

ACTING CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Okay. So I guess our application, 244 Old Tappan Road.

MR. REGAN: Diane, is the chairman arriving?

MS. FROHLICH: He should be here shortly, but he said to start.

MR. REGAN: Okay.
COUNCILMAN GALLAGHER: I'll be stepping
down.
MR. REGAN: Yes, because the
D variances are implicated, so the Class I and Class III members --

MS. FROHLICH: And Councilman Boyce.
(Whereupon, Councilman Gallagher and
Councilman Boyce recuse themselves and step off the dais.)

MS. PRICE: Hi.
All set?
Good evening, Gail Price from the firm
of Price, Meese, Shulman \& D'Arminio again for the application of CSH at 244 Old Tappan Road.

I'm back for this evening for our
testimony of our professional planner who I expect
will tie together all of our prior witnesses'
testimony in conjunction with the proofs that are
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required pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law to justify the grant of the required variances, as well as the site plan that's been presented.

Before I do that, I just -- I went back in my binder and I saw that we filed this application on December 22nd of '21, so it's been a long time.

MR. REGAN: The first hearing was February 9th.

MS. PRICE: Right.
Our first hearing was in February of '21.

So it's definitely our hope, of course, with the rights, you know, of the public's input that we can wind this application down to a conclusion in this calendar year before spanning yet another year into '23.

MR. REGAN: I think that's important, because you never know whether the membership of the board will change with the new year, depending on appointments or resignations or whatever.

MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. REGAN: It's always good, particularly with a significant application with multiple hearings, that it be completed before the current board may possibly have its membership
changed.
MS. PRICE: I agree, Bob, wholeheartedly.

And as we have done in the past, I supplied Diane with a copy of the last transcript.

So everything should be up and available and we're ready to proceed from there.

We also supplied our new set of plans on October 3rd of -- October -- Dynamic Engineering submitted new plans, original date of May 18, '21.

MR. REGAN: Revised 9/26?
MS. PRICE: Right, 9/26, that set.
MR. REGAN: Are you going to want them marked?

MS. PRICE: I think I would like them marked at this point.

MR. REGAN: We're up to A-31, I think. If I'm wrong on that, let me know.

MS. PRICE: Let's see...
MR. SKRABLE: Mr. Chairman, just while you're figuring that out, I will not be here for the December meeting.

If we get through planning tonight and start question, public questions and then get into public comment, I'm not sure that it's critical I be
here.
I think the board knows where I stand on the drainage aspects of the project, but I just want to let you know that schedule-wise.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Okay.
Thank you.
MS. PRICE: A-31.
(Whereupon, Engineering Plans prepared
by Dynamic Engineering, Last Revised 9/26/22
is marked as Exhibit A-31 for identification.)
MS. PRICE: And that was filed together with the updated stormwater management report, last revised September 22nd.

I don't know if we need to mark that as a separate or --

MR. REGAN: If you want to, we'll do it.

MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. REGAN: A-32.
(Whereupon, Updated Stormwater
Management Report, Last Revised 9/22/22 is marked as Exhibit A-32 for identification.)

MS. PRICE: So if I could, unless there are any questions of me, I'd like to call George Williams, our planner, for testimony.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Williams, would you raise your right hand, please.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give in this proceeding shall be the truth, so help you God?

MR. WILLIAMS: I most certainly do.
GEORGE W. WILLIAMS, PP, AICP
105 Grove Street, Suite 3, Montclair, New Jersey
07042, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. REGAN: And for the record, state your full name, please, and spell your last name.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening, Commissioners.

My name is George Wheatle Williams, Williams with an "S," W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
BY MS. PRICE:
Q. George, could you provide your background for the board and the members of the public, specifically your educational background and your professional background and experience in the area of professional planning?
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A. Certainly.

Commissioners, again, good evening, I'm
a founding principal of the firm Nishuane Group
headquartered in Montclair, New Jersey at 105 Grove Street, Suite No. 3.

I completed -- I am a licensed
professional planner in New Jersey, also certified nationally by the American Institute of Certified Planners.

I completed my graduate studies at
Rutgers Graduate School at Rutgers University now known as the Bloustein School, just to date myself a little bit.

I've been practicing in the field of planning for over 30 years now with a primary focus on land use, of course, but I and my firm also practice in a variety of other planning specialities including the development of master plans, zoning ordinances, redevelopment plans, a lot of civic engagement.

I've appeared before numerous land use
boards throughout the State of New Jersey, but I believe this is my first time appearing before this august board, although I have been in attendance at some of the hearings for this matter.

Lastly, I would say that most proud of the fact that I've served as a volunteer on my hometown zoning board of Montclair, New Jersey.
Q. And you are specifically aware of this applicant having served as the planner in conjunction with its applications in Norwood, New Jersey and Washington Township, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And your license is in good standing?
A. It is.
Q. And you have been accepted as an expert witness in the zoning matters that you referred to?
A. Correct, and in particular in applications for this applicant in other municipalities.

MR. REGAN: Acting Chairman, I believe
Mr. Williams' credentials may be accepted as an expert in the field of professional planner.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Okay, we accept.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Counsel.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PRICE:
Q. So, Mr. Williams, in conjunction with
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your testimony tonight, I believe that you've taken a series of steps that are necessary by an expert planner when taking on the role of reviewing an application.

## Is that correct?

A. That is correct.
Q. Maybe you could explain to the board and the members of the public those initial steps that you took on this particular application.
A. Certainly, and with the board's permission I'll remain seated.

I'm also going to refer to my notes, because there's a lot of information to get correct, if you will.

So I approached this application the way we approach every land use application and that begins with a review of the local land use documents.

In this case, Old Tappan's Master Plan or reexamination report, the zoning ordinance and all of that in the broader context of the Municipal Land Use Law.

Also, of course, I looked at the site plan and site plan application that are before you this evening. I have reviewed the planning literature and case law in support of the relief we
are seeking this evening and I visited the project site, I and my staff on several occasions.

Finally, I have attended, as I
mentioned, a couple of the hearings for this matter and/ or my staff for additional hearings and I did review the transcript for those occasions when we were not at or in attendance.

Lastly, I did review with particular attention your board planner's report first dated October 11th of 2021 and the revised memo, if I have this correct, February 4th of this year.
Q. And then from there you proceeded to look at the application for development specifically based upon the knowledge that you gleaned from Old Tappan's documents, correct?
A. That's is correct.
Q. So from your perspective, we've heard from the civil engineer, from the architect, from the landscape architect, a variety of witnesses.

What is your role in an application?
A. So -- and this will not be unfamiliar for this board.

My role as the planner is to provide the requisite statutory proofs on the record.

Typically, in my experience and my
firm's experience we build upon all of the testimony you've heard from the prior witnesses.

In fact, in many cases they establish
the predicate for my professional planning opinion and so what I would like to do is state a few things for the record. I'll try not to be redundant, but there are two instances during my testimony where you will hear some repeated information. The first will be simple statement for the record and the second will probably be when I recap some of that testimony that you heard from the prior witnesses for this matter.
Q. So why don't you start us off with how you started with your analysis?
A. So, again, for the record this is
property commonly referred to as 244 Old Tappan Road as read into the record by the chairperson and identified in the municipal tax records as Block 1606, Lot 3 and it's located in the RA-40 residential one-family district.

That is important, because that's what drives the need for our variances.

I won't go through the details of the project, that was covered at length by the applicant, the site engineer and the project architect. You
know that this is an application for an assisted-living development.
(Whereupon, Chairman Weidmann is now in attendance at 7:25 p.m.)

THE WITNESS: Worth repeating, however, is the benefit of the 10 percent of the total bed count will be Medicaid eligible and to that end, 10 of the 100 beds proposed will satisfy our Certificate of Need for the affordable housing obligation under the state statutory law.

So other than that, I won't go through the details of the project.

What I would like to do, if it's okay to go into that now, is the recap. I'm going to begin with taking a little bit of license and say to the board, as I mentioned earlier I have had the opportunity to work with the applicant and its representative in the form of Joe McElwee and I would begin by saying that this is an applicant, for me a client that is a pleasure to work with.

What you see of Mr. McElwee as a representative of the applicant is what you get. He is that way in every community in which Capitol Seniors Housing enters. That's important for a few
reasons.
client, that encourages its team to be as creative and comprehensive as possible, sparing no expense, and I think you've seen evidence of that.

Also, a good neighbor. As planners, and I think your board planner will agree, we are trained to engage with the community, if possible. I don't always get clients that agree with that, but Capitol Seniors Housing does and that's evidence in the testimony you heard from Mr. McElwee earlier about his efforts to reach out to some of the stakeholders in the area.

In my opinion, as a professional planner, that kind of engagement with the neighborhood actually makes for a better product moving in.

Some of the results of this engagement resulted in benefits that accrued not just to the applicant or the site, but to the community as a whole.

I will repeat this on one or two occasions, but examples are: The widening of Old Tappan Road, for example, the regrading of a street to help with runoff.
Q. Just let me stop you there.
A. Okay.
Q. Both of those items in your review,
both the widening of Old Tappan Road and the modification in the crown to help the property owner on Holbrook, neither of those items were triggered by this application.

Is that correct?
A. That's correct. And worth repeating again in the context of my introductory comments about this applicant being a good neighbor wherever they go and that's certainly evidence in this particular instance.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm going to mention the Certificate of

Need. I will preface my comments by acknowledging that financial considerations are not part of this board's deliberation, but there are one or two references in the Certificate of Need that I thought were worth repeating.

One is the total project cost is listed as $\mathbf{\$ 2 6 , 0 0 0}, \mathbf{0 0 0}$. That's before all of the additional costs.

It's worth sharing that with this board, however, in terms of the character of the
applicant truly committed to a quality product and to, again, not spare expense to deliver a quality product which goes to the benefit of the community at large as opposed to just the applicant.

The Certificate of Need also refers to the applicant's extensive experience in development, ownership and operation of assisted-living communities specifically in New Jersey.

Again, I mentioned some of the other experts' testimony are important because they established the predicate for my testimony.

I'm going to begin with our site engineer just to recap some of the things that were mentioned in the course of his testimony, which span several hearings.

Dan spoke first about the stormwater management design which will result in less water leaving the site at a slower rate than it currently does.

So if you were to approve our application, the site would -- it would result in a better site condition than currently exist. Water generated by parking areas will be cleaned before discharging from the site. We are preserving the wetlands and the associated buffer or transition
area, no disturbance proposed and we are providing an additional $\mathbf{1 0}$-foot buffer to the wetlands.

The wetlands will function the same as they currently do, which goes to this design's team or site design team's commitment to being sensitive to the natural resources and sensitive areas and as may have been mentioned by counsel at a previous meeting, we have our LOI for this particular site.

Finally, preserving the historic stone portion of the existing dwelling on the site will be relocated across the street to borough property, again, at the applicant's expense.

And this is, again, another example of this team's efforts to be responsive to issues we've heard both from the board and other stakeholders in the community.

The three-story building results in less disturbance in the area and allows for the applicant to accommodate not only the rooms, but more amenities for the proposed users of this site.

Senior living is an extremely low traffic generator. I'm going to mention that again under the traffic expert, but you heard testimony from our site engineer about that as well.

We have sufficient parking on site and
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want to emphasize that -- well, reemphasize that when I get to the traffic engineer's portion.

Senior living generates extremely low levels of noise. There was some testimony from Dan about the generator, perhaps, being one source of noise and the applicant has agreed to relocate that generator further from the property line, again, evidence to being a good neighbor and showing that this site can operate or function properly with the proposed use. We propose low-level energy efficient lights that will not spill over to residential property line. We listened to the neighbors concerns about the buffer and redesigned the site to move closer to Old Tappan Road in order to provide an additional 7 -foot buffer area to the rear, which is closer to the residential use.

We updated the plan to address fire department concerns about providing a grass emergency access lane, which allows a fire truck to fully circulate the building without the need to turn around on the site.

Even after we had the county comments and approval, we listened to the residents, our team listened to the residents and they have agreed to widen Old Tappan Road, which I mentioned a few
moments ago.
That widening of Old Tappan Road makes
for a safer circulation pattern and comports with other portions of Old Tappan Road.

Again, this is being done at the expense of the applicant and is not triggered by our development, but is certainly evidence of being a good neighbor.

Similarly, we were made aware of the drainage issue that resulted and this is what counsel mentioned a few moments ago down on Holbrook Court causing issues for residents there and the applicant agreed to re-grade so that that can fix the crown.

So that would no longer be an issue for that resident or residents. Again, not generated by this application, but certainly something that demonstrates this applicant's desire to be a good neighbor.

Landscaping, careful inventory of the specimens and code compliant replacement plan, the special attention given to the specimen selections. Mr. Lagenstein provided significant testimony about that and agreed to comport with what the ordinance requirement is and had an exchange with your board planner about how to satisfy your requirements for
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landscaping.
I would just submit that based on the plans you've received, that landscaping buffering is substantial.

Finally, and I will close this out, our traffic expert testified, again, that the -- from a traffic expert perspective that this use is a low traffic generator. The proposed widening of Old Tappan Road is an added safety benefit and the extra parking spaces provided on this site will more than satisfy the real demand for parking on this site and we added the, I believe the electric vehicle charging stations as well.

Perhaps, most importantly, this a less intense traffic generator than some of the permitted uses that could go on the site, such as a school or a daycare and that goes to just how appropriate this site is for the proposed use as an assisted-living facility.

With that, Commissioners, I'm going to recite the reliefs that are captured in your report. They've been testified to by our site engineer before, but for the record they are the $\mathrm{D}-1$ use variance.

Again, as this board knows, a D-1 use
variance is required when the proposed use, in this case an assisted-living facility is not among the permitted uses in the zone district.

There are several bulk and area deviations. I will submit to the board that in my opinion those deviations or $C$ variances could be subsumed under the granting of the $D-1$ use variance, but we feel so confident and strongly about the C variances that I'Il offer proofs in support of those as well.

Those C variances, as you know, begin with the improved lot coverage. Allowed is $\mathbf{3 0}$ percent. We come in slightly above that at 33.4 percent.

Maximum floor area, allowed is $\mathbf{8 , 4 0 0}$. This is where you see a larger delta. We come at 81,342 square feet and I'Il explain why that delta is a bit larger than the others.

Maximum height of building to the ridge line. The allowed height is $\mathbf{3 5}$ feet, $\mathbf{2 - a n d}$-a-half stories. We're very close to that by the way. We meet the standard in terms of height. We come in at 34-feet-5-inches and three stories. So it's the three stories that we do not comport with.

