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PLANNING BOARD BOROUGH OF CLOSTER, NEW JERSEY Special Meeting Thursday, November 14th, 2013

Mr. Lignos, Chairman called the Special Meeting of the Planning Board of the Borough of Closter, New Jersey held on Thursday, November $14^{\text {th }}$, 2013 in the Council Chambers of the Borough Hall to order at 8:04 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
Mr. Lignos, Chair
Dr. Maddaloni
Mr. Baboo
Mr. Sinowitz
Ms. Isacoff
Mr. Pialtos
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:
Councilwoman Amitai
Mr. DiDio

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

## Item \# 1

Block 1607 Lot 1 (BL 1310/ L 2)
19 Ver Valen Street (7 Campbell Ave.)
Application \# P-2013-03

Applicant: Closter Marketplace (EBA), LLC
Centennial AME Zion Church
Attorney: Mr. Basralian

## *Refer to attached transcript.

Motion was made by Dr. Maddaloni \& seconded by Mr. Nyfenger to adjourn meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 10:02 PM.
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CHAIR LIGNOS: I call to order this special meeting of the planning board of the Borough of Closter, New Jersey, being held on this day, Thursday, November the 14th, year 2013 in the council chambers of the borough hall.

This meeting has been duly
advertised in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey. It is commencing, according to our computer, at 8:04 p.m. The planning board adheres to a 12 O'clock midnight curfew. No new matters will be considered after 11 p.m.

Please join the board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

I thank you all very much.
Ms. Mitchell, would you kindly take attendance.

MS. MITCHELL: Mayor Heymann.
MAYOR HEYMANN: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Councilwoman Amitai.
Dr. Maddaloni.
MR. MADDALONI: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Baboo.
MR. BABOO: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Ms. Stella.

MS. STELLA: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Lignos.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Chagaris.
MR. CHAGARIS: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. DeNicola.
MR. DENICOLA: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Sinowitz.
MR. SINOWITZ: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Didio.
Ms. Isacoff.
MS. ISACOFF: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Pialtos.
MR. PIALTOS: Here.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Nyfenger.
MR. NYFENGER: Here.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Let the record show
that the board has received the following correspondence as they relate to the Closter Plaza application. On the 12th, Atlantic Traffic and Design Engineers, on the subject of traffic engineering services. And on the 14 th of November, from Mr. Tim Sack on the Closter Plaza redevelopment.

No outgoing correspondence has gone
out from this board.
Any members of the board wishing to discuss any piece of correspondence?

I see and hear none. And,
therefore, we go right into item No. 1, block 1607, lot 1, 19 Vervalen Street, application P2013-03. Applicant is the Closter Market Place, LLC, Centennial AME Zion Church. Mr. Basralian is the attorney.

> Again, this is a subdivision, site plan, soil movement application, received back on May the 16th. It was deemed perfected with mentioned stipulations on June the 5th. The application was continued and received final perfection at June 27 th regular monthly meeting, and now hearings have taken place July 11th and 18th, August 7th, 8th and 29th, September 12th, October 2nd, 10th, 17th and 21st, and this application will continue here this evening at this November 14 th special meeting.

Mr. Basralian, welcome.
MR. BASRALIAN: Good evening. At the last meeting on the 21st of October the applicant concluded its direct testimony, reserving all rights for rebuttal, should it be
necessary. This meeting was scheduled for Mr. Segreto to present his witnesses. I understand that at 5 o'clock, or a little after 5 today, received an email that the own only witness he had available was Mr. Kauker, his planner. His engineer and traffic consultant are not available this evening.

MR. CHAGARIS: Could we have that put on the record, Mr. Segreto.

MR. SEGRETO: Yes. That's accurate.
That was the email that \(I\) sent also to you Mr. Chagaris, as well as Mr. Basralian.

MR. CHAGARIS: And what was the reason as to their unavailability, just for the record, please?

MR. SEGRETO: Mr. Simoff indicated to me that he had four other meetings and he was trying to get coverage. And, obviously, trying to come to this meeting. But me just couldn't do it. Same thing with the engineer. The engineer had a number of other matters. So, I could not -- I could not get them here.

MR. CHAGARIS: And when did you first learn about this?

MR. SEGRETO: I first learned about
it probably on Monday. I didn't think it was significant to, you know, \(I\) wasn't going ask for the hearing to be adjourned. I mean we had the special hearing. And I had Mr. Kauker.

MR. CHAGARIS: So, I assume you wish to present Mr. Kauker at this time, and wish to proceed at the next meeting, at another meeting for the other witnesses.

MR. SEGRETO: Yes, that would be my request.

MR. CHAGARIS: And it's your request that we proceed next Thursday, a week from today?

MR. SEGRETO: Well, I had in my
notes that we were talking about the 21st. So, that's what \(I\) was talking about.

MR. CHAGARIS: And you will be able to produce those witnesses at that time?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Members of the board, being -- having heard that, can I have a show of hands of which members would be available for a meeting, special meeting, next Thursday. One, two.

MR. SINOWITZ: It's Hanukkah.
CHAIR LIGNOS: I don't have a
quorum.
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, we don't know when Mr. Didio and --

MR. PIALTOS: What
about councilwoman? Councilwoman.
MR. CHAGARIS: And councilwoman.
MR. DENICOLA: When is Vicky coming back, Sophie?

MAYOR HEYMANN: I'll be coming back Friday morning because it's dark when I come --

MR. DENICOLA: No, Vicky. Vicky.
MR. CHAGARIS: Vicky. Vicky.
MAYOR HEYMANN: Vicky will be back.
MR. DENICOLA: For Thursday?
MAYOR HEYMANN: She will be back.
MR. BASRALIAN: By the way, I
thought Hanukkah starts Thanksgiving.
MR. DENICOLA: That's what I
thought.
MR. BASRALIAN: Following week,
Thanksgiving. It coincides with Thanksgiving.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Lenny, are you available next Thursday, which is not Thanksgiving or Hanukkah or any other holiday that I know of?
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MR. SINOWITZ: Yeah.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. I have a quorum. So, here's what \(I\) need to do. I need to be assured that you three gentlemen will be here on next Thursday. And Dr. Maddaloni, that you will definitely be here, short of any catastrophic event in our lives.

MR. MADDALONI: Short of any catastrophic event in our lives.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So there'll be at least --

MR. DENICOLA: Mr. Baboo.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, Mr. Baboo is not available. I asked.

MR. MADDALONI: And possibly we'll have the councilwoman and Mr. Didio.

CHAIR LIGNOS: But at least \(I\) know I have five here. Somebody like to make a motion -wait a minute.

Mr. Basralian, are you -- is your -the applicant available for next?

MR. BASRALIAN: We will be here.
CHAIR LIGNOS: You will be here.
Okay.
MR. CHAGARIS: And I assume you
would consent to any extension of time necessary for this board to act?

