STECK: Okay. All right, would you repeat your question?

MR. KURSHAN: My question is this, sir: In the Montvale zoning ordinance, Section $400-8$, definition of "building height," is there any exception or exclusion for a story, such as a basement story, used exclusively, if one were to make that assumption, for parking uses only?

MR. STECK: In that definition, there is no exclusion.

MR. KURSHAN: So even if -- assuming the Board were to determine that the first story
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where the parking area is located and where the parking lobby is located is exclusively used for parking, is that story level excluded under the Montvale zoning ordinance definition of "building height"?

MR. STECK: If you just look at the generic definition of "building height," it is not excluded.

MR. KURSHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you. MR. KURSHAN: I have nothing further for Mr. Steck.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay, thank you. With that said, the Chair will entertain a motion to open the meeting to the public. After the Board hears from the public, there will be a polling of the Board as to whether or not we will continue with this application considering the points set forth as D variances or, in fact, they would be $C$ to the alternative. So anyone care to make a motion to open the meeting to the public?

MS. CUDEQUEST: Motion.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mrs. Cudequest. Is there a second?

MR. LINTNER: Second.

|  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Lintner. All |
| :--- | :--- |
| in favor? |  |
|  | BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. |
|  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Members of |

the public who are here, this is your opportunity to ask questions through the Chair directed to either Peter Steck, who is the Professional Planner retained by the condo association, or questions of the Borough professionals that have testified this evening or questions of the Board. If you wish to be recognized, I'm going to ask that you raise your hand and the Board secretary who's hosting the meeting will recognize you.

Anyone have any questions they would like answered with respect to the testimony they've heard thus far today?

Lorraine, could you please monitor to see if anyone raises a hand?
(Pause)
MR. DOUR: Lorraine, you're muted.
MS. HUTTER: Mr. Chairman, there is no one raising their hand.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, last call. Anyone from the public wish to speak at this time, have any questions of Mr. Steck or the Borough
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professionals or the Board?
(Pause)
MS. HUTTER: No.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, with that said, the Chair will entertain a motion to close the meeting to the public.

MR. CULHANE: So moved.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane;
seconded, Mrs. Cudequest. All in favor?
BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: With that said,
Bob, would it be appropriate -- I believe so -- to
poll the Board to determine whether or not the Board, in fact, agrees or disagrees with Mr. Steck, agrees or disagrees with the opinion of Board professionals, or to the alternative, carry to our next meeting and invite Mr. Preiss to return?

MR. REGAN: I think either of those options would be appropriate. I would just like to get on the record that Mr. Kurshan and Mr. Wolfson have nothing else to offer the Board on this particular issue so we don't come back at the next meeting and have this issue resurrected again.

MR. WOLFSON: I have nothing else to offer but, respectfully, Mr. Chairman, we would --
we would say that carrying this matter for further testimony from my witness who I finished with and who was cross-examined by the objector's representative is really not necessary or fair at this point.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
MR. REGAN: But we still haven't heard from Mr. Preiss on the other variances, so you still plan on re-calling him, I assume.

MR. WOLFSON: He'll be back for the bulk variances that we acknowledge --

MR. REGAN: Yeah.
MR. WOLFSON: -- for sure.
MR. REGAN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, well, clearly, if the Board disagrees with Mr. Steck in the fact that the principal structure, the lobby, those issues, the percentage exceeding maximum permissible on the building height, if it's not found to be -- if they are not found to be $D$ variances, then clearly, the argument will be made for $C$ and that argument could only be made by your planner. So it's not a question of we've only seen Richard or we've seen the last of Richard. He will be back. The question that I'm trying to deal with 53
is eligibility of the members of this Board who also serve on the governing body. It's that simple.

MR. REGAN: And Mr. Chairman, as I said before, that's a threshold issue which should be resolved sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes. So with that said, let's go back to a polling of the Board and we'll start again with Mr. Gruber. And Lorraine, could you open up Mr. Gruber's mic?

MS. HUTTER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Gruber, you've heard the testimony and you've heard argument both for and against the classifying of certain aspects of this plan requiring or not requiring $D$ variances. We need your opinion, it's a poll. What is your opinion on this?

MR. GRUBER: I'm agreeing with Mr. Regan's recommendations.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Very good. Thank you. Ms. Curry.

MS. HUTTER: Rose, you have to --
MR. REGAN: She's muted.
MS. HUTTER: Yeah.
MS. CURRY: Mr. Chairman, tell me again what I am being polled on.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, the objector
has stated that he believes this application
requires certain $D$ variances because they're not compliant with the code nor are they compliant with being classified as $C$ variances and he's given his reasons why. Our planner disagrees and Mr. Regan disagrees and I guess Mr. Dour disagrees. What is your opinion?