Loading spaces, four are required.

We're proposing one.
Side yard -- rear yard buffer, required 62.2, proposed 47.9.

Side yard buffer, 40.1 required, 20.1 feet is being proposed.

Commissioners, lastly, the sign.
Ground sign area, required is $\mathbf{3 0}$ square feet. We propose 37.1. And I'II talk about that when I get to the proofs.

And, lastly, the distance from the bottom of the sign display area to the ground, required is 4 feet, we're proposing 2 feet.

So that's the recitation of the reliefs. What I would like to do is just talk generally first about some of the planning issues and then go into the proofs.
Q. That's perfect.
A. This is the fact that we're here
requesting a $\mathbf{D}$ - 1 use variance is not uncommon in my experience.

There are a number of municipalities
that do not have specific regulations and standards for this particular use.

The state defines an assisted-living facility as follows: A licensed -- a facility
licensed by the department of health to provide apartment style housing, dining and assisted-living services when needed.

Apartment units offer at a minimum, one unfurnished room, a private bathroom, a kitchenette, a lockable door on the unit entrance.

In our planner's dictionary, the definition provided is: A special combination of housing, supportive services, personalized assistance and healthcare designed to respond to the individual needs of those who need help with the activities of daily living. A facility with a central or private kitchen, dining, recreational and other facilities with separate bedrooms or living quarters where the emphasis of the facility remains residential.

Commissioners, that is what's before you this evening.

Again, with the number of amenities that have been described and then focused on providing a quality option for this housing typology.
Q. And that use has been recognized by the Certificate of Need that you referenced from the state?
A. That's correct.

MS. PRICE: And just for the record,
the Certificate of Need is A-22 that the witness has referred to.

THE WITNESS: I believe it's dated June of this year, but it's marked in the record. BY MS. PRICE:
Q. Yes, June 29th.
A. Very briefly, there are a number of articles that speak to this land use.

One that we used in our preparation is a zoning update or zoning newsletter. It's called "Zoning Obstacles Facing a Developer of Senior Housing Options."

And it notes that, again, this is not uncommon to find municipalities that don't have specific regulations for its land use and it's likely due to the fact that the demand for such housing has increased so rapidly in recent years as elderly individuals and their families seek senior housing within continuing care communities, retirement communities.

This is exactly the demographic trend that's occurring in Old Tappan and, I would say, just about all over the country.

Typically, I don't discuss the Master
Plan until it's time to go through the proofs,
particularly the second prong of the negative criteria, but in this particular instance, it's probably good to set the stage with some references to your 2016 Master Plan Reexamine Report.

There are a number of sections that speak generally to the importance of addressing the needs of seniors in Old Tappan and then there are some very specific goals and objectives that in my opinion as a professional planner would be advanced if you were to grant our application.

The first is Goal 3, senior citizen residential where it speaks to the encouraging of age-restricted housing with varying levels of care within reason and with the specific controls that accompany conditional land uses.

In the alternative and if so desired, these facilities could provide with their own land use and zoning designation and that comes from page 15.

Goal No. 4, to provide a variety of housing types and densities that insure a balanced housing supply as one component of this goal, Old Tappan Borough recognizes the particular housing needs of its citizens with special needs, this goal statement should be interpreted broadly to
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specifically include encouraging a delivery of special needs affordable housing.

And, Commissioners, perhaps, even more on point, Goal No. 5, create opportunities to encourage the creation of both market rate and affordable senior housing. A policy statement for that goal, and I quote, that:
"The baby boom generation continues to age, Old Tappan has witnessed an aging of its population. There's a general lack of housing design to service the unique housing needs of older residents and while senior housing has been developed in the Borough to meet this need, Old Tappan should continue to encourage developers or the public sector to provide such housing, especially to meet the needs of older Old Tappan residents who seek housing design specifically for your needs."

Commissioners, that is spot on for what's before you this evening. This is a housing topology on a continuum of housing that is dedicated to that population cohort.
Q. And the language that you just read, you've taken directly from Old Tappan's documents, correct?
A. That's correct, on page 46.

So based on that, Commissioners, on the review of the land use documents, the review of the site plan, site plan application, in my professional opinion there is ample planning support for the requested relief and I guess that's a good segue into addressing the variances now.
Q. Great.
A. And I'Il take a sip of water.
Q. And you'll address both positive and
negative as required by the land use law?
A. Yes.

In fact, this board is aware there's a particular guideline for inherently beneficial uses, but I'll get to that in a second.

Generally speaking, as this board
knows, a D-1 use variance requires the satisfaction of both the affirmative criteria and the negative criteria.

The affirmative criteria can be deduced by a showing of special reasons. Special reasons are the use is inherently beneficial, which we submit this is, that the granting of our relief would advance the purposes of zoning, which I submit this would, that the use is particularly suited for the
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particular site.
I would argue that this is, although that's not a requirement for inherently beneficial uses.

And lastly, Commissioners, if you were to deny our application, it would constitute an undue hardship on the applicant. We're not submitting that's one of the special reasons today.

That's all balanced with the negative criteria, which this board knows is a two-prong test.

The first prong is that if you were to approve our application, there would be no substantial detriment to the public good.

I'm going to say, parenthetically, in my opinion there would absolutely be no substantial detriment and that word comes directly from the Municipal Land Use Law.

In fact, I would argue no detriment given all of the agreements that have been made by this applicant to perfect not only the development scheme, but some off-track approvals as well.

The other prong is no substantial impairment to the zone plan.

It's kind of why I began with
references to your Master Plan early on. In my
opinion, there's no substantial impairment to the zone plan.

In fact, I would argue if you grant our relief, this board would actually be advancing some goals and objectives of your plan.

I mentioned inherently beneficial. The Municipal Land Use Law under 40:55D-4 provides a definition for "inherently beneficial uses" and I'm going to read that definition.
"It is a use, which is universally considered of value to the community because it fundamentally serves the public good and promotes the general welfare. Such a use includes, but is not limited to a hospital, a school, a childcare center, a group home, wind or solar energy facility or structure. I nherently beneficial uses presumptively satisfy the positive criteria."

So I gave you what the positive and negative criteria were. Inherently beneficial uses have the advantage of presumptively satisfying the affirmative criteria. Therefore, they don't have to show that enhanced quality of proof from the Medici court case.

But I'll go one step further, I

There are several court cases that speak to inherently beneficial uses. I won't go through them in great detail, but just to give a bit of context for the remainder of my testimony, but the D-1 use variance, the first is Krousos v. Zoning Board, and I apologize if I butchered the name "Krousos," but in that court, in that case, the court found that the proposition of an Alzheimer's facility, residential facility was deemed inherently beneficial use and invoked the less stringent Sica test that we're proposing to you this evening for our assisted-living facility.

In that case, the court also found the board acted within its authority in concluding that the applicant's property did accommodate a large assisted-living home for persons affected with Alzheimer's disease.

I hearken back to Mr. McElwee's testimony about the application before you including a number of units for memory care. So this is very similar to the case that $I$ just mentioned.

Finally, Commissioners, the Jayber, Inc. v. Municipal Council, that court found that the grant of variance for congregate care housing facility for senior citizens was also inherently
beneficial and recognized that it promoted the general welfare.

In Borough v. -- excuse me -- Borough of Roselle Park v. The Township of Union, the court found that senior citizen housing inherently serves the public good.

So there is a fair body of literature and court cases that support our testimony to you that this, or my testimony to you that this application is inherently beneficial.

Beginning with the first step under the Sica test, the public interest, part of that public interest is articulated in your Master Plan. I've mentioned a few goals and objectives. Just to repeat one of them, the plan recommends that senior citizen residential land uses of all types and levels of care be added as a conditional use within their surrounding zoning district with specific controls. In this manner, these facilities would be treated as desirable land uses that would be encouraged within the borough and that's page 15.

That applicant's testimony was very similar. He mentioned in his testimony at the first hearing that his company, Capitol Seniors Housing does significant market analysis before they select
locations and that they found that this location, this community demonstrates a demand for this type of housing comporting with what your Master Plan says.

Our demographic analysis, we looked at the 2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates and found the following: Approximately 27.7 percent of the population of Old Tappan was 60 years or older, which was an increase from 20.6 percent in 2010. Regionally, approximately 24.6 of Bergen County residents were $\mathbf{6 0}$ years or older in 2019, increasing from $\mathbf{1 8 . 1}$ percent in 2010.

Thus, the senior resident population of Old Tappan is greater than the Bergen County cohort as a whole.

However, it demonstrates that both residents of Old Tappan and the greater Bergen County region are aging in place and will need this type of housing or housing for this cohort on a continuum. You heard Mr. McElwee refer to it as a "Silver Tsunami."

Step No. 2, negative impacts of the use. Again, my opinion is that there are certainly no substantial negative impacts. I would argue there are no negative impacts particularly given the applicant's efforts to meet any concerns expressed by

36
this board and/ or the community to mitigate anything that might be considered a detriment.

I mentioned some of those in my introductory comment, but certainly the site engineer's efforts to design a site that is safe and functions at the highest standards, the traffic engineer's testimony about the low-traffic generation of this site and how the widening of Old Tappan Road only increases or enhances safety.

Step No. 3, conditions that can be imposed to ameliorate impacts, again, in my professional opinion having attended the hearings, reviewed the transcripts, the applicant and the board have already identified a number of realistic and fair conditions that the applicant has agreed to.

I won't go through all of them, but again, some of those have been mentioned during my introductory comments and repeated as I went through my recap of what our site engineer testified to.

In terms of weighing -- Step No. 4, weighing the positives against the negatives and determining if the detriments outweigh the positives, in my opinion is the reverse. The benefits of the application for this $\mathrm{D}-1$ use variance to construct an assisted-living development at this site far outweigh
any detriments.
The benefits accrue to the community in terms of providing quality housing for this cohort of the population. The benefits of the site design, again, far outweigh any potential detriment.

In fact, the applicant would leave the site in a far better condition than currently exists and we talked about the relocation of the historic structure already.

Finally, Commissioners, there's certainly no substantial detriment to the public good or impairment to the zone plan, which is a good segue into the remaining variances, which are the C variances.
Q. Talk for a minute about the Price vs. Himeji case.

No relation to this Price?
A. I thought it was the first time I saw the case. I will butcher this name as well.

There are a couple of court cases that talk about the ability to subsume the $C$ variances under the granting of a $\mathbf{D - 1}$ use variance.

Price v. Himeji is probably the most current one and it found that the required bulk variances may be considered subsumed under the
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consideration of a use variance. Why? From a planning perspective, it's rather straightforward to me. The standards that we're being held to are for a use that's not intended and so if you agree with our showing of proofs for the D-1 use variance, it stands to reason that a different set of open area standards would apply other than those in the zone district, which houses our use.

In Kessler v. Bowker -- and I think I pronounced that one correctly -- the court found that where a use variance is sought and there are also bulk variances required for the project and the applicant proves special reasons for the use variance, those special reasons can also be used and entitle the applicant to $\mathbf{C - 1}$ variances to build -$C$ variances, excuse me, in violation of the side yard, parking and bulk restrictions. Very similar to what we are proposing to you this evening.

Again, we're comfortable providing the proofs despite the court cases that make it pretty clear that these $C$ variances can be subsumed under the grant of the D-1.

I would just add one more court case and that's the Pullen v. Township of South Plainfield.

As a planner I particularly like this court case, because it suggests that a board, in considering an application like this one, can look at the development schema or concept in total. And if you agree with what we are proposing is a very good development concept, despite those deviations you can look at those deviations in the aggregate and say overall not withstanding those deviations from the strict application of your bulk and area standards, the overall development concept works and, therefore, you can grant the $C$ variances.

To that end, as I mentioned earlier, the two context for $C$ variances, the first is the traditional C-1 or hardship and that means that there has to be a demonstration that their hardship is created because the lot is unique in its shape, size or topography, all of that may be true for this site, and then the other is -- or structures lawfully thereon, excuse me, and the other is the flexible C-2 and that allows the board to consider the benefits versus the detriments again.

And if you agree with us that the proposal before you is a better zoning alternative than the strict application of your code, that hearkens back to Pullen and the other court cases and 40
I would submit to this board that both the C-1 and C-2 are appropriate for your deliberation.

Under the C-2 context, as you know we have to demonstrate that the purposes of zoning would be advanced if you were to approve our relief.

I'll go through several purposes of zoning that in my professional opinion would be advanced if you were to grant our relief.
Q. And these purposes are all contained in the Municipal Land Use Law, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. You're not making these purposes up?
A. That is very correct.
Q. Okay.
A. The first is Subsection A. It's a --
it's the first one. It's a bit of a catchall, but I submit it is appropriate.

It is, I quote:
"To encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in the state in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals and general welfare."

The deviations we're asking relief from, all lend to a better development plan or
concept which enables the inherently beneficial use, which is the assisted living and so for that purpose -- for that reason, rather, my opinion is this purpose would be advanced by advancing certainly the public health and general welfare.
"Subsection I, to promote a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangement."

Commissioners, I'm focusing, for the purpose of the $C$ variances, on the good civic design. Our site engineer focused very clearly on the tradeoffs necessary to develop the site while still being sensitive to the wetlands and other environmentally-sensitive areas.

And so if you were to grant these reliefs, some of which are tied to those restricted areas, you would be advancing Subsection 1 .
Q. And with "I," the design that we heard about from the project architect was also relevant, correct?
A. Correct.

And more often than not, we planners focus on the aesthetic design and visual environment. That's certainly the case here. I would argue it's
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the case with all Capitol Seniors Housing developments and you heard extensive testimony from the architect about the efforts that went into designing an aesthetically-pleasing environment through building material, fenestration, roof design, et cetera.
"Subsection J, to promote the conservation of historic sites and districts, open space, energy resources and valuable natural resources in the state and to prevent urban sprawl and degradation of the environment through improper use of land."

Commissioners, it's the same as above,
the civil engineer's attention to being very sensitive to the constraints of this land and the relocation of plan for the historic structure would all be advanced if you were to approve this application.

Finally, Commissioners, Subsection L, "to encourage senior citizen community housing construction."

This is a form of senior living, housing and so you would advance that purpose as well.

Now for the individual deviations and

I'm almost at the end, so I appreciate your indulgence.

The first is improved lot coverage as I mentioned early on, $\mathbf{3 0}$ percent is allowed. We come in at 33.4. This is a good example of why the $C$ variances should be subsumed under the $D-1$ use variance. It's a different standard for a different use than what we're proposing, but what's interesting or worth noting is that despite the difference between the one-family development and the assisted-living development, we almost meet that standard.