MR. BASRALIAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Can \(I\) have a motion
to have a meeting Wednesday at 8:00?
MR. DENICOLA: Next Thursday.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Next Thursday at
8:00. Dr. Maddaloni makes the motion. Seconded by Mr. Pialtos. Discussion? None. Ms. Mitchell please poll the board.

MS. MITCHELL: Mayor Heymann.
MAYOR HEYMANN: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Dr. Maddaloni.
MR. MADDALONI: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Baboo.
MR. BABOO: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Ms. Stella.
MS. STELLA: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Lignos.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Sinowitz.
MR. SINOWITZ: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: I'm sorry.
MR. SINOWITZ: Yeah.
MAYOR HEYMANN: Ms. Isacoff.

MS. ISACOFF: I'm going to abstain.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Pialtos.
MR. PIALTOS: Yes.
MS. MITCHELL: Mr. Nyfenger.
MR. NYFENGER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, members of
the public, anyone who is here for this application, this hearing, and the public hearing will continue next Wednesday.

MS. MITCHELL: Next Thursday.
CHAIR LIGNOS: I'm sorry. I did it again. I am so sorry.

MR. BASRALIAN: We can do Wednesday and Thursday. I'll be here.

CHAIR LIGNOS: We can't. I wanted to do Wednesday but the room is taken. Next Thursday. Next Thursday at 8:00 p.m. Okay? So --

MR. CHAGARIS: Madam secretary you'll publish in the newspaper and the Open Public Meetings Law?

MS. MITCHELL: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Mr. Segreto, I think the floor is all your's. Or at least the table.

MR. SEGRETO: Good evening
Mr. Chairman, members of the board, board professionals, for the record, John Segreto on behalf of the objectors, A\&P. And I have with me tonight, Mr. Kauker, who is our professional planner.

Mr. Chairman, I have premarked exhibits. Objector's Exhibits.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Your witness.
MR. CHAGARIS: Can you raise your
right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, I do.
MR. CHAGARIS: And can you give us your name and your business address.

MR. KAUKER: Michael F. Kauker.
That's spelled \(K-A-U-K-E-R\). Address is 356 Franklin Avenue, in Wykoff, New Jersey.

MR. SEGRETO: All right. As I
indicated, Mr. Chairman, I did premark a number of exhibits. I've made -- I've given Mr. Basralian a copy. I have some extra copies for the board.

MR. CHAGARIS: Do you have a set for us? Is there a report?

MR. SEGRETO: No, there's no report
by Mr. Kauker. And I'll just go over the exhibits.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, as he goes over each -- he is going to go over each, I presume, Mr. Segreto, as you're introducing the evidence, you'll be going over the item.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, Mr. Kauker is going to refer to some of these, but all of these exhibits do not need anyone to testify. They're all documents that should speak for themselves. Though one is a copy of sheet 6 of the Omland plans and that is the 2012 plan. And that shows the --

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me. There are no plans that we submitted in connection with this application for 2012. They're all dated 2013.

MR. SEGRETO: I know. The 2012 application was the same applicant. It's the application that was withdrawn. And the \(0-1\) is sheet 6 of the Omland overall plan and the purpose of the exhibit is to show where they proposed a new freestanding building \(G\) in the parking lot.

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me. I would like to know what the relevancy is of referring to
a plan in 2012 for an application that was withdrawn and is not before the board.

MR. SEGRETO: It goes hand-in-hand with Exhibit \(0-2\), which is Arthur Chagaris' letter of January 21, 2013, to Mr. Basralian, wherein Arthur Chagaris opines that, because of that freestanding building, the board did not have jurisdiction.

MR. BASRALIAN: Again, what's the relevancy, since that dealt with an application which was withdrawn?

MR. SEGRETO: It has absolute relevancy to the jurisdiction of this board with regard to this application. It's intimately related. 0-3 --

MR. BASRALIAN: I object to the submission of anything that was -- that deals with --

MR. CHAGARIS: Let's have him go through it and then we'll go back to each one.

MR. SEGRETO: Right. \(0-3\) is a deed from the Ironny's to Valley Savings and Loan. It was a subdivision from 1985. They subdivided a piece of their property off, that is the Closter Plaza property. That deed is dated June 26 th,
1985. O-4 is an agreement between the Borough of Closter, Closter Plaza Inc., Grand Union and Citizens National Bank. It is a recorded agreement dated April 11th, 1973. It deals with what can or cannot be done on this property. \(0-5\) is, again, another recorded document recorded in Bergen County. It's a memorandum of amended and restated lease between this applicant and the Whole Foods.

MR. BASRALIAN: What's the date on that?

MR. CHAGARIS: Recorded November 26th, 2012 .

MR. SEGRETO: Right.
MR. BASRALIAN: Is that the memorandum of lease?

MR. SEGRETO: Memorandum of amended and restated lease. And I believe it has, attached to it, the first memorandum of lease.

Those are our exhibits.
MR. CHAGARIS: Well, they're marked for identification. And when we proceed see if they are entered into evidence.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, I don't need -I believe I don't need any witness to testify
regarding these exhibits. They're recorded documents. One is an agreement with the town concerning this property. One is a memorandum of lease, which is a recorded document. \(0-2\) is your letter --

MR. CHAGARIS: No, but the question is whether it's relevant to the application. I understand we're not talking about the authentication. I'm talking about whether or not they're admissible in evidence. But let's proceed and see where we go.

MR. BASRALIAN: But the first two, the first two exhibits he referred to, which is the Omland site plan, 2012, and Mr. Chagaris' letter dated January 21st, 2013, are not recorded documents.

MR. SEGRETO: No, they're not recorded documents.

MR. BASRALIAN: And, so, they would require --

MR. CHAGARIS: They're actually -yeah, they're not -- they're not -- these plans, the plans, the '01 is not a plan that's being considered by the board. And O-2 refers to the O-1, which, of course, is not being consider by
the board either. So, how is it relevant to this application?

MR. SEGRETO: It's relevant because it goes to jurisdiction. And it's our contention that the mere fact that they are now removed building \(B\), eliminated it, and proposed to subdivide the property for purposes of a later date, putting a building \(G\), makes it quite relevant to the issue of jurisdiction.

MR. CHAGARIS: That's just a
conclusion. What's the -- what's the relevance? What does that -- in other words, one could argue that they're all -- their opinion was that with the building there would be a jurisdictional issue and so they took the building away. So, then what?

MR. SEGRETO: And by proposing a subdivision where they proposed that freestanding building, does not change anything. At least that's our legal position. So, for purposes of having a clear record.

MR. CHAGARIS: Why does it change anything. It's a totally different application.

MR. SEGRETO: It's not a totally different application.

MR. CHAGARIS: Sure it is. With a building or without a building.

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I know. If you're not going to allow \(0-1\) and \(0-2\) to go in evidence, that's fine. We have marked it for identification. I put my position on the record. If you don't allow it to go into evidence we'll talk about it, obviously, on another day. But I have the right to mark these and demonstrate to the court that I wanted to do that and I thought it relevant.

