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PLANNING BOARD BOROUGH OF CLOSTER, NEW JERSEY<br>Work Session \& Special Meeting<br>Wednesday, December $4^{\text {th }}, 2013$

Mr. Lignos, Chairman called the Work Session/Special Meeting of the Planning Board of the Borough of Closter, New Jersey held on Wednesday, December $4^{\text {th }}, 2013$ in the Council Chambers of the Borough Hall to order at 8:00 PM. He stated that the meeting was being held in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey and had been advertised in the newspaper according to law. He advised that the Board adheres to a twelve o'clock midnight curfew and no new matters would be considered after 11:00 P.M.

Mr. Lignos invited all persons present to join the Board in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

The following Planning Board members and professional persons were present at the meeting:
Mayor Heymann
Councilwoman Amitai
Mr. Lignos, Chair
Dr. Maddaloni, Vice-Chair
Mr. Baboo- 8:04 PM
Mr. Sinowitz
Mr. DiDio
Ms. Isacoff
Mr. Pialtos- 8:04 PM
Ms. Stella- (alt \# 1)
Mr. Nyfenger- (alt \# 2)
Mr. Chagaris, Board Attorney
Mr. DeNicola, Board Engineer
Rose Mitchell, Planning Board Coordinator

The following Planning Board members and professional persons were absent from the meeting: N/A

Mr. Lignos read the correspondence list and asked if any members had any comments. There were no comments at this time.

Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Mr. DiDio to approve minutes of October $10^{\text {th }}$. All present were in favor of approval. Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Mr. DiDio to approve minutes of October $17^{\text {th }}$. All present were in favor of approval. Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Mr. Pialtos to approve minutes of October 21st. All present were in favor of approval. Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Councilwoman Amitai to approve minutes of October $31^{\text {st }}$. All present were in favor of approval with the exception of Mr. Baboo, Mr. DiDio \& Mr. Pialtos who abstained. Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Mr. DiDio to approve minutes of November $6^{\text {th }}$. All present were in favor of approval with the exception of Councilwoman Amitai who abstained.

## Item \# 1

Block 2105, Lot 19
13 Sherman Avenue
Application \# P2013-07

Applicant: Cohen
(on behalf of Homeowner)
Even-Chen/Avtalion
Attorney: N/A

Mr. Cohen introduced himself \& spoke of review letter received from Mr. DeNicola. Mr. DeNicola also commented on review letter. Ms. Stella asked for clarification of tree removal. Mr. DeNicola \& Mr. Cohen responded. Councilwoman Amatai asked about existing curb ramp. Mr.
DeNicola responded. Motion was made by Dr. Maddaloni \& seconded by Ms. Isacoff to perfect application with mentioned stipulations. All present were in favor of perfection. (Alternate members did not vote).

## Liaison's Reports

There were no comments at this time.

Open Meeting to the Public
There were no comments at this time.

Motion was made by Mr. DiDio \& seconded by Mayor Heymann to approve 2014 Planning Board meeting dates. All present were in favor.

The Board discussed escrow fee increase. Motion was made by Dr. Maddaloni \& seconded by Councilwoman Amatai to recommend to the Mayor \& Council an increase in legal escrow. All present were in favor. (Engineering escrow was not discussed at this time.)

Mr. Chagaris spoke of resolution regarding 40 Homans Avenue. Motion was made by Mayor Heymann \& seconded by Mr. DiDio to approve mentioned resolution. All present were in favor of mentioned resolution with the exception of Councilwoman Amatai who abstained.

Mr. Lignos stated that the resolution regarding 679 Closter Dock Road is still pending.
Mr. Lignos announced completion of work session portion of meeting \& the start of the special meeting. Time was 8:22 PM.

## Special Meeting Portion

| Block 1607 Lot 1 (BL 1310/ L 2) | Applicant: Closter Marketplace (EBA), LLC |
| :--- | :---: |
| 19 Ver Valen Street (7 Campbell Ave.) | Centennial AME Zion Church |
| Application \# P-2013-03 | Attorney: |

**Refer to attached transcript.

Motion was made by Ms. Isacoff \& seconded by Dr. Maddaloni to adjourn meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 10:36 PM.
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CHAIR LIGNOS: The time now is? MS. MITCHELL: 8:22.

CHAIR LIGNOS: At 8:22, we have, under our special meetings portion of our meeting, this evening, block 1607, lot 1, 19 Vervalen Street, 7 Campbell Avenue, application P2013-03. Applicant is the Closter Marketplace, LLC, Centennial AME Zion Church. Mr. Basralian is the attorney. This is a subdivision, site plan soil movement application, received back on May the 16th. Was deemed perfected with mentioned stipulations on June the 5th's work session meeting. The application was continued and received final perfection on June the 27 th's regular meeting. Hearings have now taken place: July 11th and the 18th, August 7th, 8th, 29th, September 12th, October 2nd, October 10th, 17th, 21st, November 14th. The application is here this evening for continuation at this December 4th, 2013, special meeting.

Mr. Basralian, once again, welcome. MR. BASRALIAN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. The applicant has concluded its case. Mr. Segreto had proceeded with his first witness. I presume he has the
balance of his witnesses this evening. So, it's the objector up on his witnesses.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Thank you very much. Mr. Segreto, welcome.

MR. SEGRETO: Thank you. Nice to see you all. All right. I have one witness with me tonight. That's going to be our final witness. He is Dr. Bahman Izadnehr. And I'll spell that. It's $B-A-H-M-A-N$. Last name $I-Z-A-D-N-E-H-R$. He is a professional engineer, as well as a traffic engineer. Dr. Izadnehr, why don't you come up, please.

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me, John, could you spell the Doctor's last name again?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes. I-Z-A-D-N-E-H-R.
MR. IZADMEHR: M-E- M-E.
MR. SEGRETO: Oh, $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{R}$, I'm sorry.

CHAIR LIGNOS: One more time then, I'm sorry.

MR. SEGRETO: I-Z-A-D-M-E-H-R.
MR. CHAGARIS: Can you raise your right hand, sir. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, I do.

MR. CHAGARIS: Will you please
repeat your name and give us your business address.

MR. IZADMEHR: Sure. Bahman
Izadmehr, $B-A-H-M-A-N$. Last name is I-Z-A-D-M-E-H-R. I'm at 550 Coal Fax Road, Wayne, New Jersey, 07074.

MR. CHAGARIS: And you are a professional engineer?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, I am.
MR. CHAGARIS: Licensed in the State of New Jersey?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
MR. CHAGARIS: And you're a traffic engineer?

MR. IZADMEHR: I'm also a traffic engineer.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay.
EXAMINATION BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q Dr. Izadmehr --
MR. BASRALIAN: Before -- are you -are you going forward with qualifications or are you --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Well, I'm sure he is doing that right now.

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah. Qualifications, yeah, of course. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q Dr. Izadmehr, would you please give us the benefit of your educational, professional background as an engineer.

A Sure. I have 3 degrees in civil engineering from University of Texas at Austin, bachelor of science in civil, a master of science and a doctorate of philosophy in civil engineering. I'm a professional engineer in the State of New Jersey since 1990. I'm also a certified I.T.E., Institute of Transportation Engineers, Professional Traffic Operation Engineers. I have been practicing in the field of civil engineering, site engineering, transportation engineering, structural engineering, since 1980 .

I have appeared before numerous boards in the State of New Jersey, in New York, in Texas, and in some other states. I have appeared, also, as an expert witness in Superior Court of New Jersey.

I don't believe I have been before this very court. But I have been in neighboring towns.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Can you name one of the neighboring towns.

MR. IZADMEHR: I have been in Mahwah, in Upper Saddle River, in Paramus.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Members of the board, does anyone have an objection? I don't see any from the board's side. Mr. Basralian?

MR. BASRALIAN: Yes. Excuse me, but I want to make sure I get this right, Izadmehr?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
EXAMINATION BY MR. BASRALIAN:
Q Mr. Izadmehr, you said you were a civil engineer and a traffic engineer. In civil engineering, how many site plans have you prepared in the last two years?

A Last two years, about -- I do have to guess. I don't know exact number. But over five.

Q All right. And how many of those were for shopping centers? A About two.

Q Okay. What -- of the five that you prepared, where were the two shopping centers that you prepared?

A I have prepared small shopping center in Wayne, New Jersey. And I have also worked on

Bergen Mall in Paramus.
Q Let's start with, how big was the shopping center in Wayne, New Jersey?

A About 10,000 square feet.
Q Thank you. Was that a freestanding store or multiple stores?

A Multiple stores.
Q And you said you were involved with -- you worked on Bergen Town Center. What was your -- in what capacity did you work with respect to the site plan?

A I basically reviewed the site plan and provided my professional comments to the site plan. Also, I prepared the master transportation plan for the entire mall, including its on-site parking, parking decks, intersections, roads.

Q But you didn't prepare the site plans?
A I did not prepare the site plans.
Q All right. I thought that's what you had said.
Ao.
Q And you said you practical five site
plans. We've covered -- in the last two years,
we've covered two. What were the other site
plans?

A I also prepared the site plan in Jersey City for a gas station with a convenience store. I've also prepared a site plan for a four story medical office building with retail on the bottom floor, in Newark, New Jersey.

Q Is the predominance of what you work on, as a civil engineer and site plan, those types of stores, 10,000 square foot store, a gas station, and that type, rather than a shopping center of the magnitude before the board? A Yes.

MR. SEGRETO: In terms of site plan preparation?

MR. BASRALIAN: As a site engineer.
MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
MR. BASRALIAN: He testified he prepared site plans. And I just want to know what areas that he dealt in.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, I have.
BY MR. BASRALIAN:
Q Have you -- are you also testifying this evening as a traffic engineer?

A I don't believe so.
MR. SEGRETO: I'm only offering him
for a limited purpose. He's going to compare a conceptual site plan, to the one that's proposed by the applicant. And to the extent that he may talk about some site circulation, in comparison, in comparing the conceptual plan. But he did not review any of the traffic plans, traffic reports -- excuse me, either by the applicant or by the board's engineer. So, we're not going to be reviewing traffic in depth.

MR. BASRALIAN: Is he propose -- I ask you, John, is he proposing to submit a site plan of some type as -MR. SEGRETO: Yes. Yes, he has with him a conceptual site plan that he will be testifying to.

MR. BASRALIAN: I believe I asked the board if Mr. Segreto was going to be submitting reports or plans, I believe the answer was, no, there were none intended. And, so, at this late date, on December 5th -- 4th, I'm sorry, I understand there is a site plan, a conceptual site plan that's going to be presented tonight, which neither the board, nor $I$, have had an opportunity to see before. And that was specifically asked on two separate occasions.

MR. SEGRETO: This site plan is the site plan that this board entered into evidence in 2009 application. Same property. Same applicant. People came in and testified with regard to that plan. It was a conceptual plan that we propose is a better zoning alternative, better site design alternative. That is the plan. There's no surprise. It's the same plan. And I've asked -I've Dr. Izadmehr to review both the site plan, the applicant's site plan that's been submitted here, as well as the L2A plan, which was previously submitted, for the purposes of rendering an opinion with regard to whether or not the better zoning alternative and/or a better site design. So, that's what he's prepared. That's what I'm offering him for those purposes.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, actually it should have been presented ahead of time, at least certainly ten days ahead of time, which the applicant did on its plan.

MR. SEGRETO: I know. But there's no required --

MR. CHAGARIS: But for purposes of tonight, $I$ think we'll allow him to -- if you can pass it out, I don't know if you want to pass it
out now.
MR. SEGRETO: I don't have copies. I only have it on the board.

MR. BASRALIAN: I do have a question though. This plan was prepared by Mr. Dipple, and not by this witness, then what is the basis for -MR. CHAGARIS: I think what the -Mr. Segreto says is that it's basically a conceptual concept just to help illustrate his testimony. That's my understanding of what he talks about. It's not really a plan for, per say, to be approved or not approved. It's done, designed to illustrate what he's testifying to about, how it's a better circulation plan alternative. I don't think it's technically a matter of evidence. It's more of an illustrative, I'm repeating myself, of his testimony. I think, while it should have been presented earlier, I think we can proceed, because he's not testifying about its accuracy or its -- or its drawn -- being drawn to scale or not, but it's just basically, am I correct, it's basically more or less for illustrating his testimony.

MR. SEGRETO: Right. It's our position, in this case, that the applicant was
required to prove to this board that their proposal presents a better zoning alternative for this property. Now, I didn't hear any testimony from the applicant with regard to that. But that's certainly to see. What he is going to testify, is, he's going to testify about this plan. The plan has smaller buildings, more plazas, more landscaping, different types of access. And it's going to be his testimony that this conceptual plan offers a better zoning alternative, better site design than that which the applicant has presented to this board for approval.