So we're only off by that 3.4 percent and in doing so, the tradeoff in true $\mathbf{C - 2}$ context is we preserve the wetlands.

Maximum floor area, this is where the delta is greater. Proposed is $\mathbf{8 1 , 3 4 2}$ square feet. 8,400 square feet is what's the standard.

Again, in my opinion this is one that should be subsumed under the $\mathbf{D}-1$ use variance. The standards were intended for a use dissimilar from that which is before you this evening.
Q. And that 8400 square feet really goes to development with a single-family home, correct?
A. Exactly. again, it should be subsumed. It makes sense for a single-family home. It's out of whack or not contextually appropriate when you look or apply it to the assisted-living facility on this acreage.

Maximum height of the building to the ridge line, allowed 35 feet, $\mathbf{2 - a n d - a - h a l f ~ s t o r i e s ~ a n d ~}$ proposed is 34.5, three stories.

Commissioners, again, same as above, we still meet the standard in terms of feet where we are not in strict compliance is the number of stories and you've heard testimony from previous witnesses that allowing the third story makes for the provision of all of those amenities that you heard about work on the site and which serves the needs of the seniors that are intended to live there.

Getting close to the end,
Commissioners.
Loading spaces, four are required, one
is proposed. This is a classic C-2 tradeoff. We don't think operationally, we submit we don't need operationally four spaces.

In point of fact, if we offered more
than one, they would lie fallow, they would cause more disturbance and, quite honestly, again, they would take away from space in a building that could be put to a better use as has been presented.

Rear yard buffer, 62.2 required, proposed 47.9. We meet this from the line, property line to the building.

So in spirit we meet the intent of the space, but the function of the definition of the buffer does not allow for us to include the detention basin.

So it's kind of a technical variance in my opinion. We meet the spirit intent of the setback, but technically we are required for relief and so in the context of $\mathbf{C - 2} \mathbf{I}$ think that's appropriate.

Side yard buffer, 40.1 feet required, 20.1 is proposed.

Again, from the property line to the drive aisle, the distance is closer to $\mathbf{3 0}$ feet. So we close that gap, but the deviation is really tied to the wetlands and sensitive areas. It's worth noting that we are actually further from the property line than our neighbor, abutting neighbor, the church, which is closer on their side, to their side
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of the property.
Q. And this side yard buffer is on the church side, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that side yard buffer was increased during our application, correct?
A. That is correct.

That was one of the agreements of the team being responsive to concerns and comments we heard to shift so that that side yard was increased.

Winding down, Commissioners, ground sign area, 37.1 square feet is proposed, required is 30 square feet. This is interesting because the sign face is actually much smaller, but when you add the decorative borders, et cetera, it does come in at a square foot area that is greater than the strict application of your code. My understanding is that if necessary, the applicant is willing to actually decrease it even further, but the intent, Commissioners, as you heard from our project architect was to provide context sensitive signage on the site that was decorative, something that the community could be proud of and, of course, we want it to be readable, legible, conspicuous, so the drivers, the intended audience can easily identify
our site and make some intelligent decisions about how they enter our site.

Similarly, the distance from the bottom of the sign display area to the ground, $\mathbf{4}$ foot is required, $\mathbf{2}$ foot is proposed. The intent here was strictly to be as context sensitive as possible.
This standard is probably more appropriate for a commercial area, but given the nature and character of this area, it was our intent to keep it lower and be context sensitive.
Q. And the 4 foot that is referenced is typically to allow a line of sight in a commercial area, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So our design is really for a low
monument?
A. That is very correct and, again, in the language of the C-2 context, I would submit to this board as a professional planner that what we're proposing in each of these cases is a better zoning alternative than the strict application of your code.

I can confidently say to you if you
were to grant any and all of the $C$ variances, there would be no substantial detriment to the public good and certainly no substantial impairment to the zone
plan.
And that would conclude my direct testimony.

Again, thank you for being patient, but I'm here to answer questions.
Q. Let me just ask one final question: As a professional planner, do you believe that the applicant by way of its professionals has satisfied the proofs pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law as to what is required for the grant of the variance relief for the use, itself, and the various C variances, whether they're C-1 or $\mathrm{C}-2$ and whether they're subsumed or not?
A. I do, both for the D-1 and the C variances, whether a C-1 or C-2.

In my opinion, this is a good application for all the reasons I've mentioned, but more importantly you have an applicant and a team that have demonstrated their ability to be creative and responsive and meet the burden of those proofs to make my job much easier.
Q. And in your review of everything, did you come across anything that was asked of this applicant from the board during the course of the application that the applicant did not agree to look
into or take into account?
A. No. evening.
necessarily have to pertain to this. good for an application of this type. traffic. lot of traffic generated. not as carefully selected as ours is, the properties could be a concern. surrounding neighbors. impact potentially? issue in terms of the neighbors.

And I like the way you phrased that. I mean, this applicant will agree to look into almost every suggestion and good bit of advice that's given and that's true for this application before you this

MS. PRICE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. Questions?
Tom, do you have any questions of the --
MR. SKRABLE: Just one, and it doesn't

I think your opinion would be that it doesn't pertain to this application, but what would you consider an example of a detriment to the public

THE WITNESS: It's a good question. What's interesting is the assumption is typically

You've heard me and others testify that it's a low traffic generator, but when people -- when interested parties see the number of beds or units, there's this natural assumption that there will be a

It turns out not to be the case, but
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that would be one indicator. If the site design is juxtaposition of our development onto other

But, again, in our case I would submit
that the site design and engineering is done so extremely well that there's no negative impact on the

MR. SKRABLE: That's all I have.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: That's it?
MR. SKRABLE: I'm good.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: John?
MR. SZABO: I don't have much.
Density would be part of that negative

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. SZABO: Because too many units on the site that expands parking that it can't meet, site design flaws with drainage, for example, which by the way is still an issue I understand, an open

But you covered all the bases. You covered the one aspect of this. You covered the inherently beneficial aspect of this and the Cs and I -- I really don't take exception to any of your
testimony.
I think Mr. Williams is accurate. He testified as to the types of things that planners look at when we evaluate use variances, particularly when they relate to senior housing.

How would you prioritize, though, I mean -- you covered everything, but would you put the inherently beneficial first and then if we don't meet that, and, of course, you need D-1 or is it the D-1 and then inherently beneficial -- what is your position in terms of -- of the criteria that should be most appropriately applied here?

THE WITNESS: If I understand the question, I'm going to say that the inherently beneficial use should be the top priority.

The fact that the application before you serves the need of your community and the broader region is of paramount importance, I think that's why the Municipal Land Use Law has drafted the language the way it did. It takes the focus from the benefits that accrue directly to the applicant or developer and really shifts it to the benefits that accrue to the overall community and general welfare. And I think that's hugely significant.

MR. SZABO: And you feel that the
proposed density of the project is suitable and can function here in an appropriate manner?

THE WITNESS: That's a good question.
I glossed over that in my testimony. I do.
No matter how you define density in this context if you're --

MR. SZABO: With 87 units with 100 beds.

THE WITNESS: Right, right.
Given the testimony that you've heard,
I've reviewed from our site engineer and traffic experts and given the size of the property, the location of the property, it's my opinion that this site can comfortably accommodate the density or number of units that's being proposed on this site.

MR. SZABO: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Charlie?
MR. MAGGIO: No, other than that was a very good presentation and even made someone like myself understand, so I appreciate that.

Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anything else?
MR. MAGGIO: That's it.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I'll be honest, I think your presentation was excellent and I think you were very well prepared and delivered all the most appropriate points and your use of case law was important, so I think you did an excellent job.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Probably one the best I've seen in 15, 20 years.

THE WITNESS: I have a good coach here.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I don't have anything really that's earth shattering. I'm just -I was always concerned about neighbors and, you know, the neighbors to the rear have counsel, I believe.

The church is the one that is still the question of the 20.1 buffer next door. Did they ever come back to you with anything?

MS. PRICE: Negative.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: They still have
not.
MS. PRICE: Nope, they have not responded to any of our attempts to contact from several different parties on that and when we -- when we looked into it a little bit more, we actually saw that they were noncompliant on their side and their macadam is almost up to the property line.

So when we increased it, we saw that it was -- you know, they're very close to --

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: You did that without entering their property, I hope, but okay.

No, all right, well, that's one of my concerns and if they're not coming back to you, counsel, is that something that they -- do they defer or do they give up their right.

MR. REGAN: No, I mean they can come back to the next meeting or if they're not happy with the board's decision, they can appeal it.

They can't waive any rights but not being here.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Right.
They were not -- not answering.
Okay. And the rear -- the rear
neighbors have counsel of their own.
MS. PRICE: Correct.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Specially one particular, I guess, person.

When you said something about the loading space, you said four were required but one was used.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: So if more than
one, I guess, delivery truck shows up, where do they -- where does that truck end up waiting?

Because is there an area next to where the delivery would be that they would not be blocking some other area.

MS. PRICE: We won't have that situation at all.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I'm just curious about if there's not --

THE WITNESS: It's all operational.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: So, my only
question is: Is there areas for either other
vehicles to pass by if that truck is there if another truck should show up.

THE WITNESS: Commissioner, I can take a stab at it. I'm not the operations guy, but I have worked with this applicant on a couple of applications.

Operationally and experientially, they know how to schedule deliveries and drop-offs, so that's never a problem.

MS. PRICE: Yeah, and this is not --
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Every time I want a delivery, they say it's between 8 and 1 in the afternoon.

MS. PRICE: I know, but this is -- this is not --

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I mean, I don't
know what you're talking about, like they're, you
know, dictating to the truckers when they're going to come.

MS. PRICE: This is not like a
supermarket, though, that gets, you know, seven deliveries a day.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I was just asking, because --

MR. SKRABLE: Just to follow up on that a little bit.

The receiving area is 26 -foot wide.
So even though it technically doesn't
meet the criteria for two loading docks, practically there's two loading docks.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: And if I could read my writing, I'd have actually quite a few more questions.

No, it's not -- I wrote big enough.
No, that's it.
Thank you --
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: -- for your

## presentation.

MR. ALESSI: Again, great presentation. Everybody is probably going to tell you that.

Last meeting, I'm going to paraphrase,
I think Ms. McGowan had said, basically less intense traffic than schools.

Have we, the group, explored everything, like -- like how many acres is there to build on now?

MR. MAGGIO: Five-and-a-half acres.
MR. REGAN: A total of 5-and-a-half
acres.
MS. PRICE: I have to get the exact.
MR. BEDIAN: Well, 2.4 is the wetlands,
so it's less.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, a lot of restrictions but --

MS. PRICE: About four.
MR. ALESSI: So four buildable acres.
Now, according to the -- the deal that the borough made with the state, 12 units per acre, so that would be 48 units if my math is correct.

MS. PRICE: Correct, affordable.
MR. ALESSI: Thank you, Mr. CPA.
The Pearson project is six units per
building. So 48 divided by 6 would be 12 buildings, right?

MS. PRICE: Eight, eight buildings.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I don't know. I would have to ask Charlie.

MR. ALESSI: Eight buildings, so you have eight.

Follow me, you have buildings, would eight townhouse buildings be more or less traffic than your proposed facility?

THE WITNESS: I'm not the traffic expert, but I can tell you in conversations with our traffic person, I'm almost positive they would argue that it would be more intense.

MS. PRICE: I think the question that you can answer is: If that type of development is done, in your opinion as a planner, would that pose more of a negative impact potential than this use with its traffic demand?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, probably because of the trip generation that would be associated with that type of development.

MR. ALESSI: And there would be more density, if I can use that word correctly, with the eight townhome buildings than the one facility that
you're proposing, that your client is proposing?
THE WITNESS: In terms of intensity, yes.

MR. ALESSI: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. ALESSI: So it would be fair to say except leaving the property vacant, obviously, because there would be nothing there --

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. ALESSI: -- so in your assessment, your client's facility would be less disturbance, less traffic flow, less density than any other proposed building that went up.

THE WITNESS: Certainly residential, yes, that's correct.

MR. ALESSI: Okay.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: I want to just add something to that, something that the public is very concerned about was the trees and the cutting.

And just adding to Mr. Alessi's point, if we were going to have to allow four houses to be built maybe with a rook and road or however it would be developed, wouldn't that be a lot more development or destruction of the trees, because it would actually be on almost the entire property with very 60
little trees being --
MS. PRICE: That's where I took our -I took our engineer. That's what I had our engineer testify --

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: But I'm just saying that for purposes of an alternative to what is being proposed at least for that purpose.

In your opinion, would that be something that besides the traffic, which would be under his, which is even more, you know, intense because of the number of buildings, we're just talking about four homes, one-acre homes, yards, lots, frontage --

THE WITNESS: Pools.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: -- pools, how much of the disturbance of the trees, which is a very big concern of the public here that we've heard would that be.

THE WITNESS: So, again, I want to be careful. I'm not the site engineer. That's a question he can answer much better.

But I would suggest and we were whispering back and forth, the homes, the garages and the pools, you know, it's a tough site to design no matter what and that's why, you know, I was lauding
our site engineer.
But when you take all those things into consideration, yes, there would be significant disturbance as opposed to the very compact design, if you will, that we have for our application.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Thank you. Sorry for holding you.

MR. SZABO: Follow up on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ALESSI: Notice my lips didn't move when you were talking.

I wasn't going to ask it that way and I was going to go back to the density part with the eight townhomes that we're figuring the eight townhomes would be the maximum that could be at the end.

And, again, barring no construction at all that your facility, your client's facility be the lower end.

Everything in between is either plus or minus.

So with the eight townhomes being the maximum, less disturbance with your facility with cutting down the trees and disturbing all the rest of the topography, I think, the word being used with the
land and such and then plus the water running off, one person had said the chemicals, I'm sure with the lawn chemicals, with a high-density property like the project on Central Avenue, which I think is eight buildings, you have it on the map there.

So I just want to get clearer on my side before Nick interrupts me again that your feeling is that your facility, your client's facility is the perfect for less disturbance, less intense traffic than anything else, again, barring no construction at all, anything else that could go on that piece of property.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
And, again, reemphasizing the site engineer's attention to all of those details making it his and the teams' focus to be very sensitive to those wetland areas and buffers and come up with a design that has the least amount of disturbance as opposed to what might occur if some of those other uses were permitted.

MR. ALESSI: Okay.
Do we have any more?
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: No, I think you're done.

