
--

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. We're ready now for the application portion of the meeting.

COUNCILMAN BOYCE: This is when I will

MR. REGAN: Yes, Class I and Class III members can't participate, because this is a D-1 variance.

MS. HAVERILLA: Tom, we don't actually have a quorum as of yet.

MR. REGAN: One, two, three, four, five, we have six.

MS. HAVERILLA: That's enough?
MR. REGAN: We have six.
MS. HAVERILLA: We're good?
MR. REGAN: Yeah.
MS. HAVERILLA: Yes.
MR. REGAN: We only need five.
Ideally you should seven if you're going to have a vote, but you're not going to have a vote on this tonight.

MS. HAVERILLA: Okay.
MS. PRICE: No.
Good? All right. Hi, everyone, Gail
Price from the firm of Price, Meese, Shulman \& D'Arminio back on behalf of CSH Old Tappan.

I just want to talk about a couple of
housekeeping items.
We were supposed to have 90 minutes
tonight and then the second application, 90 minutes.
I contacted -- actually Jen Knarich from our office contacted the applicant's attorney on the other matter and we did a little switching of our time, because I can't proceed with our planner this evening because of the tree expert on the environmental commission.

So I have abbreviated testimony tonight. So how we left it was whatever testimony time I have left, I will give to that application and then we'll switch it for September so it balances out. Okay?

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Seems fair. CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. MS. PRICE: That's one thing. And just in terms of the environmental commission, we did meet on 8/04 with Mr. Levy and Jim Langenstein and Dan, our civil engineer, were there, as well as a representative, two representatives from my office.

And there was an initial walk of the site and Mr. Levy indicated he needed more time to
put together a report.
So naturally we didn't have a problem with that. So we're hopeful that that will be ready for the environmental commission as noted and then to the extent that any of that needs to be addressed, we can then address it at the September 14th meeting.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay.
MS. PRICE: Okay? So tonight I just want to recall our civil engineer.

The board had asked for several exhibits to be prepared in conjunction with line of sight issues both from Lakeview, as well as from Old Tappan Road and also the actual buffers between the church property and our property because there had been some conversation at one of the hearings regarding the actual physical separation, what was there on the church side versus ours and as you'll recall, we actually pulled our building further away from that common boundary line to increase the buffer over that, which was originally provided.

So we have a couple of those exhibits and that's pretty much it. I think that these exhibits address the board's requests.

We will be in a position for September to have a fully revised set of plans that address
questions that have come up from the board, your board professionals.

And I want to just reconfirm that our client will be responsible and has agreed to be responsible for the movement of the historic portion of the home that is currently on our property for which we are the contract purchaser. The applicant, CSH Old Tappan, will undertake the movement of that house and as I understand, will move it across Old Tappan Road and place it on an area to be designated by the senior center.

CSH will also take care of constructing and laying the foundation for that building to be placed upon and then the borough can decide what it wants to do from there, how it's to be used or, you know, maybe take a breath before you make that decision, but we will be financially responsible for moving the structure.

That will not include the part of the house that everybody has agreed is not historic.
It'll just be the historic portion and the barn will be coming down on our site.

So with that, it will certainly affect the number of variances on the site since we're going to be eliminating those that were previously
necessary because of the historic home and its
location and the revised set of plans that Dynamic
will present for the September meeting and in advance of the September meeting so your professionals can review and confirm or revise our list.

We've also tried -- continued to try to gain access to the church's property so that we can also, at our cost, get into the drainage pipe that is located on the church's property.

If you recall we have an easement from our property to the church's property for drainage purposes. And the church had complained that they were having a backup of water on their site, so we indicated that we would run a camera test in the line at our client's cost to determine what, if any, issues were causing, you know, that backup of water and debris.
(Whereupon, Mr. Mamary and Mr. Eller are now present.)

MS. PRICE: Unfortunately we have not gotten access to that line despite --

MR. REGAN: You haven't been permitted access.

MS. PRICE: We have not been permitted access despite multiple attempts.
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to them?
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: You actually spoke

MS. PRICE: Yes.
And Pat Segedin who is our Old Tappan hands, legs, feet --

MR. REGAN: Coordinator.
MS. PRICE: -- coordinator has spoken
several times, and earlier in the conversation there seemed to be reasons relating to events that might happen at the church and other reasons why it couldn't be done.

MR. REGAN: Well, that's not going to hold up the board's decision or consideration of the application in its ultimate decision.

MS. PRICE: Right.
And I need to get the board a final set of plans, because we've had this in limbo now.

So we also made the profer to Lakeview to run the camera test on their side and get in that way to determine whether we can see anything from Lakeview into the church.

So that's on the table. But similarly to the church, we need to bring that to a close as well.

MR. REGAN: Have they denied access to?

MS. PRICE: No, they've actually retained engineering assistance, so we're hopeful that we're going to be able to work something out with Lakeview, but it's got to have a time certain so we can get the revised plans done and to Mr. Szabo and Mr. Skrable and to you as a board before the next meeting. So we'll continue to work on that.

So I think that's everything on my end, so if I could recall our civil engineer.

MR. SKRABLE: Gail, do you mind if I just follow up on those things, a couple of those things quickly?

MS. PRICE: Sure.
MR. SKRABLE: With regard to moving the
house, is -- there won't be any other testimony on that, right?

MS. PRICE: No.
MR. SKRABLE: So just from the board's perspective as far as nailing that down, if they dig it up, move it, put it on the foundation, there's still a lot of work to be done as far as connecting any utilities to it, et cetera.

You're saying your responsibility ends at placing it on the foundation?

MS. PRICE: Right.
favorably on this application, that that would be a condition of approval and clearly spelled out in the developer's agreement. So it's covered in terms of the documentation.

MR. SKRABLE: Okay.
MS. PRICE: And I have no problem with
that.
MR. SKRABLE: And then just drainage-wise, there's just a lot up in the air.

And I know you're trying to get to a final set of plans, I appreciate that. But I don't think we've answered the question of whether or not Lakeview has the obligation to take this water or not. And there are still ongoing negotiations, I'm assuming, with them.

And then, secondarily, the church, if they're not going to cooperate, even though the easement already exists, if this were to be approved and a connection were to be made, we have no idea what the problem is, how bad it is, if there really is a problem, where it is, who's responsible for it. I think it can get really complicated determining who would have to fix it.

MS. PRICE: Well, we're clearly not responsible for anything on the church's property.

The church provided the easement. The church has an easement into Lakeview for drainage purposes that have been on the books and not revised, not voided.

MR. REGAN: It's existed for, like, 30 years.

MS. PRICE: Yes, it's been in existence and not challenged and not revised for years.

The church granted our property owner the right to connect our property and development into the church's property. So there's two different easement agreements that have not been challenged.

But we're trying to assist here by doing a camera test of the line from either one or the other, because we're not -- we're hearing that there's a problem on the church's side, but we're hearing the same that you've heard.

So we're going the extra step offsite from our property that's not triggered by anything that's -- you know, that is happening on our lot, Tom, so...

MR. SKRABLE: I agree with all of that and I think you're trying to be cooperative.

My concern is, this moves forward, the work gets done, somehow the problem gets exacerbated and the public is affected by it, then what do we do?

MS. PRICE: Well, our original plan, and we may end up going back to the original drainage plan, because if both of these off-site properties do not cooperate, it's a private party issue, it's not -- and I think --

MR. REGAN: Well, that was discussed one or two meetings ago.

MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. REGAN: I had thrown out the idea of someone seeking a declaratory judgement. And I think that would not be to anybody's liking.

MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. SKRABLE: I think you were negotiating at that time and didn't think it was necessary.

MS. PRICE: Well, and there -- and our respective clients are still talking with each other, but the missing link is the church.

MR. SKRABLE: And going back to that original plan, I've got a lot of concerns about that plan --

MS. PRICE: Well --
MR. SKRABLE: -- from a design standpoint.

MS. PRICE: -- if I could ask that a
report be issued in that vein, Tom, it would be helpful, because if nothing happens from Lakeview's perspective and the church's perspective, we've been pending for a really long time and I've given the board multiple extensions, but at some point in time we have to say this is the application.

So if you could do a report on that
first plan that we could review with our professionals, it would be very helpful.

MR. SKRABLE: I'm happy to do that, but just to be fair, you've been moving along and saying we're working on it, we're working on it and nothing has happened.

MS. PRICE: That's not -- don't look at our side of the table on that. You know, we -- and, again, it's a private party issue, so it's not a zoning board issue. The easement negotiations are private parties. You have to be satisfied that the drainage works. That's why a report would be very helpful on either one of the layouts, because then Dan can address that, those issues.

MR. SKRABLE: I mean, it's really one issue with the first design, that you're -- you're discharging a pipe at grade, a concentrated flow onto a private party. I don't know that you've got the
legal right to do that, that's the issue.
MS. PRICE: Under Option 1.
MR. SKRABLE: Under Option 1.
MS. PRICE: That has nothing to do with the easement agreement, though.

MR. SKRABLE: No, but I thought you said you wanted a report on both options.

MS. PRICE: Right, but the easement agreement has nothing to do with Option 1; agreed?

MR. SKRABLE: Agreed, yeah.
MS. PRICE: Agreed, okay.
So that takes that off the table, but that's a legal issue in terms of ability to -- and I'll have Dan address this if you need that tonight. I didn't want to get into drainage tonight. I wanted to just keep it to these exhibits, because we don't know where we're going and we need to hear from Lakeview and the church in the next week or 10 days and then we'll be able to address where we're going.

MR. SKRABLE: And I'm not saying you need to address it tonight. I just don't want the board to get backed into a corner in September and you say we've done everything we can do, this is our plan, you got to approve it.

That's not fair to the board.
18 original plan since I filed and I don't have my whole file here, so I can't give you a date, but it was a long time ago.