MR. CHAGARIS: In any case, the board, I'm sure, will take this -- the plan, and the testimony for, and give it the weight that the board thinks it deserves. I don't think it's, at this stage, appropriate to bar the use of the proposed plan, but, as I said, the board will give it as much weight as it thinks appropriate.

MR. BASRALIAN: Well, two comments. One, I reserve my right to object as the testimony goes forward. Second, I don't believe that our burden was to give a better zoning alternative. We were talking about an alternate site plan, or a
site plan modifications to the existing center, not a zoning application. And I think that's a misstatement on the part of Mr. Segreto.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. In any case, why don't we proceed.

MR. SEGRETO: And just one last
comment. There's no requirement in the Municipal Land Use Act, that an objector has to present its exhibit ten days prior to their witnesses testifying about those.

MR. BASRALIAN: Yeah, but your comment was, you didn't have anything to present. Because the question was asked at the two past hearings as to whether or not there would be any reports or plans, and you said there would not.

MR. SEGRETO: I was only talking about reports. I did not anticipate anybody doing a report.

MR. CHAGARIS: All right, the point has been made. Why don't we proceed.

MR. SEGRETO: All right.
BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q Dr. Izadmehr, before you -- before you get up and you set up that board, just please tell the board, additionally, the either documents
and/or transcripts, or other matters that you reviewed for purposes of your testimony tonight. A Yes. I have briefly reviewed the site plan, which was presented to the board, as well as the previous testimony that have been presented by the applicant. I've also looked at the traffic report, which was prepared by the applicant's consultant.

MAYOR HEMANN: Can you speak a
little louder. I'm having a hard time hearing you.

Q And are you familiar with the site?
Have you visited the site?
A Yes, I have visited the site.
Q Okay. All right. Then I'll ask you to please, put the board -- put the board up. Come to my left actually and set it up there.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Segreto, just for the record, because I misunderstood. You said that the witness had not reviewed the traffic, or did I misunderstand that?

MR. SEGRETO: Well, I'm not offering him for review of the traffic. He may have -- he may have just looked at the report. I gave him, you know, I gave him a file. So, he may have
reviewed that report. But I'm not offering him as with regard to that report, or any of the traffic. To the extent that he talks about traffic, it's only going to be with regard to this conceptual plan. Doctor, why don't you set it behind the mayor. Unfortunately, the mayor will have to turn. And our proposed ID would be $0-6$ for this conceptual plan.

MR. BASRALIAN: Just for
clarification, it's my understanding that this plan that goes -- this conceptual plan that goes, apparently back to 2009, but there was another application here, is going to be proffered as an alternative to the plans submitted by the applicant, which is different than anything that occurred in 2009. And I don't see the relevance of using a plan from 2009 as an alternative, when it's not the same plan. It's not being compared to the same plan that was submitted in 2009. The plan that was submitted with this application is different.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah, but my understanding is that he is comparing what is on the easel there now, $0-6$, to what is presently proposed.

MR. SEGRETO: He's testimony is going to be that it's a better zoning alternative site design than what they're proposing now, here, in 2013. He has indicated he has reviewed the 2013 site plan. Yes, it's obviously different, because we think it's a better plan than what they're proposing.

BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q All right, Doctor, if you can, please start at the -- why don't you start at the K-mart building and walk us through the plan, and why don't you tell us how this plan is different from the plan the applicant is proposing before this board.

A The K-mart building is on the upper left. It's basically the first facility building at the existing site, which is going to basically remain in Phase I. And in phase II it will be reduced in size a bit.

Q Now, the existing -- the existing
square footage of that is approximately 84,000 square feet, is that correct?

A Yes, 84,000, but we are proposing, in lieu of that 84,000 square foot building, a 61,000 square foot building. Basically creating
landscaping behind it, with pavers, for pedestrians. So, we are basically opening the shopping center for the pedestrian traffic from Homans Road -- Homans Avenue, to the shopping center, which doesn't really exist today. And, also, we are maintaining that existing driveway, which means the existing K-mart building, which is going to be remaining as part of this proposed site plan, and the previous -- previous vacated supermarket. And, also, we are widening it and landscaping that driveway, and instituting a bikeway. Which is, again, in conformance with the new recommendations by the federal government, State of New Jersey, and New Jersey Department of Transportation and many municipalities. Basically this concept is called a complete street design. That includes all type of users, from walking to motoring.

Q All right, and with regard to that existing supermarket space, this conceptual site plan keeps it at 27,000 square feet, is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Now --
A In lieu of 41,000 square feet.

Q All right, which is being proposed by the applicant. If -- on this conceptual plan, if you wanted to make the supermarket larger, let's say 30 or 35,000 square feet, under this conceptual plan could you do it?

A Yeah, you could do it by basically taking the space from the neighboring building, which is called building $B$, and $I$ don't remember what it's called on the applicant's site plan, but immediately to the east of the existing vacant building.

Q Now, behind that supermarket space, and the building $B$, I see you provide parking, is that correct?

A Yes, not only parking. But also we're providing a strip of landscaping for a buffer zone, as well as a sidewalks, paver sidewalks.

Q Now, when we get to the -- that furthest driveway, I guess that's the easterly driveway on Homans Avenue, are cars able to traverse into the front of the shopping center under this conceptual plan?

A Yes, they are.
MR. BASRALIAN: Could you please
indicate it. It's tough to see it. It's pretty
small from here.
Q All right. Why don't you show us the driveway that we're talking about, whether or not you can traverse all the way into the front of that property from the driveway.

A This is the existing driveway right here. Again, which is part of, $I$ believe, the agreement that was signed by the township, as well as the previous developer, back in 1971. So, they are basically proposing to open this up to the front of the shopping center, and having direct access from Homans Avenue to the front parking lot.

Q All right. I was speaking with the driveway to the furthest to, I guess that's the east, is that correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. Tell us about -- tell us about that driveway, and whether or not you can turn into the front --

MR. MADDALONI: Just for the record, I would like to express my displeasure in not being able to see this, and having one single map for the whole room. It's absurd.

Q Can you continue with that, please, sir.

A Sure. Well, it's right here. Basically it's all the way to the easterly edge of the building, building $D$ on this plan. There's a small driveway that you can have access to the front of the -- to the back of the building on to the --

Q But you can't traverse into the front of the front parking lot, can you?

A No, you cannot.
Q Is that consistent, also, with the agreement that you referred to between the town and the owner of the property?

A Yes.
MR. BASRALIAN: I object. There's
no foundation for any agreements between the town. This -- this witness is here as a engineer. Not as a, an attorney with respect to agreements. And I object to his testimony.

MR. SEGRETO: We marked for ID, at the last hearing, $0-4$, which was an agreement dated April 11, 1973, between Closter Plaza, Inc. and the Borough of Closter.

MR. BASRALIAN: That doesn't make it relevant for this particular witness to testify to.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, that's a legal argument. But, you know, the man can testify it's consistent with the recorded agreement that is now a restriction on the property. Yes?

MR. CHAGARIS: Go ahead, ask your next question.

Q All right. Now, I want you to please go down to what you have on there, talk about that very large plaza right there in front of building $B$ in front of -A Again, for this proposed concept plan being a better zoning alternative, as well as a better site plan, we are also proposing quite a bit of plaza in the back of this -- in the back of the parking lot, or in the front of the main building, which will become part of this supermarket. It creates an open space. It creates a place that people can gather. And especially it's within the walking distance of the theater. So, not only are we providing basically an outdoor seating plaza where people can sit and relax and have a cup of coffee, or a drink. We are also providing, immediately next to the theater, another plaza.

Q With regard to the amount of plazas
on this plan, compared to the plazas that are proposed on the applicant's, is there a substantial difference between the two plans? A Oh, yes, the proposed -- with what is being proposed here, is about three to four times in size of what the applicant is proposing in their site plan. So, of course, this encompasses a lot more area for outdoor seating and plazas.

Q All right. Now, I want you to talk about the front of the property there on Vervalen Street. Tell us about that green area that is demarcated on that plan.

A Sure. As we walking through the parking lot you will see that we are also introducing more the landscaping islands. Again, trying to break that massive pavement structure for parking, by creating landscape islands, and, also, presenting a better, esthetically better pleasing site. And we are also proposing landscaping next to this bank building. And, as we walk toward Vervalen Street, we are proposing, basically a 20 foot landscaping zone, which we can make it into form of a berm, just to basically, again, break that massive parking, as you're traveling on the road. So, it gives a better, esthetically better
pleasing overall site plan. And also creates a green area, so, it would be next to, basically a paver sidewalk. So, we are also promoting people to walk to the site rather than driving from the neighboring communities.

Q All right. Now, I'd like you to -I'd like you to talk about the main entrance, main entrance into the property from Vervalen.

A The main entrance, the shape of the main driveway, in terms of the number of lanes and the geometry of the road itself, it's kept, again, in consistency with what applicant is proposing. But, here, we are introducing a landscape median as well as a bikeway. So, there is a bikeway. And also all across there are two sidewalks to either side of the driveway. And then there is also a substantial crosswalk right across the driveway, which is paved. So, not only, again, this accommodates the bikes. It also accommodates pedestrians walking to the site, as well as it gives a very pleasing, you know, vista as you arrive to the -- to the shopping center.

Q All right. Now, continuing --
A And then --
Q -- continuing to the west, again,
you have that 20 foot landscaped area, is that correct, continues on Vervalen?

A Yes. Basically we are extending that from the movie theater all the way across this driveway, and continuing to the next driveway, and then all the way to the end of the property. As I said, that is a 20 foot strip, not only creates a buffer zone, but also is esthetically very pleasing. It gets rid of some of the impervious areas that we have. And it creates a landscape, you know, surround it. Basically landscape perimeter of the entire shopping center.

Q All right. And then please just speak about that smaller entrance there on Vervalen.

A Yes. And then also, this driveway exist, where we are converting it into two-way driveway. So, there will be traffic, you know, permitted in all directions, through this driveway. Again, there's another access point to this massive shopping center. So, you basically need as many access points as possible. We are not interfering with the main traffic on the roads.

Q The total square footage on the retail space, under this -- when I say retail
space, including -- including the theater, what is the total square footage on the conceptual plan? A It's reduced from 212,000 , to roughly about 180,000.

Q Now, with the -- now that the square footage is reduced, what is the parking requirement then for this 180,000 square foot? A Yeah, not only this proposed concept has that advantages that $I$ just actuated, a better landscaping, better plaza, safer and more walkable site. Also, when you are using the site of the proposed building or proposed shopping center, we are also providing a better parking situation. Because as the square footage of the retail area gets reduced, therefore, there is less requirement for parking. And also the traffic will be less, of course. Because there is now smaller shopping center. As you know, I.T.E. determines that there is traffic generation based on the square footage and the number of employees, in this case it's based on square footage. So, not only this reduction in size helps us in terms of parking, but also in terms of the traffic.

Q All right. Under -- under this zoning ordinance, what would be the parking
requirement for the 181,000 square foot shopping center?

A It is roughly about 1,000 parking spaces.
Q All right.
A As opposed to more than, I believe 1,200 that is required for the regional site. And the applicant is only proposing 820. So, we are coming close to what the applicant is proposing.

Q All right. If the requirement is somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 parking spaces, how many parking spaces are provided on this conceptual plan?

A On this conceptual plan, roughly 800.
Q All right. Sir, so am I gathering correctly that your -- it's your opinion that this plan, this conceptual plan, offers a better zoning alternative and a better site design for the property, as opposed to what the applicant is proposing, is that correct? A Definitely. Again, as I said before, you will see much larger area of landscaping, a better outside plaza, as opposed to the applicant's proposed site plan, and a safer pedestrian routes throughout the entire shopping center. We are introducing bikeways, which is basically a trend,
many municipalities are requiring biking facilities at the sites. And, also, esthetically much more pleasing, and it will fit better with this community.

MR. SEGRETO: I have no further questions.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. You have -when you say, no further questions, this concludes the testimony, both on the site plan and the traffic?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes, that's correct.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Members of the board, is there a question for Dr. Izadmehr?

Councilwoman, I'm going to begin -and, Mayor, let me begin with you. Do you have any questions?

MAYOR HEMANN: Not at this moment. Except I do want to call attention to the fact that rather than considering the applicant's position, and ameliorating the applicant's plan, this plan is dated from 10/07/09. And isn't relevant to what we have heard up to this point.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Right now I'm asking you for questions of this witness.