MS. CURRY: I agree with our professionals and if there is a way that Mr. Preiss could come in at our next meeting and give his background explanation on the reason that he stated so in our planning to begin with, but I agree with the professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: If you agree with the Board professionals, their position is $D$ variances are not required, then Mr. Preiss will return when Mr. Wolfson chooses to have him return to justify the $C$ variances that are associated.
We're not going to go back to discussing the $D$ variances.

MS. CURRY: That's fine with me.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We either call them
Ds now or forever let it rest in peace and move
forward with an application for site plan approval
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inclusive of the need for $C$ variances.
MS. CURRY: I understand. I agree with the professionals, our professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Fine then. Thank you. Mr. Teagno?

MR. TEAGNO: I agree with the testimony and the written reports that our professionals have provided.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you.
Mr. Lintner?
MR. LINTNER: I agree that an elevator access does not require an additional story and that apartments certainly appear to be a permitted structure in the AH-6 zone and the number of stories does not require a D variance, so I agree that they're all $C$ variances and we could proceed as such.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Very good. Thank you. Mayor Ghassali?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Yeah, the case was not made for a $D$ variance so it's going to be a $C$ variance, but I'm going to submit, I'm going to argue for less density going forward, so this is not going to be a walk in the park by you, no means, even if it's a $C$, but I agree it should be a $C$
variance.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Zitelli?

MR. ZITELLI: Yes, I agree with Mr.
Regan and Ms. Green and I do not think D variances are here.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Stefanelli. Frank, you have to unmute yourself.

MR. STEFANELLI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I agree with our professionals. I respect Mr. Steck, but I do agree with our professionals that we need to call it a $C$ and move forward.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Culhane.

MR. CULHANE: I concur with the Board professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mrs. Cudequest?

MS. CUDEQUEST: I agree with everything that's been said so far, Mr. Chairman, in regards to our Board professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Huseynov?

MR. HUSEYNOV: I concur with the Board professionals as well, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you, and I think I've called upon everybody.

MS. HUTTER: Except yourself. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah. Well, obviously, I'm going to go with the majority of the Board and rely upon the advice of our professionals; however, consistent with what the Mayor has said with regard to going further with this application, I think we're going to have to carefully examine it because I guess probably the letter of the law has been met in not calling these differences $D$ variance requirements but calling them $C$. The reality is, what are we doing here, what is this density and what is -- what is this finished product going to be; whether you call it a C, a D, a Q or an R, I don't care, let's get down to the meat of what this application is all about. And with that said, Mr. Wolfson, what do you have to say now?

MR. WOLFSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Board members, we appreciate your patience with that exercise and we're glad to get on with the substance of the application.

You'll recall that our engineer, Patty Ruskin, appeared on more than one occasion and that
a number of revisions have been made to the plan, including a significant reduction in the number of units and a movement of 25 feet further away from the Summit Ridge common boundary line. Where we left the engineering was we submitted by my letter dated November 20 a point-by-point, extremely detailed response to the Maser Engineering memo of November 9, 2020. I also have with me (audio freeze)...

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry, Peter -Peter, you're breaking up.

MR. WOLFSON: I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry, you're
breaking up, Peter. Would you repeat that?
MS. HUTTER: We can't hear you.
MR. WOLFSON: Can you hear me now?
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. WOLFSON: Okay, I apologize.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It's okay.
MR. WOLFSON: I was just orienting all of us, since this has been going on for quite a while, that we left the engineering last with our submission of a letter over my signature dated
November 20, 2020, which provided a point-by-point detailed response to the Maser Engineering memo of 59
November 9, 2020, and I'd like to mark that into evidence as A-28 so that I don't forget and then I'd like to just let you know, Mr. Chairman, that I have with me Ms. Ruskin, I also have with me our architect and our traffic engineer. I know Mr. Dour is here covering for Mr. Hipolit. If it pleases the Chair and the Board --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, here's the -MR. WOLFSON: (Audio freeze) CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah, here's the difficulty we have. I could only allow you to go until 10:00, so we only have about 15 or 20 minutes.
I'm afraid if we continue with Ms. Ruskin, the testimony, her direct, will go beyond that, and then we'll have questions, and true, Mr. Dour is here, but Mr. Hipolit is far more familiar with the file than Mr. Dour. If you believe that you could have your architect offer testimony and limit it to about ten minutes or so, then I would say we'll -- we'll continue. If not, we're going to have to find a date to carry this hearing to.

MR. WOLFSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the opportunity to get Mr. King on.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. So limit it 25
to ten minutes and we shut down at 10:00 on this case.