And we had testimony on that original plan for multiple meetings before we changed it to provide the alternate layout by tying into the church our easement and then the church into Lakeview, but all the initial testimony went in on Option A, so it's nothing new.

MR. SKRABLE: No, but that big question was not answered, do you have the legal right to do it?

MS. PRICE: Okay. We're spinning here.
I will make sure that I address that, but our initial application and the initial set of testimony inputs from the -- from the professionals deal with that and I'm not sure how Dan wants to refer to that, so I'll ask him when he comes up, what we're calling that.

MR. STEINHAGEN: Gail, this might help, this might help.

So can I be heard for two seconds on what Ms. Price just said?

MS. PRICE: Just for the record --
MR. REGAN: Identify yourself.

MR. STEINHAGEN: Sure.
Daniel Steinhagen from Beattie Padovano on behalf of Lakeview, the association and also Angeline Sheridan.

The first time I heard about the camera going in through the Lakeview property was tonight, but I have no problem with that, that's a good idea. So in terms of inspection on the Lakeview property, which is all that I can give to the applicant, they can come on our property and do that provided we work out an agreement, insurance indemnification, things like that, which are the standard things.

But my conversations with Ms. Price, at least to my recollection, were I can't get in touch with Lakeview -- excuse me -- the church. So we're at a standstill.

So the suggestion that she's made tonight, which is, again, the first time I've heard it, I think is at least a good half measure to determine that there's no blockage on the Lakeview property. I can't speak to anything going on on the church, but to Mr. Skrable's point, we agree that we don't think that without an agreement between the association and the applicant that there's a right to do any of this.

```
question?
```

MR. ELLER: So how do we answer that

MS. HAVERILLA: Wait, I just want to be clear, you don't think they have a right to discharge on Lakeview's property, obviously --

MR. STEINHAGEN: Well, so --
MS. HAVERILLA: -- or you don't --
MR. STEINHAGEN: So --
MR. SKRABLE: You're saying either option.

MS. HAVERILLA: Either option.
To join in on the easement, they have no right?

MR. STEINHAGEN: No, absolutely not. Absolutely not.

The -- the church can't confer rights in our property to the applicant. I think we went over this, I believe, in June and I think there's a letter that I submitted that puts our position on the record.

And we agree with Mr. Skrable about the points of discharge onto our property, particularly where they're changing the drainage patterns, but we can leave that for another day since the plan was amended and it's not before the board.

|  | 21 |  | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | I do have a question. I did notice |  | MR. REGAN: It's a question of -- |
| 2 | that the agenda said we were starting at 7:30 and I | 2 | MR. MAMARY: Is it -- is it based on |
| 3 | did see people coming in. Is that something -- I | 3 | what the property was originally used for that the |
|  | mean, did that get changed? I just want to make sure | 4 | easement was allowed that if the property changes its |
| 5 | that we're not -- | 5 | usage -- |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: The meeting starts | 6 | MR. REGAN: There's no language |
| 7 | at 7:00. |  | regarding anything. |
| 8 | MR. STEINHAGEN: Yes, I understand | 8 | MR. MAMARY: Because -- because if it |
| 9 | that, but the agenda which is posted on the board's | 9 | changes its usage, then maybe the applicability for |
| 10 | website advises the public that this was going to -- | 10 | the easement isn't exactly the same. |
| 11 | this particular portion was going to start at 7:30. | 11 | MR. REGAN: There's no prohibitory |
| 12 | If it was changed, that's fine, but I didn't know | 12 | language, no limitation as to the extent of |
| 13 | that and I got here at 7:10. | 13 | development. |
| 14 | MR. REGAN: Well, we haven't really | 14 | MR. STEINHAGEN: So, Mr. -- |
| 15 | done much. | 15 | MR. HAVERILLA: When was that easement |
| 16 | MR. STEINHAGEN: No, I understand -- | 16 | -- |
| 17 | MR. REGAN: -- except hear from | 17 | MR. STEINHAGEN: Mr. Mamary, I |
| 18 | Ms. Price. | 18 | apologize -- |
| 19 | MR. STEINHAGEN: -- but they're | 19 | MR. MAMARY: Mamary. |
| 20 | entitled to hear Ms. Price too. | 20 | MS. HAVERILLA: -- given? |
| 21 | If it was changed, that's fine. | 21 | MR. STEINHAGEN: I apologize. |
| 22 | MS. PRICE: I don't know how many | 22 | The example I gave the last time I was |
| 23 | people want to hear Ms. Price. | 23 | here when I spoke about this was, if I gave my |
| 24 | (Laughter.) | 24 | neighbor an easement to use a path in my backyard, my |
| 25 | MR. BEDIAN: Come at 7:00 next time | 25 | neighbor can't give his cousin an easement to use the |
|  | 22 |  | 24 |
|  | so... |  | path in my backyard, I have to do that. It's the |
| 2 | MR. STEINHAGEN: No, but you put it on | 2 | same principal. |
| 3 | the agenda that it was starting at 7:30, that's the | 3 | MR. MAMARY: Right, but if you had a |
| 4 | -- the point I'm making. | 4 | path to use to your backyard, but then you changed |
| 5 | MR. REGAN: Well, look, that's an | 5 | the usage of your property to a multi -- |
| 6 | estimate as to. | 6 | MR. STEINHAGEN: I agree. |
| 7 | COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Yeah, otherwise | 7 | MR. MAMARY: To a carnival, now all of |
|  | they're going to sit around for 15 minutes. | 8 | a sudden people that are attending the carnival can |
| 9 | MR. STEINHAGEN: It's the board's -- | 9 | use the path. |
| 10 | it's the board's prerogative. | 10 | So I'm asking now that it was a |
| 11 | I just was curious, but... | 11 | single-family, five-unit development or allowed to be |
| 12 | COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: We won't put times | 12 | development, now all of a sudden is a 100-bed unit, |
| 13 | in anymore. | 13 | it changes the usage. |
| 14 | MR. STEINHAGEN: Okay. | 14 | MR. STEINHAGEN: I -- I -- |
| 15 | MS. HAVERILLA: Yeah, just the closing | 15 | MR. MAMARY: So, therefore, I'm asking |
| 16 | time. | 16 | our attorney and you're an attorney, I'm assuming -- |
| 17 | MR. MAMARY: Can I ask our attorney a | 17 | MR. STEINHAGEN: Yes. |
| 18 | question? | 18 | MR. MAMARY: -- with Beattie Padovano. |
| 19 | Is the -- the easement that the church | 19 | MR. STEINHAGEN: You're going -- you're |
| 20 | has that gave to the developer -- to the townhouse | 20 | going the next step and I agree with you. |
| 21 | complex, right, is that a -- that's not assignable? | 21 | MR. REGAN: But there is no prohibitory |
| 22 | MR. REGAN: No, it's recorded. | 22 | language and no restrictions. |
| 23 | MR. MAMARY: It's recorded? | 23 | MR. MAMARY: Well, but it might allow |
| 24 | MR. REGAN: Yes. | 24 | the church to change. |
| 25 | MR. MAMARY: So is it able to be -- | 25 | MR. REGAN: Correct, that's why I |

suggested that someone --

MR. MAMARY: And that's maybe what Tom was saying in a certain kind of way, that there's no -- there's no, maybe, ability to assign responsibility.

MR. HAVERILLA: Well, when was the -it could have to do with the ownership and the use of the property when this was done, because at some point it was the church and this property, so...

MR. REGAN: 1991, I have it right here.
MS. HAVERILLA: So...
MS. LOULOUDIS: Didn't the church own 244 at some point?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. STEINHAGEN: Not at the time of the easement, though.

MS. LOULOUDIS: Not at the time of the easement?

MR. STEINHAGEN: No.
MS. PRICE: Well --
MS. HAVERILLA: It was not purchased by
the Korean church at that point?
MS. PRICE: Right.
MR. STEINHAGEN: No, it wasn't purchased at the time.

The easement that Lakeview gave to the church was only for the property that the church building is on.

MS. HAVERILLA: And that was a Korean Presbyterian Church?

MR. STEINHAGEN: I'm not sure who -what the denomination is.

MS. HAVERILLA: Well, the only reason
I'm saying that is because a Korean Presbyterian Church inevitably bought --

MR. STEINHAGEN: Sure.
MS. HAVERILLA: -- the property, so that is why maybe they gave the easement, because they owned both the properties.

MR. STEINHAGEN: All I know is that the easement allows drainage from a particular lot. It doesn't say you can or you can't, but it just -- I mean, your attorney will tell you --

MS. HAVERILLA: Right.
MR. STEINHAGEN: -- there's no
prohibitory language, but as a matter of basic property law, you can't extent an easement to an additional property without the consent of the party that's giving the easement.

MR. REGAN: Correct.

MS. PRICE: Well, can I just add a couple of things there?

Because the title search reflects exactly who owned the property, when they owned it and it's not as simple as just saying, you know, the church and Lakeview, because there were a series of ownership entities involved, including a buyout of a mortgage from Valley Bank, Valley National Bank.

So, we also don't know if the drainage was changed on the church so that all of the drainage coming from the church that had been directed into that 15 -foot easement that was established back in the early '90s was still in effect.

So they may have directed some of their drainage in a different manner, a different location, thereby providing us with the ability to tie in.

All of this is -- unless it refers to the drainage component of our application, I would present to the board is a private party/private party-issue that needs to be decided by the Superior Court of New Jersey.

MR. REGAN: That's what I said two meetings ago.

MS. PRICE: Right.
It's not for the zoning board to get,
you know, wrapped up in who owns what and how did it get there and all of these different issues.

That as Mr. Steinhagen said, it's a concept of fundamental property law. What I just said is a concept of zoning law.

MS. HAVERILLA: But wouldn't it help the planning board if this -- what was it?