MAYOR HEMANN: Well, would you like
to explain why you're using a plan from '09 instead of reacting to the plan that is in front of us?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Doctor, if $I$ may, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mayor, if you were starting this site plan from scratch, would you have even come up with a better site plan or did you use this particular site plan for a particular reason?

> MR. IZADMEHR: Well, I used this
particular site plan, and because it was prepared, and it was introduced in the prior application, and also because this is what $I$ would have exactly done, based on what $I$ have learned in my profession. And, again, based on the trend that we are following. We are basically trying to get away from that massive pavement structures that we see all over the places. I am pretty sure some of you might have traveled outside of New Jersey, and especially fascinated by what $I$ have seen in California. Most of the shopping centers have just complete gorgeous landscaping. So, I am a big fan of walkability. So, we have to really make sure our residents, our shoppers can walk to places. And also another need, has a health
benefit, it also improves the air quality. So, this particular plan introduces the walkability concept to the site plan. It introduces biking. And also landscaping, plaza, people like to gather and chat and communicate. So, in that respect, this plan is a lot better than what was presented. I mean of course we can maximize and use 100 percent of the property by just making it all pavement, asphalt and roof of the building.

CHAIR LIGNOS: All right. Mayor, does that answer your question as to why the doctor used that site plan?

MAYOR HEMANN: Can I use a follow-up question on that? Have you measured -- I mean you are telling us that this plan allows for more bicycling and walking. Have you actually compared the amount of foot traffic that's available on the plan that the applicant provided for us, as opposed to this particular plan?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes. The applicant does not have any footprint between the two buildings, between the $K$-mart building and the old Stop and Shop. That's just the one example. And not only that, the applicant uses plain concrete. So, we are proposing pavers, which are a lot more
pleasing to the eye. And also, it identifies the pedestrian walkways from traffic, from roads.

MAYOR HEMANN: You didn't answer my question. I asked --

MR. IZADMEHR: No, I did not do exact square footages of what they're proposing, and what this is proposing.

MAYOR HEMANN: Okay.
MR. IZADMEHR: But, again, comparing them as over all plans, this is a lot more than what they're proposing, but $I$ don't know by how much more.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mayor, any other questions? Councilwoman?

MS. AMITAI: Would you just point out, because I'm not quite sure what I'm looking at, could you show me access into the shopping center from all the points that it's possible, on this plan?

MR. IZADMEHR: Sure. All the way on the east side there is an access off of Vervalen, here. The very first access by the movie theater buildings. And then as you travel south, you will see the main access, which is sort of in the middle of the site, and then you have the third
access, you got all the way in the south portion of the roadway. In the back you have an access all the way to the east. And then you have a access between the $K$-mart building and the old Stop and Shop supermarket. And that's about it basically.

MR. NYFENGER: Just to clarify --
MR. IZADMEHR: Oh, no, there is also -- I'm sorry, there is also an access here, all the way in the end of the property.

MR. NYFENGER: The northeast --
MR. IZADMEHR: So, there are basically three accesses on each side.

MR. NYFENGER: I'm sorry, the northeast access, is that a full access into the main parking lot? It looks like it would drive across the plaza.

MR. IZADMEHR: The northeast.
MR. NYFENGER: Yeah, you pointed to that --

MR. IZADMEHR: This one?
MR. NYFENGER: Yeah, that one. You said that was an access into shopping --

MR. IZADMEHR: Just to the back.
MR. NYFENGER: Oh.

MR. IZADMEHR: To the back of the property.

MR. NYFENGER: Okay.
MR. IZADMEHR: Because you have parking spots that you need to have access to. It also provides pedestrian access too.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Now, Doctor, I normally wouldn't jump in. I just want to get this clarified. That particular entrance that you're talking about, based on your traffic knowledge and your expertise as an engineer, having a dead end like that, coming into a plaza and dying like that, is good design?

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, because we have a building here, and we didn't want to basically go through that plaza there.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Why would you open that?

MR. IZADMEHR: So, you still have to serve these parking spots, right? We have to have provide access for all these parking spaces here. So --

CHAIR LIGNOS: How many are those, Doctor?

MR. IZADMEHR: It's nine parking
spaces there.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, I'm gonna -- I'm opening up --

MR. IZADMEHR: And also it provides an exit for all these parallel -- I'm sorry, for those angled parking spaces.

MR. DENICOLA: But if someone pulls in there and there's no parking available what do they do?

MR. IZADMEHR: They have to turn around and come out.

MR. NYFENGER: You have to park in the fire zone like I do when I park at Closter No. 1.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Please, please, one at a time.

MR. IZADMEHR: We could stripe one of them as a turn-around; the very last parking spot.

MR. PIALTOS: But the proposed --
MR. IZADMEHR: So, if you come there and there is no parking spaces --

MR. PIALTOS: -- the proposed sketch right now, they're showing here about 25 spaces in that -- in that particular area, and a wider exit.

And also they're showing nine -- nine entrances and exits. Where you're saying three and three, that's six.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
MR. PIALTOS: So, they're showing more access and exits. Plus more, instead of a dead end in that one spot, 25 spaces, and also access into the plaza. So, you're showing more confusion, aren't you?

MR. IZADMEHR: No.
MR. PIALTOS: How?
MR. IZADMEHR: As I said --
MR. PIALTOS: If it's a dead end, if you pull up to a wall, you have to turn around and go back out with another car coming at you.

MR. IZADMEHR: No, but there's
enough distance there for two-way traffic.
MR. PIALTOS: How much room is
there? How many feet are there?
MR. IZADMEHR: It's twenty-four
feet.
MR. PIALTOS: Twenty-four feet.
MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. Also, not only that, we are proposing this angled parking spaces here. So, this access point provides an exit for
those.
MR. PIALTOS: They had that also though.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. So, but, I
mean again, this is just to improve the landscaping, increase the amount of plaza and introduce bikeways.

MR. PIALTOS: So, are you improving the landscaping or are you improving --

MR. IZADMEHR: Both.
MR. PIALTOS: Landscaping, yeah.
But not access and entrance, no.
MR. DENICOLA: Circulation.
MR. IZADMEHR: Well, I mean --
MR. PIALTOS: Circulation is blocked by the landscaping that you're putting in there.

MR. IZADMEHR: As I said, it's not really blocked. I mean this is pretty much common though.

MR. PIALTOS: It looks like a dead end to me.

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, it's a dead end, but project is acceptable as long as you can get out, right.

MR. PIALTOS: How do you get out of
a dead end, by turning around and going the other way.

MR. IZADMEHR: No, no, you would pull into the last parking space, which is striped for turn around --

MR. PIALTOS: And let's say we have about 3, 4 cars coming in at the same time, what are they going to do, you're going to stop at the dead end you're going to back out and back out.

MR. IZADMEHR: No, that is very rarely happen. I mean it will happen.

MR. PIALTOS: It will happen though. It will happen.

MR. IZADMEHR: It may happen but the chances of that happening is very slim.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Let me go back to her question and I'm going to come around. Councilwoman can you please finish.

MS. AMITAI: So, these are -- this is the current driveway solution? This is the current --

MR. DENICOLA: This is existing.
MS. AMITAI: -- entrances and exits

MR. DENICOLA: This is the existing
plan.
MS. AMITAI: Exactly the same as what we have now. Lot's more ways to get into the shops. I like that. I like the idea of having good access. Easy in and out.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Any other questions, councilwoman?

MR. IZADMEHR: Again, this is concept plan. Could be perfected.

MS. AMITAI: No, not right now.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Dr. Maddaloni.
MR. MADDALONI: I have two questions. Have you done an analysis of the economic feasibility of this plan?

MR. IZADMEHR: No. I mean that's not part of the site plan.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Yeah, in all fairness it wouldn't be part of the site plan.

MR. MADDALONI: Okay. Let me see how this one goes over. You have the supermarket at 27,000 square feet. In your professional opinion is that an adequate size for a modern supermarket?

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, they range from anywhere from 5,000 square foot to 50,000 square
foot. But if you go, for example --
MR. MADDALONI: Let's look at how many square feet is the $A \& P$ in Closter?

MR. IZADMEHR: I have not --
MS. AMITAI: Forty. Forty. Forty.
I think it's 40,000 square feet.
MR. MADDALONI: Let's just go
through it. What's the Shop-Rite in Emerson? What's the Shop-Rite in Northvale? What's the Kings in Creskill?

MR. IZADMEHR: I don't know what's coming here but I know --

MR. MADDALONI: What's the Fairway
in Paramus?
MR. IZADMEHR: Fairway in Paramus, if I have to guess, maybe 25,000 .

CHAIR LIGNOS: Doctor, he, in his testimony, he said that if the food retailer needed to be larger, that particular retailer would creep into building $B$. In other words, it could be made larger.

MR. SEGRETO: Without increasing the square footage of the total shopping center.

MR. MADDALONI: Okay.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Any other questions?

No.
Mr. Baboo.
MR. BABOO: Could can you highlight the pedestrian entrances again to this proposed design?

MR. IZADMEHR: Right very close to the movie theater you have an entrance here. You have a paver crosswalk, and we have this pedestrian walkway, all the way to the main plaza, continuing on all the way to the end of the mall. End of the shopping center. So, we have pedestrian access from here. And then, we have, again, both site access for pedestrian from the main driveway. Again, to the main plaza, all the way to either side of the shopping center. And then we also have access here for the pedestrians, but then the rest of it they have to use up the parking aisles to access the main building.

MR. BABOO: So, the current proposed plan by the applicant, the right-hand side, the first one that you were pointing to, that pedestrian access is always -- it's also the same, correct?

MR. IZADMEHR: True.
MR. BABOO: So, the only difference
would be that that main center?
MR. IZADMEHR: Main center, which
is, again, the main driveway to the shopping center.

MR. BABOO: So, that actually goes all the way down?

MR. IZADMEHR: All the way down and gets connected.

MR. BABOO: To the main plaza. Gotcha.

MR. IZADMEHR: To the main plaza and also to the sidewalk in front of building.

MR. BABOO: It also has a bikeway as well?

MR. IZADMEHR: Bikeway starting from the main driveway, all the way to the main plaza. Again, bike racks here and here. And then we also have a bikeway on this side of the drive in the back.

MR. BABOO: Okay. How do you isolate the bikeway from the road? Are you using curbs or --

MR. IZADMEHR: No. Basically we have a striping, 5 feet designated, with a bike symbols on the pavement. Every designs have the
bike design.
MR. BABOO: So, that's both the
front and back?
MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
MR. BABOO: It's just isolated by a -- by a sign?

MR. IZADMEHR: By sign and also by marking on the pavement. And usually they're colored in green.

MR. BABOO: Okay. Any issues with, well, possible issue that a car swerving hitting a bicycle or --

MR. IZADMEHR: No, that's basically the trend. I don't know if you've seen the new county roads, they introduced now bikeways. If they can do it on both sides, they do it on both sides. If not, on one way. And this is what they mean by complete street design. That we introduce bikeways, greenways, sidewalks. So, basically they're trying to promote other modes of transportation.

MR. BABOO: Okay. And you also have pedestrian entrance from the back as well, that green section.

MR. IZADMEHR: We have pedestrian
entrance from the back here. And also this is landscaping. But we have pedestrian to the west of the building. And then here they have to use basically the driveway side because of the loading. So, we didn't want to have a dedicated pedestrian walkways there.

MR. BABOO: Okay. I do like the pedestrian walkway that starts from the main driveway and goes all the way to the end of the plaza. Okay. Thank you. No further questions. CHAIR LIGNOS: Ms. Stella,
questions?
MS. STELLA: The roadway that comes in between the two buildings, K-mart and the supermarket, that crosses the walkway and then does it match up with one of the lanes? Where does that traffic go when it comes in between the two buildings?

MR. IZADMEHR: The traffic either have to make a right or left and use the main aisle in front of the building and then you use one of the parking lots to park. No, we didn't want to put it purposely in front. Because this exists already. So, we couldn't really choose its location. But, also, it's a better idea not to
line up directly with a parking lot because it becomes a speeding issue.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Thank you.
MR. NYFENGER: You said your practice is in Wayne?

MR. IZADMEHR: I have an office in Wayne, yeah.

MR. NYFENGER: What's that, about 20 miles away?

MR. IZADMEHR: About 22 miles, yeah.
MR. NYFENGER: How many architects do you think there are in a 20 -mile radius? Right here. Architects, site plan engineer, people who draw the pictures?

MR. IZADMEHR: I assume a lot. I don't know exactly how many.

MR. SEGRETO: I have to object to the question.

MR. NYFENGER: Fifty? A hundred? I have a reason for my question.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Can you get to the question?