MR. ALESSI: I think I'm done, thank
you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: John, are you going
to --
MR. SZABO: No, I was just going to --
Mr. Williams, if this were a single-family cul-de-sac
kind of development which is typical in what the zoning would permit, there are no buffer restrictions with the exception of the wetlands, correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MR. SZABO: And there are no restrictions on tree removal per se?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yup.
MR. SZABO: Would it be accurate to say that the board or the borough would have more control over how the site gets developed given the
sensitivities in this type of a situation than a single-family subdivision?

THE WITNESS: Yes, and I spoke about
Mr. McElwee's character, but on the business side, I think the applicant realizes that the board does have more control in this development scenario and that hence part of the reason for being so open to working with the board and community.

MR. SZABO: Thank you.

I'm good, Mr. Chairman.
MR. ALESSI: That was my last question.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: David?
MR. KEIL: In your recap of the
variances you mentioned on building height, but the
number of stories, three stories, and you said that
that would -- you needed the third story in order to accommodate certain amenities that the guests would be privy to.

If this facility was a two-story facility, what sort of amenities would need to be eliminated and has CSH ever built a facility with only two stories in your experience.

THE WITNESS: I don't know the answer
to the last part of the question, whether they've
built -- they've ever built facilities with two stories.

When I spoke about the third floor being important for this use, again, we meet the standard in terms of feet, but stories we are a half-story higher. It just makes for the functionality of this particular building work much better given what's being proposed for the site.

So the architect went through each
floor and explained what would be on each level.
That third floor makes this work for the intended tenants.

MS. PRICE: And I can say that if you're looking at a two-story, it's a much bigger footprint, because everything goes on two stories rather than on the three.

So it's not a question of eliminating the services and the amenities. It's just that the building gets shaped differently and larger footprint.

MR. KEIL: Have you had an experience with CSH with a two-story facility?

MS. PRICE: No.
THE WITNESS: And I apologize for missing it in recapping what the site engineer spoke about and what was testified by our site engineer, that was a big part of the selection of the third story is, again, minimizing disturbance by going up as opposed to going outside.

I should have mentioned that when I spoke about his testimony.

MR. KEIL: Thanks for the clarification.

That's all.

MS. HAVERILLA: I'm good.
MS. PRICE: You're good?
MS. HAVERILLA: Yes, thank you.
MR. ELLER: So am I.
MR. BEDIAN: Yes, I have a question.
Good presentation.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. BEDIAN: You said in the D-1
variance, you have to cite the affirmatives and the negatives.

I heard about a lot of the affirmatives and the benefits and, you know, you stated, but I didn't hear much about the negatives. And you always said they overcome or, you know, the beneficial use outweighs the negatives.

Can you cite, like, a few negatives
that this site will generate?
THE WITNESS: So it's kind of the same, similar question than what your board planner asked and I tried to answer saying in my opinion there is certainly no substantial detriments. And that word "substantial" comes directly from the Municipal Land Use Law.

I would go a bit further and say there really are no detriments based on this applicant's
willingness and ability to improve the site plan application and respond to the concerns.

So that any detriments that might have existed have now been --

MR. BEDIAN: Like what?
Can you give us examples of the detriments?

THE WITNESS: Sure.
One of them was the side yard setback.
So we increased the setback to give more space, buffering and screening to provide a greater barrier between our property as it's developed and adjacent properties.

And then, of course, the widening of
Old Tappan Road as well.
MR. BEDIAN: Okay.
No more questions.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Any questions?
MR. ELLER: No, I'm all set.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else?
You have --
MR. REGAN: I have one question.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Go ahead.
MR. REGAN: Thank you for your analysis
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of the Sica v. Township of Wall Board of Adjustment and the four-prong test. The third step in the four-prong test relates to the imposition --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you speak up, I can't hear you, Mr. Regan?

MR. REGAN: Sure.
The third standard or third requirement
of the four-prong test relates to the imposition of reasonable conditions.

And this is, perhaps, more for
Ms. Price than for you.
The concern that I raised in a prior meeting references the fact that Old Tappan has a volunteer ambulance corps and my opinion the need for a contract or an agreement with an ambulance service to address healthcare needs at the facility should patients need to be transported to a hospital or another location, I'd like to include that as a condition and, hopefully, the applicant will agree to that.

I would like to also see a proposed contract or agreement with a provider so that can be addressed in any approving resolution.

MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. ELLER: Can I just --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: I think this was --
MR. REGAN: It was, I think.
MR. ELLER: Can I add to that too? I
think when we spoke about that, we also included the ability for in the event that the private contractor or the ambulance service wasn't there, the town would be able to bill them if we were to send our -- send the municipal ambulance squad.

MR. REGAN: Well, that's appropriate, we can add that also.

MR. ELLER: Thank you.
MR. REGAN: But it's been my experience with these type of uses and when a board has the review of the application, we pose it as a condition and I actually like to have the proposed agreement marked as an exhibit so it can be referenced in a resolution.

MR. SKRABLE: Bob, when we did the memory care on Central Avenue, wasn't the Borough the third in line, that there was a private provider and then there was Plan B, which I can't remember and then the Borough was Plan C?

So we might want to look at that.
MR. REGAN: Yeah, that was the Artis application?

MR. SKRABLE: Yes.
I want to see what that one --
MR. REGAN: I think we may have had
that as a condition as well. I don't remember whether there were three levels.

MR. SKRABLE: I believe there was.
MR. REGAN: But I would like to see at
the next hearing if we can have an exhibit be marked into evidence.

I mean, I've had that in other applications elsewhere in Bergen County and I think it provides, I think, the municipality with some security in terms of having a private service to address.

MS. PRICE: So, Bob, do you have a form agreement that you --

MR. REGAN: I don't have a form.
I can copy what was marked into evidence at another meeting.

MS. PRICE: Okay. So --
MR. REGAN: You might even have it with
Artis.
Were you the attorney on Artis?
MS. PRICE: Yes.
But, you know, we didn't do a form. It
was just a stipulation.
MR. REGAN: You just had a condition?
MS. PRICE: But if you have a form that you used --

MR. REGAN: Yeah, I think I had it from --

MS. PRICE: -- in another one, just send it to me

MR. REGAN: I'll look and see what I
have in the file, but I really would like to see that addressed.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Also, did you see the letter for the Old Tappan Ambulance Corps?

MR. REGAN: She hasn't seen that yet.
MS. PRICE: No.
MR. REGAN: Yeah, the representative of the ambulance corps spoke to me earlier.

And I suggested that when the meeting is open to the public, that he read that correspondence into the record.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay.
MS. PRICE: I don't have it.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Do you want a copy
of it?
MS. PRICE: That would be great.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. PRICE: Okay. Well, it's basically
what we just talked about.
MR. REGAN: I believe when the meeting is open to the public, the representative from the ambulance corps will go over this as an exhibit and it will be marked in at that time.

MS. PRICE: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: All right.
One other question as far as the height
of the building and number of stories to the building, you know, your plan was for 100 beds, correct?

Is what you want on this property?
MS. PRICE: Right, that's our
Certificate of Need, 100 beds, 10 --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: And if the building
--
MS. PRICE: -- credit.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: -- isn't three
stories, you're not going to get 100 beds.
MS. PRICE: Not in the present configuration --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Right.
MS. PRICE: -- correct.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay.
So, you know, 2-and-a-half stories is not going to work, there's no such thing, you know, half a story.

So no matter what, when this application came before us, you know, it's a three-story building.

MS. PRICE: That's why we presented it that way and asking for the relief and we've kept it under the 35 feet, which is the --

MR. REGAN: I think that's more critical than the actual number of stories, the height.

MS. PRICE: Right, we're compliant with the measurement, but not the story count.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: I didn't like the original answer just so everybody knows, it's got to be three stories, okay, and one other thing as far as trees goes and everything on this, correct me if I'm wrong, but this piece of property is going to be clearcut?

In other words, you're not going to have any trees on this property when you go into building?

MS. PRICE: No.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: How many trees are you going to have left on this property?

MS. PRICE: No, it won't be clearcut, because trees --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: It will be clearcut.

Is that correct?
MS. PRICE: No.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: What's not -- I
haven't seen a map showing, okay, this tree is going to be left here.

MS. PRICE: No, that's Jim Langenstein, our landscape architect testified to that and that he
had been out there and marked trees and his
landscaping plan confirms that.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: There's a couple of trees on the side of the property. You know, there's no -- the internal piece of the property, there's no trees left.

MS. PRICE: Where the building is going there won't be any trees, where the parking area -where the parking area is.

There undoubtedly will be an area where there will be substantial clearing, yes, but the entire site --

MR. REGAN: I think he testified that 165 trees will be removed.

MS. PRICE: The entire site is not being clearcut, though.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Well, it's going to look that way when you do that.

MR. ELLER: From the center out it's going to look that way.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Pardon me?
MR. ELLER: From the center out it's going to look that way whenever you get to the edge of it.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Right.
MR. ELLER: Wherever the parking lot is going to stop.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: And I think a lot of people in the public don't understand that. If you just look up the road a little bit where the construction is going on, count the number of trees left on the property. There are none.

This piece of property is going to look the same way, okay, just so you understand, you know, you know, what's going on here.

Okay. Does the board have any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: None?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Seeing none, okay.
Going to make a motion for we're going
to open the meeting to the public.
MR. ELLER: So moved.
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: Second. CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: But the questions can only be directed at the planner. It's going to be -- and these are questions to the planner, not statements to the planner.

Everybody is going to be limited to one question. Okay, everybody is going to be limited to one question.

After we have a first go-around, if you have any other -- a second question, you can raise your hand again.

Okay, the meeting is open to the public.

Yes, sir.
MR. STEINHAGEN: Good evening,
Chairman, Members of the Board. Daniel Steinhagen on behalf -- from Beattie Padovano on behalf of Lakeview Association and Angeline Sheridan.
next meeting.

Ms. Price and I spoke prior to the
commencement of tonight's meeting. Ms. Price and I agree that I would defer any questions that I have for Mr. Williams to allow that to happen.

So my understanding is, and I've asked
Ms. Price to confirm it on the record, that
Mr. Williams will be back for questions for me to the extent necessary next month.

MR. REGAN: And it would be great if we can have that agreement sooner rather than later.

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. STEINHAGEN: Yes, before the next meeting.

MR. REGAN: Yeah, the next meeting is December 14th.

MS. PRICE: Correct.
MR. REGAN: And it's my hope that maybe
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the application may conclude by then.
MS. PRICE: My hope too.
So we're going to -- I indicated to Dan
that if we did not have a firm agreement, I would
bring George back for questioning, but, hopefully, we'll have everything done, in which case that won't be necessary.

MR. STEINHAGEN: Well, to be clear, I'm not -- I can't, for obvious reasons, waive any rights as it relates to Ms. Sheridan.

MS. PRICE: But you're going to get back to me on that?

MR. STEINHAGEN: Yes, but she needs to have the opportunity to ask those questions.

MS. PRICE: Understood.
MR. STEINHAGEN: As long as the board is acceptable with that and --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: I believe the board is acceptable with that.

MR. STEINHAGEN: And just, I don't want to put what we're talking about on the record at this point, but Ms. Price and I will -- Ms. Price and I will read Mr. Regan in some time in the next couple of days.

MR. REGAN: Okay.

MR. STEINHAGEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else from the public wish to be heard?

Yes, ma'am in the back.
MS. COSTA: Hello. Francesca Costa from Closter and you'll see me a lot tonight.

Sorry, I wrote a lot of questions.
THE WITNESS: It's all right.
MS. COSTA: Let's see which one to start with.

Here's one, so going off of both testimony and what you have spoken about with chair people, is that title accurate.

MS. HAVERILLA: Board members.
MS. COSTA: Board members, that's it, thank you.

So we did compare, you know, eight developments on this property and your proposed design, but what about, like, is your facility less damaging than a nature preserve or cemetery or historic site on this property? Is that being considered when, you know, measuring how damaging things are?
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what uses are permitted on the site and that's how they got to the townhouse scenario.

So, yeah, or residential development, excuse me.

MS. COSTA: Can I ask a follow-up?
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Go ahead.
MS. COSTA: So, going off of that,
would a, like, nature preserve or something be allowed on this residential zone?

MS. PRICE: I think a better question is, has he reviewed anything to come to a conclusion about that?

MS. COSTA: I figured he's done a lot of studying.

THE WITNESS: So that answer would be, no, I did not, as part of my analysis, look at those type of uses.

MS. COSTA: Okay.
Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, sir.
MR. ARDITO: Peter Ardito, 57 Glen
Avenue East, Harrington Park.
Just I am a member of my own planning board in Harrington Park, so I'm aware of some of the
concerns.
Just when you spoke to the court cases that you mentioned, I'm just curious that this is a very particular piece of property, do any of those other court cases, do you know, are they already -were they already developed, the items that you cited as reasons to go forward with this? Were those pieces of property when they were developed, were they developed from already developed land or was it virgin land like this?

How is that relevant to a planning board to say that the court said it's okay to do this based on a different topography possibly?

Can you make that a little clearer for us?

THE WITNESS: Sure.
I'll certainly try.
So, in my opinion your question has, perhaps, two parts, right?

One is, do any of those court cases deal with vacant property? And the answer is there are a variety of court cases that were mentioned. Some of them are -- I think all of them are for developed properties.

MR. ARDITO: Which is different from
this particular piece of land?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
What is the significance of those court cases despite the different fact patterns, the reason in land use we refer to court cases and/or literature is those courts give guidance to boards like this one, boards of adjustment or planning boards in your case, as you're aware, and even though the fact patterns are different, the concepts are the same.

So when I talk about being subsumed, whether the property is vacant or developed, the concept is still the same. The fact that the use that's being proposed is not among the permitted uses and, therefore, the bulk standards don't apply, that concept would be relevant notwithstanding the fact that it's neither vacant or developed.

MR. ARDITO: Can I ask a follow-up question, please?

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Go ahead.
MR. ARDITO: You said you have walked the property, that's correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, well, actually I said I and my staff have visited the site, but, yes, we have walked.

MR. ARDITO: Okay.

And you've also stated that you read the Master Plan as has been furnished by the planning board.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ARDITO: The Master Plan goes onto to say specifically about this piece of property, that if it was to become available, it should be preserved as is especially because of its location in town.

So when you speak of inherent benefits and you say that you don't see any negative benefits to the development of this piece of property, I would ask you by reading the Master Plan that you said you have and reading those specifics and it specifically states about 244, that would it not be equally beneficial for the community for this property to, in fact, adhere to the request in the Master Plan to keep it preserved and make it into a park in the central area of town, also preserving the historic house because of the value that that is, because you said there was no inherent value at all. One might argue -- I'm asking if you would -- could argue that maybe that is an inherent value.