MR. CHAGARIS: They're marked for identification. Okay. You can proceed.

MR. SEGRETO: All right, I call
Mr. Kauker.
EXAMINATION BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q Mr. Kauker you have been sworn in, is that correct?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes, he is.
Q All right, Mr, Kauker, can you please do us a favor and give us your educational as well as your professional qualifications. A I'm a licensed planner in the State of New Jersey. I received my license in 1970. I'm a principal in the firm of Kauker and Kauker. We
are municipal planners. We serve approximately 12 municipalities in northern New Jersey and New York State. We also do a substantial amount of testimony and work before boards such as this, and zoning boards of adjustments, related to use variance applications and site -- major site plan applications.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Have you ever testified here?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir, last year.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Before the planning board?

MR. KAUKER: On this particular matter.

CHAIR LIGNOS: You have?
MR. KAUKER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Does anyone have any objection to Mr. Kauker's qualifications? I don't see or hear any. So, I think that we can move to accept Mr. Kauker's qualifications.

MR. SEGRETO: And we're offering him, obviously, as a professional planner.

CHAIR LIGNOS: As a professional planner. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q All right, Mr. Kauker, will you please tell us what you reviewed for purposes of coming before this board to testify.

A I reviewed the current site plans. I took a look at the 2012, Omland site plan. I reviewed the zoning ordinance and site plan ordinance, transcripts of the past several meetings, particularly the meeting at which Joe Burgis testified. I reviewed the architectural plans and prior master plan documents. I have reviewed the report of your planner, Francis Banisch, and evaluated that, in the light of my testimony. Essentially those are all the documents that \(I\) reviewed.

Q All right. And as the chairman indicated, with regard to the 2009 application made by -- for redevelopment of Closter Plaza, you, in fact, reviewed that 2009 plan, is that correct?

A Yes, I did.
Q And you testified here before this board?
A I did.

Q Now, Mr. Kauker, can you please go through the pre-existing nonconformities on this
property.
A Firstly, it is our position, as was my position at last year's hearing, that the restriction on the number of buildings on any given lot in this zone renders this particular entity, the shopping center, not a permitted use in the zone. Shopping centers, by their very nature, have multiple dwellings and multiple structures on them. And, respectfully, I do not view this particular shopping center as contemplated as a permitted use within the zone.

Second major restriction that has a
bearing on this application is the maximum size of any one given building, as per ordinance 2009, 1036, which sets that maximum square footage at 45,000 square feet. Those are the two particular nonconformities on this property, which I think are relevant to the presentations made in support of the application.

Q All right, the \(K\)-mart building is
84,000 square feet. So, that is nonconforming, is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q All right, now, building \(B\), that's
the, sometimes we refer to that building as the
one having the old Stop \& Shop. What is the size of that building?

A 67,000 square feet. 519 to be exact.
That was confirmed by Mr. Roncati on his testimony.

Q All right. So, that building is nonconforming, is that correct?

A Yes, it is.
Q What about -- what about parking spaces?

A The current parking ratio, standard, within the borough, is 1 space per 175 square feet. That would produce a approximate total number of required spaces for the center as it exists, at 1,500 spaces. Only 720 spaces are existing with, I believe, phase I, adding 10 spaces, for a total of 730 spaces. That certainly is well short of the standards set by the municipality.

Q And what about the height of the K-mart building, does that conform or not? A The height of the K-mart building is an existing nonconforming height situation, because, in deed, it exceeds by several feet. A few feet. The maximum height is 25 feet.

Q Now, I want to turn the page and go to the issue of jurisdiction. You have indicated that you read Mr. Banisch's report, is that correct?

A Yes, I did.
Q Do you agree with Mr. Banisch's opinion with regard to the planning board having jurisdiction over this application?

A No, I do not. Mr. Banisch correctly makes the board, and all of us aware of the fact that the situations where nonconforming structures are -- are present, which in deed is a condition we have here. That a subsection C variance would be required, as long as the use is a permitted use. And it's our contention that this particular shopping center is not effectively a permitted use within the zone. Mr. Banisch also calls out a test, as set forth in Cox, of several criteria, that he notes and sets forth on page 17 of his report, and it's entitled 'Application of the Cox Jurisdictional Test for Closter Plaza's Application.' And in that, he lists five particular questions that need to be answered in the negative, if in fact his position is to be supported, and his position certainly --

MR. BASRALIAN: If I could just
interject, there's no page 17 in Mr. Banisch's report.

MR. KAUKER: I apologize. Page 3.
At the bottom of page 3 .
MR. BASRALIAN: Let's see, 14 pages.
CHAIR LIGNOS: No, you're saying there were five questions that needed to be answered.

MR. KAUKER: In the affirmative.
CHAIR LIGNOS: In the negative you had mentioned.

MR. KAUKER: All of those, they need to be answered in the negative. For instance, the first is, does it involve a use not permitted in the zone. In deed, Mr. Banisch takes position that the answer to that question is, no, because he feels that the proposed uses are permitted. They may be permitted individually, retail, but they're not permitted in the aggregate, because this in fact is a shopping center not contemplated by that particular regulation, which effectively states that you can only have one building on any given lot within the zone.

MR. CHAGARIS: That ordinance
doesn't say you can only have one use within a zone though, right?

MR. KAUKER: Building and use in the eyes of the municipal land use law are essentially synonomous.

MR. CHAGARIS: I would take issue with that legal conclusion, but there's -- it doesn't say that they can't have more than one use in a lot though, right?

MR. KAUKER: That's correct. You can have multiple uses but they need to be in one building. The second question: Does it involve a principal structure not permitted in the zone. There -- and he answers, "no". I disagree with his conclusion. Because there are several principal structures that are proposed, four in number. And the answer to that question is, essentially, in my view, respectfully, should be yes. So, that in the light of those particular tests, I agree with item C, sub-item D, in terms of his answer. And sub-item C. By virtue of the fact that it is our respectful position that two of those, \(A\) and \(B\)--

CHAIR LIGNOS: Can you repeat your position on item two, please.

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir. Would be
item two, would be subsection \(B\), does it involve a principal structure not permitted in the zone. And my answer to that question, that it does involve a principal structure not permitted because there are not only one, but two, three and four structures. So, structures, essentially No. 2, 3 and 4, are not contemplated and permitted within the zone because it limits any given lot to one principal use and/or structure. That is the basis for my disagreement, aside from --

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me. That's contradictory to what he just said, whether multiple uses are permitted. Now he said only one use is permitted. It just makes no sense.

MR. CHAGARIS: I agree.
MR. KAUKER: Multiple uses are
permitted but not multiple structures.
MR. CHAGARIS: Let me ask you this though: Do you agree that this application reduces the number of structures from four to three?