MR. NYFENGER: Fifty? A hundred? My next question: How many versions of the plan do you think we could look at if everyone put
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    together one?
    MR. IZADMEHR: Many versions.
    MR. NYFENGER: Okay. That's my --
    that's my question.
    CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, is that
    your only question?
    MR. NYFENGER: That's it.
    CHAIR LIGNOS: Thank you.
    Mr. Pialtos.
    MR. PIALTOS: Well, what are the
    square footage on the building that you're
    proposing?
    MR. IZADMEHR: Roughly 180,000.
                            MR. PIALTOS: No, each one. What is
        each one?
                            MR. IZADMEHR: Oh, each one. The
        K-mart building, after phase II will be 62,000.
        The supermarket, 27, which is existing size of the
        building.
            MR. PIALTOS: 27?
            MR. IZADMEHR: 27,000. And then --
            MR. PIALTOS: I thought the existing
        is 67.
            MR. DENICOLA: K-mart.
            MR. PIALTOS: No, the Rudy's
```
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| 1 | building is 67. |
| 2 | MR. IZADMEHR: Oh, there is another |
| 3 | building next to it, 39,000. |
| 4 | MR. PIALTOS: Yeah, the entire |
| 5 | building that's there, what are you proposing? |
| 6 | MR. IZADMEHR: That building, |
| 7 | 39,000. |
| 8 | MR. PIALTOS: Together what does it |
| 9 | come to? |
| 10 | MR. IZADMEHR: Together it will be |
| 11 | about 67,000. |
| 12 | MR. PIALTOS: That's what it is |
| 13 | right now though. |
| 14 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct. |
| 15 | MR. IZADMEHR: No, right now it's a |
| 16 | little bit more, isn't it? |
| 17 | MR. PIALTOS: No, it's 67,519 square |
| 18 | feet. |
| 19 | MR. IZADMEHR: Okay. This will be |
| 20 | exactly 66,000. So it's very close to that one. |
| 21 | MR. PIALTOS: No, not 67, 66. |
| 22 | MR. IZADMEHR: 66, yeah. |
| 23 | MR. PIALTOS: And your other |
| 24 | building? |
| 25 | MR. IZADMEHR: The other building, |

building $D$, is roughly 18,000 square foot.
Building E is about $231 / 2,23,000$. And the movie theater is exactly what I did today, which is 8, 642 .

MR. PIALTOS: So, 41 1/2. So, almost 50,000.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Almost 50,00 what?
MR. PIALTOS: Square feet. Those
three together there. The way that's showing them. The one building there is one building, right now it's proposed at 56,992, you're proposing about 50,000.

MR. IZADMEHR: No. These are all existing.

MR. PIALTOS: Right.
MR. IZADMEHR: All these three buildings are existing.

MR. PIALTOS: But it's not three buildings though.

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, you label the buildings B, D, E and F.

MR. PIALTOS: Who labeled it? I don't understand. Who labeled it? You labeled it?

MR. IZADMEHR: I said we labeled it
here. But not me, but L2A labeled it building B, D, E, and F.

MR. PIALTOS: I was under the impression it's one building there.

MR. DENICOLA: I don't know what --
I don't what he's got up there. I can't see. I've never seen the plan before so I can't tell you.

MR. SEGRETO: The difference is in 2009 the applicant talked about these being different buildings. And now they changed that. So, that is the slight discrepancy. Because now they say these are one building. In 2009 this applicant told you, and this board found, that they were separate buildings. They were not combined as one building. That's the discrepancy.

MR. PIALTOS: So, you're showing 62,000 --

MR. DENICOLA: So, you're -- I can't -- we don't have the plans so we don't know. CHAIR LIGNOS: Let him finish. I'll come back to you.

MR. PIALTOS: Okay. And actually I need for you to go back to that entrance access into the lot in the back northeast area there.

How do you propose that working now, when there's a dead end there?

MR. IZADMEHR: This one here?
MR. PIALTOS: Yeah.
MR. IZADMEHR: As I said, this will work for this angled parking. So, the angled parking, well, if they park here, they can exit from this entrance here. And also this is for this nine parking spots on the side.

MR. PIALTOS: So, you think that's a better exit and entrance when they're showing four entrances and exits on that back lot.

MR. IZADMEHR: We didn't talk about that. It's mainly for the trucks, the loading docks.

MR. PIALTOS: I'm asking you how many exits and entrances.

MR. IZADMEHR: We have one, two, three, four in the back. And three in the front. Seven.

MR. PIALTOS: Okay. You're not showing anything on Campbell?

MS. AMITAI: There's one more, yeah.
MR. IZADMEHR: Well, there is another entrance too. But $I$ was not focusing on

Campbell.
MR. PIALTOS: So, you're showing eight all together?

MR. IZADMEHR: Eight all together including Campbell.

MR. PIALTOS: They're showing nine.
But the part -- the one in the northeast, when they're coming in, they're showing nine spaces there. Because you look like you have a lot of landscaping in there, an overabundance of landscaping actually, in that area.

MR. IZADMEHR: You mean back here, by the angled parking?

MR. PIALTOS: No, come up -- come up. Come down. Right there. Is that -- you have nine spaces there, you're saying, right?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah.
MR. PIALTOS: Nine spaces is better than having 25 spaces. And they're showing access into the entire mall. You're stopping it dead right there. I don't understand how that would work better. You're showing a blockage over there.

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, because, as I said, we were trying to protect this plaza.

MR. PIALTOS: Protect the -- what do you mean, protect the plaza?

MR. IZADMEHR: We didn't want to have a drive through the plaza.

MR. PIALTOS: Well, then why are you showing something driving through in between the two buildings there?

MR. IZADMEHR: This one here?
MR. PIALTOS: Yeah.
MR. IZADMEHR: We were trying to introduce a main entrance just like what we're introducing on this one.

MR. PIALTOS: Okay. Well, if they have a main entrance on the other side --

MR. IZADMEHR: These two main entrance to the shopping center.

MR. PIALTOS: Well, they have a main entrance on Vervalen and then they're showing another entrance on the other side there, by that spot that you have a dead end, with extra parking spaces also. So, I don't understand what you're accomplishing there when you're moving it from in between the two buildings there and you're blocking it on the other side. What's the difference?

MR. IZADMEHR: Again, the main purpose of what this presents is it's a concept plan. Not a final site plan. What we are saying is that there are better ways of presenting the site plan.

MR. PIALTOS: And in fact if you have something coming off of Vervalen here, and you have your other entrance into the main lot over there, that's closer than what's on the other northeast side, and it's easier for them to enter in and exit out that way, than it is to go in between the building at the K -mart. Because you said that to make a left or a right. Where if they make the left there there's a lot of confusion over there, isn't there?

MR. IZADMEHR: I don't believe so, no.

MR. PIALTOS: Okay.
MR. IZADMEHR: Again, this is not going to be the final site plan. All we are trying, we are trying to introduce some concepts here. A concept of better landscaping. A concept of bikeways. A better walkability into the mall from the neighboring streets.

MR. PIALTOS: That may be good --
that may be good in a park.
MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. I mean we are not saying what they're presenting is not right. We are saying, let's improve on that one. Let's increase the amount of landscaping. Let's introduce bikeways and pedestrian ways and this and that.

MR. PIALTOS: Well, maybe in a park.
Okay but --
CHAIR LIGNOS: Do you have any other questions?

MR. PIALTOS: No.
MR. NYFENGER: I'm just confused, because its been referred to, this 2009 plan that the applicant submitted, but isn't this a brand new applicant, like corporate entity?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct. Correct. They just happen to be, from what I'm understanding, they're piggybacking on the 2009 because its closest to the conceptually better plan that the Doctor believes is a better plan. So, they just happen to be using the 2009.

MR. SEGRETO: We're using that plan, submitted into evidence before this board.

CHAIR LIGNOS: This could have been
an 1847 plan.
MR. SEGRETO: Mr. Chairman, you
know, it has nothing to do with 1847 or --
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, no, it could have been -- no, it has nothing to do with the year. They found it to be a better plan.

MR. SEGRETO: Oh, all right. I
thought you were being sarcastic.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, no, no, no, no.
MR. NYFENGER: So, these are
suggestions of what a plan could be.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct. Correct.
MR. NYFENGER: And as to my point before, we could be looking at 50 different suggestions.

CHAIR LIGNOS: You made that point.
Ms. Isacoff.
MR. NYFENGER: I was very confused. Makes sense now.

MS. ISACOFF: Nothing.
CHAIR LIGNOS: None.
Mr. DiDio.
MR. DENICOLA: I understand your philosophy with regard to this plan. There is a few concepts that I like. There is a few that I
don't really care for. One of the concepts that I like, is in regard to increasing the green space. I happen to like the fact that on the Vervalen Street main entrance you added a green median through the center.

MR. IZADMEHR: True. MR. DIDIO: However, by adding a green median through the center, that has to take away from something. And my assumption is that that something in this specific case would be parking. How many parking spots does that greenway take away?

MR. IZADMEHR: Overall we are reducing the number of parking which has been proposed by the applicant by 20. But on the other hand, we have also reduced the footprint of the buildings.

MR. DIDIO: Right. I understand.
Let me rephrase my question slightly different.
MR. IZADMEHR: So, I don't know, to answer your question, I don't know exactly how many is being reduced because of the landscaping, but I'm looking at the overall picture.

MR. DIDIO: All right. I'm going to rephrase my question and give it to you in a
different way, which you might be able to answer. In this proposal, the total main entrance, from east to west, because the length is the same.

MR. IZADMEHR: Sure.
MR. DIDIO: So, from east to west is how wide, compared to the applicant's proposal? What is the difference in the width of your main entrance with the greenway versus that of the applicants? And how would that difference translate into parking spaces?

MR. IZADMEHR: It's about 20 feet more than what the applicant is proposing.

MR. DIDIO: Okay. So, let me just make sure I understand. So, you're saying your proposal is 20 feet wider?

MR. IZADMEHR: Exactly.
MR. DIDIO: For a length of how many feet?

MR. IZADMEHR: For the length of about, I would say 250 feet.

MR. DIDIO: Okay. So --
MR. MADDALONI: Divide that by 9 and you go the number of spots.

MR. DIDIO: Theoretically what would that be in terms of parking spots?

MR. IZADMEHR: Roughly 25.
MR. DIDIO: Okay. All right.
Because I happen to like the greenway. I think that would add a nice flavor to it, so-to-speak. My other question is: I also like the fact of keeping the roadway between $K$-mart and the supermarket. If you were to do that, building B, how far easterly would you have to go to make up that square footage? How many feet in an easterly direction to make up that same square footage?

MR. IZADMEHR: I would say about
25 feet.
MR. DIDIO: Twenty-five square feet. Twenty-five feet. So, would that be equivalent to one less store there?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. Or there is sort of a added building to the K -mart building, that $I$ noticed when $I$ was visiting the site.

MR. DIDIO: What do you mean an added building?

MR. IZADMEHR: It looks like there was an addition.

MR. DENICOLA: --
MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah, on the side of the building. Even has a lower roof than the main
building. So, possibly the applicant could remove that portion of the building and add it to this driveway.

MS. AMITAI: Where they used to
serve food.
MR. DIDIO: Okay. Okay. Okay.
MS. AMITAI: Remember in the olden days.

MR. DIDIO: Way back.
CHAIR LIGNOS: That was before you were born.

MR. DIDIO: Not really. I'm older than you think. I'm older than you. Okay. Thank you for answering my question.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Sinowitz.
MR. SINOWITZ: I have no questions.
MR. DENICOLA: None.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Concepts are wonderful, but if $I$ can't match apples with apples and oranges with oranges, $I$ don't -- I don't understand things. So, let's begin. The width of your parking space, your width times length of your parking space, what are the two dimensions? You claimed in your testimony you have about 800 cars.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, the about bothers me because I need to know exactly what you have so I can compare apples with apples. But let's say you have 800, what is the width of your parking space?

MR. IZADMEHR: 9 X 18.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, do you
know what the zoning is in our town?
MR. IZADMEHR: For parking?
CHAIR LIGNOS: Yeah.
MR. IZADMEHR: I don't know exactly.
I can't remember now.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. But you've made them 9 X 18 because --

MR. IZADMEHR: Just a standard parking space.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. The width of your aisles, are what?

MR. IZADMEHR: Twenty-four.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Do you know what is required by our police and/or fire department?

MR. IZADMEHR: I believe it's 26.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, right now this conceptual plan would not meet with our fire
needs, is that correct?
MR. IZADMEHR: That's correct.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, in essence, what you're showing us, although could be a nice concept, it would not fit, would not meet some of that criteria that we have for life saving, is that correct?

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, 24 is a national standard, you know.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Twenty-four is a national standard. Do you know the size of our fire truck? Again, I'm asking.