MR. REGAN: I believe Mr. King was previously sworn.

MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. KURSHAN: Peter Kurshan.
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. King, you continue to be under oath.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, hold on one second, Mr. King. Mr. Kurshan?

MR. KURSHAN: Can Mr. Steck be excused?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes, he may. MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Steck, you're excused. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And thank you, Mr.
Steck. Okay, Mr. King. There you are.
MR. KING: How you doing this evening?
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. King, you remain
under oath.
MR. KING: Yup.
MR. WOLFSON: You qualified at the
last hearing when you presented testimony on the height issue.

DAN K I N G, P.A., having been previously sworn, testified as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WOLFSON:
Q. Did you prepare the architectural plans last submitted to the Board dated October 16, 2020?

## A. That is right, yes.

Q. Okay. Can you give us a broad description of the building that is proposed from an architectural perspective?
A. Sure. Is it okay if I share my screen and go through the plans real quick or do you want to just do a verbal --
Q. No, I think that would be the most direct and efficient way to do it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah, we would have no problem.

MR. KING: Okay.
MR. WOLFSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. KING: I think I need the host to
enable me to present my screen.
MS. HUTTER: I believe you can.
MR. KING: Okay. Yup. All right.
All right, could everybody see that?
MR. WOLFSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.

MR. KING: Okay, so this is the garage level and just some of the things that I wanted to highlight that we've added to the plan to comply with some of the engineering requests. We did add security cameras, they're marked by these black squares and all the entry points. We did add two charging stations for electrical vehicles and we did include vehicle warning signs at these locations.

186 total spaces in here; as indicated in previous testimony, it is mainly parking with pool equipment rooms, storage, utilities, and then a security lobby here for people to make use of the elevators to the upper floors.

Jumping to the next floor, this is the first floor and here off the elevators is the public spaces, which I'll get into in a little more detail on the next page, but on this floor, we have 47 units, there's a mix of one-bedrooms, one-bedrooms with dens, two-bedrooms, and two-bedrooms with dens. We do have low-income houses designated by this COAH designation and they are sprinkled throughout the plan so that, you know, those who desire, are in need of this type of unit, have a choice of where they want to go around the perimeter of the building.
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There is a trash area on each floor. In this location next to the stair, you'll find on every floor that there's another elevator at this location for convenience. The two elevators here are large enough to accommodate gurneys.

If we go to the next page, this is kind of the heart of the building where all the action takes place. This is why people are moving in. They want to participate in social events and get to know others their age and in their period of life so that they can share moments together using the game room. We have a reel room, which is the theater, a large lounge area with different seating areas, there's a fitness area, we have your offices here, we have some private dining, this is a dining area for eating and those would just be for -- what's the word I'm looking for?

MS. CURRY: Reservation.
MR. KING: No, it's for catered -catered events, sorry. There's no cooking here, it's for catered events.

And then we move to the second floor.
The second and third floor are largely the same so I won't spend too much time on them. 55 units per floor; again, the COAH units are spread out around
the perimeter of the building in various locations.
We do have a lounge on each floor and this is just, you know, a place for people to gather. We hope -the goal is to try to create neighborhoods on each level so that people can get together and play cards or watch TV and share a sporting event together in this area. We also have a small art room here behind the secondary elevator. On the third floor of that area is actually a library so they can check books or exchange books whenever they please.

We go to the elevations next. This is the west and south elevation, as you can see. This is the elevation you would see upon approach. Parking is along here in the front, I mean, you can drop people off here at the front. The parking garage is below the west end of the building where the garage is completely underground.

We move to the east and north
elevation, again, very similar architectural detailing which I will get into with this rendering. And material board. The roof will be asphalt shingles, as you see here in number 1. We have different styles of siding, we have panel siding as well as vertical planks, or horizontal planks, rather, and the different -- the two different blue
colors, we have some highlights of this cream color down at the lower levels. We do highlight some of the gabling with this wood look, horizontal plank, and then we have a stone -- a gray stone along the base to kind of give it a base.

Again, we have white paneling, we have black-framed windows, and a little bit of painted copper roofing. That's some of the hipped roofs to highlight those. And that's about it.
Q. Dan?
A. Yes.
Q. Of the 157 units, 97 will be one-
bedroom and 60 will be two-bedroom?
A. Yes.
Q. And 24 of the units will be affordable units.
A. That is -- that's correct.
Q. Okay. And in your design on the elevations, it looks like you took great care to create articulation and architectural detail.
A. We did and, you know, these units all have balconies and so that allowed us to break up the elevation to little, smaller components, you know, we broke up the roof line with gables so that it didn't look as linear as it could. The balconies
provide a nice vertical break along the elevation.
MR. WOLFSON: I have no other questions for Dan.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Questions from Board members starting with Mr. Gruber.