MR. KAUKER: I believe -- well, yeah, four to three, yes, it does.

MR. CHAGARIS: It does reduce.

MR. KAUKER: Yes, it does.
MR. SINOWITZ: Excuse me. I think it would be clearer, and more accurate to say --

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
MR. SINOWITZ: -- as the ordinance reads, it doesn't speak of structures. You know, an air conditioning unit is a structure. A driveway is a structure. It says, in all the districts the number of principal buildings per lot --

MR. KAUKER: Buildings.
MR. SINOWITZ: -- shall be limited
to one.
MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
MR. SINOWITZ: A building is a
structure.
MR. KAUKER: Yes, it is. Yes.
MR. SINOWITZ: This is speaking of buildings. Not structures.

MR. KAUKER: You're absolutely
correct. A building is the dispositive word. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q All right. Now, Mr. Kauker, with regard to the fact that this applicant is proposing a subdivision, in your opinion does that
have any effect on the board's jurisdiction?
A The existing array of uses on this site are essentially nonconforming, in the several respects that \(I\) testified to, in terms of number of buildings, and parking deficiency. And in that context, when you have a nonconforming situation, and a reduce for the size of the lot that supports that nonconforming condition, it increases the intensity of use on the site, and, therefore, change -- changes the degree of nonconformity. It increases the degree of nonconformity. Municipal land use law and accepted planning principles take the view that nonconforming conditions, within a given development situation, are encouraged to be minimized and reduced, if not made into conformity. That is a goal and objective and a principle set forth in municipal planning practice. When you have a situation that essentially reduces the size of the parcel upon which supports the nonconforming condition, that results in a change in the degree of nonconformity, or an intensification of the use on the site.

Q Now, Mr. Banisch, in his report, discussed two decisions, the Rasberry and Nuckel
decision. Do you agree with his analysis with regard to those decisions and specifically what you're talking about, and that is, decreasing the size of a property where there is nonconformities? A No, I do not. And I believe that Rasberry and Nuckel are directly relevant to this application.

Q All right. Now, I want to talk to you, specifically, about building \(B\), and that's the building where the new Whole Foods is going to be situated. According to Mr. Roncati the building is going to go from 67,500 square feet to 85,200 square feet. Now, with regard to the increase of that building, does that have any effect on the jurisdiction of this board to hear this application?

A I believe that that change in increase, in the size of the building, essentially which is guided and controlled by the 45,000 square foot maximum, obviously in that particular instance where you're increasing the size of the building, in that particular instance for building B, you're increasing the degree of nonconformity, which is opposite -- in the opposite direction that good planning practice suggests that you go.

Q Now that at least part of the new Whole Foods is going to be constructed where there presently is a driveway, does that have any effect on the issue of jurisdiction in the issues we have been talking about?

A Well, that essentially merges those two structures as they are now separated by driveway and, obviously, increases the size of that single particular building. And, again, renders it far in excess of the max size of 45,000 square feet.

Q The expansion into that driveway where no building exists, is that the -- is that the same -- the same reason reasoning that Mr. Chagaris used in '02 when he had an opinion with regard to that freestanding building G? A Essentially it does, yes.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I'm sorry. One more time. I didn't understand the question. Nor did I understand where it's going.

Q Mr. Chagaris, in the controversial \(0-2\), that we marked tonight, today, indicated that the board did not have jurisdiction over that application because the applicant was proposing a new building \(G\), where no building \(G\) previously existed. Now this applicant is proposing to
expand building \(B\) into that driveway area where no building now exists. It's our position that for the same reasoning that this board did not have jurisdiction in 2012, they're doing the exact same thing with regard to building \(B\), and that is substantially expanding that building well beyond 45,000 square feet. And they're doing so in an area where there exists no building. So, for the same reasons that Mr . Chagaris stated that the board didn't have jurisdiction in 2012, the same reasoning should apply here.

MR. DENICOLA: You're saying the building is 45,000 square feet, is that what you're saying? I didn't understand what -- I'm not clear, 45,000 square foot building you're saying.

MR. SEGRETO: There's only -there's only permitted, 45,000 square foot -- one 45,000 square foot principal building.

MR. DENICOLA: No, that's not what it says. It's right here. Retail store size. Not a building.

MR. SEGRETO: All right. Well --
MR. DENICOLA: I just want to make sure we're clear on what we're talking about.

Because this is store size.
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I'm -- I'm -I'm very clear what I'm talking about.

MR. DENICOLA: Okay. You're claiming the code says, building?

MR. SEGRETO: I'm not claiming anything, and \(I\) don't want to get into an argument.

MR. DENICOLA: I am trying to understand what variance you're talking about.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, I think -- I
think the issue is very, very clear. And I think respectfully you're trying to cloud the issue.

MR. DENICOLA: No, I'm actually reading from the code.

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me, shouldn't the question be directed to Mr . Kauker rather than Mr. Segreto?

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, that's --
MR. DENICOLA: Mr. Kauker, it's
true, is it -- I think we're interchanging building and store size. Do you see the difference?

MR. KAUKER: No, I do not. And I'll tell you why.

MR. DENICOLA: Okay.
MR. KAUKER: If the ordinance didn't limit development to one building on one lot, you would be correct. But by virtue of the fact that only one building is limited on a lot, with the maximum size of any permitted retail in that building, being 45,000 square feet, there is one. It's in play.

MR. DENICOLA: So, you can't have two -- you can't have two stores in one building?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, you can. But they cannot exceed 45,000 square feet.

MR. DENICOLA: The building can't?
MR. KAUKER: That's correct.
Because under -- under -- when you read the ordinance in its entirety, you take into account, and take note of the fact that only one building is permitted on a given lot. That's the standard.

MR. DENICOLA: I understand but --
MR. KAUKER: And then you apply --
MR. DENICOLA: You're not answering my question. My question is: Regarding the size of the building. We're not talking about the number of buildings. I'm talking about the size of the building. You're claiming the maximum size
of the building is 45,000 square feet.
MR. KAUKER: That's correct.
MR. DENICOLA: Where are you getting
that from the code?
MR. KAUKER: It's maximum -- the maximum is -- applies to this site because you can only have one building on the site.

MR. DENICOLA: No, no, no, I'm
talking about the size of the building. You're claiming the maximum size of the building is 45,000 square feet. Where are you getting that from?

MR. SINOWITZ: Maximum size of the store.

MR. DENICOLA: No, no, he's saying building. I'm not sure where the building is again. Where is the building coming from? I tell you what the requirement is, if you want to look at the requirement. It's in the zoning code on schedule A. If you want to look at it and just take a look at it real quick.

MR. KAUKER: Well, I believe you. However, if the maximum size of any retail entity is 45,000 square feet, okay, and you can only have one building on the site --

CHAIR LIGNOS: You can have one building on the site but not necessarily --

MR. KAUKER: You can have one building greater than 45,000, as long as any separate building. But any separate building can't be --

MR. DENICOLA: We're not talking about buildings. We're talking about -- we're talking about -- we're talking about -- right now we're talking about --

CHAIR LIGNOS: We just want to get a clarification on the retail aspect.