MR. IZADMEHR: The same fire truck is all over the country. I mean it's not unique to Closter.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Then is your radius, what you're showing, is your radius for a fire truck?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: What radius are you showing? Because I can't see it again. I have to agree with Dr. Maddaloni, it's at a disadvantage when I can't have an understanding of the drawing. Are you showing a 50 foot radius on your turn?

MR. IZADMEHR: No.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay.
MR. IZADMEHR: Fifty, again, is too excessive, in my opinion.

CHAIR LIGNOS: And what wouldn't be too excessive?

MR. IZADMEHR: I would normally use anywhere from 15 to 35.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Fifteen for a fire department -- for a fire?

MR. IZADMEHR: No, no, no, I said on a site plan, depending upon the specific location.

CHAIR LIGNOS: What do you mean -sir, you're a traffic engineer. What would you use for a fire engine to turn?

MR. IZADMEHR: Thirty-five.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Thirty-five. Are you showing a 35 on that drawing?

MR. IZADMEHR: In some locations, yes.

CHAIR LIGNOS: In some locations but not necessarily all of them, correct?

MR. IZADMEHR: That's correct.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, again, we're not meeting, necessarily, the life safety on that, with that plan. Can you please tell me the ratio
of cars per square footage? Are you getting 4 cars per thousand here? What are you getting?

MR. IZADMEHR: This is roughly
180,000 square feet. You have 800. Right? So, it's about 225, 250.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, you're getting about 4 cars per thousand?

MR. IZADMEHR: Four cars about. A little bit more than 4.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Well, we're getting a little bit more than 4 , but we haven't met, necessarily, the width criteria, which may actually reduce our. So, in essence, we might be at 4 or a little bit less, which is no different than, I understand we are today with the applicant's site plan.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, true. And your ordinance requires 1 per 175.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct. Correct. Right. I know that. By the way, that's a good question. Based on your experience, is 1 per 175 excessive for parking for a -- for a site shopping center of this size?

MR. IZADMEHR: For a normal shopping center, yes.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you. MR. IZADMEHR: You're welcome.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Outdoor eating is something that we've seen with the applicant's plan. Where would you recommend restaurants, if any, would be placed in this conceptual plan? MR. IZADMEHR: I would recommend in this building. We haven't given a lot of thought. Because I don't know. Maybe in this building here.

MR. SEGRETO: All right, well, for our purposes you have building -- buildings are identified with letters. So, why don't you tell us.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Right.
MR. IZADMEHR: Okay, portion of
building D.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Where would they eat, Doctor, and apologize, if I'm -- where would they eat at $B$, for instance?

MR. IZADMEHR: They could eat here in this plaza.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, the pedestrian plaza would be the place that would also have to have tables? In other words, the restaurant can't
have secluded outdoor seating, they would have to be part of the public seating?

MR. IZADMEHR: They could have -- we could rearrange this parking, or remove this parking spots here.

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, you gave those 9 parking spaces with a dead end entrance. It has to be one or the other. I mean I agree with you.

MR. IZADMEHR: You're asking a hypothetical question and I'm trying to answer your question.

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, no, but what I'm saying, enter very good things about the plan, and I was kind of hoping that you would -- you'd elaborate on them. I'm asking you that if you -if that entrance, which is a dead end entrance, was taken away, you would -- you would be reducing the entrances that Mr. Pialtos was talking about, from 8 to 7, but you -- you would be inclined to put outdoor eating in that area, is what you're just saying now, am I correct?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. Yes, you
could. That could be one possibility.
CHAIR LIGNOS: That's one. What other?
MR. IZADMEHR: Possibly here.
MR. SEGRETO: When you say, here
please --
MR. IZADMEHR: Again, in front of
building E.
CHAIR LIGNOS: You want me to eat right on Vervalen? Now, based on your experience --
MR. IZADMEHR: Again, but with this concept plan --
MR. SEGRETO: I don't think that's a correct characterization. There's a plaza there. You're not eating directly on Vervalen.
MR. IZADMEHR: Not only that you can use the berm, 20-foot landscaped berm to cover that area. So, it will protect the public as they're eating.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Doctor, right now there's a sidewalk where you're proposing that berm.
MR. IZADMEHR: I understand. So --
CHAIR LIGNOS: It's got to be one or the other. Our town has a sidewalk --
MR. IZADMEHR: You can still have a sidewalk in front of the berm.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I'm talking about -MR. IZADMEHR: I mean --

CHAIR LIGNOS: It's another one of those conceptual.

MR. IZADMEHR: This is what is called redevelopment plan, right, so, you're going to have to redevelop the site.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Now, based on your experience with shopping centers, and I understand it's not extensive, but stores that have this very long facade, seem to be designed in the past, usually we break -- is there a reason why you chose something so linear like that?

MR. IZADMEHR: No. Well, as I said, this was not prepared by me, but I liked the concepts that were presented.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct. So, if you like the concepts that were presented, what about that flat face fast straight edge facade did you like about it?

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, that, again, this is a concept plan. It's shown as a square or rectangle. But I'm pretty sure the applicant's architect can introduce beautiful facades, you know, that will break that linear facade.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Without reducing, further, the square footage you think? MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, of course. CHAIR LIGNOS: You made an interesting observation. If you kept the roadway between, or the driveway between the present Sears, K-mart, and the old Grand Union, did you put in a planter in that? Did you make that a boulevard, that driveway? Is there a green down the middle?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, there is.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Sir, did you measure that driveway?

MR. IZADMEHR: Well, as I said, this is not exactly the existing driveway. We are introducing a new driveway.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Oh, you're widening
it?
MR. IZADMEHR: Widening it, yeah, sure.

MR. MADDALONI: Taking it from the K-mart building.

CHAIR LIGNOS: You're taking it from the K-mart side?

MR. IZADMEHR: Mm-mm.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. And let me ask you this: Because you did say in your testimony, that the present square that is about 27,000 square feet, and you did admit that big boxes could be up to 50, I think is the number you said, and that you would take further from building B, is it, sir?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Do you know whether these big box retailers are willing to live in non rectangular or non square footprints?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: They can live in abnormal footprint? You know that?

MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay.
MAYOR HEMANN: John.
CHAIR LIGNOS: One second. Finally, I understand from this concept plan that having more pedestrian walkways and having more plazas would be ideal. And I happen to agree with you. It's always something that is welcome. To that end, there's got to be a point where the plaza is -- becomes insignificant, because just by making it that much bigger, you're not gaining
that much more attendance, or it's not as necessarily more welcoming, because it's an extra 500 square feet. Do you have any idea what that magic ratio is, building to open area?

MR. IZADMEHR: I've seen some
numbers. I don't know what exactly the magic number is. But I've seen $80,20,25,75$.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. But clearly, Doctor, you're not saying that you have anything 25, 75 here, right?

MR. IZADMEHR: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Would you say here your 5 percent, 95 percent?

MR. IZADMEHR: Maybe 10 to 90 here.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Okay.
Mayor.
That's all I have.
Mayor.
MAYOR HEMANN: Yeah, I have a
question. You are, in this plan, proposing to take some space away from K-mart building, this is building A?

MR. IZADMEHR: Or from building B.
I don't know.
MAYOR HEMANN: No, but on the K-mart
building --
MR. IZADMEHR: K-mart building or building A?

MAYOR HEMANN: On the K-mart. And you want to take space away. There's a lease on that building which lasts until two years hence. Does that mean this project can't begin until two years hence?

MR. IZADMEHR: No, this project, as the applicant also is proposing, could be done in phases, in phase A we are not touching --

MAYOR HEMANN: So, you're proposing two phases, is that correct?

MR. IZADMEHR: I said, I'm not proposing any phases. I'm saying the applicant is proposing two phases. Phase A and phase B. So, if they are not touching K-mart's building in phase A, but they are altering in phase B. So, the same thing could be done with this plan.

MAYOR HEMANN: But you couldn't
install that double driveway?
MR. IZADMEHR: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Mayor. Mayor. If I may, the Doctor is proposing that he could take it either from Sears or from the old Grand Union.

So, in theory, if you have a lease that can't be touched on K-mart, you have to take it off of the present Grand Union, to widen.

MR. SEGRETO: Or do it in phase II. CHAIR LIGNOS: Or put the boulevard in in phase II.

MR. IZADMEHR: Yeah. Maintain the existing driveway, but then do it in phase II. CHAIR LIGNOS: Any other member of the board having questions? I now open up this portion of the meeting -- I don't see any or hear any, so, therefore, I'm opening up this portion of the meeting to the public. Any member --

Mr. Basralian, if it's okay with you, $I$ was gonna do it after the public, is that okay? Is that all right.

MR. BASRALIAN: Sure.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Sir.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Jessie Rosenblume,
65 Knickerbocker Road. Does your plan make a better connection between the shopping center and Main Street? A better merger? A better connection?

MR. IZADMEHR: I think so.
Definitely by introducing two main access points
from two main streets.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. Right.
because I believe that the Borough is trying to do. Is there a combination.

MR. IZADMEHR: The rear of the shopping center is very blunt. I mean it needs some life.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right.
MAYOR HEMANN: In what way is that so?

MR. IZADMEHR: There is nothing
there. Basically you see a huge wall there. I mean you don't see any windows, you don't see any lights. You don't see any sign of life. So --

MAYOR HEMANN: That's all.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Any other questions from the public? I see and hear no -- no member of the public having a question of this witness, so now I'm going to go to Mr. Basralian. Mr. Basralian, do you have cross on this?

MR. BASRALIAN: I have several questions, yes.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Yes, sir, go ahead. EXAMINATION BY MR. BASRALIAN:

Q Doctor, did you review the zoning
ordinances of Closter?
A I have briefly looked at it, yes.
Q And you also said that while you
didn't design this plan, this is exactly as a
concept plan which you would have designed?
A Yes.
Q When you're -- are you not aware
then that the number of buildings you propose,
exceeds the maximum that's permitted under the
zoning ordinance?
A That's correct.
Q So that you would not be before this
board, because you said that if you started from
scratch, this is what you would propose, you would
be before another board.
MR. SEGRETO: I'm going to object to
the -- to the question. In terms of the
buildings, all right, again, in 2009, this
applicant came before this board.
MR. BASRALIAN: That's not -- excuse
me, don't refer to this applicant. It's an
applicable perhaps.
MR. SEGRETO: No, it was this
applicant.
MR. BASRALIAN: No, it was not this
applicant.
MR. SEGRETO: I'm not going to argue about it. My understanding is that the Ironny's still have an interest in it. The Ironny's -- the Ironny's came in with an application, and during that application they indicated exactly how it's depicted on our conceptual plan, that their -that their supermarket was building $A$, and next to it was building B.

MR. BASRALIAN: Objection. This is not the question $I$ asked him. This objection is raised to the wrong issues.

MR. SEGRETO: I understand. And they had a building C, a building D, a building E. All right. And now they talk in terms of this is retail A, this is retail B. They changed the number of buildings. All right. So, that is the difference between this conceptual plan, all right, which talked about buildings like they talked about buildings, in 2009 .

MR. CHAGARIS: All right. The objection is overruled. You can continue.

MR. BASRALIAN: How can you object -- overrule an objection when the question is, he's referring to something that $I$ wasn't here
for, nor was this applicant here for, referring back to 2009 .

MR. CHAGARIS: No, he had an objection to your question. But you can proceed.

MR. BASRALIAN: Well, clearly this witness said that even though he didn't design the plans, this is exactly what he would do, in response to a question; if you starting over, what would you design. He said, this is exactly what it would be. And I asked him whether he was familiar with the zoning ordinances, he's not. But clearly we wouldn't be before this board with a clean slate if you had four buildings.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. The next
question is.
BY MR. BASRALIAN:
Q So, in addition to the other deficiencies that you've gone through in your plan, this would not be the appropriate board, because you're only permitted one principal building on a lot.