MR. GRUBER: I have no questions other
than -- actually, I do have a question. Where --
the mechanicals, where are all the mechanicals
going, the air-conditioning units; are they all going up on the roof?

MR. KING: No, a lot of the commonarea mechanical units will be above the ceiling located at different corners in the public corridor area. There will be some condensers and things up on the roof but no major rooftop units.

MR. GRUBER: Okay. And are you planning any kind of backup energy source, like a generator for this building in case of a power loss?

MR. KING: We are not.
MR. GRUBER: Okay. That's the only question.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you. Ms. Curry?

MS. CURRY: No questions at this time. 67
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr.

```
Teagno?
```

MR. TEAGNO: I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr.
Lintner?
MR. LINTNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
No questions at this time.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mayor Ghassali?
(Pause)
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mayor?
MS. HUTTER: You're muted, Mayor.
MAYOR GHASSALI: Of course.
Are you planning on solar power, any
solar on top or anywheres?
MR. KING: We are not.
MAYOR GHASSALI: The charging
stations, those are free of charge or you're
charging for the charging?
MR. KING: That's a good question. I
-- I don't know the answer to that.
MR. WOLFSON: I think we're going to have to get back to you with an answer on that. We did not discuss that in any of our calls.

MAYOR GHASSALI: Okay. That's all I
had.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Zitelli?

MR. ZITELLI: On those charging stations, I think you indicated two.

MR. KING: Um-hum.
MR. ZITELLI: I would suggest you might want to look and get a few more of those, I think especially with the popularity of electric vehicles.

MR. KING: Yeah, the Tesla's taken over.

MR. ZITELLI: But anyway, no, Mr. Chairman, I think that's -- we're going to get -we'll talk about police and fire reports and so on later, right?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. KING: Yeah, we can go through
that.
MR. ZITELLI: Okay, then I'll hold off. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Stefanelli?

MR. STEFANELLI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned the siding. You know, what type of 69
siding? Is it going to be cement board? Is it vinyl? Is it --

MR. KING: Yeah, thank you for asking that. It is cement board. I should have said that.

MR. STEFANELLI: You know, since we have elevators and it's going to be a senior 55, I would look at having at least a generator for -for, you know, for the infrastructure of, you know, elevators, emergency lighting, stuff like that, so I would be advocating some type of small generator, at least for the essential services. And then I have no other questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Culhane?

MR. CULHANE: I have one question. Do any of the elevators accommodate a stretcher?

MR. KING: Yeah, the two front ones do. The two main ones do accommodate stretchers.

MR. CULHANE: No other questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Ms. Cudequest?

MS. CUDEQUEST: Yes. I just want to question something that Mr. Stefanelli brought up. I didn't -- this is a 55 -and-older community?


## sending foot-candles into an area beyond 10 feet of

 the building.MR. KURSHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. The
Chair will entertain a motion to open the meeting to
the public.
MR. CULHANE: So moved.
MR. STEFANELLI: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane; seconded, Mr. Stefanelli. All in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Anyone from the public wish to be heard, have any questions of Mr. King or Board professionals or the Board? Please raise your hand to be recognized by Ms. Hutter.
(Pause)
MS. HUTTER: There is no one, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The Chair will entertain a motion to close the meeting to the public.

MR. STEFANELLI: So moved.
MS. CUDEQUEST: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Stefanelli;
do that.
that have an interest in this application, please be advised that it will be carried to February 2. Our meetings start at 7:30 p.m. Right now, we believe the meeting will be another Zoom meeting and we will continue with our Zoom meetings until further notice. If there is any change or -- you can find out if there's a change by either going to the website or contacting Ms. Hutter, and again, please be advised that other than this notice, you will not receive any other notification, you won't get any direct mail or anything like that, with regard to the carry. And with that said, I think that covers everything, Mr. Wolfson?

MR. WOLFSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Board members, Board professionals, we appreciate your continuing patience and consideration of our application. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, and thank you, everyone.
(Hearing adjourned at 9:59 p.m.)
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traffic engineer, will be the two witnesses and we would respectfully request a February 2 date based upon schedules on our side.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And Ms. Hutter, can we accommodate that?

MS. HUTTER: I have available the 19th, Mr. Wolfson. The 2nd, I have three applications already.

MR. WOLFSON: Yeah, I'm informed that the 19 th doesn't work in terms of scheduling on our side, so I would respectfully request that we be carried to February 2 and as we get closer, we can see if people drop out or as things develop, then if necessary, we can either request a special meeting or carry it to your next February meeting.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, why don't we
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