MR. KAUKER: Yeah, I understand.
MR. DENICOLA: We are discussing terms here and it's very confusing. So, there is no limit for a building size. Just to set the record straight.

MR. SEGRETO: That is incorrect.
MR. DENICOLA: Okay. Can you show me where you're getting that from?

MR. SEGRETO: It's our -- we obviously there's going to be a legal issue involved in this case. And the legal issue concerns exactly what we're talking about.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Segreto, we're
trying to make it so there isn't a legal issue. We're trying to actually help --

MR. DENICOLA: You're providing
testimony on something we're trying to clarify.
MR. SEGRETO: You're not going to be able to resolve this issue as a board.

MR. DENICOLA: Oh, okay.
CHAIR LIGNOS: You've already
determined that for the record?
MR. DENICOLA: Yes, he did.
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I determined that, yes. Yeah, I did.

CHAIR LIGNOS: That we can't help in getting this resolved?

MR. SEGRETO: Nope. That's right.
MR. MADDALONI: Could I ask a clarifying question. So, how many acres is this site?

CHAIR LIGNOS: It's 15.
MR. MADDALONI: Fifteen acres. So,
Mr. Kauker, is it your opinion, as a professional, that this site should be developed with retail space, no -- not more -- not exceeding more than 45,000 square feet on 15 acres?

MR. KAUKER: No, it's not. But I
    believe --

MR. MADDALONI: But it sounds like that's exactly what you're saying. It sounds exactly what you're saying.

MR. KAUKER: The amount of square footage on this site is controlled by other regulations.

MR. MADDALONI: That's not what you're saying.

MR. DENICOLA: That's not what you're saying.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Let's keep going. All right. We have that one area that we're trying to resolve. I understand. Let's go on. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q All right, Mr. Kauker, I walk to talk to you about the K -mart building and the proposed subdivision right in front of that \(K\)-mart building. Am I correct that there's a substantial deficiency in the parking as a result of that subdivision?

A Parking proximate to the K-mart building, consistent with good design practice is deficient.

Q And you'll agree with me that if
the -- if the applicant did not propose to subdivide that property off, it could be used for parking, isn't that correct?

A Yes, it could. You could more than likely get 40 to 50 spaces within that half acre. The area is . 541 acres \(I\) believe.

Q Now, with regard to the new uses, the applicant has indicated it may be three to four new uses in the \(K\)-mart building, compared to the present \(K\)-mart use. Is there going to be any kind of intensification of that use of that building?

A Yes, there would.
Q All right. I want to talk to you about Mr. Roncati's testimony, and the indication that there's going to be substantial demolition of buildings, and how that relates, again, to the issue of nonconformities and jurisdiction. Now, with regard to building \(B\), Mr. Roncati testified that the existing square footage is 67,500 square feet. They will be demolishing 52,900 square feet. Approximately about 78 percent. Does the -- after demolishing the building, does this applicant have the right to rebuild and expand that building?

A When that building is demolished the nonconformity is extinguished, and the nonconforming rights attributable to that building disappear. They go away because the building has been taken away. It's demolished. And that increases the burden upon this applicant to prove to the board that that -- essentially that degree of nonconformity has a reason to be reconstructed, as proposed by the applicant. So, it's a brand new deviation. It's a brand new variance as opposed to modifying an existing structure, either reducing or increasing its size. But -- and certainly demolishing and putting in a new structure is certainly not a bad thing. But technically and legally when you remove a building, in its entirety, and then completely rebuild it, essentially you're giving up your nonconforming use rights.

MR. DENICOLA: I though you said it was 78 percent.

MR. KAUKER: Seventy-eight percent demolished.

MR. DENICOLA: That's not the entirety.

MR. KAUKER: Well, that -- that 78
percent you're giving up. And what you're retaining is the differential, which would be 22 percent.

MR. DENICOLA: You said when a building is demolished in its entirety you said.

MR. KAUKER: No, I take that back.
I take that back. When you're demolishing that area which you've taken away in its entirety, ceases to have nonconforming rights.

MR. DENICOLA: So, any time you demolish a portion of building you cannot get that portion of the building back?

MR. KAUKER: Unless you renew the variance necessary to rebuild the structure. And I know -- I understand that's an integral part of this application. But the burden of replacing a building that doesn't exist, from a portion of a building that doesn't exist on the site, is a brand new variance.

MR. DENICOLA: And where do you cite that requirement that, you know, a portion of the building is demolished can't be reconstructed?

MR. KAUKER: When you reconstruct
any of the multiple buildings on this site, because a shopping center use is not permitted,
you need a variance in order to rebuild it. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q Does this board have jurisdiction over the variance that's needed?

A No.
Q To construct a building over 45,000 square feet, in your opinion?

A No, it does not.
Q Now, same thing with regard to
building D; Mr. Roncati indicated that the existing square footage is 56,900. They're demolishing 42,900. That's -- they're demolishing about 75 percent of building D. Do they have the rights, in your opinion, to rebuild, once they demolish, without a variance?

A No, they do not.
Q And a variance is not from this planning board, is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Now, with regard to the K-mart building, again, Mr. Roncati indicated that the existing square footage is 84,000 square feet, approximately. They're demolishing 15,500 square feet.

A And that computes out to 18 percent of
that total structure.
Q But after they demolish that 15,400 square feet, Mr. Roncati indicated that they are going to build an additional 4,500 square feet after demolition. Do they have the right to do that without a variance?

A No, they do not.
Q And what type of variance do they need for that?

A They would need a D variance.
Q Okay. And that's from the board of adjustment, is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Now, let's go to their variance
request as well as their waiver requests. Can you just go through briefly what variances they're asking for.

A They are asking for a variance to permit multiple structures on the site.

CHAIR LIGNOS: May I ask one question before you get off of that topic, which is important to me. When you take all the buildings that are on the site and you calculate the amount of demolition for all the buildings as one entity, as one enterprise.
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MR. KAUKER: In the aggregate?
CHAIR LIGNOS: In the aggregate.
MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: What is the percentage that you find, as far as demolition, percentage-wise, to the aggregate?

MR. KAUKER: 52.7 percent in the aggregate.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Of 52 --
MR. KAUKER: When you add all of those numbers together and do the calculations.

MR. CHAGARIS: Fifty-two percent is being demolished?

MR. KAUKER: Fifty-two percent of in the aggregate of the total square footage of building B, D and K-mart, are proposed to be demolished, and reconstructed under the application.