```
        A That's correct.
```

    Q Now, how many buildings does your
    plan call for?

A Three buildings. Four. Four I'm sorry.

There's one here too. Four buildings.
Q How many buildings does the
applicant call for in its plan?
A Two. If I remember correctly, two.
Three. I'm sorry. Three.
Q Thank you. Okay.
A I forgot the bank.
Q Well, it's there, and that's what exists. What is the percentage of green area on your plan as to the total site?

A I did not calculate that.
Q And what is the percentage of plaza area to the total site?

A Again, I don't know the exact number.
Q Do you know what it is for the applicant's plan?

A Yes, I do.
Q What is it?
A I have to look it up. I remember looking at it before. I believe it's two percent of the overall site.

Q Well, if you looked it up you would find that answer is incorrect. The plans speak for themselves. So, there's no reason to go forward.

A It's in the plans, but $I$ don't remember.
Q Have you designed a site plan with a supermarket?

A No.
Q Have you ever designed a site plan

A I did work on a plan with a supermarket.
Q No, I asked you: Did you design it yourself?

A No, not myself.
Q Did you -- would it not be
reasonable for a site engineer, when laying out a site, to also consult with the applicant as to the feasibility of depth of buildings and layouts, in order to make it an economically feasible project in order to make it successful?

A Usually that happens, yes.
Q Did you consult with anyone on this site plan, your client, about A\&P?

A No.
Q Did you consult with a party that designed this plan?

A No.
Q How does the -- or do you know the number of new trees that are being proposed by the
applicant in this site plan, to, in his opinion to beautify the shopping center?

A I know there are a few of them, but I don't know exactly how many.

Q All right. The applicant also proposes to open up the easterly drive because that would allow ingress and egress to the plaza, and allow access from the northeast portion of the project to Homans, and for those cars going east, to the light at Piermont. Why would your concept plan not follow that same theory or same proposal in order to exit cars from the center?

A Well, as I said, this was prepared already. And I liked the concept. So, I didn't alter this plan. And that might be another concept plan, another version of this particular concept plan. As I said, this is by no means a final site plan. It's just a concept plan.

Q Versus what the applicant has presented as a preliminary and final site plan? A That's correct.

Q And his testimony -- have you reviewed the testimony of the engineer with respect to why the plan was laid out the way it was?

A No.
Q There's also another access point, you gave no credence to, which was to Lewis Street off to the west. There is an access point, is there not?

A You mean Campbell?
Q Campbell.
A Yeah, which ends up in Lewis.
Q Okay. But isn't that a viable access point?

A Yeah. Well, this also has that access.
Q Okay. But so does the plan that the applicant has proposed. A That's correct.

Q So, while it eliminates the driveway between the -- pardon me, the existing $K$-mart and the vacant Grand Union/Stop and Shop, it's plan substitutes it with a full access at the northeast corner.

A Yeah, but it's all the way at the northeast corner. It's not at the center of the shopping center.

Q Did you do an analysis as to the amount of traffic or the extent of the traffic that goes in and out of the center that utilizes
that driveway between the two buildings?
A Yes, I looked at the numbers.
Q Did you do an analysis?
A There were not that many. The existing numbers are not that many.

Q Then the loss of that wouldn't have an impact if you have -- a significant impact if you have a two-way access at the northeast corner. A It will not. It may not have that much of an impact.

Q Thank you. You also indicated that you were installing a bike lane between the two buildings, and for the main access, with a specific bike lane. Where do those bikes go to a bike lane once they exit the shopping center since there are no shoulders on either Homans or on Vervalen?

A Well, they could use, as I said, they could use the public roadways. They could use the sidewalks. But that's the trend. So, we have to start from somewhere, right. So, we cannot do all the bikeways in town in one shot.

Q And what's the significance of having a bike lane if they exit into roadways with traffic?

A Well, that's the case everywhere else. Bikeways are usually coexist with traffic. They are not unique.

Q But what's the purpose of introducing them here then, if there are no bike lanes anywhere else?

A As I said, this is a new policy that the federal government is promoting. The State of New Jersey has adopted it. And many towns have adopted it. I'm not sure if Closter has adopted this complete street design features or not. But we -- I just did a gas station in Wayne Township, and I have a bikeway to a gas station. Because there's community need for it. And as a matter of fact, the town required us to put a bike rack next to the community. So, this is, again, is the future trend, and we are trying to promote biking/walking.

Q Are you familiar with the applicant's plan to provide bike racks within the shopping center as well?

A Yes.
MR. BASRALIAN: I don't have any further questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Segreto, anything else?
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I do. Very
briefly.
BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q Doctor, with regard to the line that's shown on the conceptual plan that is separating building $A$ and building $B$, is there any, you know, significance to that line separating the two buildings in terms of this conceptual plan? And that is, could you simply remove that line, and if it is essentially one building now, make it one building in -- in this conceptual plan?

A Sure.
Q Now, same thing: With regard to the line that you're showing between existing building D, and existing building E, could you do the same thing, that is eliminate it?
A Yes.

Q And would it have any effect on the conceptual plan? A No.

Q All right. Now, one last question, and that is, that you did indicate that you worked on a -- worked on a site plan. You did not design
it, but the site plan of, am I correct, large shopping center, is that correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. And what was that shopping center?

A It was a Walmart supermarket, version of the Walmart in Hawthorne.

Q All right. Is that an existing Walmart or was that a proposed?

A No, it never materialized.
Q Were you the engineer for the applicant?

A No, I was not. I was part of the group that worked on it.

Q And how large was that Walmart supermarket?

A If I remember correctly, it was about 60,000 square feet, 50 to 60,000.

MR. SEGRETO: I have no further questions.

MR. IZADMEHR: And that was a main anchor. There were other retailer stores in the shopping center.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I've closed the meeting to the public, sir, because I had a raised
hand. I'm sorry, Mr. Segreto, you said you had no further questions.

MR. SEGRETO: No further questions. Sorry.

CHAIR LIGNOS: All right. I believe that that concludes your witnesses.

MR. SEGRETO: That concludes our witnesses. And the only thing I would like to do is move Exhibits $0-1$ through $0-6$ into evidence.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay.
MR. CHAGARIS: Do you have -- did you take those back the last time, the exhibits?

MR. SEGRETO: I don't believe so. I have more copies if the board does not doesn't have --

MR. BASRALIAN: Would you reiterate, for the record, what those were -- those marked for identification, but there was no proffer as to how they come into the evidence other than Mr. Segreto saying two of them, one or two of them were of record.

MR. SEGRETO: Exhibit O-1
applicant's 2012 plan, part of their 2012 plan, that shows the freestanding building $G$, and the parking lot where the -- and that was I think
sheet 6 of the Omland overall plan, and that to the new proposed building $G$, where there's now proposed a subdivision.

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me. What relevance is that plan to the applicant's application before the board, since it was totally withdrawn before the board even acted on any part of it?

MR. SEGRETO: Right. And it's related to $0-2$, which is Arthur Chagaris's letter to Mr. Basralian, dated January 21, 2013. Again, that goes to both of those -- both of those exhibits go to the issue of jurisdiction of this board, because I think it's the opinion that's set forth by Arthur Chagaris's, in his letter of July 21, 2013, with regard to that plan, and why the board did not have jurisdiction, is the same reasoning that should have been applied to this -to this matter, and that is that the board does not have jurisdiction.

O-3 is a recorded deed from the Ironny's to Valley Savings and Loan, dated June 26th, 1985. And that's when they subdivided off a portion of their property.

Exhibit O-4 is the agreement dated

April 11, 1973, between Closter Plaza, Inc., and Grand Union and Citizens National Bank, and the Borough of Closter. And that agreement specifically places restrictions on this property, and it's a recorded agreement with regard to that center driveway between the $K$-mart and the Stop and Shop, as well as the buildings that we've had a lot of discussion -- I mean the driveway we've had a lot of discussion about, which is in, I guess, the northeast corner of the property. And it provides that there should not be a drive-thru, and that is, that you should not allow cars to come into that entrance and go into the front of the property.

And, finally, with regard to Exhibit O-5, that was the memorandum of amended and restated lease, Closter Marketplace and Whole Foods. Again, that's a recorded document.

Moving ahead. And then, finally, $0-6$ was the conceptual plan --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Can we get a copy of $0-6, \mathrm{Mr} .--$

MR. SEGRETO: NO, 0-6, unfortunately, I only have -- I only have the one on the board. I could possibly get it from --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Could we get that -could we get that for the record?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes, I will -- yeah, I
will provide the board --
MR. BASRALIAN: Then $I$ ask it be marked and be left here as part of the record.

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, absolutely, we'll leave it here and then --

MR. CHAGARIS: You have to leave it.
MR. SEGRETO: Marked tonight then.
MR. CHAGARIS: Let's mark it before we close it.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Can you mark it O--
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, we'll mark it $0-6$, and put the date, December 4th, 2013. Please, Doctor.

MR. CHAGARIS: Mr. Basralian, do you have any objection to these exhibits?

MR. BASRALIAN: I will state, for
the record, I have objections to all of them.
MR. CHAGARIS: You do?
MR. BASRALIAN: Yes.
MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. Let's start with the first one; $0-1$. And your objection is based on the fact that it's not the present
application?
MR. BASRALIAN: That's correct.
MR. CHAGARIS: Excuse me. And O-2
is not based on the current application?
MR. BASRALIAN: That's correct.
MR. CHAGARIS: And 0-3, where is --$0-3$, is the deed from Ironny's, between Ironny's and Valley.

MR. BASRALIAN: There's no proffer of what the purpose of the deed is. All it is, is a proffer of a deed that's a public record without any purpose. There's no -- there were no proofs -- there were no proofs submitted as to -or testimony submitted as to why it's a relevant document to this application.

MR. SEGRETO: It's absolutely relevant because this is a nonconforming lot and they continue to subdivide off pieces of property making it smaller and intensifying the --

MR. BASRALIAN: Objection. Because it is a conforming lot by many, many acres. So, to make a statement that it's a nonconforming lot is inappropriate and plain wrong.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, we'll argue
about that another day.

MR. BASRALIAN: No, it's -- no,
it's -- there is a -- there's a statute -- there's an ordinance requirement for a minimum acre size. A minimum size of a lot. This property far exceeds the minimum requirement for this zone. So, to characterize the property as a nonconforming lot is wrong.

MR. CHAGARIS: And $0-4$, the agreement between Closter Plaza Inc., and the Borough, you object to that as well?

MR. BASRALIAN: Again, it's a public record.

MR. CHAGARIS: And $0-5$ is the memorandum of lease?

MR. BASRALIAN: Again, it's a public record. There's no -- nothing has been proffered as to why this should be part of the objector's exhibits to this application.

MR. CHAGARIS: And $0-6$, same grounds?

MR. BASRALIAN: I've already stated my objection. It's irrelevant. It doesn't conform.

MR. CHAGARIS: I think, for purposes of their introduction into evidence, I think some
of them may have more relevance than others. Maybe they don't. But I think the board is able to discern the relevance of these documents. I don't think there's any reason not to include them as evidence as part of the objector's case. So, they should be admitted in evidence as part of the objector's case.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Now, Mr. Basralian, we have a meeting scheduled, this board has a meeting scheduled for Thursday of next week. I believe it's the 12th.

MR. CHAGARIS: Will you be having any rebuttal witnesses?

MR. BASRALIAN: No. MR. CHAGARIS: No.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Will you be prepared for summation?

MR. BASRALIAN: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. In that case then I'm going to ask the board to obviously have --

MR. ROSENBLUME: Are you going to open to the public?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Open what? I had opened the meeting.

|  | Page 90 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. SEGRETO: Not for testimony or |
| 2 | comments. |
| 3 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Oh, for comments. |
| 4 | MR. SEGRETO: Or testimony. |
| 5 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Or testimony? |
| 6 | MR. SEGRETO: Yeah. Yeah, members |
| 7 | of the public can testify. |
| 8 | MR. CHAGARIS: Mr. Rosenblume, are |
| 9 | you going to have any testimony? Are you |
| 10 | proposing any testimony? |
| 11 | MR. ROSENBLUME: Yes. |
| 12 | MR. CHAGARIS: You do. |
| 13 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Oh, then I apologize. |
| 14 | MR. BASRALIAN: Would you give my |
| 15 | reporter five minutes before he starts? |
| 16 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, this board |
| 17 | will take -- we're going to take a five minute |
| 18 | recess for purposes of the court reporter. And |
| 19 | we'll come right back. I apologize. The time now |
| 20 | is? |
| 21 | MS. MITCHELL: 9:50. |
| 22 | CHAIR LIGNOS: 9:50. |
| 23 | (A recess was taken.) |
| 24 | CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Okay. We are |
| 25 | calling this meeting back to order. It's 10:02. |

Mr. Baboo had to leave the meeting and has left during this recess. During the recess

Mr. Rosenblume had passed out, to the -- to the board, a stapled packet of approximately -- no, exactly, 58 marked exhibits from plaintiff Rosenblume. That's what it's labeled at. No. 1 to No. 58. At this point, Mr. Chagaris, you've have had a chance to look at this.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah. Yeah, I mean we just got these during the recess. I really haven't had a chance to evaluate every single one of these 58 documents. And I would say, at this point, rather that hold up these proceedings, that you allow Mr. Rosenblume to testify, as to whatever he's going to testify about, and reserve on the admissibility of these 58 documents until the next meeting, because $I$ can't make the decision like that at this time. Unless, we have a consent by the objector, and the attorney for the applicant as to these documents. If there's no objection then that's different. But if there's going to be objections I want to have an opportunity to review these things, as I'm sure Mr. Basralian and Mr. Segreto will want to as well.

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, well, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, from our perspective, I don't have any objections to them. I'll note, I know you don't like to talk about the 2009 proceedings, but, many, if not all of these exhibits, were both testified to with regard to where Mr. Rosenberg got all these documents. But they were, in fact, accepted by the board and they were placed into evidence as part of that proceeding.