THE WITNESS: What's the inherent value.
read that in the Master Plan.
MR. ARDITO: I have the information. I will be happy to furnish it to you.

THE WITNESS: I would just -- I would
just submit that when I look at a Master Plan notwithstanding your point about the specific reference, which I did not see by the way.

MR. ARDITO: I can give you a page number and paragraph.

THE WITNESS: I can trust -- I'm just saying, I didn't catch it. That I look at the plan in its totality. That's why I shared the goals and objectives I did. All of which suggest that, two things: One, there is support in the local Master Plan for this type of development; and, two, very generally there is local recognition that more has to be done in support of that population cohort, that Silver Tsunami that was mentioned and, again, it's not uncommon to happenings all across, certainly, the state.

MR. ARDITO: May I beg you for one more very relevant follow-up question, please?

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: (Nods affirmatively.)

MR. ARDITO: Thank you very much.
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And that is, as a planner looking at the totality of what's beneficial to the town, if there was, in fact, another piece of property in town that fit all of the requirements that they are looking for except for a possibility of a few, very few less rooms, could be the three stories, could be everything they're requiring and that property is already zoned commercially and it would not require the wholesale removal of 165 trees, I believe is what you said, 165 trees that, in fact, that piece of property came before this planning board in the past and was approved for a completely different client but for the same exact use and that client pulled out because they couldn't do it anymore, would as a planner who has to look at the overall view of not just what's beneficial to an applicant, but also beneficial to the town, would you not say that if there was another location in the town that is clearly more suited for such a piece of property, wouldn't that not be an equal benefit to the town?

MR. REGAN: That's not what's before the board.

## (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: I've asked in the past that we refrain from what just happened.

MR. ARDITO: I apologize on their behalf.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: No, but we're not
dealing with -- just so the public -- we're not
dealing with hypotheticals here. We're dealing with this one application.

MR. ARDITO: Well, a hypothetical was brought up about in this property, two of your board members said that if they put other types of houses on that, those are both hypotheticals.

MR. REGAN: I was looking at permitted uses would be allowed on the property.

MR. ARDITO: Well, this is permitted usage on another piece of property --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: No, listen.
MR. ARDITO: -- that you approved --
MR. REGAN: We can't talk about another piece of property. We're talking about this property and this property only.

MR. ARDITO: I'm merely asking him his professional opinion if that was relevant.

THE WITNESS: One way to respond would be simply to say that and it's part of the court case law, et cetera, that it's the application that's
before the board and now under the recent court cases there's no obligation for an applicant to say there are other suitable sites in the area. It's about their approach to a particular piece, which in this case is 244 Old Tappan.

So, I understand your question, but I would just offer from a land use perspective, that's not the obligation.

MR. ARDITO: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. PRICE: Wait, wait, wait, I have a question.

MR. ARDITO: Okay.
MS. PRICE: So, you sit on the planning board, correct, in --

MR. ARDITO: I do.
MS. PRICE: -- Harrington Park?
So, in your role as a planning board member, do you look at speculative developments or do you look at an application that's before you and rule on it?

MR. ARDITO: My role on the planning board is there because I am on the environmental commission, so I look at everything environmentally.

MS. PRICE: That's not my question.

MR. ARDITO: This plot is going to cut down 165 trees, so I would be looking at that.

MS. PRICE: Mr. Ardito, that's not my question.

MR. ARDITO: Okay.
MS. PRICE: Do you look at an
application that's before you or do you look at speculative developments that are not before you in your role as a planning board member?

MR. ARDITO: In my role as a member for the environmental commission --

MS. PRICE: No, that's not my question.
MR. ARDITO: I'm giving you my answer.
As my role, specifically as a member of the environmental commission, when Allegro came before us, I requested specific things and specific actions as a member of the environmental commission because I am there by state law only because if a town has an environmental commissioner, they have a member from the environmental commission on the planning board.

So, therefore, it's my responsibility as that member to view the environmental aspects.

MS. PRICE: I agree with you
100 percent, but --
MR. ARDITO: So, if I have approved on
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that planning board another piece of property in the past for that and they were going to -- and that property is properly zoned already as opposed to another piece of property which is not properly zoned and they're going to cut down 165 trees, yes, I would bring that up.

MS. PRICE: So, you think --
MR. ARDITO: And if you stop me from that, then you would stop me from that.

MS. PRICE: You think that you're allowed to make all those ifs?

MR. ARDITO: No different than the questions, the two questions that were asked prior to this from two members of the board right here.

MS. PRICE: And in your reference to acquisition of the property, this property to be in conformance with the Master Plan, who would be acquiring this property, this 5-and-a-half acres with

```
--
```

MR. ARDITO: If the applicant was
refused?
MS. PRICE: You referred to a Master
Plan section --
MR. ARDITO: The Master Plan --
MS. PRICE: Wait, let me get my
question out.
MR. ARDITO: Oh, I'm sorry, I apologize.

MS. PRICE: You referred to the property being acquired specifically as noted in the Master Plan?

MR. ARDITO: Correct.
MS. PRICE: Who would be acquiring the property in connection with that reference?

MR. ARDITO: Okay.
The Master Plan says if it becomes available, the town should acquire it and we have brought up in other meetings for this, I brought up that I have reached out to Tenafly Nature Center and I believe Closter Nature Center, both combined and said they would assist, we well as Bergen SWAN who I represent has -- we have a million dollars in a fund that we have authority over and we have offered to use that money to help pay for this, as well as the town has Green Acres funds and other sources, so that is who would buy it.

MS. PRICE: Has the town put any acquisition out to the best of your personal knowledge?

MR. ARDITO: To my personal knowledge,
people from the town have asked the mayor and council and no response was --

MS. PRICE: I'm only asking your personal knowledge.

MR. ARDITO: To my personal knowledge, no.

MS. PRICE: Okay. Thank you.
FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's not on trial.

MR. SKRABLE: Bob, can I ask you a question?

MR. REGAN: Sure.
MR. SKRABLE: And I honestly don't know the answer, so I'm not being cute.

MR. REGAN: That's okay.
MR. SKRABLE: Is the Borough allowed to require as part of the application for any non-single-family development a no-build analysis?

MR. REGAN: No.
MR. SKRABLE: Thank you.
MR. REGAN: Absolutely not.
FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Why not?
MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, why not?
MR. SKRABLE: I thought that might be the answer, but thank you.

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why not? CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, any other questions?

MR. ALESSI: Before we go forward -CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: What? MR. ALESSI: Before we go forward, I went back and researched my notes and I believe it was either February or March Mr. McElwee did the -your presentation and said basically it would be two calls per month ambulance-wise and Bill Hal (phonetic), everybody knows Bill Hal, did his math and said it would be 104 calls a year and at that point we decided that it would be -- the private ambulance service would be the first tier, the county would be second tier and the town would be the third tier and as Mr. Eller said, the town would look into billing the facility for that call.

And at that point in time, then we decided to increase the size of the elevator, remember, and have -- so that was what was discussed and agreed upon way back when.

MR. REGAN: February or March.
MR. ALESSI: February or March.
So I hope that clarifies some -- I
didn't get to read the letter. I didn't even know
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about the letter.
MR. SPILKA: Hi, my name is Terrence
Spilka. I'm a resident here in Old Tappan.
I just wanted to clarify something, Mr. Williams.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, spell your last name, sir.

MR. SPILKA: S-P-I-L-K-A.
THE COURT REPORTER: And your current
home address?
MR. SPILKA: 22 Deberg Drive.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. SPILKA: With respect to
Mr. Williams testimony on it being a low-impact
traffic situation, I heard in the testimony just a
lot of emphasis on the facility accommodating
X number of beds and the type of -- type of
environment, the type of building, the type of service being provided would, in fact, result in a low traffic as compared with a school or other types of facilities.

I'm just trying to envision, though, the reality of what we live through each day and you have the residents, you have employees and in my opinion, it would be more or less given the situation
where there may be some vulnerable residents, 24/7 type of employee shift turnaround, deliveries, food provisions, supplies, Amazon deliveries to residents, Mother's Day a lot of traffic in and out if it falls on a Sunday with a neighboring church service exit.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: We need a question.
MR. REGAN: Question for the planner, please.

MR. SPILKA: Widening the road.
I'm just wondering if you can clarify what you mean by low-traffic impact as it relates to all days of the year rather than at nighttime or just as it concerns those residents themselves.

MS. PRICE: Can I just -- Mr. Williams can answer the question, but I just want to be clear that he's not our traffic --

MR. REGAN: Not the traffic --
MS. PRICE: -- engineer and his reference was based upon the record that's been established.

MR. REGAN: Right, he referred to the traffic expert's testimony.

MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. MAGGIO: And that was covered in the traffic engineer's report.

MS. PRICE: Correct.
THE WITNESS: So, what you just heard would have been my answer anyway, so I think --

MR. SPILKA: I know you're not the traffic expert.

THE WITNESS: Correct, but I relied on the testimony of the other experts to establish the predicate for my planning conclusions, in addition to my experience working with this applicant elsewhere and that's how I arrived at my opinion about the low-traffic generation.

There are some planning literature also that talk about parking demand and traffic generation nowhere near the level of our traffic expert, but they all conclude that this type of development is a low traffic generator.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. KING: Hello, Wendy King,
48 Dearborn Drive.
You said that the benefits to -- this
is a benefit to seniors and that aging in place is important and I'm just wondering at past meetings we discussed that most seniors cannot afford this when we did the math, somebody came up and did it and said, well, my mother can't afford to live here and
most people agreed it was ridiculously experience and
their parents wouldn't and also the term "aging in place" is referred to staying at home and bringing aides in and staying with family members and that is aging in place, not going to a nursing home.

So I'm wondering --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, do you have a question --

MS. PRICE: Now we're getting into --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: -- to direct to the planner, please?

MS. KING: I just asked it.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: That is not what the planner spoke about.

MS. KING: I'm quoting him.
I put in quotes as he was talking and
I'm asking him two questions -- I'm asking him a question about two quotes he said.

MR. ELLER: Could you just repeat the question, because I didn't understand it?

MS. KING: He said, the planner said --
now I lost -- the planner said that it benefits the seniors in town, this thing, right, and then he said, you know, he talked about aging in place, you know, being important and a trend and so my question is,
that how is he determining it's a benefit to seniors in town when most of them can't afford to live in there?

MR. REGAN: I don't think he talked about affordability.

MS. PRICE: Correct, that's not --
MR. REGAN: He didn't talk about affordability.

MS. PRICE: -- this witness or any of the witnesses.

MS. KING: But he's saying people can live there. So how do you know people can live there? How do you know people can afford to live there then?

THE WITNESS: So, my testimony in part
was based on the Master Plan for Old Tappan suggested and it, like a good comprehensive plan, suggested that there be a continuum of housing opportunities specific to people of certain age cohort and so the provision of this product in my opinion addresses what the local Master Plan has recommended.
"Aging in place" is a term that is used in planning parlance regularly and while I appreciate what you just said, the broader context is allowing residents the opportunity to not have to move out of
state, out of town for housing, but to be able to stay in their community near family and friends and that's what senior housing in this typology and other typologies is intended to achieve.

MS. KING: But if seniors can't afford to live in it, then they can't stay in the town.

MS. PRICE: There's nothing in the record about affordability or in the proofs.

MR. REGAN: It hasn't been discussed.
MS. KING: You have to be able to afford to live --

MR. ELLER: I disagree, we had a conversation with that and we even went to the point where we discussed with the operators the ability of people that live in town to have first right at a discount, I think, for the first year when we talked about pricing and for residents of the town to get a discount when they did their first round of enrollments.

So, I believe that was going to be another condition of the approval too.

MR. REGAN: I think the applicant -- I thought the applicant indicated they would review that. Okay.

MS. PRICE: Yeah.

MR. REGAN: But --
MR. ELLER: I'm sorry.
MR. REGAN: -- again, it would be --
(Simultaneous Speaking.)
VICE CHAIRMAN MAMARY: You brought up that point up.

MR. REGAN: -- the Medicaid benefits and they can't be --

MR. ELLER: That I agree, yes.
MR. REGAN: -- earmarked for Old Tappan
residents.
MR. ELLER: Correct, but the balance.
MR. REGAN: The regulations under the affordable housing.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, next question? Yes, ma'am.

MS. MAGARRO: Patches Magarro, 4 Churchhill Road, Old Tappan.

So my question is back to the Master
Plan. I do have the wording from the Master Plan for you.

THE WITNESS: Which one?
MS. MAGARRO: The one that references this property.

THE WITNESS: Which year?

MS. MAGARRO: 2016. I don't have the page number.

Since most of the Borough's recreation lands are not centrally located, explore and pursue any opportunities that arise to obtain properties suitable for recreation near the Borough's central zone.

One example of a recent success story is the Oaks property on Central Avenue north of Haring Drive.

One other such pursued property that has not as yet been successful is the historic Gerrit Haring House property adjacent to the west side of the Korean Presbyterian Church of the Palisades, which is a different church now on Old Tappan Road west across from Russell Avenue, which this property.

So, as a planner, when you're
discussing inherently beneficial uses, in this case would be mutually exclusive, your beneficial use of the assisted living is a generalized one and can be placed in other locations. This is a unique piece of land that is specifically named in the Master Plan.

So, as a planner, how would you prioritize a specifically named use of a specifically named property versus a generalized community
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beneficial use.
THE WITNESS: It's an excellent
question.
This is, perhaps, a super particular instance because in my opinion they're not mutually exclusive. Why? Because you have a situation where the Borough has identified an alternate site for that historic structure and an applicant who has agreed to at significant expense to relocate that historic structure, which was in a state of disrepair to a site which may actually be more suitable given its access and visibility, et cetera, and the care of that property. So --

MS. MAGARRO: They mentioned the historic house, but they're referring to this property as a recreational property, not as a museum.

So once its become an assisted living, it will no longer be a recreational property. They are mutually exclusive.

THE WITNESS: I don't agree with that, but I hear what you're saying.

MS. MAGARRO: Well, how could it be a recreational property centrally located at this specific location if it becomes an assisted living?

THE WITNESS: Again, and I tried to
address this in my earlier comment about the Master Plan. I still can't find the citation.