MR. DENICOLA: Is that with or without E? The movie theater.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Excuse me one second, please. If you don't mind, I just want to, as part of this complex, or this enterprise, there is a bank.
```

                                    MR. KAUKER: Yes.
    ```

CHAIR LIGNOS: Does that in your
calculations --
MR. KAUKER: No, it was not in our calculations. Just the three buildings that are affected by demolition.

CHAIR LIGNOS: With that bank, would it reduce the amount of demolition's percentage of the aggregate?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, it would.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Does your total
include the movie theater?
MR. KAUKER: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: If you were to
include the movie theater would it further reduce the percentage of demolition? Reduce the percentage of demolition?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, it would.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you.
I'm sorry, Mr. Segreto, you can continue.
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I just want --
that's all right. I just want to do a little numbers myself.

BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q Just so the record could be clear, if you take Mr. Roncati's number as to how much is
going to be demolished of building \(B, D\), and the K-mart, it adds up to 111,300 square feet, the total site, which includes the bank, as well as the theater is 211,553 and that is more than 50 percent.

A Yeah. I apologize. The aggregate that I used to create that 52.7 percent was the proposed after phase II, total amount of square footage proposed on the site. Total. And I do apologize. That includes the bank. It does include the bank. Because the bank is an integral part of phase I. And it does include the theater. So that the total number, in this equation, in this calculation is 211,337 square feet under the 111,424 square feet, which is the total of the three buildings to be demolished. So, that the 52.7 percent is in fact in the aggregate.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. So, let me then -- that's an important clarification. I thank you. If that 52 was to be 49 , does it change your opinion as to --

MR. KAUKER: Less than 50 percent demolition?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Yeah.
MR. KAUKER: No. In the back of my
mind I know that's a concept as it relates to ability to rebuild on some -- in a non -- to rebuild a nonconforming structure, if it's less than -- I think the standard is less than 50 percent.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Right. MR. KAUKER: I don't believe that is the same as what we're talking about here. What we're talking about here is a portion of a structure being completely removed before it's completely rebuilt. And when you do that, legally, you are extinguishing your nonconforming use rights attributed to that portion of the building.

CHAIR LIGNOS: All right. Just
attribute -- I'm sorry. I'm trying to get this for myself, because it's an important -- it's an important issue. If -- on this site sits one enterprise that we know as Closter Plaza. MR. KAUKER: Yes.

CHAIR LIGNOS: If that Closter Plaza
was to be demolished less than 50 percent for improvements to be made, does its nonconformity change if it's demolished less than 50 percent, as a whole, on the site, as a whole?

MR. KAUKER: I don't believe it
does. If it were less than 50 percent.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Right. It maintains -- it could maintain it's nonconformity.

MR. KAUKER: No, I don't believe -that's in event of fire or -- I don't think -MR. DENICOLA: And in the event of fire --

MR. SEGRETO: I don't believe that there is anything -- because \(I\) know, but you are getting into legal issues.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Well, no, I'm going into planning issues.

MR. DENICOLA: These are planning issues. These are planning issues.

MR. SEGRETO: When there's no case and there's no statute that talks about a certain percentage as to when you can rebuild and when you cannot rebuild.

MR. DENICOLA: That's exactly right.
MR. CHAGARIS: That's right. And the point is, the statute says, if it's a complete demolition. And this is not. I'd like to ask Mr. Kauker that question. Certainly, we're talking about percentages. But it's certainly
your opinion, is it not, that this is not a complete demolition of the structures on the site.

MR. SEGRETO: And my objection to
the question the statute does not talk about demolition. The statute, and specifically that we're talking about is 40:55(B) 68: Says, any nonconforming use or structure can be continued, and such structure may be restored or repaired in the event of partial destruction.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. So --
MR. SEGRETO: It doesn't talk about
demolition.
MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. I stand corrected.

MR. SEGRETO: This is -- this is destruction by design.

MR. CHAGARIS: This is not a -- this is not a complete destruction or demolition, is it?

MR. KAUKER: That is correct, it's not a complete demolition.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay.
MR. DENICOLA: Okay. Good.
MR. KAUKER: Although --
MR. SEGRETO: And my -- and my
objection is that you have two substantial buildings out of the four that are being substantially demolished, 78 percent and 75 percent.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. Well, the witness answered.

MR. SEGRETO: That's not a partial
destruction. That's substantial.
MR. CHAGARIS: I don't know that --
MR. SEGRETO: I know but these
issues --
CHAIR LIGNOS: That's fine. That's
fine.
MR. CHAGARIS: It's a legal argument
for a later date.
MR. KAUKER: There is one final
aspect or result as a product of the demolition that I haven't mentioned to the board.

Mr. Chagaris' prior opinion, relative to what happens when you construct a new building on the site, would essentially tend to place the jurisdiction of that kind of an application with another board, zoning board. In essence, what's happening here, when you demolish and extinguish and remove that part of the structure, you're
building a new structure on that pad, on that area, or on an area slightly related or substantially related to that pad. And I believe that that falls within the category of the kinds of activities that would trigger a zoning board jurisdiction, as opposed to a planning board, consistent with Mr. Chagaris' prior opinion related to a prior application.

MR. CHAGARIS: But you're in
agreement though that the opinion before had to do with a totally --

MR. KAUKER: New building.
MR. CHAGARIS: -- new structure, all four walls.

MR. KAUKER: Right. Right.
MR. CHAGARIS: But that's not what's happening in this circumstance.

MR. KAUKER: Well, this in fact is a new structure on an area that has been vacated. So, generically, and very simply, there's -there's an absolute comparison, a parallel between the two.

MR. CHAGARIS: All right. That's your opinion that's -- we can move on. BY MR. SEGRETO:

Q All right. I want to go to the issue of what the applicant calls their waivers. Now, they are asking for a substantial amount of waivers, is that correct?

A Yes, they are. Or variances?
Q Well, I want to talk about waivers first. They're indicating that the number of parking spaces, or waivers, the number of loading spaces, parking setbacks, driveway widths, size of spaces, that they're all waivers. Do you agree that the relief that they're seeking is waivers and not variances?

A No, I do not.
Q All right. Tell us -- tell the board why, please. A The zoning ordinance has a particular section in it that incorporates, by reference, the parking standards that are located, legally and physically within the site plan ordinance. When you incorporate by reference, and I'll give you the section in a minute, when you incorporate by reference, a standard that exists in another ordinance, it essentially becomes an integral part of the ordinance, which implements the incorporation, so that those regulations are as
much as, legally, as much in functionally within the zoning ordinance, as they are in the site plan ordinance. So, they're in both ordinances. And in that cont --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Is that your planning opinion or is that a legal opinion that you're giving because I'm a little confused.

MR. DENICOLA: Yeah, what is it?