MR. CHAGARIS: Mr. Basralian.
MR. BASRALIAN: Well, clearly some of them I don't object to. You know, they go back to the 60's, et cetera. I do have an objection to the plaza rent roll of January 31st, 2005. And the plaza rent roll of July 12th, 2000, the plaza annual statement of 1998, ordinance No. 1986:526, which has been repealed, and Mr. Rosenblume's suit with respect to that repeal, was determined against him with prejudice by the court this year. I don't see the relevance of that kind of -- of that ordinance. No. 58 I haven't got to it, which says, Whole Foods San Francisco. So, I'm not sure what that means.

MR. CHAGARIS: It looks like it's a newspaper article.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Magazine.
MR. CHAGARIS: Or magazine article.
MR. BASRALIAN: You know, I just -I just can't be expected to pass on those so quickly. I wasn't party to the litigation in which these may have been submitted. So, I would reserve my right to go through each one of them and have an opportunity to do that.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. So, why don't we then proceed with them marked in effect -- do you have them?

MS. MITCHELL: I wasn't given one for the file.

MR. CHAGARIS: Did you give a set to --

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, I haven't.
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, we had them marked for identification, JR-1 through JR-58, but for identification only at this time. And we'll proceed with the balance of the hearing and reconsider this matter at the next hearing. Reconsider these exhibits, proposed exhibits.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Rosenblume you may continue. Is there anything that you want to say along with these?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yes. If the board members would look at Exhibit 31 and 32.

MR. CHAGARIS: First of all, let's raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. ROSENBLUME: I do.
MR. CHAGARIS: State your name and your address.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Jessie Rosenblume, 65 Knickerbocker Road.

MR. CHAGARIS: And you said that the board should direct their attention to 30 --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Whoa, whoa, whoa, wait a minute. There is one thing I don't understand here. You need to explain to me. Every time we swear in a witness we ask for credentials.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, if they're -if they're experts. He is a fact witness I assume.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Basically as a fact witness.

MR. ROSENBLUME: I'm a Closter resident.

MR. CHAGARIS: And a Closter
resident, but you're not testifying as to any -anything that you would need a degree for like in engineering or traffic?

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, but I have some experience in finding documents in the board files that the board members don't know about.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah, but you're not going to be testifying as an expert in terms of investigative research.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Oh, yeah, of course.

MR. CHAGARIS: And what will you -how is that relevant to this case?

MR. ROSENBLUME: I've gone into the board files and found information that the board is not aware of.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, but that's -you're not testifying about how you went about that. You're testifying about what it is you discovered.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah.
MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. And actually what -- you weren't presenting whatever it is you discovered, you're telling what's in the records, what you saw.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. I did the investigation.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, but again, and I apologize, because it's very important for me to understand, the relevance of such documents are Mr. Rosenblume's opinion to be of importance to this application.

MR. CHAGARIS: You know, I haven't found out --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Well, that's what I'm saying, Mr. Rosenblume is going to be saying some things here, and what I'm understanding, Mr. Chagaris, is that, as a fact-finder, that the documents that he claimed so far to be an expert in finding that this board, or anyone else has never come across, are relevant.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, he'll have to, he'll have to show how it's relevant. Just by way of illustration, and not by way of example or anything else, but if you look at his -- the No. JR-7 of his packet here, I'm just using this for illustration. I'm not giving it any credit one way or the other. It's a letter dated January 8th, 1973, apparently signed by William L.

Murphy.
MR. MADDALONI: Mr. Chair, could the board members be the judge of their relevance?

MR. CHAGARIS: No, I was just getting to a different point though.

MR. BASRALIAN: Which exhibit are you referring to?

MR. CHAGARIS: JR-7. So,
Mr. Rosenblume could testify maybe how he came across this document. But he can't testify as to the meaning of this document. Because he wasn't the addressee or the signatory.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I gotcha.
MR. CHAGARIS: So, he say what it means or doesn't mean. He can say, I got it from the record of the municipality.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Gotcha.
MR. ROSENBLUME: As Mr. Lignos just stated, this is background material, and each board member can give it whatever weight they wish.

MR. CHAGARIS: And in essence, the way I understand it, all these, and, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Rosenblume, all of this material, other than like a newspaper or magazine article,
came from the records of this municipality.
MR. ROSENBLUME: That's right.
CHAIR LIGNOS: How does the -- how does the monthly -- how does the bank roll, the rent roll come from the municipality?

MR. CHAGARIS: I don't know. I don't have any idea what it is or how he got it.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, just 20, 30 minutes ago Mr. Basralian was questioning the witness about economic feasibility.

MR. MADDALONI: That was me.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, no, no, I
understand. And, by the way, it was Mr -- yeah, it was Dr. Maddaloni. And we said that it really wasn't relevant. But more importantly, is something like a plaza rent roll public information?

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, just as an
illustration, JR-50 --
MR. ROSENBLUME: It's a borough
record.
MR. CHAGARIS: -- apparently it's a plaza rent roll for July 20 -- 12, 2000. Apparently looks like it was produced as part of some litigation. Because at the top it says,
reference K-mart Corporation versus Borough of Closter.

MR. BASRALIAN: I suspect that was for a tax appeal, and this was part of the -for --

MR. CHAGARIS: Part of the record for appraisal or something like that.

MR. BASRALIAN: What relevance does
it have to this application?
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, that's a different issue. You're right. That's a different issue. The question -- first question is: Are these authenticated somehow. Or do they -- you know, do they have some validity in terms of authenticity. And if it's part of a public record, or if it's part of a litigation, or if it's a newspaper article, you know, so be it. But whether or not it's relevant to this application is a totally different issue.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Gotcha. Okay. I understand.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah, well, on that particular subject --

MR. CHAGARIS: No, no, let's go right now. So, what is it that you -- now, let's
go back to the ground rules. We are reserving the right to determine whether these are admissible.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right.
MR. CHAGARIS: But if you want to talk -- testify; now is your chance to say what you want to.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, I'll make a couple of comments. There was a discussion just a few minutes ago about reducing the retail space. And somebody questioned what -- whether, if we reduced the space too much, would the shopping center be economically feasible.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah but that's not a planning -- that's not really grounds for a planning issue.

MR. ROSENBLUME: I know. But it was part of the discussion.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah, but that doesn't mean that it was something that the board really deemed is relevant.

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, but it's just background material.

MR. CHAGARIS: No, you can't even use it. For land use purposes you only talked about the use to which the property is put. Not
whether or not it's economically feasible. That is for the developer to figure out. Not the planning board.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right but --
MR. CHAGARIS: -- just
determining -- just looking at it from terms of land use in the municipality and whether it comports with the master plan and the goals and purposes of the municipality.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. But what those documents show is there were 42 stores, about ten years ago, and the documents also show that shopping center was 95 percent rented out. In other words, the center has been very viable from day one. It's not an isolated shopping center as it is now. In other words, it was a money maker basically.

MR. CHAGARIS: What does that have to do with land use planning?

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, to show that it was a viable shopping center.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah, but again, whether or not it's viable or not viable is a question of whether there's proper planning for the municipality.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. Well, the argument before was how much retail space should be in the shopping center. And Mr. Segreto's witness said there should be more greenery and less selling space. So, the board has to determine what that mix should be. You know 80/20 or whatever.

MR. CHAGARIS: And your next point.
MR. ROSENBLUME: If you would look at Exhibits 31 and 32, which, 1985, Closter adopted a shopping center ordinance. I don't know if anybody here was aware of that.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yes, I recall seeing this ordinance, yeah.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Of course it doesn't exist today because it was withdrawn. MR. NYFENGER: Irrelevant. MR. CHAGARIS: What is the relevance to this application? It's no longer an ordinance. MR. ROSENBLUME: Right but this would go to a legal issue. MR. CHAGARIS: Which is what? MR. ROSENBLUME: That there are aspects of the current plaza that are illegal and not prior nonconforming.

MS. AMITAI: Could you repeat that,
please. Just say it again.
MR. ROSENBLUME: There are aspects of the Closter Plaza that are illegal. They're not prior nonconforming.

CHAIR LIGNOS: If they're not prior
nonconforming, I remember somewhere along my limited education that two negatives make a positive. Does that mean that they are conforming?

MR. ROSENBLUME: No. I said or.
MR. CHAGARIS: But you're trying to say though, as we delve from the testimony that positives constructed in the 60's and 70's, and that this was an ordinance that was adopted in 1985, which is after.

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, I'm trying about the 1940 ordinance.

MR. CHAGARIS: So, you just directed our attention to JR-31, which is '85.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah, that ordinance. The shopping center ordinance.

MR. CHAGARIS: The shopping center ordinance went into effect after the shopping center was built.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right.
MR. CHAGARIS: And it's not an ordinance -- viable ordinance today. So, therefore, the center had nothing to do -- was not built in conformance with this ordinance and doesn't exist in conformance with this ordinance.

MR. ROSENBLUME: The center wasn't in conformance with the 1940 ordinance.

MR. CHAGARIS: We're not talking about that.

MR. DENICOLA: '85.
MR. ROSENBLUME: When they came up with the '85 ordinance, they evidently discovered they had a problem. So, they withdrew it.

MR. CHAGARIS: No, no, no, no, you can't say that. You don't know why they changed their minds or didn't change their minds. So, I don't see how '73 would be really admissible. Because it doesn't -- it's not in effect --

MR. ROSENBLUME: It's a public
document.
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, it's not
relevant.
MR. SEGRETO: Mr. Chagaris can I be heard?

MR. ROSENBLUME: We can't argue everything.

MR. CHAGARIS: No, he's testifying right now.

MR. SEGRETO: I know but can I be heard on the issue of whether or not this 1985 ordinance is relevant? I think it is legally relevant.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, yeah, when Mr. Rosenberg -- Mr. Rosenblume -- I'm sorry, has completed, we can get to that question.

What's your next point then?
MR. ROSENBLUME: When the subject of economic feasibility was mentioned, the success of a shopping center does not depend on the amount of retail space. It depends on the tenant mix.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, no, now you're getting into an area of opinion, and you're not qualified as a planner. So, therefore --

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, as a layman.
MR. CHAGARIS: No, but a layman --
MR. ROSENBLUME: As a shopper.
MR. CHAGARIS: As a shopper you can't say that the land use considerations come into play with --

MR. ROSENBLUME: As Mr. Lignos would say, how good would the shopping center be if we had 42 nail salons.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Lignos said something about nail salons?

MR. NYFENGER: Most of them will go out of business and they'll be replaced by some other stores.

MR. CHAGARIS: You can't testify to what makes a successful shopping center. Go ahead. Yes, next.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah. As I stated before to the board, the board should subpoena the owner to testify about what the K-mart building would become, and also about the subdivision.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. Well, that's not -- that's not really testimony.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, I'm giving my comments.

MR. CHAGARIS: No, well, the comment -- this is not time for the comments. This is time for testimony.

MR. ROSENBLUME: I thought there was
a time for everything.
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, not at this
time. The comments will be at the next meeting. MR. ROSENBLUME: Oh, at the next meeting.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Wait, what? Why? MR. ROSENBLUME: Oh, okay.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, because you're not going to have summation tonight.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Oh, summation and then comments.

MR. BASRALIAN: Comments come before the summation. So, in other words, comments can effect the summation or the opinions.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Why can't the comments be tonight? There's no --

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, first of all, has he completed his testimony.

CHAIR LIGNOS: After you complete your testimony, Mr. Rosenblume, you can make your comments. Finish your testimony then make your comments. Because everything is going to happen tonight. If I have to stay here until three in the morning it's going to happen tonight.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah, well, it seems like a waste of time to talk about the exhibits because you have to look at them really
first.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, but
Mr. Rosenblume, you have to understand that we take -- you've done a lot of work here.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah.
CHAIR LIGNOS: And I respect the fact that you've done a lot of work. But at the same time, I have to tell you that I have to know what I'm looking at, and the validity of what it is that I'm looking at. So, if you would be kind enough to give us your testimony, if your testimony is hinged upon some of these, I want to make sure that they're, in deed, relevant. And if they're not relevant, I want to, you know, scratch them out and go onto the next thing. So, what is your testimony? And how do these documents support that testimony? That's what I want to hear.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Basically you have board documents. You have public documents. You have documents that were generated by the Borough clerk. Basically it's background material.