MR. REGAN: Declaratory judgement.
MS. HAVERILLA: -- declaratory judgement was done, so that at least the planning board would be clear as to what can be done?

MR. REGAN: Well, a judge would sort it out and everyone would know what everyone's rights are and obligations.

MS. PRICE: If you get a judge that --
MR. REGAN: I'm sorry?
MS. PRICE: If you get a judge who --
MR. REGAN: Well, that's the problem too.

MS. PRICE: -- understands zoning law.
MR. SKRABLE: Bob, you obviously know this stuff better than I do, but...

MR. REGAN: I don't know about that.
MR. SKRABLE: Let's say we approve -let's say we were to approve an application with a

and then thing collapses, what's left after that when you guys -- if something like that were to happen and the house came down while you were moving it, it crumbled, what do you guys plan to do to document it to...

MS. PRICE: I'm not sure I follow you. We have pictures of inside and outside --

MR. ELLER: Okay.
MS. PRICE: -- already. No one had a key, so our historic consultant climbed in one of the windows and took pictures.

So we have -- we have a whole set of photographs at our disposal.

So, but, you know, just -- I think what happens is that, like in any -- any project, that if it -- if it doesn't stand up, it comes -- it comes down.

But every -- we'll exercise what's required under proper professional guidelines.

MR. ELLER: If any of the other, like Bergen County groups or the other historic groups wanted to come in and do the same type of thing, pictures, whatever records they wanted, would you guys have a problem doing that before you moved it, allowing them access?
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I mean anything --
MS. HAVERILLA: I think a lot of that
has been done already, all the stones have been numbered or something.

MS. PRICE: Yeah.
MS. HAVERILLA: I think they've gone --

MR. ELLER: Okay.
MS. PRICE: It gets into access on the property and then liability, you know, if somebody falls.

MR. ELLER: Sure. No, I understand that.

MS. PRICE: So --
MR. MAMARY: That's why you have insurance.

MS. PRICE: I know, but if you have all kinds of people coming in and out of the property, that's a headache.

MR. MAMARY: You have insurance now, don't you?

MS. PRICE: The property owner has insurance --

MR. MAMARY: Yeah, the property owner.
MS. PRICE: -- right. So --

MR. MAMARY: You get a rider or --
MS. PRICE: I would think that we could present to the borough what we have available already and if there was a need to present more, we would go back at that point, that would be fine.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. The floor is still yours.

MS. PRICE: Dan?
MR. REGAN: Mr. Sehnal was previously
sworn at the initial public hearing in February and he remains under oath.
DANIEL T. SEHNAL, PE
245 Main Street, Suite 110, Chester, New Jersey 07930, having been previously sworn, testifies as follows:

MS. PRICE: Bob, I think that my last exhibit was A-26.

MR. REGAN: Right, we're up to A-27.
MS. PRICE: Right. Okay.
Are we doing up top too or no?
MR. SEHNAL: It was on a second ago.
It kind of just shut off, because it wasn't being used.

MS. HAVERILLA: Right, because it wasn't being used.
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MS. PRICE: Can you get this up to Dan.
And maybe just pass it down. Okay.
MR. STEINHAGEN: Do you have another copy?

MS. PRICE: Yeah, it's coming down.
MR. REGAN: We're marking?
MS. PRICE: A-27.
MR. REGAN: What are we calling it?

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. PRICE:
Q. Dan, can you just identify what this is called --
A. Yes.
Q. -- A-27?

MR. STEINHAGEN: Gail, do you have a copy?

MS. PRICE: Oh, yeah, sorry, sorry, sorry.

It will come back around. That's where all the copies are.
(Whereupon, Site Plan Profile Exhibit, dated July 13, 2022 is received and marked as Exhibit A-27 for identification.)
BY MS. PRICE:
Q. Sorry, Dan.

Dan, what's the title on this?
A. Again, this is Exhibit A-27 marked with today's date. It is identified as site plan profile exhibit, Sheet 1 of 1. It is dated July 13, 2022.
Q. Okay. So this was one of the exhibits that the board asked to be done, correct?
A. Yes, exactly. What this exhibit is essentially showing -- I'm going to zoom in here without my mouse.

What this exhibit is essentially doing is providing two site line views from the Lakeview townhomes directly to the north of the site.

The top profile view is Profile View AA, which is the closest townhome building to the site itself. Earlier, I believe, the first or second hearing that I testified, we had the same exact exhibit that we've shown.

However, we've since updated it since the building has moved a little bit further away from that property line and there was some revisions to the berm and retaining wall for that area and then the profile view to the bottom of the two is identified as Profile View BB. And it is the view from the townhome Building 1 to the west over from
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the one that's directly behind the site.
What, essentially, this does, if you
look at the dashed line on both of these profile
views, this is a site line, and normally we would take this from the second-story window, but we didn't exactly know the elevation of that second-story window, so we went a little bit more conservative and took it from the -- essentially the bottom of the peak of the roof, the eave of the roof.

And that line of sight then connects the dots to the tallest portion of the proposed building on our site.

And what you can see here is on the top portion of the site, you have those taller trees and then there's a bold black line that is essentially going vertical through those profile views, that's the property line. So that's the location of the property line. And those trees that are directly to the -- to the left side of that property line are all the existing trees that are on Lakeview property that will remain. And then you have our proposed development to the right-hand side and those lower level trees, those are essentially proposed trees. Those are the height of the trees at the time of planting.
testify, essentially, to the rate of the growth of those trees and as you get into 5, 10, 15 years down the road, those trees will, you know, essentially double in size and begin to grow into maturity and further buffer that.

So the intent of this exhibit is to essentially show that the existing trees to remain will still act as a visual screen to help screen the view from those closest townhome buildings to the highest point of our proposed development and as well as the landscape buffer berm that's associated with our basin, which is that little mound that is directly to the right of the property line, that has the proposed plantings on it.

And as you take the site line from the first story window of those townhome buildings, those trees even at the time of planting, will help buffer and screen the view from the Lakeview townhomes to the parking area on our site to really help, you know, provide a nice visual screen and provide some landscaping buffer.

I don't know if you have any questions regarding that exhibit.
Q. So the next one that was done also at
the request of the board.
A. The next one which I will identify as

Exhibit A-28.
(Whereupon, Site Plan Profile Exhibit, dated June 22, 2022 is received and marked as Exhibit A-28 for identification.)

THE WITNESS: This is identified as "Site Plan Profile Exhibit" with a date of June 22nd, 2022, Sheet 1 of 1.

And, essentially, what this view is doing is providing the same thing, however, it's from the front of the site.

This is a comparison from the Old
Tappan Road to our side, as well as the comparison of the church directly to the east of us.

So the profile view exhibit that is to the left-hand side of the page would be the
difference in elevations from the Old Tappan Road to the finished floor of the proposed building, as well as the height of the finished building.

So, essentially, what we're looking at here is from the roadway to the finished floor elevation of the Capital Seniors building is about a 3-and-a-half-foot difference.

So the Capital Seniors building,
finished floor of that building is 3-and-a-half feet higher than the roadway.

Taking it a step further to the top of the building, essentially where that building is measured to, would be a 38 -foot difference from the roadway to the top of the building.

The exhibit that is directly to the -or the profile view that is directly to the right of that is the same exact type of perspective.

However, it is the view from, essentially, or the elevation of the roadway in front of the church to the same thing, finished floor elevation of the church and the highest point of the church.

So from the road to the finished floor of the church there's a difference of about 6 -and-a-half feet versus the Capital Seniors building is 3 -and-a-half feet.

So the church's finished floor is set about 3 feet higher than the Capital Seniors building finished floor will, and then taking it, again, a step further, the view from the roadway to the highest point of the church is about 49-and-a-half feet versus the Capital Seniors is 38 feet.

So it's just to put in comparisons. I
know there was comments, I believe, from the church at the previous hearing that our building will be higher than the church, it would, you know, stand out a lot more. However, this is showing that the church is plus or minus 10 feet higher from the elevation view when you're looking from the roadway to the highest point of that church.
Q. So we wanted to show this, because that question came up from several board members asking if the church was lower or higher than our proposed building from Old Tappan Road.

So that's the purpose in terms of this exhibit.

And, Dan, just to reiterate those numbers, the differences, we are at 3-and-a-half from grade?
A. Correct, from the finished floor --
Q. Finished floor?
A. -- to the grade of the roadway,

3-and-a-half feet.
Q. Right.

And the church is at?
A. Six-and-a-half.
Q. Six-and-a-half.

And the difference to the top on our
property is?
A. Thirty-eight versus 49-and-a-half.
Q. Okay.
A. Approximate.
Q. Right?
A. Because we have an actual surveyed elevation of the finished floor of the church from the survey, however, the height was taken, essentially, by field measurements in which, you know, it could be plus or minus about 6 inches.
Q. And then you have one more, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That will be A-29.
A. That's correct.
(Whereupon, Site Plan Colorized Buffer
Exhibit, Dated June 8, 2022 is received and marked as Exhibit A-29 for identification.)
BY MS. PRICE:
Q. And I want you to just walk through the different items that are shown on this one.
A. Identified as A-29, this is technically labeled as site plan exhibit, dated June 8, 2022, however, with just color added to our site plan exhibit, so I will further mention this is a buffer exhibit.
well as a retaining wall that is in the northern end of the church property, as well as our retaining wall that separates the two sites.

The Capital Seniors buffer from the property line to the wall is just over 20.1 feet versus the retaining wall from the church in the rear is about 6 feet from the property line and the retaining wall at the front of the property is about 15 feet from the property line, so a little bit closer there as well.

And then, finally, we were speaking in a measure of minimum buffers. So any type of impervious surface or disturbance between those property lines.