MR. KAUKER: Well, it's a
combination thereof because as municipal planners, we're able to craft ordinances in concert with a legal partnership, so-to-speak. And incorporation by reference is a common mechanism. In this particular instance it may have been crafted, as Mr. Burgis observed, to make the planners or the administrators of the zoning ordinance, aware that there's -- that there's a parallel -- that the criteria for parking, the parking standards, resides in another ordinance. That may have been the intent. And I agree with Mr. Burgis in terms of his observation. But the legal import of that, and the legal result, is that -- that by that incorporation, it becomes an integral part of the zoning ordinance. And, therefore, any deviation from the parking standards, effectively, is a
variance as opposed to a waiver.
MR. CHAGARIS: What do you base that on? Or is it just your conclusion that because -MR. KAUKER: Well, there's a chapter in the zoning ordinance that essentially is integral to the zoning ordinance. It's section 200-32. It's entitled, 'Off-Street Parking." It's on page 200-25 of the zoning code. And it simply says that there shall be provided, off-street parking, as required by this ordinance. But it also says that in accordance with the requirements of the site plan ordinance of the Borough of Closter, all off-street service entrances for loading or unloading shall be in the rear yard. That raises a question as to the two front yards that have been testified to in this application.

MR. BASRALIAN: Excuse me. Can I have the citation? Really, I don't have a citation for which you're referring to.

MR. SEGRETO: 200-32.
MR. KAUKER: 200-32.
MR. SINOWITZ: 32 what?
MR. DENICOLA: 32. That's it.
MR. CHAGARIS: Of the zoning code.

MR. KAUKER: Entitled, 'Off Street Parking.' It's on page 200- or :25.

MR. SINOWITZ: But isn't that under article 4, district 4-B, officiary of 4 -officiary B. And 200-25 through 200-33 encompasses that article specifically. It doesn't include other articles or other districts.

MR. DENICOLA: Yeah, it's in a different zone.

MR. SINOWITZ: Other zones. So, that would be applicable to article 4 district 4-B officiary B.

MR. SEGRETO: Well, then that would mean that every other zone in this town does not have any kind of off-street parking requirements because --

MR. DENICOLA: No, it doesn't.
MR. SINOWITZ: It means that there are specific language --

MR. DENICOLA: Site plan code. Site plan ordinance.

MR. SEGRETO: I understand.
MR. SINOWITZ: It means that the specific language you're speaking of only reference to article 9.

MR. KAUKER: It's kind of odd that they would place that chapter --

MR. SINOWITZ: That's why it was written.

MR. KAUKER: You're certainly correct that's where -- that's where it is. But it's kind of odd that they would place it just for that one zone when all the other zones need parking. So, it raises a question in my mind. MR. MADDALONI: Maybe we can get a -- I certainly would like a clarification, perhaps our counsel, on distinguishing between a waiver and a variance. Because we have had numerous parking waivers in front of this board over the years. And why it's now being described as a variance, it begs an explanation to me.

MR. DENICOLA: It's his opinion.
That's all.
MR. CHAGARIS: It's his opinion. MR. MADDALONI: All right even -MR. CHAGARIS: Because there's one section of the zoning code that references off-street parking. He's saying that therefore it's a zoning issue.

MR. MADDALONI: Okay. And we've
been wrong all these years.
MR. SINOWITZ: Even though it's a zoning office, it would still, I would think is construed as a waiver.

MR. CHAGARIS: Well, yeah, it doesn't even apply to this district.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Can we continue, please.

BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q Mr. Kauker, since we're talking
about waivers, there is the Municipal Land Use Act does have a provision that deals specifically with the burden of proof with regard to waivers, isn't that correct?

A Yes, it does.
Q Do you know what that section is?
A It's N.J.S.A. 40:55(D)-51.
Q And what does the land use, the municipal land use specifically say about waivers, and when they should be granted?

A \(\quad\) They should be granted only when their -their denial would exact an undue hardship because a particular peculiar condition pertaining to the land in question.

Q Do you know of any kind of
impracticality or undue hardship or peculiar condition pertaining to this specific piece of property that prohibits this applicant from complying with all of the off-street parking requirements, whether they're site plan requirements or whether they're, like we say, zoning ordinance requirements?

A There are -- the property is relatively
flat. And certainly there are no physical constraints that would prevent a situation where you would have less building and more parking so that you would be able to come closer to the standards set forth by the Borough.

Q Do you agree with me that if the applicant, since they are demolishing substantial parts of building \(B\) and building \(D, i f\) they did not rebuild all that they demolished, and that they reduced, substantially, the square footage of all of their buildings, that they would be able to comply with the off-street parking requirements? A You could come closer to compliance. Ideally, which may not be a reasonable or practicable or exact some degree of hardship on the -- on the property itself as it now exists, if the level of demolition, at 52 percent,
coincidentally matches the shortfall in parking, which is about 50 percent. So, ideally the ideal situation for complete compliance would be to essentially replace that demolished area. And I could certainly understand that that -- that that's an ideal situation, and that's one that would be in full conformity with the ordinance.

Q Actually I want you --
CHAIR LIGNOS: I'm sorry.
MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I'm sorry.
CHAIR LIGNOS: When you say ideal --
MR. KAUKER: Well, ideally in the eyes of the ordinance it would be fully conforming.

CHAIR LIGNOS: You said non practicable before.

MR. KAUKER: Well, I think the applicant can make a reasonable case, based upon contemporary parking standards, as Mr. Burgis has attempted to do in his testimony, to convince the board that maybe the 175 standard is a very stringent standard, as opposed to say 1 per 200 , which is commonly the average standard that's in play in most updated ordinances. And in that context, one would, obviously, in order to comply
with that, you would still be short by approximately 300 spaces. But that would certainly be more compliant than the 50 percent shortfall.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Now, as the
planner --
MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: -- this is under the parking issue.

MR. KAUKER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: As a planner, have you come across a standard that we have been given here, that is more commonly used with --

MR. KAUKER: Retail.
CHAIR LIGNOS: -- with retail and shopping centers at 4 cars per thousand?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Would you consider that practicable? Again, a word that you used, which I guess is a good word.

MR. KAUKER: I would consider the most appropriate standard at 1 per 200 because that's common for retail. When you -- the 1 per 250, which is a lesser standard, it usually comes into play for regional shopping centers, larger
scale. I don't know whether this, at 200,000 square feet, fits into that category. I think it's more in the category of a large shopping center as opposed to a regional center.

CHAIR LIGNOS: But there is the moment of impracticality \(I\) understand.

MR. KAUKER: Well, I understand the case that the applicant has made. And I don't -I don't -- and I would -- and I don't -- I think it's unreasonable. But, nonetheless, there is a substantial shortfall. So, something has to give.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. SEGRETO:
Q All right, lastly, Mr. Kauker, I would like you to talk about the 2009 master plan reexamination report, and its relationship to this application.

A One of the reasons cited in that particular master plan, for, at least from the view of the writers, as to the obsolescent conditions and degree of vacancies and the age of this shopping center, is that they threw out the theory, or the possibility that that might be the case in part because of the fact that there's too much retial to serve this community and