I'm looking at the Master Plan, but you read it verbatim, so I will go on faith that that's what is in the 2016 Master Plan, but as a planner, I'm looking at the Master Plan in it's totality and that's why I read the goals and objectives that I read and I would stand by my opinion that the application before this board is for the development for the purposes that it was stated and submitted and that the tradeoff or compromise in this case is the relocation of that structure, yet it won't be used as recreational space, but I'm not sure it is now, which salvages the historic significance of that site or this structure and allows for a development of this site in a way that has been quite challenging, but successfully done.

MS. MAGARRO: No, I'm not asking about that historic building as a historic building.

That's used as a reference point to dictate which piece of property is being discussed in the Master Plan.

So, I'm not asking about using that building as a historic building. I'm asking about using that acreage as recreational space in the
center of town. That's what's -- and it doesn't say that it's being used as that. It's saying that it should be acquired if at all possible.

So given a specific use of a specific piece of land versus a generalized beneficial use, how can one prioritize those?

THE WITNESS: Again, if you look at the totality of the Master Plan and the number of goals and objectives and weigh them against the citation you're providing, my testimony will still be that the application before this board and its community is a good application, it does advance the goals and objectives of the Master Plan for all the reasons I've stated.

MS. MAGARRO: Okay.
I disagree.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Fair enough.
MR. ELLER: Can I -- quick question, because --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Go ahead. MR. ELLER: Just because the point has come up a couple of times about that language in the Master Plan and this is, I guess, more for Bob, but the point has come up if the property becomes available, et cetera.

As far as I know, this -- the town never was approached to purchase it or right now there's a sale agreement for this, so it -- as far as we know it's never been available to the town to purchase. I don't know what the --

MR. MAGGIO: Can I take a stab at this? CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes.
MR. MAGGIO: So, I think it was in 1997 the Borough adopted a law called the Open Space Advisory Law and it took a small percentage tax out of everybody's --

MR. REGAN: Probably a referendum.
MR. MAGGIO: Exactly.
I forget what it was. It was some ridiculously low number.

MR. ELLER: Two cents, two cents a square foot or something.

MR. MAGGIO: It was like seven-tenths of a percent and it was used to acquire properties for the public good and the reason why I know that, I was the Chair of that committee for about seven years and we acquired quite a few sites and I personally picked out the Oak site and the Bonae site and both of them became parks for us.
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that list of properties to acquire, but we didn't have enough money for it and it wasn't for sale and the person never came to us and approached us for it.

MR. ELLER: And that's the point I'm trying to make.

Is the burden -- I don't -- yeah.
MR. SZABO: Mr. Chairman, if I may,
it's page 26 of the 2016 Re-Exam and that was referring back to your 2006 Master Plan, but the point I'd like to make is it's aspirational, you do an open space plan, you have a target list, you try to acquire those properties, but the key word here is "availability."

Absent an offer and an interest, the town would have to go in and condemn it and that's the alternative and that becomes an expensive process and you just heard that there's a limitation on funding, so you have to prioritize.

So, it's aspirational. If you don't put these properties, got do a lot of open space planning on a list, then, you know, you're not -Green Acres will look at it and say why are you buying those properties when you've identified these.

MR. MAGGIO: Yeah, like 14 or 16 properties.

|  | 109 |  | 111 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | something sworn -- | 1 | MS. LEVINE: Yeah, but I don't know |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: No. | 2 | what we've used the money for since then. |
| 3 | MS. LEVINE: It's nothing sworn. | 3 | MR. MAGGIO: I don't think there's |
| 4 | MR. REGAN: You're going to ask a | 4 | anymore money left. |
| 5 | question. | 5 | MS. LEVINE: We keep doing it. We keep |
| 6 | MS. LEVINE: He gave his experience. | 6 | collecting the money. |
| 7 | I'm giving my experience. | 7 | MR. MAGGIO: Well, I'm not on the |
| 8 | MR. REGAN: This is time for questions | 8 | committee anymore. |
| 9 | of the planner. | 9 | MS. LEVINE: Well... |
| 10 | MS. LEVINE: No, but I just want to | 10 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: A little history of |
| 11 | correct something that was stated for the record. | 11 | Old Tappan. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. | 12 | Any other questions? |
| 13 | MS. LEVINE: Okay. | 13 | MR. ALESSI: Buddy, can we take a |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Thank you. | 14 | break? |
| 15 | MS. LEVINE: And that referendum came | 15 | MR. REGAN: For the court reporter. |
| 16 | because there was a developer by the name of Reduci | 16 | MS. HAVERILLA: She needs a break. |
| 17 | (phonetic) that wanted to develop five or six homes | 17 | MR. ALESSI: The court reporter. |
| 18 | along the Washington Avenue reservoir and at that | 18 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The court reporter |
| 19 | time Carmen Ian (phonetic), the councilwoman, did not | 19 | needs a break. |
| 20 | want to see that happen and that's when we started | 20 | MR. ALESSI: We're taking a break for |
| 21 | the referendum, Reduci was already submitting plans | 21 | the court reporter. |
| 22 | for the building. We got the referendum. And we | 22 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: We're going to have |
| 23 | blocked the building of the houses. | 23 | a five-minute break. |
| 24 | MR. MAGGIO: And then went ahead and | 24 | (Whereupon, a brief recess is held.) |
| 25 | got some parks out of it too. | 25 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The meeting is |
|  | 110 |  | 112 |
| 1 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Thank you. | 1 | going to reconvene. |
| 2 | MS. LEVINE: Well, it was just green | 2 | Take your seats, please. |
| 3 | space. | 3 | The meeting will reconvene. |
| 4 | So there is precedent for that. Okay? | 4 | Is there anyone else from the public |
| 5 | He didn't approach us, we approached them and we | 5 | that has any questions for the planner? |
| 6 | stopped it. | 6 | Yes, sir, please come forward. |
| 7 | MR. MAGGIO: But for Bonnabel and with | 7 | MR. GELFAND: Yes, I'm H. Gelfand. |
| 8 | Oaks, we spoke to those people and they chose to sell | 8 | I'm the Chairperson of the Bergen |
| 9 | those homes to us. | 9 | County Historical Society, Historic Preservation |
| 10 | MS. LEVINE: Okay. But -- | 10 | Committee. |
| 11 | MR. MAGGIO: And that was after -- that | 11 | And so I wanted -- |
| 12 | was after that referendum occurred. | 12 | THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, your |
| 13 | MS. LEVINE: The development was | 13 | name again, sir? |
| 14 | already talked about -- | 14 | MR. GELFAND: H. Gelfand, |
| 15 | (Simultaneous Speaking.) | 15 | G-E-L-F-A-N-D. |
| 16 | MR. MAGGIO: -- there was a lot of good | 16 | THE COURT REPORTER: And your address, |
| 17 | that came form that referendum. | 17 | please? |
| 18 | MS. LEVINE: -- on that property to | 18 | MR. GELFAND: It's 33-05 Rosalie in |
| 19 | already go and we circumvented it -- | 19 | Fair Lawn. |
| 20 | MR. MAGGIO: That's good. | 20 | THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. |
| 21 | MS. LEVINE: -- for green space. | 21 | MR. GELFAND: Thank you. |
| 22 | MR. MAGGIO: That was good -- | 22 | So, since you were bringing up |
| 23 | MS. LEVINE: So -- | 23 | precedent about legal issues, I wanted to bring up |
| 24 | MR. MAGGIO: And then what came out | 24 | precedence also about the incorporation of historic |
| 25 | afterwards was good. | 25 | stone houses, intra-medical facilities and other |

types of assisted living facilities in Bergen County of which there are multiple examples. I'll just bring up one.

I made a whole list of them, but
there's a place called Sunrise Assisted Living on Paramus Road in Paramus where the planning board --

MR. REGAN: Sir, we need a question.
MR. GELFAND: I'm providing some background information.

In the case of Paramus, what happened is because there was a -- excuse me -- a historic house, the municipality and the developer worked together --

MR. REGAN: You're getting involved in testimony. I'm going to have to swear you in. This is really not the time.

MR. GELFAND: I'd be happy if you were to swear me in, but I'm just trying to make a point here that the municipality and the developer worked together so that the historic house could you part of the facility and I'm wondering why, because you called the plan creative, why the house is not being incorporated into this particular plan.

MS. PRICE: Just for the record, Mr. McElwee -- that's Mr. McElwee's project.
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```
testified.
```

MS. PRICE: Yeah, he previously testified.

I'm not sure of the relevance of that
--

MR. REGAN: It's beyond the parameters of his testimony.

MS. PRICE: Correct, beyond Mr. Williams' testimony in its entirety.

MR. GELFAND: He did call the plan creative and I'm just wondering why the creativity was not extended by the architect for this proposal.

MR. MAGGIO: But it was actually.
The first six months of this hearing we've had, that house was part of the design.

MR. GELFAND: And yet it's not now is the point.

MR. MAGGIO: Because there was an agreement made with the --

MR. REGAN: With the municipality. MR. MAGGIO: The municipality, correct. It had nothing to do with the developer. The developer was very happy to leave the house there.

MS. PRICE: And at one point we were
subdividing the property, giving two acres to the Borough, giving the house and the two acres to the Borough and it was then revised to put -- transfer the house at the developer's cost across the street.

MR. GELFAND: So, I guess I'm just wondering why it can't be put back into the plan.

MS. HAVERILLA: Well, the problem is whether or not they keep it on that property or they put it on the Borough's property, it has to be moved, because it is in the way of the building that they need to --

MR. GELFAND: Ma'am, with all due respect, the point that I'm making is that I have a list here of other facilities where people have incorporated the historic house into the architectural design.

MS. HAVERILLA: So, you're saying with the building, not move the building?

MR. GELFAND: Exactly correct, that's the point.

MR. REGAN: That's not part of the plan.

MS. PRICE: Yeah, that's not the application.

MS. HAVERILLA: It was never part of 116
the plan.
MR. GELFAND: Well, with all due respect, since the historic house is listed in the Master Plan as a historic resource, which the Borough is supposed to be protecting as part of the Master Plan, one of the things that this committee could potentially do -- this board, excuse me, is to suggest, i.e., require that the house remain part of the plan.

So I'll just leave my comments there.
MR. ALESSI: Buddy, I got to make a comment. I just got a note that a lot of illegally parked cars in the fire department lot.

If you don't want your car ticketed and towed, I would suggest you go out and move from the fire department members only lot, the lot right next door to the firehouse, it has a sign, "do not park, firemen only."
(Laughter.)
MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Have new volunteers.

MR. ALESSI: And nobody is getting up to move, okay.

MR. ELLER: I got a ticket there a couple meetings ago.
(Laughter.)
MR. ALESSI: Okay, ticket.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else have
any questions?
The young -- no, no, the lady in the
back who's had her hand up.
(Applause.)
MS. SONG: Kaitlin Song, 56 Leonard
Drive.
THE COURT REPORTER: Spell your last name.

MS. SONG: S-O-N-G.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. SONG: So, how does the location of this development best support other goals referenced in the 2016 Master Plan specifically Goal 8, which states that Old Tappan seeks to pursue opportunities to achieve a greater balance of nonresidential to residential land use in appropriate locations and appropriate intensity.

So, my question is: How do you justify this lot as the most optimal space for this project?

THE WITNESS: I'm trying to parse the questions.

It sounds like there are a couple of
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questions, right?
One is specific to Goal 8.
The other is, how does the proposed development comport with the Master Plan and there was a third, I think.

MS. SONG: Two, just two.
THE WITNESS: Two, okay.
As I review the Master Plan in support of this application, I look at, as I think I've mentioned before, the overall intent and purpose of the Master Plan and goals and objectives that may support this application. I listed several. It doesn't mean that this application will advance every goal and objective of the Master Plan. There's some that are just not applicable, but in my opinion having reviewed the Master Plan, there were significant goals and objectives and policy statements that would be advanced if this application were to be approved.

MS. SONG: So, you're saying Goal 8 doesn't have to do with this?

THE WITNESS: No, that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying that in terms of -- and I should make sure which goal -- do you know what page you're looking at for Goal 8.