MR. CHAGARIS: So, you're saying that this packet that you've here shows the history of the plaza?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Partially right.
MR. CHAGARIS: And what is the point? So, you have a history. Now what? What does the history of the plaza tell us visive this application?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Because it tells you what you have today, how it came about. It's not a complete picture. But it gives you the flavor of the planning board then, and the mayor and council.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. But this planning board has its opinion as to land use issues and also has the benefit of the master plan and the recent master plan re-examination.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right.
MR. CHAGARIS: So, does any of this history relate to the master plan and how Closter should be developed? Not how it was developed. But I'm sure historically there used to be horses and buggies. That doesn't have anything to do with the planning going forward.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Not when the plaza was built. I don't think there were any horses around.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, I'm saying that
the history of the town, they love horses. Okay. We have the lone horseman over there to tell us that. But my point is, what does the history of the plaza have to do with how it should be developed in the future?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. When I
first saw the property where the Closter Plaza is, it was a swamp.

MR. CHAGARIS: But what does that have to do with how it should be developed?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, the applicant comes along and it's basically maintaining about half of the buildings, and half are going to be torn down, let's say. Well, they're all in, let's say in a straight line, good portion of them. As the witness testified, maybe we should break the line, have a more interesting pattern.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. But you're going off -- first of all, that's your opinion.

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, it's not my
opinion. The boards can ask the applicants to level all the buildings and redesign.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Wait, I think I'm getting to something here, if I may. I don't think that Mr. Rosenblume is using these documents
necessarily for testimony. I think what he wants to do -- I don't think he even wants to testify. I think what he wants to do is give us his comments that he's observed over these 15 meetings. Would you agree that basically you want to comment, not so much testify, am I correct?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yes. I want to
give you a broader picture. Because you're looking at the application --

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, I think we should just let him comment. So, there's no testimony. There's really comments. And we're at the point of comments anyway.

MR. ROSENBLUME: You're looking at the application based on what is out there on the property.

MR. CHAGARIS: Right.
MR. ROSENBLUME: As Mr. Segreto's planner suggested, make some changes. The board can ask the applicant to break up the buildings, make it more interesting, reduce the retail space, put in more greenery, connect it with Main Street through a bicycle path, better walkways, et cetera.

MR. NYFENGER: Mr. Chairman, just
procedurally, can we determine that there is no testimony?

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah, I was just gonna say --

MR. NYFENGER: Because otherwise we didn't do that officially.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Sure. There is no --
I think --
MR. NYFENGER: Anybody else in the audience?

CHAIR LIGNOS: You're not trying to testify at this point, but give us comments, am I correct?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, what would you deem testimony? Because it may be in these documents, but I don't know what you're basically looking for.

MS. ISACOFF: That's why
Mr. Chagaris asked, is there something in the documents that you want to testify about. If not, we'll just listen to your comments.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. Well, as I -- item 31 and 32 are interesting because, at that time you had Mayor Bianco, and an application came in for Pathmark, where Annie Sez is, in the

Commons. And the public came out and said, we don't want any big boxes. So, in 1986 the Borough passed the 40,000 square foot limit because they didn't want big boxes. Now the board is hearing an applicant that wants to go from 40 to 45. You know --

CHAIR LIGNOS: You bring up a fair point.

MR. ROSENBLUME: It's all connected. CHAIR LIGNOS: It's connected. It's connected. But it's 30 years later. With the master plan that's been redefined every 5 years, in those 30 years.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. But if you read the master plan, it talks, basically out of both sides of its mouth. It says, we don't want big boxes but we want to work with the applicant. Because you have a choice. You could have six big boxes on the property, or you could have 42 stores, as it was back 10 years and more.

CHAIR LIGNOS: But you do have to admit, Mr. Rosenblume, that what you had 30 years ago may be a retail philosophy that doesn't -that doesn't exist today. Or doesn't work as well today.

MR. ROSENBLUME: The main problem, Closter residents have said, can't we get a name like the Gap. Can't we get name stores. Name retailers.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, we're not -MR. ROSENBLUME: Named retailers. CHAIR LIGNOS: But nobody says here that --

MR. CHAGARIS: How about Whole Foods.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Like Whole Foods for instance.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah, yeah, right.
Like Whole Foods.
CHAIR LIGNOS: But we didn't hear anything to the contrary here on this application. You're saying that the Closter residents are asking this. I don't think we've heard anything contrary to that. As a matter of fact, if I heard anything, was that the type and quality of the construction was -- was done that way in order to attract that kind of -- that kind of national retailer.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. But how do you get the quality or the mix that the shoppers
in Closter want; it's not the total retail space that the applicant is suggesting; it's getting the greenery in; and all the features that people find desirable. If the applicant gets the right tenant mix then they will make a lot of money. But if they have run of the mill tenants --

CHAIR LIGNOS: What you're doing, and I respect your -- your passion for the greenery. I understand that.

MR. ROSENBLUME: That's part of it.
CHAIR LIGNOS: I understand that. I understand your passion for connecting the plaza to the -- to our downtown some way through branding or somewhat.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Doesn't everybody
want that?
CHAIR LIGNOS: I understand your passion for pedestrian circulation, that maybe is more defined. I understand all that. What I have to tell you, is, though, that the kind of mix that you're talking about, is really a market factor.

MR. ROSENBLUME: That's right.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Literally, if they don't produce the right mix, they're going to fail as a shopping center. And you and I can't
possibly dictate what that mix is.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Of course.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, to get back to the authorship that you gave me before, which I never said, they're not going to do very well if they decide to put in 35 nail salons.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Why do say that? Because those 35 nail salons will be paying the going rent. So, why does the plaza --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Correct.
MR. NYFENGER: They won't have money coming in.

CHAIR LIGNOS: As long as there's enough fingers and toes coming in.

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, that's not their problem. It's the tenant's problem.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, I think at this point --

MR. ROSENBLUME: I thought you quit at 11 .

CHAIR LIGNOS: The point is made. Mr. Rosenblume, in all due respect, members of the board, in all due respect, we understand your passion for the pedestrian, for the green, and for your branding/connection to the downtown. What
else did you want to bring to our attention?
MR. ROSENBLUME: Well, the last
exhibit is the Whole Foods that was built in the District of San Francisco.

MR. MADDALONI: Haight Ashbury. If you're suggesting Closter is like Haight Ashbury.

MR. ROSENBLUME: No, you been there?
Anyway, the store is 18,000 square feet. I don't know about in this application, but in the prior application, $I$ believe it was the mayor, or somebody else, mentioned that in somewhere further south in Jersey, there's a Whole Foods. Yeah, it was a college town of about 30,000 square feet.

CHAIR LIGNOS: There's one on 100th
Street and Amsterdam. It's probably around 18,000, okay. And the relationship to Amsterdam. MR. ROSENBLUME: Okay. Size is unimportant.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I won't touch that but depending on the location, depending on the location, where there's an urban location -suburban location, rural location, I can't possibly tell you where the size factor comes in, but there are different size retail -- food retailers. And the one that's interested to come
in here, from testimony, $I$ understand is the size that has been brought to our attention.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Now, anything else?
MR. ROSENBLUME: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. I thank you very, very much.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Thank you.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Is there any other
testimony here or comments on the application? Yes, ma'am. Please step forward.

MS. HARTWELL: Lee Hartwell, 1
Bradley Terrace. I just have a few questions. I agree that the appearance of the shopping center will bring people into this town, if you have it like a shop at Woodcliff Lakes, Tices Farm, Ridgewood, or whatever; to have the nice pavers, to have it nice and not make it like an industrial type center. Then you will get the Ann Taylor, the Banana Republic in. So, that does make a difference. But I have a question because I missed some of the meetings: Has there been any discussion about the traffic light at Piermont by Wells Fargo?

CHAIR LIGNOS: We've had traffic
discussions.
MS. HARTWELL: So, what was the decisions about that?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Ma'am, you're welcome to come and get the transcripts. Because we can't --

MR. CHAGARIS: I don't think there really was any decision. It was a discussion.

CHAIR LIGNOS: There wasn't a -there was a discussion. There wasn't a decision.

MR. NYFENGER: It's not in our purview to put a light there. Is that what you're talking about?

MS. HARTWELL: Yes.
MR. NYFENGER: It is.
MAYOR HEMANN: There was a considerable amount of discussion.

MS. HARTWELL: Has there been any of these, with all the meetings, any discussion, any accident reports about the number of accidents that have been at that light? I mean I had to change my bank. Coming out of Wells Fargo, I have seen so many accidents. There needs to be a traffic light there.

CHAIR LIGNOS: A traffic light at --

MS. HARTWELL: At Piermont and
Vervalen. That is the worst intersection ever in this town. I mean it's dangerous.

MR. NYFENGER: Wasn't it deemed a county decision?

MR. CHAGARIS: County plays a role --

MS. HARTWELL: Well, it plays a role, but $I$ think Closter has the right to say something about it.

MR. DENICOLA: The county makes -Closter has input into it.

MR. CHAGARIS: So, the question is, if -- how is this application impacting that?

MS. HARTWELL: Because we were hoping that it would bring more people into this town, and more traffic, which you will definitely need a light. I mean there have been so many accidents. When they expanded $A \& P$ over there, there was never a light at Durie and Demarest Avenue. And when they made that store bigger, there was a traffic light at that intersection.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, $I$ don't know if one has anything to do with the other.

MS. HARTWELL: I think it did, yes.

MR. NYFENGER: County road?
MS. HARTWELL: Yes.
MR. DENICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARTWELL: And it was put there. I don't care. I mean it was there because of the traffic. And this is going to be major traffic at that intersection. Everybody that lives in this town knows that.

MS. ISACOFF: We have expressed that to the applicant.

MS. HARTWELL: Well, I just hope that this mayor and planning board, zoning board whatever, will do something and make it a priority.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Let me ask you this: Now, based on that, Rose, could you do me a favor, could you please have distributed, in the next 24 , 48 hours, from the police department, anything that they can give us in the last 24 months, as far as accidents on the corner of the intersection of Vervalen and Piermont. Thank you.

MS. HARTWELL: Thank you.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Is that all?
MS. HARTWELL: That's all.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you very
much.
Any other member of the public wanting to make a comment? At this point we've heard testimony, I don't know, 13 hearings. We are going to come back next Thursday. We are going to begin summation from Mr. Basralian.

MR. CHAGARIS: You are going to have
summation?
MR. SEGRETO: Yes. I can make
summation too, can't I?
CHAIR LIGNOS: Yes, yes, yes, you certainly may. You certainly may. And at that point we'll go into deliberation. If the deliberation gets to a point where we can have a vote, we'll do so at the next meeting. So --

MR. CHAGARIS: I'm sorry,
Mr. Chairman, just so the record is clear, you have -- you're rested, you have no rebuttal witnesses. You rested, you have no surrebuttal.

MR. SEGRETO: That's correct.
MR. CHAGARIS: Jessie, the same, no other witnesses?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, at this point, I really ask you to please go over your material and please look at anything you need to
review so that we can be prepared in case, during those deliberations, we have a point of vote.

MS. MITCHELL: I will mention that I do have some members that still owe me papers that either listened to the $C D$ or read the transcript.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I strongly beg you to please make sure you're up to date with all your meetings in case there's a vote, okay?

MR. MADDALONI: Motion.
MR. DENICOLA: Even the alternates.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Even the alternates, you're correct. Now, did you take care of the administrative issue on the vote?

MR. CHAGARIS: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Is there any other further business before this board? Anybody else have anything? The chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. MADDALONI: Motion.
MR. BASRALIAN: Please, two things:
One, we will endeavor to have a transcript well before Thursday, which puts the burden on my friend here. Second, please announce, formerly, that there will be no further notice that the meeting will take place and be carried.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Any member of the public here who is interested in this application, the next hearing will be on December 12th.

MR. CHAGARIS: And you're extending the time within which the board has time to act, correct?

MR. BASRALIAN: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Motion -- hold on.
Members of the board -- no, no, I'm going to do that next week. Members of the board, we have a motion from Dr. Maddaloni to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Isacoff. Any objection? I see none, and, therefore, this meeting is adjourned at 10:36.

```
                                    (Meeting adjourned.)
```
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