The closest item for the assisted living development remains the retaining wall at the northern end of our property next to the dumpster that is cut off just from that screen. That is $\mathbf{2 0 . 1}$ feet. Again, same as our minimum from the retaining wall, that's our shortest possible portion of the buffer is $\mathbf{2 0 . 1}$ feet versus the church's minimum buffer is the existing air conditioning condenser units that is just to the east, essentially the centralized portion of the site is only set back 3-and-a-half feet from the site.

So when we're comparing the church property to the Capital Seniors development and assisted living development, the proposed development definitely provides more buffering in comparison to what exists from the property line to the church today, because I know there was some speculation and questions previously provided by the church that we were closer to the property line than what they had thought.
Q. And you were recently out on our property, correct?
A. Yup, exactly.

We, essentially, wanted to confirm and see what was back there, make sure that condenser unit, that structure was still there.

The structure itself was still there.
However, it looks like they've been doing some construction to those units. I believe that the priest previously mentioned that they would be replacing the condensing units. So they've since been removed.

There's a bunch of trenching that was done. I guess they removed the existing utilities. It looks like a lot of that soil that was trenched back there was piled onto the Capital Seniors
property line and just walking over there, kind of tripping over some trash that there seems to be there was a lot of trash along that common property area as well, but we went out there to essentially, you know, verify that these buffers, how they existed in comparison to the survey.
Q. So just on that point, based upon your -- when did you see that condition?
A. That was on the 4th when we were out there for the tree survey.
Q. On the 4th?

So you attended the initial tree walk
with Mr. Levy, correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And at the time of that walk, is that the time that you noticed the dirt from the work on the church's site being on our site?
A. Yes, yes, absolutely.
Q. And was there a lot of dirt or was it
concentrated in one particular area?
A. It was generally concentrated in one area directly to the southwest corner of that existing enclosure for those condensing units.
Q. And to the best of your knowledge as project civil engineer, you haven't been called in to
look at any construction on the church's property and use of this site that's before the planning board, correct?
A. I have not.
Q. You have not, okay.

So just run down those buffers again, starting with the 47 feet.
A. Well, 67.

So the setback, building setback to the assisted living is $\mathbf{6 7}$ feet versus the church is 43. The driveway setback for assisted living is 26-and-a-half feet versus the church's 17-and-a-half. The retaining wall setbacks are 20 and -- 20.1 for the assisted living versus 6 feet, and 15 feet respectively for the church. And then the minimum buffer overall, the assisted living remains that 20.1 for the wall separation and the church's buffer is 3-and-a-half feet from the back of that enclosure.
Q. So I think -- and you heard me explain what our client was willing to do moving the home and is committed to doing that as a condition of approval, is that your understanding?
A. Yes, absolutely.

When we were out there on the 4th as well, we did take an opportunity to review the

## portion of the site directly across the street and, you know, just from an aboveground visual standpoint, quick inspection, it looks suitable for the relocation of the stone portion of that house. Obviously we would have to make sure <br> there was no subgrade issues, but we'll be placing it right in front of the community garden. And then placing it on a new foundation with no utility improvements or anything like that, simply moving it to a new foundation. <br> Q. And that cost would be borne by our client, correct?

## A. That's correct.

MS. PRICE: I don't have anything else,
Mr. Chairman, just those exhibits for tonight.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Tom, do you have any questions?

MR. SKRABLE: Just one quick comment.
Again, I think you said the trees shown on the cross sections were planted height. They're much larger than that.

I think this is mature height.
THE WITNESS: Well, the -- the trees
that are to the left of the --
MR. SKRABLE: No, like on your property
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if you look at the Old Tappan Road section, you have trees 35 -feet tall.

THE WITNESS: Well, I'm speaking of the buffer to the rear of the site.

Under -- yes, the -- the Old Tappan
Road exhibit, yes, those trees would be the height of the tree at mature.

But these actually might be a couple of trees that are existing on our property. If you look at the trees that are directly adjacent to the building, those will be proposed plantings. The trees may have been a couple that we have picked to remain, but that would be, yes, the mature height.

MR. SKRABLE: Okay.
The same thing in the basin, I think you're showing them at, like, 20 or 25 . I think the largest you are planting is 14 .

THE WITNESS: I would have to confirm with our landscape architect, the actual height at time of planting. I believe it's still that caliper, so I mean, we can certainly provide that if you like us to show trees that --

MR. SKRABLE: And it doesn't change the content. I just -- they're going to look smaller than that.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Mr. Szabo?
MR. SZABO: No, no questions.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anna?
MS. HAVERILLA: No.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Charlie?
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: I have a bunch of random comments. In the order of the sheets I'll do them in.

So the first one, the first sheet that you have which is that one, two questions or comments. One is, where you -- where you decided to do the profile, why did you choose those locations? Because it looks to me that that's where the trees are thickest on the plan.

THE WITNESS: We took that Section AA
was just from the closest point between the two buildings was the same section view that we took from the first exhibit at the hearing. And the second was just from a central portion of the building, no rhyme or reason why.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Only because somewhere in the middle there, and obviously the photograph is not clear, it's actually quite blurry, but it looks like there's a dead spot of trees and

I'm wondering what the view is from that center area.
If you just go a little bit to the left of the yellow line, the right-hand yellow line, yeah, right there.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean, again, this is just a visual representation.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Yes, I'm just wondering, you know, is that going to be as concealed in that location?

THE WITNESS: It's tough to say.
Again, it's just a rendering. It's a
computer-generated image.
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: I understand. THE WITNESS: So we take the elevation of the trees are relatively accurate.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: It seems -- it
seems convenient in terms of --
THE WITNESS: We were not trying to get one up on you or anything like that.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: The second one is
an observation, you probably will like this
observation, but looking at that very top profile, it
looks like the water is draining, the ground is
draining down from Lakeview towards your property.
Is that -- am I reading that right? in compliance?

THE WITNESS: It's a peaked roof, so it's likely measured from the midpoint of that roof. It may be a compliant building height. You mean from the zoning analysis?

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: But it's not drawn that way.

THE WITNESS: Well, that's because it's to the highest point, not to the midpoint where a zoning code likely reads that sloped roof, maximum height elevation.

This is just to represent the tallest points.

MR. SKRABLE: We actually measure peak. THE WITNESS: Okay.
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: So then --
MR. SKRABLE: The only thing that would be excluded is the parapet on a flat roof.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: So, again, back to that question then, is this implying that the church was either approved with a variance at one point or
is not compliant?
THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Not that it matters. I mean we can't do anything about it, I'm just kind of curious why it's 43-feet tall.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: All right. And then the last one is just more of an observation, again, on the last page it shows -and I'm really playing detective here and just looking at different drawings, but it sure looks like there's a lot of impervious on the church property and I just don't know if that has anything to do with their drainage problems.

THE WITNESS: It could be. We didn't analyze their drainage design. I do know that there's an existing detention basin below their parking lot that consists of --

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: That's all pavement.

THE WITNESS: There is a lot of pavement. But I believe that's why the detention system was designed underneath that parking lot to capture the water in.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: That was it, just
fun looking at drawings.
MR. MAMARY: I've got a question for Charlie.

How strong are your glasses?
(Laughter.)
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: I took them off.
MR. MAMARY: What font did you use?
THE WITNESS: So that's just a reduced size of our -- we just printed a smaller version.

MR. MAMARY: Right.
So we're, intentionally, not supposed to be able to read it, right, because...

THE WITNESS: I'd be more than happy to print the board full-sized exhibits in the future, but --

MR. MAMARY: Well, we have this --
MS. LOULOUDIS: We're saving paper.
MR. MAMARY: The second thing in
Charlie's -- follow-up on Charlie, because you're unable to get in touch with the church, you've decided to do a comparative and tell us about how the other property is incompliant in many different areas or at least less compliant than what your application is.

MS. PRICE: No.

put a berm on their property with a couple of evergreen trees which decreased the amount of road traffic noise. But also kind of hides their house. Did you every think of maybe doing a berm with some smaller plantings that kind of get between those 30-foot-tall trees and the -- I going to say stems -trunks?

THE WITNESS: Along the frontage or the rear of the property?

MR. ALESSI: The frontage.
THE WITNESS: I mean, we can certainly look at that --

MR. ALESSI: Both.
THE WITNESS: -- but it was a -- the grade along the front of our property was already relatively steep and our landscape architect always yells at me when I have a 3-on-1 slope, because you can't plant as big trees in there.

MR. ALESSI: That's right, you said that last time.

THE WITNESS: We try to make it flatter for him.

But I mean, if the board wants, you know, a little bit more of a berm, we can attempt to raise it, but the way the grading works out, it makes
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it tight.
MR. ALESSI: Okay.
I'll ask about the fire trucks now.
I'm only kidding.
I'm done.
Thank you.
MR. ELLER: The only thing that I --
the only question I have is we have discussed, I think, at the last two meetings the possibility of an additional or a smaller retention basin somewhere in the location of where the house is currently proposed to be and which would potentially take some of the water away from the Lakeview property and potentially reduce some of the mounding and that was an issue some of the residents raised.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, again --
MR. ALESSI: I don't know if we ever
did that math? Did we ever try to figure that out?
THE WITNESS: Again, I can't change
drainage areas. I can't take less water away from what's going to Lakeview now under, you know, stormwater regulations, but I'm more than happy to see if we can add another basin there for storage --

MR. ELLER: I mean, anything that's currently diverting on the bigger building platform
or the parking lot or anything like that that's going into your seepage pit, into the retention basin, what could we move to divert --

THE WITNESS: Again, are we --
MR. ALESSI: -- we at one point talked about --
(Simultaneous Speaking.)
THE WITNESS: We can certainly -- I
don't want to get back into drainage. We can certainly --

MR. ELLER: The only reason I'm bringing that point up is because we've raised it two or three times and we were told you guys were going to address it.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, we're waiting to meet with the Lakeview's engineer to see if they have any preservations to the our design, but far, far less water going to Lakeview than what's going there currently.