```
MS. SONG: 50, it should be.
THE WITNESS: You said 5-0?
MS. SONG: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: Bear with me one second,
please.
No, that's not it. You're looking at
``` the 2016 Master Plan?

MS. SONG: Yes.
THE WITNESS: So, page 50 appears to be Roman Numeral No. 7, recommendations concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans.

MS. SONG: I think it was like 55 pages.

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Page 47. THE WITNESS: Forty-seven.
"Old Tappan seeks to pursue opportunities to achieve greater balance of nonresidential to residential land use in appropriate locations at appropriate intensities but within existing commercial areas."

Yeah, so I think I would go back to my original statement that while Goal -- there are a number of goals and objectives in the Master Plan. I cited the goals and objectives that I think would be
advanced by approval of this application.
Goal 8 seeks to pursue opportunities to achieve greater balance of nonresidential to residential. It doesn't seem to apply, because this is, although deemed commercial, it's really residential development, it's for living accommodations, so...

MS. SONG: Okay, thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else have any questions?

Yes, ma'am, in the back.
MS. PILKINGTON: Laura Pilkington, Old
Tappan.
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, your last name again.

MS. PILKINGTON: Pilkington, P-I-L-K-I-N-G-T-O-N.

THE COURT REPORTER: And your address?
MS. PILKINGTON: Pilkington 28 Country
Squire.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. PILKINGTON: Thank you.
So, in attempt to truly quantify the need, what is the historic and current utilization of



Tappan Road.
questions? wait until they leave.
personal. been no mention of -question, please. unique situation.
look like?
that. other people. answers. I wouldn't --
relevant --

Yes.
MS. FONOROW: Cherie Fonorow, 256 Old

MR. ELLER: Can you just --
MS. FONOROW: I'll just wait, yeah,

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, one question

MS. FONOROW: Okay. I understand, okay. I want to just sort of nobody's ever questioned Mr. McGuillie's [sic] reputation.

THE WITNESS: Who's Mr. McGuillie?
MS. PRICE: McElwee.
THE WITNESS: Oh, McElwee, okay.
MS. FONOROW: McElwee, sorry, I
mispronounced your name, I apologize.
He's not on trial here.
So I'm going to speak -- this is

I'm a neighbor of the property and I've
lived here 25 years and I would love to have the luxury of having an attorney represent me, because that was mentioned, the other neighbors -- there's

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, one

MS. FONOROW: Yes, this is a highly

So, my question is: Being its
historical and environmental importance, can you tell
me what is or was done regarding the neighbors that
live to the west of the property?
Have there -- can you show me any
renderings of what the view or the sight lines will

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am.
MR. REGAN: He didn't testify about

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: He didn't testify
-- he's the planner and you've asked that question to

MS. FONOROW: And I haven't gotten any

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: If something
is being left out that's important, critical and

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, it's not your turn to speak. You want to get up and speak, you can come up and speak.

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you do this every time.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am.
MS. FONOROW: I don't know how I'm supposed to ask questions that are relevant to the property, because I am a neighbor, I do have a well, there's carcinogens with development and building materials.

MS. FONOROW: Okay. I -- I -- do you know that -- what the median age is -- because A Place For Mom was 75 , so it was within a 5 to 10 mile radius, but do you know the median age of the Old Tappan residents?

THE WITNESS: Not offhand.
I'd have to -- we have the demographic analysis. I don't have that committed to memory.

MS. FONOROW: Okay. The Census currently, the new Census says 45.4 is the average age of an Old Tappan resident, median age.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, are you testifying or are you asking a question?

MS. FONOROW: I was asking if he knows the questions, because they're making --

MR. REGAN: He answered no.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: He said no.
MS. FONOROW: Okay. So have you done
research on how many residents of Old Tappan and the neighboring residents will actually use this facility that are 75 years old plus that are going to stay in Old Tappan and use the facility?

MS. PRICE: It goes beyond Mr. Williams' testimony. Mr. McElwee provided all of the initial demographic --
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MR. REGAN: At the first hearing.
MS. PRICE: -- and market analysis.
MS. FONOROW: And the planner just
reiterated all of it and I wouldn't have brought it up if he hadn't, because I only took notes based on what he said.

MS. PRICE: I think that what the planner testified to were two prongs in terms of the increase in the population, it was two sentences. He did not testify as to any need. He testified based upon the 2019 American Community Survey five-year estimate.

They were -- he was not testifying as to his personal research or his recollection or his data. He was referring to a document done by others and referred to Old Tappan and actually in that document that he referred to said that it was 60 year old that increased.

Correct, Mr. Williams?
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MS. FONOROW: And I'm just -- this was presented to the public as part of your testimony and we we're told we can ask questions based on what your testimony is.

So where you sourced it or what year it
was from, I'm not questioning that. I'm just looking to compare it to the research that I've done, because you're establishing this inherent beneficial use for all in the community and to me this doesn't fit the criteria for that particular segment of the population, what you're talking about, it's a very narrow segment of the population and it did say over 51 percent is male and unfortunately, they're not supposedly supposed to live as long as we do, so I don't know how many of them are moving in.

MS. PRICE: I don't know what we're referring to now.

MS. FONOROW: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else wish to be heard?

Yes, ma'am, please step forward.
MS. CHO: Jane Cho, 16 Lakeview Drive.
Hi.
THE WITNESS: Hello.
MS. CHO: You testified earlier that a single-family home was 8400 square foot and that you would require over 81,000 square footage.

THE WITNESS: No, that wasn't me.
MS. CHO: Okay.
I don't know how I got these numbers if
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you didn't say it before.
So, but I know it's going to be something to that effect, it's okay.

Basically, we were all questioning
about the trees and the reduction, the cutting down of the trees.

As a planner, did you ever consider
putting the parking lot that's take up a lot of impervious footprint on the lot, putting it a level, two level underneath so that the people who come to visit don't have to go fight through rain and snow and storm which we will have and have the convenience of visiting their relatives indoors and having access to elevators and whatnot, to create more trees or nature preserved areas in the parameter, as a planner to have maybe a nature walk surrounding the parameter instead of a parking lot, which will create impervious, rainwater that's going to go somewhere, lights that will be, you know, for the night, light pollution.

So as a planner, would you be able to plan something that will reduce the square footage of the building for imperviousness and go, since you have a -- \(\$ 26\) million, I think you stated, right, as a total project, I'm not quite sure how much more
it's going to cost, but seeing that it may increase, you know, 1 to 5 percent of it to create more to save the large trees that we have may pacify or, you know, to bring some of the people who have so much things against the killing off of a lot of the nature things, have you ever planned that or thought about it.

THE WITNESS: I'll try to answer this question as best I can.

I understand your question did I plan it and just so we're clear, we have a site engineer that gave a lot of thought to how to design the site, how to be sensitive to the wetlands and so I think my testimony as a planner was based on the testimony from our site engineer. It was not an easy feat and so he deserves a lot of credit for that.

Whether the site engineer, not me, the site engineer considered subterranean parking, to be honest with you, I don't know the answer to that.

I know that that's even more
challenging than what we have, but that would be a question for our site engineer. I don't know that he did that.

MS. CHO: Okay. It's difficult for me because I live right abut to the back and you as a 134
planner had done some -- as you say, what is that drainage, the --

THE WITNESS: No.
MS. CHO: -- water retention thing?
THE WITNESS: No, the site engineer.
MS. CHO: That's the site engineer that
does that?
MS. PRICE: Yes.
MS. CHO: Okay. All right.
THE WITNESS: So, I apologize for any confusion.

What I did in my introductory comments as a planner was to try and summarize what other experts testified to over the course of months of these hearings so that it gave context for the planning arguments in support of the variance.

MS. CHO: I see, okay.
I'm just into saving the trees and trying to reduce water going into the wetlands behind my basement and getting flooded, so I wanted to know if you had considered.

Would you be speaking with the site engineer to consider, "subterranean" was the word that you used for the parking space? Would you be considering that at all?

THE WITNESS: At this point, no, but I can tell you that this team investigated a number of scenarios, some of which were discussed in previous hearings, but, yeah, I'm not the site engineer, so that would not be my purview.

MS. CHO: Okay. So, I may -- if I may ask one more question, I was just made aware actually yesterday of this incident that happened and you had mentioned that the inherent benefits of a church and the nursing home. There is a church right across from CDW, the middle school.

And we were talking about -- I know this is the traffic issue, but this is not a traffic, this is a safety issue. There was a child who was hit right outside of the church and they don't have any traffic really and a child was hit.

So, how would you prevent that from happening when now we have the Enclave, which is about over 200 units and more kids coming and walking on that sidewalk now that we made it? I mean, how do you --

MS. PRICE: Mr. Williams --
MS. CHO: Lights or crosswalks or --
MR. REGAN: It's beyond the planner's testimony.

MS. CHO: Is that beyond the planner or does the planner --

MR. REGAN: It's beyond his testimony. He testified extensively about the criteria for variance relief.

MS. PRICE: Right. Our traffic engineer --

MR. REGAN: Ask a question about that.
MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. ELLER: Maybe it was just a confusion about what a planner does versus an architect or an engineer. It sounds like it's just a misunderstanding.

MS. CHO: I guess because it was the culmination of information that you presented in the beginning and we thought that that's all you did, because you said it, so we were addressing you and my concern was a child that I know was hit and so how do we prevent that?

Have you ever thought about the prevention of children being hit on that sidewalk?

As you mentioned, you guys were doing a lot to prevent the water flow from going to Holbrook, which is only like one or two units into that street and you guys are doing revisions on your plan as a
planner, right?
So would you be considering doing
any --
THE WITNESS: No --
MS. CHO: Oh, it wasn't you?
THE WITNESS: No.
MS. CHO: I know you testified to that.
THE WITNESS: But the commissioner
brings up a good point. I tried to be as articulate
as possible when I recapped. I mentioned each recap and category. I said the site engineer brought up these highlights, traffic expert highlighted \(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}\) and Z. The landscape architect highlighted \(A, B, C\) and D.

So that was just to give context, because, remember, it's been several months and so some of that context gets lost in my opinion if I didn't recap it and it then gives context for my testimony.

So the commissioner's point, as a professional planner my task is really to consider everything that's been done up until this point and provide support for the application in the context of, A, the state Municipal Land Use Law and, B, the local Master Plan and that's why there's been a lot
of discussion about what the Master Plan says and the case law and literature.

So, to the commissioner's point, I
didn't design the site, that's our civil engineer. I
didn't discuss -- I didn't analyze traffic or traffic conflicts or parking, that was our traffic expert that testified. I did not analyze the landscape tradeoff.

We had a landscape architect that provided significant testimony about that to your point about tree removal, tree placement, et cetera. Those were all done by other experts.

MS. CHO: Okay.
Is there a time in this room today to ask these questions or would this be the finish?

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The finish is going to be next month.

MS. PRICE: But, Mr. Williams --
MR. MAGGIO: There will be an opportunity for the public to question the entire --

MR. ELLER: All of the professionals
will be there for that, correct?
MS. PRICE: No, this is our -- this is
our final --
MR. ELLER: We told people throughout
all the hearings that that was going to be the case.
MS. PRICE: No, the public has a right to comment.

Oh, yeah, absolutely, absolutely.
MR. ELLER: On the totality of the application?

MS. PRICE: Absolutely, the public will have a right to come in and make all of their comments.

MR. MAGGIO: Mr. Williams is done and then we -- and we're done with all of the witnesses, there will be an opportunity to come up and you can say whatever you want.

MR. REGAN: It will be the public's opportunity to testify.

MS. PRICE: Absolutely.
MS. CHO: Okay.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else wish to
be heard?
Yes, sir.
MR. GAMBUTI: Patrick Gambuti, 16 Autumn Lane.

So, I guess being it wasn't brought up, what do you actually do?
(Laughter.)
MR. GAMBUTI: Because I really don't know.

THE WITNESS: My parents don't even know what I do.

Fortunately there were a couple of people in the audience that are planning students, that warmed my heart a little bit, but as a city planner, I'm serving as an expert witness, as an expert witness as part of this team, my job is to review the application, the site plan that is before the board, analyze it to see if there are appropriate arguments according to the state statute, which is the Municipal Land Use Law, in support of this application.

So, my testimony was roughly 50 minutes long. All of that was designed to demonstrate to the board and hopefully the community that their statutorily required proofs have been met.

MR. GAMBUTI: Okay.
Thank you.
That clears up a lot for me personally.
Can I ask one more question? It's about the age thing.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The what?

MR. GAMBUTI: The age thing. Because you brought up 60 year old as your point of reference.

So, I was just curious how many 60 -year-olds use assisted living facilities? Is there some kind of -- and why you would use that number, because I mean, in my mind I would think it would be like, you know, \(75,80,85\) would actually be -- and what percentage of the population in Old Tappan or the surrounding communities is of that age that would actually use the facility.

THE WITNESS: So, perhaps, two questions again.

One might be more appropriately or was probably more appropriately answered by the applicant's representative, Mr. McElwee going back to the first hearing where he talked about his market analysis for the site and his analysis of the demographics in general, both go hand in hand.

The other question seemed to be more about how I chose my data points and all I did was look at the demographic trends provided by the Census report that I cited and it showed that there was a trend for 60 plus, I think was my testimony, to be growing at a significant rate both here in Old Tappan
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and in Bergen County.
I would argue that's something we are
seeing in other municipalities as well throughout the
State of New Jersey.
MR. GAMBUTI: Right.
So, I guess then -- but what -- so
that's 60 plus, so then we're talking more about the future than what the need is today.

THE WITNESS: No, no, the testimony was
if you looked at 2019, for example, the increase in
2019 from 2010 was significant and if we go even further, my submission to you would be that it just keeps growing, but my data points were from 2010 to 2019.

MR. GAMBUTI: Okay.
Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yup.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else wish to

\section*{be heard?}

You've spoken already.
Yes.
MR. CARPENTER: Kurt Carpenter,
168 Central Avenue, Old Tappan.
Mr. Williams, that was a very informative presentation. I appreciate that.

Everybody recognizes that.
But you've -- your response to a
question from the board about what should guide their
decisionmaking from a prioritization level in evaluating this application.

According to your interpretation of Municipal Land Use Law and the determination of inherently beneficial use of this project, is it my understanding that you recommend as a professional planner here that that -- that one element essentially be the foundational, the lynchpin as it were, the foundational aspect of their decisionmaking for proving the key issue here, which is the \(D-2\) variance.

THE WITNESS: D-1.
MR. CARPENTER: Oh, D-1, thank you so
much.
The land use variance, because this use
that -- that your client is proposing is not
presently permitted and that the -- this specific property is also explicitly called out as an aspirational goal in the land use -- in the Master Plan in furtherance of the goals and the spirit of the -- of the Master Plan.

So, is it your estimation that that one
specific -- the inherently beneficial use of this function should supercede both the Master Plan and the actual present zoning law and the -- the zoning of this property and would basically unlock the project?

THE WITNESS: It's a good question.
There was a lot in there, so give me a second to try and parse it.

No, it doesn't supercede the Master Plan and I don't think you or anyone else should look at it as an either/or or zero sum, that's not how the land use is set up.

But to your point about why did I choose to say inherently -- the status of this use as inherently beneficial being so important requires, perhaps, a little bit of scenario playing, right?

So, if you were proposing a -- I'm going to exaggerate to make a point -- a prison, which may not have inherently beneficial status, the requirements to meet the proofs are exponentially greater, because it's not inherently beneficial.

You heard me mention in my testimony there's an enhanced quality of proof when it's not inherently beneficial. That's jargon, but what it really means is the board deliberation requires a
higher standard of proof.
I went through my testimony to explain what the state defines inherently beneficial, as what the courts define it as and they give it a less stringent view entirely because it benefits the general public and that's why I think that's so important, because it's different than, you know, I want to put in a -- you know, an amusement park because it's going to benefit me.

The inherently beneficial use is something whose benefit accrues to the larger community as opposed to just the developer.

MR. CARPENTER: And that is what would justify the use variance as opposed to, for example, staying within the same -- the approved use of single-family, right, that lot could theoretically come before the board as a subdivision or request, hey, I'd like to subdivide into five properties or whatever, four properties, still staying within the use and you're saying that this scenario here would be -- the use of this property, right, in this function would supercede even that scenario?

THE WITNESS: No.
So, I would encourage you not to think of superseding, because that's just not how the land 146
use -- I think I'm going to answer the question.
MR. CARPENTER: Okay.
THE WITNESS: That's not how the land use law is designed.

And I would submit to you that the New Jersey land use law is just genius. They thought about everything.

So, a permitted use could come to the land use board and seek approval, that's one scenario.

The scenario before us today is this application for a use variance and the inherently beneficial standing is one of the criteria for deliberating about the application.

Remember, I mentioned its inherently beneficial uses, purposes of zoning being advanced, particular suitability and the undo hardship.

So, the board's got to sift through all of those indices and make a decision based on all of the testimony they've received over the months and your input to see if as an inherently beneficial use does it meet the test that's outlined by that court case that I mentioned, but they're not superceded.

If you want to come tomorrow -- last year and make a proposal for a permitted use and
thought you had the wherewithal to deal with all the environmental constraints, you would go to this board functioning as the planning board and submit your application, get approved or denied.

We came with ours and we'll hopefully get approved, but the board has to basically look at each application based on their singular or individual merit, but it's not superceded.

MR. CARPENTER: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Any other questions?

Yes.
MR. ARDITO: Peter Ardito, Harrington

\section*{Park.}

I'll make this very simple, is there ever a case where undeveloped land would be equal in stature for inherent beneficial use as opposed to development, in this case, inherent beneficial use for a senior center? Is there ever a case where there would be an equal importance for preserving a piece of property?

THE WITNESS: So, there may be -- I'm not sure I understand the question 100 percent.
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in its characterization of inherently beneficial use undeveloped lands? I would argue no.

Is there a value to undeveloped land? The answer would be yes.

MR. ARDITO: Thank you.
MR. ELLER: So, there's no
classification of a park or anything like that as inherently beneficial?

MR. REGAN: The definition in the MLUL of inherently beneficial doesn't include a park.

MS. PRICE: No.
THE WITNESS: And that could be in part, Commissioner, because it's public land, right, as opposed to private development.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. COSTA: Hello again, everyone.
THE WITNESS: Hello again.
MS. COSTA: I don't know, should I be
-- like I have a lot of questions.
Is it okay if I read them all or should
I be sworn in as a professional on history and archaeology?

Sorry, I'm not a urban planning
student.
MR. REGAN: If you're going to testify,
the appropriate time would be at next month's meeting.

MS. COSTA: Okay. Is it okay if I just read -- I have a lot of questions, so is it okay if --

MR. REGAN: Questions to the planner?
MS. COSTA: Yes.
MS. PRICE: For this witness?
MS. COSTA: Yes, yes.
MS. PRICE: Just on planning testimony?
MS. COSTA: Yes.
I don't know if it's relevant, but I
have a master's in archaeology, history and the classics from the University of Edinburgh. I've worked at sites such as the Roman Colosseum. I've worked at -- on the Battlefields of Gettysburg. I've done extensive archaeological digs. I've worked for Earls of Scotland, actually who -- the Hope family who the diamond is named after.

I've done a lot of work abroad, but
I've also done a lot of local history. I worked for the state at the Palisades Interstate Park as a historic interpreter.

So, if I lead with a statement, I promise you it will be a question; is that okay?

MS. PRICE: This has to 100 percent go on George's testimony.

MS. COSTA: It does, don't worry.
MS. PRICE: No leading, no leading with any statements. It has to just be a question on the planning --

MS. COSTA: I also -- I also wanted to take this opportunity to just note that the removal of this house from the specific site does actually pose a detriment in the case of --

MS. PRICE: That's testimony.
MR. REGAN: Now you're getting involved in testimony.

MS. PRICE: Now you're giving testimony.

MS. COSTA: -- grants, potential grants for the 250th.

MS. PRICE: All right. We're going off
--
MS. COSTA: I'm also on that council.
MS. PRICE: -- going off the topic.
MS. COSTA: I'm sorry.
MR. REGAN: This is the time for
questions.
MS. COSTA: Okay.

So, I'll just ask some questions then, but that was something that I wanted to correct because earlier folks had said that it --

MS. PRICE: We're back on, we're back on.

MS. COSTA: Anyway, what cultural value do you place on the property itself?

THE WITNESS: I did not.
MS. COSTA: I mean, we just had questions about, you know, like, obviously, you're valuing the, you know --

MS. PRICE: I think he answered the question. He said, "I did not."

MS. COSTA: No, this was actually one of the first questions asked. I'm going off of that.

MR. REGAN: He answered your question.
Next question.
MS. PRICE: Yeah, next question.
MS. COSTA: Okay.
But he is agreeing that the value is placed on the facility, not the --

MR. REGAN: He answered your question.
You don't need to editorial it, just ask the question.

MS. COSTA: Okay.

Does this development get less -- more or less valuable on the specific property?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, does what?
MS. COSTA: Does this development, does
it get more or less valuable on this specific property --

MR. REGAN: He didn't talk about economic value.

MS. PRICE: No, yeah.
MR. REGAN: That's irrelevant --
MS. COSTA: No, no, no, not economic value, value to the community, because, you know, we've talked about other lots and everything.

MS. PRICE: I don't think this witness opined on value to the community --

MS. COSTA: That's -- let's see, larger community benefit.
(Audience Outburst.)
MS. PRICE: Wait a second, wait a second, everybody yelling.

He didn't testify as to value on this property versus other properties, that was my statement.

MS. COSTA: I'm sorry, I -- replace that word with another word, benefit.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, so what's the question now?

MS. COSTA: Does this development get more or less beneficial on this specific property or, you know, the same value for the town on another property?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand the question, but I assume you don't mean real estate value.

MS. COSTA: Yeah, I'm talking about everything that you've spoken about as benefits to the Master Plan and everything.

THE WITNESS: So, the inherently beneficial status travels with the use.

So, no matter where it's located, you would hear me argue that it's inherently beneficial.

MS. COSTA: Okay.
So, it's not the property, itself.
THE WITNESS: It's the use. And it's specific to a use variance and, again, that value is not real estate value, it's the value to the community.

MS. COSTA: Right, and that's like invaluable, right, you know, like you can't really put a price on it.

Going off of that, what value do urban planners, such as yourself in this situation, place on archaeological possibilities? Especially artifacts from indigenous nations, enslaved people or free black Americans who in the 1840 s did work on this property.

MS. PRICE: That's outside the scope of --

MR. REGAN: We haven't heard any
testimony throughout --
MS. PRICE: Right, no historic testimony has gone on the record.

MS. COSTA: Well, from previous
testimony there is no archaeological survey about the happen.

MS. PRICE: No, there's nothing in the record.

MR. REGAN: It's not required.
MS. COSTA: Okay.
Yeah, but, you know, I'm free to ask.
If he wants to answer or not, that's okay.
MS. PRICE: No, there's nothing in the record, so --

MS. COSTA: So, then you pass on the question, that's okay.

MS. COSTA: All right.
Thank you.
Okay. So, are you aware that this historic house, which you have mentioned and, you know, we've talked about, like, the importance of history involved in this, are you aware that this historic house will lose all ability to receive funding nationally and at state level --

MS. PRICE: Okay, he didn't testify to anything --

MR. REGAN: He hasn't testified to
that.
MS. COSTA: He did.
MS. PRICE: No.
MS. COSTA: He testified that there was no impact to this house if it was moved.

MS. PRICE: No.
MS. COSTA: The impact is no longer able to take grants.

MR. REGAN: He didn't testify about grants.

MS. COSTA: Yeah, but that's okay.
MS. PRICE: I'm objecting.
I'm --
MS. COSTA: I'm asking if he's aware.
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MS. PRICE: I'm going to --
MR. REGAN: The question is irrelevant.
MS. PRICE: -- level an objection across
the board --
MS. COSTA: All right.
MS. PRICE: -- there's testimony --
MS. COSTA: Are you aware that --
MS. PRICE: There's testimony coming in
-- there's testimony coming in on the question that
has nothing do with Mr. Williams' testimony.
MR. REGAN: It was mostly related to the criteria for variance relief.

MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. ELLER: You may be better off with these at the next meeting.

MS. COSTA: I mean, he can always pass on any question, like feel free.

MR. ELLER: Rather than just wasting your time where these aren't things that he can answer.

MS. COSTA: It's okay, like, I'm
actually curious, like, he seems very knowledgeable.
So, if he can answer any of these, that's awesome. I don't think that these questions are meaningless, but okay.

So cultural value, would you place any sort of cultural value of the highest point of Old Tappan -- I'm sorry -- would you place cultural value on the highest point of Old Tappan because this is a mountaintop removal project?

MS. PRICE: Same objection.
No testimony --
MR. REGAN: Objection sustained.
Next question.
MS. COSTA: So, you said that this property was, quote, appropriate for a use, but is it exceptional for a use?

MS. PRICE: Same objection.
MR. REGAN: The question is vague and ambiguous.

MS. COSTA: It's not, it's quoting him directly.

THE WITNESS: What was my quote?
MS. COSTA: Your quote was, this land is appropriate for use, end quote.

THE WITNESS: Correct, that part I stand by.

MS. COSTA: But do you think that this site is exceptional for use as this facility?

MR. REGAN: He didn't testify
exceptional.
THE WITNESS: Right.
And I would just offer from a planning perspective based on the Municipal Land Use Law, that's not the standard and a question was asked in a different way by someone else and I mentioned in my testimony there was a court case that says we don't have to prove that there is an exceptional site. The application before this board and this community is for what's been presented and so part of my analysis would never be in this context, are there exceptional or other exceptional sites.

MS. COSTA: Yeah, because you also said that the site was specifically fitted for certain reasons. You know, what reasons are there that this site is specifically fitted for this specific purpose?

THE WITNESS: Actually, I testified that the special reasons are inherently beneficial, advances the purposes of zoning, particular suitability and undue hardship and I said that our focus was on the first two, inherently beneficial and advances the purposes of zoning.

So, my testimony went through the description of why it's inherently beneficial and
what that meant and the Sica test, the four-prong test and then what purposes of zoning specially it advanced.

MS. COSTA: Is this facility -- would this facility be favorable to a community without anything having to do with COAH or any sort of low-income housing requirements?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand that question.

MS. COSTA: So, a lot of the reasons why this is a beneficial structure is actually due to, you know, COAH and like, you know, land use for affordable housing. It sort of checks a few boxes like that.

So would this facility still be beneficial in the same level it would be that it checks off COAH .

THE WITNESS: So, just keep in mind that the inherently beneficial label is a term of art and I would argue based on all of the testimony I've given thus far, yes, it would still be inherently beneficial, because senior housing, senior living accommodations have been deemed to be inherently beneficial.

MS. COSTA: But, you know, as we've 162
agreed not necessarily on the specific location, it can be anywhere as you've said, we agreed like a question or two.

Is this structure beneficial -- bah, bah, bah, bah, bah, sorry.

Do urban planners place value, like, you know, value from a community to cultural and historic places?

MS. PRICE: He hasn't testified to any of this.

MR. REGAN: He didn't mention cultural in any of his testimony.

MS. COSTA: He did.
MS. PRICE: No cultural. And I think you already asked that question and I objected on a cultural basis.

MR. REGAN: She objected to the question.

I think the objection should be sustained.

Next question.
MS. COSTA: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am, how many more questions?

MS. COSTA: Just a few, don't worry,
just one more page.
MR. REGAN: You've had more time for questioning than any other member of the public.

MS. COSTA: Does anyone else have any more questions?

I'd be happy to step down.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Ma'am? Ma'am?
MR. REGAN: They don't run the meeting, the board does.

MS. COSTA: Okay.
Does anyone have any more questions?
Because I'm very happy to step down until everyone gets their turn.

MR. REGAN: Ask your next question, please.

MS. COSTA: All right.
Have you considered the current insect mass die-off predominantly due to overdevelopment when weighing if a site is beneficial after forest clearing.

MS. PRICE: Objection, objection.
MR. REGAN: Beyond his testimony.
MS. COSTA: Okay. I've asked, like, the civil engineer these same questions, don't worry, it's okay.

MS. PRICE: There's --
MS. COSTA: Everyone objects to them, it's fine.

MS. PRICE: This kind of colloquy -this kind of colloquy really I'm going to ask that it be stricken from the record, because it really is not representative of --

MR. REGAN: Your objection is noted. I don't think it has any relevance and I doubt it will be given consideration.

Ask your next question, please.
MS. COSTA: I've asked this of many of the people stepping up here. Have you considered threatened species, such as the eastern box turtle, salamanders --

MR. REGAN: He didn't testify about species.

MS. PRICE: The same objection.
MS. COSTA: He talked about environmental impact.

MR. REGAN: He didn't talk about species.

MS. COSTA: Okay. He talked about trees and the ground.

MR. REGAN: Please ask your next
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into the new year there's risk that the board may not have the seven members needed to vote on a use variance application, number one.

Number two --
(Audience Outburst.)
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear with the public speaking.

MR. REGAN: I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The public.
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
MR. REGAN: The concern I have is that the board may not be -- have the composition with seven members qualified to vote on the application in the new year.

And in addition, we have the time constraints. Under the MLUL we're way past the time for rendering a decision on this application.

MR. SKRABLE: Gail, are you willing to share the drainage agreement assuming it moves forward?

I know you mentioned sharing it with
Bob.
MR. REGAN: It will be an exhibit.
MS. PRICE: Oh, yes. Yes, that will be
--
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MR. STEINHAGEN: You'll be aware of it.
MR. REGAN: We'll mark it as an
exhibit.
MS. PRICE: That's not a problem.
MR. SKRABLE: Because I'm going to be out of commission. I'm having an operation. I'm not going to be available.

MR. ELLER: So at least before the next meeting so that he can give us an idea of what --

MR. STEINHAGEN: The goal is to have it written and adopted subject to -- I mean, by the board and the applicant.

MS. PRICE: Yeah.
MR. REGAN: That would be great.
MR. BEDIAN: Maybe a few days before the meeting?

MR. STEINHAGEN: Sure.
MS. PRICE: Oh, yeah.
MR. STEINHAGEN: We can always try.
MS. PRICE: So it's -- yes, it's our
hope --
MR. STEINHAGEN: And if not, we'll put it on the record.

MS. PRICE: -- that everything is concluded because we are way out of time on the
statute and we've granted a bunch of extensions.
MR. ELLER: My concern is, obviously, you guys have an agreement, that's great, but we still want to see Tom's opinion of it, because there's other properties in other parts of town.

MS. PRICE: No, absolutely.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, you know, get on your computers and Tweets and let everybody know, next meeting is the last meeting for this application.

So, if anybody has anything they want to say, be here December 14th at 7 p.m., because it's not going to be extended. It's impossible to be extended.

Okay. Anything else?
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioners.
MR. STEINHAGEN: The applicant extends
the time, I assume?
MR. ALESSI: Motion to open the non-agenda items.

MR. STEINHAGEN: Bob, you extended it?
MS. PRICE: I'll talk to Bob. We're only extending to the --

MR. STEINHAGEN: To the 14th, yeah, that's fine, just as long as it's on the record.

MS. PRICE: We'll extend.
MR. STEINHAGEN: There's an extension on the record?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
(Whereupon, this matter will be continuing at a future date. Time noted: 10:16 p.m.)
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