MR. ELLER: I understand what you're saying, but I don't see why --

MS. PRICE: It's on our list. It's on my list for down towards the driveway we said we would look at that whether we could put a smaller basin in there.

MR. ELLER: Okay. Do you think we'd have an idea of what we're looking at at the next meeting?

MS. PRICE: It's on my -- I star everything on my list that needs to be followed up with and I have that as one of the continued issues, when we finalize the overall drainage, that's something --

MR. ELLER: That's going to be a big one for me, so...

MS. PRICE: Okay.
I'll star it again.
MR. ELLER: Thank you.
MS. LOULOUDIS: I have no questions.
MR. BEDIAN: I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: No questions?
MR. BEDIAN: No.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. Can we have a motion to open the meeting to the public?

MR. ALESSI: Motion.
MR. ELLER: Second.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Only questions for
the engineer who just spoke, no other questions.
MS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, can I just ask that our direction just on what he testified to tonight, not prior testimony.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Absolutely.
MR. REGAN: Prior testimony was already covered.

MS. PRICE: Yeah. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am, step forward and state your name and address.

MS. ANNESE: Jen Annese.
Do you need the spelling?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, please.
MS. ANNESE: A-N-N-E-S-E. 24 Lakeview
Drive.
So I'm, like, ground zero right behind everything. And I just want to know, like you mentioned about -- could you just repeat what the plans were for the buffer with the houses directly behind the site?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, so our landscape architect spoke in detail about his landscape plans. I mean, we have a berm that's about 5 feet in height that's about 10 feet off the property line on our property.

So we will be planting as much as we can on that berm evergreen screening, double row staggered along that property line. Also proposing a new solid fence versus a chain-link fence that's in bad shape along that property currently.

MS. ANNESE: Right.
THE WITNESS: I'm happy to work with Lakeview, whatever type of fence they'd like, and then we also offered up providing some additional landscaping on the actual Lakeview property if they're open to that.

But the majority of those, you know, mature trees, there's probably about 50 feet worth of trees between the Lakeview townhomes and the property line, which will remain, those mature trees.

MS. ANNESE: Okay. Thank you.
MR. ALESSI: I just have -- which is
$24 ?$
MR. DAVIS: It's the dead spot.
I'm her husband, I live there. My name
is Arie Davis.
It's the dead spot right where the
Lakeview townhomes are, like where there's a gap in between.

MR. ALESSI: Oh, the dead spot that

Charlie mentioned?

Sierra Club, Hackensack, New Jersey.

```
MR. DAVIS: Yeah.
MR. ALESSI: Okay.
MR. DAVIS: The dead spot.
MR. ALESSI: So you're like the first one on the left of \(A\) ?
MR. DAVIS: I don't -- I don't see -yeah.
MR. ALESSI: Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT REPORTER: Your name, sir?
MR. DAVIS: Arie Davis.
THE COURT REPORTER: How do you spell
--
MR. DAVIS: A-R-I-E.
THE COURT REPORTER: D-A-V-I-S?
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else wish to
be heard?
Yes, ma'am --
MS. WALSH: Yes, I have some questions for Ms. Price --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Come forward, state your name and address.
MS. WALSH: Mary Walsh, North Jersey
    MR. DAVIS: Yeah.
    MR. ALESSI: Okay.
    R. DAVIS: The dead spot
                            MR. DAVIS: I don't -- I don't see --
MR. ALESSI: Okay. Thank you.
        THE COURT REPORTER: Your name, sir?
        THE COURT REPORTER: How do you spell
    MR. DAVIS: A-R-I-E.
        THE COURT REPORTER: D-A-V-I-S?
        MR. DAVIS: Yes.
        CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Anyone else wish to
    be heard?
        Yes, ma'am --
        MS. WALSH. Yes, I have some questions
    for Ms. Price -
```

My question is for Ms. Price regarding something she said.

Is that all right?
MR. REGAN: Well, it depends on what it
is.
MS. PRICE: I'm not a witness.
MS. WALSH: It's about something she
said.
MS. PRICE: I'm not a witness.
MS. WALSH: It's just one question.
Are you aware that infiltration detention basins are not permitted by the borough ordinance on stormwater management.

MS. PRICE: I'm not testifying about what's permitted by ordinance or not. Everything comes -- whatever is in the ordinance is in the ordinance, I can say that much.

And if our plan requires something different than what's in the ordinance, then we need relief.

MS. WALSH: So you are aware --
MS. PRICE: No, I didn't say that.
MS. WALSH: -- that this is not
permitted.
MS. PRICE: I didn't say that. I said
whatever is in the ordinance is in the ordinance.
And if we deviate from an ordinance provision, then a variance is required by state law.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So you will be applying for a variance since this is not according to the ordinance?

MS. PRICE: I didn't say that either.
MS. WALSH: Oh.
MS. PRICE: I didn't say that. I said whatever is required will be followed.

MS. WALSH: Okay. That's good.
Thank you.
MR. SKRABLE: Just to kind of short circuit this if we can, infiltration basins are definitely allowed. I'm not sure where that information, where it came from.

MS. WALSH: Not according to the May 2020 stormwater management rules that the borough just approved.

MR. SKRABLE: Yeah.
MS. WALSH: May 2022 a new set of stormwater management rules was approved by the borough.

MR. SKRABLE: Infiltration basins are encouraged.

MS. WALSH: All I can tell you is what the Bergen County engineer told me today.

MR. REGAN: Well --
MS. WALSH: So there is no -- there is no approval for this.

MR. REGAN: That's a hearsay comment.
We'd need to have the Bergen County engineer come here.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So all you have to do is look at the -- look at the ordinance yourself.

MR. REGAN: You can bring the Bergen County engineer here to testify and call him as a witness.

MS. WALSH: I'm sure that you will read the ordinance yourself.

MS. PRICE: Can I just ask a question back to the witness? You're referring to a specific Old Tappan ordinance?

MS. WALSH: Correct.
MS. PRICE: By -- can you identify
that?
MS. WALSH: It is called stormwater management rules, I believe, or stormwater management ordinance. It's posted on the website.

MS. PRICE: Do you have an ordinance
number?
MS. WALSH: No, but if you go to the website -- if you go to the Old Tappan website, you will find it. You just go to forms and documents, planning board.

MS. PRICE: And is it in the zoning code, within the zoning code?

MS. WALSH: There's a section called "Forms and Documents" on the bottom of the website, you click on that and then it --

MS. PRICE: No, I'm just asking is it within, does it fall within the zoning code?

MS. WALSH: I don't know.
MS. PRICE: Okay.
MS. WALSH: I just know it's within the ordinances.

MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. ALESSI: Can you bring us a copy next month instead of keep saying us look up, us look it up?

MS. WALSH: Sure.
MR. ALESSI: Thank you.
(Audience Outburst.)
FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Look it up.
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't
hear what she just said.
MR. ALESSI: No, we're not going to look it up. It's for you to prove to us what you're saying -- -

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.
MR. ALESSI: -- instead of hearsay.
(Audience Outburst.)
MR. ALESSI: Our borough engineer says
nothing.
Tom Skrable is our borough engineer and he said it doesn't exist.

So the hearsay is upon you to prove him
--

MS. WALSH: It's from May of 2022.
MR. ALESSI: -- wrong, which he is an executive of our board of our mayor and council.

MR. SKRABLE: And I think it's just a misunderstanding.

MS. WALSH: No, I didn't say he was wrong, I just said that maybe he's not aware of it.

MR. SKRABLE: Every borough --
MS. WALSH: It was just approved by the borough in May of 2022. That's all I said.

I did not say he was wrong.
MR. SKRABLE: The borough had to adopt
new stormwater regs based on state requirements.
Virtually every town has the exact same regulations right now with maybe some tweaks on the penalties if you don't comply or something like that.

And infiltration basins are absolutely
encouraged. So I think it's a misunderstanding or a misreading.

MS. WALSH: May I give Ms. Price the ordinance number that she requested?

MS. PRICE: Sure.
MS. WALSH: Okay, 1215-22, Stormwater
Control Amendment.
MS. PRICE: Okay. So that's not within the zoning ordinance.

Thank you.
And is the Sierra Club taking a formal opposition to this application?

Are you here on behalf --
MS. WALSH: We only would like to see the right thing done, following the rules of Old
Tappan and honoring their ordinances and the wishes of the general public, so we're just part of it.

MS. PRICE: You're here on behalf of the Sierra Club, though?

MS. WALSH: Correct.

MR. SKRABLE: And, ma'am, I'm sorry, I know there's other people who want to speak, but just to be clear, the change in 2022 was just to add a penalty provision to the ordinance. That's not the main ordinance.

There's significantly more information elsewhere in the code.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. HOERNLEIN: My name is Carol
Hoernlein, H-O-E-R-N-L-E-I-N.
And I live at 216 Ackerman Avenue in Emerson. And I just want to ask a question.

How many cubic yard of soil will you be moving for the project?

THE WITNESS: I didn't testify to that.
MS. HOERNLEIN: Usually when you do
profiles you have existing grade, as well as
proposed, but -- okay.
I asked that last time and you said you didn't know.

As an engineer I think you should.
MS. PRICE: Wait, can I just ask the
witness, I mean you live in -- you live in Emerson, not Old Tappan?

MS. HOERNLEIN: Not Old Tappan.

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're an
engineer.
MS. HOERNLEIN: I'm a licensed civil
engineer specializing in drainage.
MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: She doesn't live
in Old Tappan either.
MS. PRICE: I'm just asking a question.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, sir.
MS. HOERNLEIN: I just find the
non-answers infuriating.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, sir.
MR. MORANDI: Good evening. My name is
Brian Morandi, M-O-R-A-N-D-I. I live on Westwood
Avenue in Old Tappan.
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, your
first name is it B-R-Y?
MR. MORANDI: No, it's the good way,
B-R-I.
(Laughter.)
THE COURT REPORTER: And your address
again?
MR. MORANDI: 1043 Westwood Avenue.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. MORANDI: In Old Tappan.
Can I -- we can't see back there. So
can we just see what the -- what the picture looks like from the front, from the street?

Because these -- this is what it
actually looks like. There's dead trees everywhere.
And this drawing, what it looks like from the street --

MR. REGAN: This is time for questions, not testimony.

MR. MORANDI: I -- I am asking a question then.

The question is: Did you attempt to make an actual rendering of what the trees look like or are these computer-generated images that would, perhaps, show this view in a favorable view of your project?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's the intent, it shows proposed plantings and --

MR. MORANDI: Is there a favorable view of your project versus what's actually there?

THE WITNESS: Versus what's actually there? That's the existing conditions, this is proposed.

MR. MORANDI: Your going to plant 30-foot-high trees.

THE WITNESS: Trees grow.
planting them that high.

MR. MORANDI: That's -- you know what, I didn't come here to have you be smart like that. I asked you a question. Are you going to put -- I know you're planting trees at time of planting. Those trees are a lot bigger.

Are you going to plant 30-foot-high trees?

THE WITNESS: No, it will be like this height.

MR. MORANDI: That's all I wanted to know.

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Tom Skrable asked that question earlier.

MR. ALESSI: That was addressed.
MR. MORANDI: Okay. All right. No, I know it was.
(Audience Outburst.)
MR. MORANDI: It was addressed from the
back of the property.
MR. ALESSI: No, it was addressed --
MR. MORANDI: Okay, all right. My
apologies. All right.
One other question is: On the
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setbacks, has anybody asked a question about what the level -- I'm assuming you're going to have utilities, you're going to have air conditioning units, you're going to have heat pumps, you're going to have a number of different things.

Has anybody done a study as to what the noise level is going to be for those folks that are in Lakeview?

MS. PRICE: I can answer.
We confirmed and agreed to a condition
to be fully compliant with the New Jersey Noise Control Act --

MR. MORANDI: Okay.
MS. PRICE: -- which regulates the decibel levels 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. and then 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.

That's where the modification is. It's regulated by the county board of health, \$3,000.00 a day penalty for non-compliance. And I agreed to a condition of approval for that.

MR. MORANDI: Okay. I just wanted to ask questions.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.
MR. MORANDI: Thank you very much for
your time.

MR. REGAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am, standing up.

MS. TALOCCO: Thank you, Counsel, for your time.

My name is Linda Talocco.
I live at 2 Manwarren Court in Old
Tappan.
THE COURT REPORTER: Please spell your last name.

MS. TALOCCO: T-A-L-O-C-C-O.
THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. TALOCCO: I'm going a whole different route with this, if you don't mind.

You don't have to live in Old Tappan to actually be a part of an environment that might be impacted by all this --

MR. REGAN: Can you just direct the question to the engineer.

MS. TALOCCO: -- by all this -- by all this building. Okay?

I'm very concerned about cutting down the trees as our children's asthma rates have gone sky high.

MR. REGAN: We need a question to the
engineer.
MS. TALOCCO: Yes, okay, the engineer, all right.

So my question is, is we need a lot of trees. We should be planting more trees than cutting down any amount of trees, because it's hurting our ecosystem. It's going to effect our wildlife. And it's backing up to the wetlands which also will affect our species. And --

MS. PRICE: Could I just ask if there's a question, because he didn't testify to any of this tonight.

MR. REGAN: This is question time.
MS. TALOCCO: I'm sorry?
MR. REGAN: We need a question for the engineer.

MS. TALOCCO: The question is --
COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Based on what he testified about.

MS. TALOCCO: Okay. How many trees are you going to be planting to protect the ecosystem and our environment?

MS. PRICE: Just for the record, we had our landscape architect testify probably 90 minutes at the last hearing.


|  | 85 |  | 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | street? | 1 | church, for visual comparison, do you know that |
| 2 | That -- so there's going to be parking | 2 | setback? |
| 3 | on the left, a tree on the right and then a building | 3 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's closer. |
| 4 | on the right? | 4 | MS. MAGARRO: It's closer. |
| 5 | MS. HAVERILLA: That's the street. | 5 | COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: And taller. |
| 6 | MR. ALESSI: It's Old Tappan Road. | 6 | MR. ALESSI: And taller. |
| 7 | MS. MAGARRO: Okay. | 7 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, they're about |
| 8 | So if there's a car, there's going to | 8 | 50 feet. |
| 9 | be some trees in front of the building. | 9 | MS. MAGARRO: Okay. |
| 10 | Can you tell me what the setback is | 10 | My other question is for something that |
| 11 | from Old Tappan Road from the beginning of the | 11 | this attorney was discussing regarding the... |
| 12 | building. | 12 | MR. REGAN: This is time for questions |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, that was testified | 13 | for the engineer. |
| 14 | the first time I gave testimony. | 14 | MS. MAGARRO: Why can't -- when do we |
| 15 | But to assist our setback from Old | 15 | have the opportunity to talk about what she discussed |
| 16 | Tappan Road to the property line, the front of our | 16 | today? |
| 17 | building is -- | 17 | MR. REGAN: The attorney is not |
| 18 | MS. MAGARRO: What do you mean the | 18 | testifying. |
| 19 | property line? | 19 | MR. ELLER: She asked when she has the |
| 20 | Like I'm asking specifically the | 20 | opportunity to ask her a question. |
| 21 | setback from Old Tappan Road. | 21 | MS. HAVERILLA: When all of the |
| 22 | THE WITNESS: Well, our setback from | 22 | professionals are done. |
| 23 | our property line is 55 feet. | 23 | MS. MAGARRO: So circle back to what |
| 24 | When we widen Old Tappan Road, our | 24 | she said tonight at the end, even if it's a question, |
| 25 | setback from the new roadway will be -- | 25 | not a comment? |
|  | 86 |  | 88 |
| 1 | MR. SKRABLE: Isn't the setback from | 1 | MS. HAVERILLA: Yeah. You can only -- |
| 2 | the property line 74? | 2 | right now you can only ask a question of -- |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, 74. | 3 | MR. REGAN: Of the engineer. |
| 4 | And from the new roadway -- | 4 | MS. HAVERILLA: -- the testimony that |
| 5 | MS. HAVERILLA: Fifty-six? | 5 | was just made. |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: -- about 56. | 6 | MS. MAGARRO: Okay. |
| 7 | MS. MAGARRO: And as we were comparing, | 7 | MS. HAVERILLA: That's it. |
| 8 | how does that compare to the setback of St. Pius? | 8 | MS. MAGARRO: All right. That's my |
| 9 | Because my thinking as I was trying to | 9 | last question. |
| 10 | visualize this is I can't even really St. Pius from | 10 | Thank you. |
| 11 | the road. So -- | 11 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what | 12 | MR. ARDITO: Peter Ardito, 57 Glen |
| 13 | St. Pius is. | 13 | Avenue East in Harrington Park. |
| 14 | MS. MAGARRO: That's the church that | 14 | I'm here representing Bergen SWAN. |
| 15 | you were comparing it to. | 15 | To what you stated, can you sort of go |
| 16 | (Audience Outburst.) | 16 | around to the other -- I guess 27. The trees on this |
| 17 | MS. HAVERILLA: No, the Korean church | 17 | one and the one that's following it, those are what |
| 18 | right next to that. | 18 | type of trees, roughly? |
| 19 | COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: The Korean church | 19 | Are they deciduous or evergreens? |
| 20 | right next door. | 20 | THE WITNESS: The existing or proposed |
| 21 | MS. MAGARRO: Oh, okay, all right. So | 21 | conditions? |
| 22 | when the road is widened, this will be setback | 22 | MR. ARDITO: No, the proposed. What |
| 23 | 50-something feet? | 23 | you're proposing that are going to be planted, are |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 24 | they deciduous or are they going to be evergreen? |
| 25 | MS. MAGARRO: Okay. And the Korean | 25 | THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. |


|  | 89 |  | 91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Our landscape architect testified to | 1 | testifying to the fact that the trees in this picture |
| 2 | that. | 2 | will help screen the visuals of the building for the |
| 3 | MR. ARDITO: And to your testimony, you | 3 | people on Lakeview and from the front. |
| 4 | just testified to the fact that the trees will be | 4 | And I'm just merely pointing out that |
| 5 | helping to block the visual of the new building? | 5 | the pictures -- the trees represented in these |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: Correct. | 6 | pictures are not evergreens. |
| 7 | MR. ARDITO: Well, obviously is it's an | 7 | So for roughly at least a third of the |
| 8 | evergreen, that would work most of the year, where if | 8 | year, if not a quarter of the year, there will be no |
| 9 | it's a deciduous tree, come fall and the leaves fall, | 9 | substantial screening. |
| 10 | that would no longer be doing that job. | 10 | If they were to plant evergreens, there |
| 11 | Would that be a fair thing to say? | 11 | would be much more of a constant screening. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: Screen, but not block. | 12 | MR. REGAN: Last month the landscaping |
| 13 | MR. ARDITO: I'm sorry, would no longer | 13 | -- |
| 14 | screen, correct? | 14 | MR. ARDITO: I just wanted to point |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: Well, you can see through | 15 | that out. |
| 16 | screens. So we'll still be screening with or without | 16 | MR. REGAN: -- according to my notes |
| 17 | trees. Evergreen, yes, would provide more. | 17 | testified that there would be 85 evergreens. |
| 18 | And as I did mention that our landscape | 18 | MR. ARDITO: Right. |
| 19 | architect did testify at the last hearing, not me, | 19 | MR. REGAN: Total of 166 new trees. |
| 20 | that we were providing a double row of evergreen | 20 | MR. SKRABLE: There's a double row of |
| 21 | trees along our rear property line. | 21 | evergreens. |
| 22 | MR. ARDITO: Okay. | 22 | MR. ARDITO: Okay. I'm just pointing |
| 23 | Because I'm just looking at the | 23 | out to you that this picture does not say evergreens. |
| 24 | pictures and the pictures that are on this -- may I | 24 | MR. ALESSI: Well, Mr. Sehnal, can you |
| 25 | take a look at the close-up? | 25 | work with Mr. Langenstein to update your picture to |
|  | 90 |  | 92 |
| 1 | MS. PRICE: Sure. | 1 | show what he testified to for an hour-and-a-half last |
| 2 | FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you turn | 2 | meeting with the evergreen trees, please? |
| 3 | the board just because we can't see it? Can you put | 3 | THE WITNESS: Absolutely. |
| 4 | it on the screen or the computer? | 4 | MR. ALESSI: Thank you. |
| 5 | MR. ARDITO: Just so you know, I'm | 5 | MR. ARDITO: I just want the |
| 6 | looking at this one, this one. | 6 | representation here to be fair. |
| 7 | Would it be fair -- it's 28. | 7 | MR. ALESSI: That's fine. |
| 8 | MS. PRICE: Just say that. | 8 | But he's going to -- the pictures are |
| 9 | MR. ARDITO: This is A-28. | 9 | going to depict what the landscape architect |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Listen, this | 10 | testified to the last meeting. |
| 11 | gentleman isn't here to testify to that. | 11 | Thank you, sir. |
| 12 | MR. ARDITO: No, I'm going by the | 12 | MR. ARDITO: That's fine. |
| 13 | drawing. | 13 | MR. ELLER: And they submitted a plot |
| 14 | And I'm saying this drawing is | 14 | plan with each tree on it, right, showing where on |
| 15 | representing not evergreens, it's representing | 15 | the property? |
| 16 | deciduous trees if you look at them. So I just want | 16 | MS. PRICE: Correct. |
| 17 | to make it clear, the testimony here -- | 17 | MR. BEDIAN: Yeah, there is a drawing. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: What did the tree | 18 | COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: It shows the |
| 19 | expert testify to at the last meeting? | 19 | evergreens. |
| 20 | MR. ARDITO: I'm not talking about the | 20 | MS. HAVERILLA: No, he was here for |
| 21 | tree testifying [sic] the expert in the last meeting. | 21 | that. |
| 22 | I'm talking about the pictures that | 22 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: He was here for it? |
| 23 | have been presented to you right now and to the | 23 | MS. HAVERILLA: Yup. |
| 24 | public are making a representation that these trees | 24 | MS. PRICE: Yup. |
| 25 | are not evergreens and you're testifying, he is | 25 | CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Yes, ma'am. |

C-O-S-T-A. I'm from Closter, but this is a public meeting, so I'm very happy to be here.

So I have a few questions. We know the drill by now, you know, if you can't answer them.

That's fine.
Concerning the deciduous trees, I'm not going to rehash what was just said, but you had just confirmed to Councilman Alessi?

MR. ALESSI: No, financial secretary.
MS. COSTA: Okay.
So you had confirmed previously during
your testimony that they were deciduous trees, so that might be a point of confusion.

So back to your testimony, you mentioned dead or dying beech trees specifically on the property.

Are you aware that the endangered -the federally endangered Indiana Bat lives mostly in bark of dead trees and that might be something to look into.

MS. PRICE: I believe we had that exact question --

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: This is not the tree expert.

MS. COSTA: Okay. He just mentioned beech trees, so...

Yeah, but you mentioned the flowering deciduous trees, blah, blah, blah.

Are you aware of extricated cicada populations, which are endangered by mountaintop removal projects, which this is one?

MS. PRICE: Again --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: This is --
MS. PRICE: -- the witness did not
testify --
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: He didn't testify
-- so, please, this was --
MS. COSTA: Well, I mean, this entire project is a mountaintop removal project.

CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: You're a month too late.

MS. COSTA: So --
MR. ALESSI: Do you have scientific data about the extrication of the cicada bugs or are you just saying, are you aware? Because I can turn around and say are you aware that there's a troop of kangaroos in my backyard. And there's no scientific proof. So --

MS. COSTA: So actually one thing about the extricated local population of the Brood $X$
Cicadas is that we don't actually have much data on it, but we don't hear them.

And the issue, the main issue facing the cicada populations is overdevelopment and since this is a mountaintop removal project, which digs large portions of soil, he doesn't seem to know exactly how much, but since you're moving all of these soils --

MS. PRICE: I'm going to object because this is --

MS. COSTA: -- these populations --
MR. REGAN: She's testifying.
MS. PRICE: -- this is way out of line.
MR. ALESSI: Scientific data?
MS. COSTA: I'm answering a question.
MS. PRICE: No, I know, but you're not
qualified as an expert and --
MS. COSTA: I'm a trustee of the
Closter Nature Center, though I don't represent them today.

MS. PRICE: Okay. I'm just -- I'm objecting for the record: A, you're testifying; and, B, you're getting into --

MS. COSTA: I'm answering a question that was asked of me.

All right.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. Are you
finished?
MS. COSTA: Yup, thank you.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Thank you.
Yes, ma'am, please come forward.
MS. FERDINAND: Kathy Ferdinand, 15 Autumn Lane, Old Tappan.

My question is a little bit about the engineering here and the engineering also of moving -- which was proposed with some conversation here tonight of moving that proposed Dutch Colonial across the street or somewhere else.

I have a question about it. I mean Old Tappan is rich in history. We have historic documents. This is from 1964 from the Old Tappan --

MS. FERDINAND: Yeah.
MS. PRICE: -- and then any house, any building you could have risk to.

MS. FERDINAND: So this is 1760 s.
MS. PRICE: The house I live in is 1760s, so I understand old houses and -- I thought you said 1960s.

MS. FERDINAND: No, 1760, I'm sorry.
MS. PRICE: Well, we've already agreed to condition it.

MS. FERDINAND: And when it -- if and when you move it across the street, it sounds as if it's going in front of the community garden, if that's even the site of where it's going --

MS. PRICE: We offered to move it to a location that the borough wants it. We didn't pick the location. We're moving it at a location where the borough would like to see it go.

So that's not at our direction or
selection, only at our cost and cooperation.
MS. FERDINAND: And I didn't think -has there been a decision that the house can't remain exactly where it is?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
I think that it's going to move, because just like the drainage, we have to get off these issues because we've been pending since February during just the hearing process alone, never mind the time we've been filed.

So we asked the borough, we asked other organizations too for several months and no one contacted us in terms of indicating any interest in moving, preserving, utilizing, any verb that you want to take. We said that we would work with any non-profit organization.

So now the borough has indicated a desire to have it and we've said fine, we're happy to help.

MS. FERDINAND: Well, it just questioned the materials of the 1760 s are fragile, are delicate as you said and --

MS. PRICE: The witness didn't testify that that.

I made a statement as a means of
confirmation for the record.
That's all.
MS. FERDINAND: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Okay. Thank you,
ma'am.
Anyone else wish to be heard?
Yes, ma'am.
MS. FONOROW: Hi, I am Cherie Fonorow, 256 Old Tappan Road, Old Tappan.

THE COURT REPORTER: How do you spell your last name?

MS. FONOROW: "F" as in Frank -O-N-O-R-O-W.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. FONOROW: You're welcome.
Are you aware if the house is moved or damaged, that it will loss it's historic state and federal designation?

MS. PRICE: Again --
MR. REGAN: He hasn't testified as to
that.
MS. FONOROW: That wasn't -- he was talking about the house.

Can I talk -- ask him questions about the house?

9 of his testimony.

MS. HAVERILLA: That was the landscape
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architect.
MR. REGAN: Last month.
MS. HAVERILLA: That was last month.
MS. FONOROW: I thought I heard it again, because I was writing notes based on what I was listening to.

But he did say, I am going to ask you, are you asking the current homeowners -- you said that the trees that are going to be replaced that you're planting on your property, the 244 property, are going to be smaller, obviously, than what's there and are you asking the current homeowners to wait 10 to 15 years to have a screened view, have their views screened of a three-story building and a parking lot.

THE WITNESS: I'm not asking them to
wait.
MS. FONOROW: So they should move if they don't like the view, because they just lost the view that they bought their property for?

THE WITNESS: I just testified saying we're planting new trees.

MS. FONOROW: And you said it will take 10 to 15 years to create a screened buffer?

THE WITNESS: Based on the landscape architect's testimony.
about that.

What is the size, the actual size and dimension of the parking lot and --

THE WITNESS: I didn't provide testimony on that this evening.

MS. FONOROW: -- and the road.
Okay. There's no mention in this of -and/or drawings. These drawings actually don't really show much. You know, it doesn't show the scale, but there's no mention of the other neighbors. You know, are you aware there's other neighbors to the property besides the church and Lakeview.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. FONOROW: Okay. Have you looked at the property from the western side where the wetlands are, there are neighbors that share the wetlands as well, and where the barn is.

And then there's two houses right there on Old Tappan Road and then you've got the neighbors on Leonard.

So there's been no mention of the neighbors at all.

Have you done any -- there's no drawing of what it's going to look like from the point of
view of the west -- the neighbors on the west of Old Tappan Road.

THE WITNESS: No.
MS. FONOROW: Okay.
I would request to see that. I would
like to see what it's supposed to look like, because
I know what it looks like now and it looks pretty amazing and very healthy.

Have you done a site plan of -- I don't
know if it's the same, done a site screening review
and report other neighbors west? Have you taken the neighbors into consideration? Have you even considered possibly not removing the barn and how many trees on the side of that neighboring property? I know all of the focus has been on the church. There's neighbors on the other side too.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
MS. FONOROW: Absolutely what?
THE WITNESS: We considered that.
MS. FONOROW: And what was the
decision?
THE WITNESS: The site plan that's submitted.

MS. FONOROW: So I don't really see anything pertinent to -- well, those -- I don't see
anything -- it doesn't even show the neighbor next door. Unless -- no, that's the stone house. There's nothing on the drawing to show anything that's going on with the wetlands. Would you say that's intentional?

THE WITNESS: I didn't testify to that this evening.

MS. FONOROW: Okay. But this drawing doesn't show --

MS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, the exhibits tonight are just --

MS. FONOROW: It doesn't show -there's other neighbors involved and they're not being -- there's no consideration and there's no conversation about it and I think that's fair.

MS. PRICE: Okay. Let me say my sentence. These exhibits were limited to the board's questions from last meeting and the meeting before.

MS. FONOROW: That's fine, okay.
MS. PRICE: Cherie, I'm not done.
It's a limited purpose. You have seen the site plan and you have asked questions every meeting relative to the site plan. This is not the site plan.

So you asked questions concerning the 106
visibility from other properties.
So I have no problem with you asking questions on his testimony tonight and these exhibits, but --

MS. FONOROW: So if he doesn't testify
-- he's talking about buffers and he's talking about
neighbors and I have every right as a neighbor to ask about a buffer that affects me.

So I'm sorry, you might not think I
don't have a right to ask about it, but it's
obviously been omitted.
MR. ALESSI: No, it was addressed last meeting during Mr. Lang --

FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, it was not.

MS. FONOROW: It wasn't, they did not address from that side --

MR. ALESSI: Please do not interrupt me during a meeting.

It was addressed last meeting by Mr. --
I might butcher his name -- Langenstein for 90
minutes, all the buffers, all the trees, deciduous, non-deciduous, everything else for 90 minutes.

And you came up afterwards and said you were self-proclaimed, whatever, by the town and asked
him 45 minutes worth of questions, which that was addressed too.

So it's almost embarrassing and insulting for you to come back every meeting and ask the same questions of different people, especially what Mr. Sehnal didn't testify to.

It's what we, based on what the -- we asked them to do is the site plan from Lakeview, which this man and woman here, we addressed that question when they said the site plan, the bald spot and we've done that.

Alls you keep doing is coming every meeting asking the same question a different way to different professionals.

He's not addressing the buffer to the west.

He's addressing the buffer that we asked him to address with the site plan from the road --

MS. FONOROW: That I understand.
MR. ALESSI: -- and this.
So your question to him about the west buffer was asked and answered last meeting.

MS. FONOROW: It wasn't asked and answered.

MR. ALESSI: Please go back and read that portion.

MS. FONOROW: It wasn't -- to correct you it wasn't asked last meeting. I was here that meeting. I'm fully aware.

And when I said I'm self-elected, that was talking about the traffic survey, Mr. Alessi.

MR. ALESSI: So --
MS. FONOROW: So it had to do with traffic. It had nothing to do with trees.

MR. ALESSI: Either way you've asked these questions.

Please limit your questions to what he
testified to. We have another applicant tonight also.

MS. FONOROW: I'm asking -- okay. I was asking about a buffer and asking about the other neighbor, so we got the answer and I'm asking for some kind of information specific about what the other neighbors are going to be looking at.

MS. PRICE: Can I ask you, you're saying "other neighbors" --

MS. FONOROW: Yes, 252 and 256, as well as -- well, Leonard you basically get an idea, because they're across the street, but this is the
property from where the wetlands -- we're happy to come look at what the wetlands and what the property looks like from the western side of Old Tappan Road. MS. PRICE: So you're two lots down from us on the western side, correct?

MS. FONOROW: Correct.
MS. PRICE: So your -- there's one --
there's the wetlands and then another lot and then you're the next lot down?

MS. FONOROW: Correct.
So you did bring up that the land from
the -- the land is lower than Lakeview.
So Lakeview is higher in the back than the property at 244 ?

THE WITNESS: I didn't testify to that.
MS. FONOROW: I thought you said when
the gentleman came up, you said that the land is lower than Lakeview.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't
hear you.
MS. FONOROW: I thought he said that
the land is lower than Lakeview.
THE WITNESS: We were speaking of the swale between the two properties. There is a low point on the property line.
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MS. FONOROW: Okay. Are you -- are you planning -- I don't know, am I allowed to talk about the wetlands since you didn't say --

MS. PRICE: No.
MR. REGAN: No.
MS. FONOROW: Okay.
I'll save that.
There is some -- regarding the
property, though, the historic -- I don't know what
it is, there is some historic in your site plan, some
drawing of stone that's in the back of the property that it says it's going to be removed.

Do you know what that is? I've never walked the whole property. I've never been on the property back there.

So it just said on the drawing it shows, like, some historic stone area.

THE WITNESS: I didn't provide testimony on that this evening.

MS. FONOROW: Okay. Let's see.
With regard to the building, the design
of the building, can I ask about that, the
three-story area.
THE WITNESS: That's the architect.
MS. FONOROW: That doesn't fall under
anything you said either?
MS. PRICE: The architect gave
testimony on that.
MS. FONOROW: Okay. You brought somebody new has come up to my attention.

You mentioned widening. Marlboro, New Jersey is objecting to the CHSH building that looks exactly the same as this one.

MS. PRICE: Okay. I'm going to ask that that be stricken and objected to.

MS. FONOROW: So you mentioned widening the roads that were approved --
(Simultaneous Speaking.)
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't

MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: There's a lot of interruption going on here.

THE COURT REPORTER: There's too many people speaking at once.

MS. FONOROW: You mentioned widening the road.

Was that already approved by the county?

THE WITNESS: Yes, conditionally.
MS. FONOROW: Okay. What's
conditionally?
THE WITNESS: Meaning we have four conditions left to address, but they approved the design.

MS. FONOROW: Can you tell us what those conditions are?

THE WITNESS: It's public record. We have the review letter that you can review.

MS. FONOROW: Where do we look that up since you -- are you not willing to mention it?

THE WITNESS: I will submit -- no, I can. I mean I can read it into the record.

MS. FONOROW: We're just wondering because -- well, I was going to ask you how much is -- how much is it going to be widened and how long will the construction be?

THE WITNESS: I testified to that earlier.

MS. FONOROW: How long will the construction take?

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I did not testify to that.

MS. FONOROW: No other questions.
CHAIRMAN WEIDMANN: Thank you.
Anyone else wish to be heard?

COUNCILMAN MAGGIO: Please make it about his testimony.

MR. CARPENTER: Absolutely. Kurt Carpenter, 168 Central Avenue, Old Tappan, New Jersey.

So I was little confused by the drawings, are those exactly -- I mean the different heights and whatnot, are they exactly to scale? It seemed -- it's very little to see the cars from -look different from side to side.

THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, there's a different horizontal versus vertical although they are both done to the same scale.

MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Cool.
So the question I had was because it wasn't clear, looking at the sides there, you said one is like a 6 foot up from the roadway and then another was 3 feet. So on the adjoining property, the church property, they are like -- geez, they're like $10--8,10$ feet below. You're -- the top of the proposed property? And there's, like, a monster retaining wall. So I just -- I'm trying to understand, like, if we're trying to do like an apples to apples comparison on the front of the
church versus in front of that new property, the church height is this. And the other property is this.

How does that account for the height of the hill, for lack of a better word? And how does that get back to making your apples to apples comparison in terms of relative heights and total height.

THE WITNESS: Right, so -- so the elevations are based on actual surveyed datum of the roadway in front of the church, the roadway in front of our property. And then the proposed elevation of the finished floor of our building and the surveyed elevation of the finished floor of the church.

So I believe you're talking about the -- the retaining wall that's between the church property and the property line.

We will similarly have a retaining wall on the same property line. So we will be on the low side of the wall in the front as well as the church. So you'll have the --

MR. CARPENTER: So -- so the retaining wall will essentially be hollowed out on your side?

THE WITNESS: Well, we're on the low side of the wall. The church is on the low side of
the wall. You're going to have a wall -- church is on the low side of the wall. You're going to have a -- a wall --

MR. CARPENTER: And the church is on the low side, right?

THE WITNESS: Correct, we'll also be --
MR. CARPENTER: And you guys -- and the
top of the hill right now is there, we're going to
say like, woop, taking it down. Okay?
So it's just literally just going to be
-- so will it be a retaining wall?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. CARPENTER: It will just be a little bit like a wall wall wall.

I mean it won't be retaining anything. The height will be about the same, yeah?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MS. PRICE: I'm not sure I follow.
THE WITNESS: I think --
MR. CARPENTER: No, because if you take out so much of the -- of the soil there's no longer going to be that much of a delta between the heights.

I was just kind of understanding that.
MS. PRICE: I didn't know if you called the wall something.

MR. CARPENTER: The wall wall wall.
MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. CARPENTER: The super duper wall.
MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. CARPENTER: Okay. So that was what I was trying get an apples to apples comparison.

MS. PRICE: Okay.
MR. CARPENTER: So on the -- on the church design, the representation here, you have that set at a 50 height, right?

So would you say that that is -- that would be, from what you said, that's the highest point on the property, that's the -- the sanctuary.

THE WITNESS: Well, the peak of the --
MR. CARPENTER: Right.
But even though the predominant height of that structure is a lot less because it's heavily peaked for the sanctuary, it's predominantly a two -a two-story property. So it's -- like, the dominant thing is probably the height, so would you -- would you not agree that that's a slightly misleading representation to characterize your client's property in a better light?

THE WITNESS: No, the board had asked us to provide a height comparison so we -- we
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