surrounding communities, and that is so noted in the master plan. Giving rise to a kind of a position or attitude that retail should in fact be reduced as opposed to increased, and that's simply what that --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Would you be -that's important to me. Could you please show me that on the master plan? Can you restate that, please.

MR. KAUKER: They opined that one of the reasons why, maybe contributory to conditions on this site, and the problem associated with this site, in terms of tenancies, is that there may well be too much retail. And those were the words in quote, "Too much retail within the community."

CHAIR LIGNOS: Was the "May be" as part of that as well or --

MR. KAUKER: No, it was a statement. It was a statement in that -- in that master plan. I don't have it with me. And I'd be pleased to give you the cite.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I'd love to have that -- I wish I -- we could read that. Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. You can continue. I'm sure there was more on the master plan than just --

MR. KAUKER: Well, that's the only aspect of the master plan that stands out in my view, as it -- as it may relate to the way in which a board might view this application.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Was there anything in the master plan that said that -- that the area of Piermont Road looking to get some --

MR. KAUKER: Infield development?
CHAIR LIGNOS: Yes.
MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Infield development.
MR. KAUKER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Would that be --
would this application go, to some degree, to fulfill that request of the master plan, or that observation of the master plan?

MR. KAUKER: Well, in the light of the fact that that there is a view expressed in the master plan, there may be too much retail, and as I recall that section, that talks about the extension, they talked about other uses, office support uses, and things of that nature. And retail, they talked about. And, of course if you have too much on any one given site, than you're going to impede the ability of those particular
target areas that you mentioned, to be -- to move in that direction.

CHAIR LIGNOS: And in particular, the -- the master plan was talking about the plaza, and not the commons, in your -- in your opinion?

MR. KAUKER: Well it -- it -- it -it used the word --

CHAIR LIGNOS: You know, the commons is that piece --

MR. KAUKER: I understand the
commons. And the commons is part of that -- part of that -- part of that statement. But that particular section of that paragraph was talking specifically about conditions on this particular site.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SEGRETO: I have no further questions of Mr. Kauker.

CHAIR LIGNOS: No further questions. Can I ask -- I want to continue on that. Would you be so kind, this is the master plan, if you would -- if you think you can just -- I would just like to read it while I'm -- members of the board does anyone have a question? We are going to do
this in a systematic way again. We'll go from the mayor over.

First of all, Mr. Basralian -- how does this work? Mr. Basralian goes first I guess.

MR. BASRALIAN: That's a change in the way you've done things before.

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, I'll go last then. I'll let you go. Yeah. I was just -- you know something, this is all new to me. Because normally I look over there. Now I have to look over there. So, it's getting complex.

Mayor.
MAYOR HEYMANN: I pass.
CHAIR LIGNOS: You pass. Dr.
Maddaloni.
MR. MADDALONI: So, Mr. Kauker, you testified that the requirement, the parking requirement, as the ordinance exist, are how many vehicles for this?

MR. KAUKER: One -- one space per each 175 square feet.

MR. MADDALONI: Right. So, how many would that be for the -- for the --

MR. KAUKER: About 1,540 I believe exactly.

MR. MADDALONI: And they have how
many?
MR. KAUKER: 730 .
MR. MADDALONI: Okay. So, they're over 800 spots deficient?

MR. KAUKER: Short, yeah.
MR. MADDALONI: And then you testified that if they didn't subdivide that lot you would be able to add another 30 to 40 parking spots, correct?

MR. KAUKER: That's correct. No, sir. About 50, 40 to 50. That half acre. It's a half acre.

MR. MADDALONI: Okay. So, about 40 to 50. So, that's roughly about 5 -- that reduces the deficiency by about 5 percent. Is that -- do you see that as a significant reduction in the parking problem?

MR. KAUKER: I think any time you can come closer to what's required in the standard is --

MR. MADDALONI: I'm asking if it's significant. If you added one --

MR. KAUKER: -- is a good thing.
It's not --

MR. MADDALONI: If you added one spot it comes closer. But I'm asking if it's significant.

MR. KAUKER: It's not significant.
As it relates to the proportion of the shortfall.
MR. MADDALONI: Right. It's about
5 percent. Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Baboo.
MR. BABOO: I'm trying to understand the phrase, not a permitted use in the zone.

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
MR. BABOO: I just, if you could shed some light on that. I don't quite understand what you meant by that.

MR. KAUKER: Shopping centers are usually recognized and regulated in most municipalities as separate entities because they do have certain unique characteristics. And no such recognition exists, nor any such word as, shopping centers, in the current ordinance, but for the fact that retail uses are permitted on the site.

This shopping center has, as evidenced in the prior testimony and discussion before the board, predated the current ordinance.

And in that context it exists as a nonconforming use.

My respectful observation is that --
MR. BABOO: Once second, when you say, predated an ordinance, which ordinance are you talking about?

MR. KAUKER: I'm talking about the ordinance, the current zoning ordinance, as written.

MR. BABOO: Okay.
MR. KAUKER: Was written after this center was built essentially. I think it was early 50's or 60's, as I recall. This ordinance was crafted, I believe in the 70's. So, that it placed the shopping center in a category, a legal use category, as a nonconforming use.

It in fact is not a permitted use. Shopping centers are not contemplated, identified or individually identified as a permitted use.

The integral parts of what are on site, retail and other types of activities, are, in fact, permitted. But a shopping center that takes on its own special separate identity, as opposed to the kinds of activities and uses that exist in this central business area, which are a
number of different individual retail or commercial entities on separate lots.

MR. BABOO: So, if the mall didn't exist, or let's say there's no mall, and it's just a piece of land --

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
MR. BABOO: And it's zoned the same way it's zoned now --

MR. KAUKER: Right.
MR. BABOO: -- you're saying that you wouldn't be able to build anything on it?

MR. KAUKER: You can't -- you can't rebuild on this site without a certain kind of a variance. And my respectful view is that that variance is a D variance, to be considered and granted by the zoning board, as opposed to a planning board.

CHAIR LIGNOS: May I?
MR. BABOO: Okay.
CHAIR LIGNOS: The building that's to the left of the shopping center, there is a bank facility, there's a doctor's office, there are offices. The building on the corner of Lewis and Vervalen.

MR. KAUKER: Right. Okay.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, if there's one retail facility, it's a single facility. When there are two, what is that called, when there are two retail functions within a building?

MR. KAUKER: Multiple use within a structure.

CHAIR LIGNOS: And when there's three?

MR. KAUKER: The same thing.
CHAIR LIGNOS: And when there's ten? MR. KAUKER: Same.

CHAIR LIGNOS: When does something become a mall or shopping center? Is there some magic pixie dust that has to be sprinkled on this building to make it --

MR. KAUKER: Well, not pixie dust but general standards that recognize certain size of single commercial entities.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. And that's
what --
MR. KAUKER: But it's not written in stone.

MR. NYFENGER: In our code?
MR. CHAGARIS: I don't think -- it's
```

not in our code.

```

CHAIR LIGNOS: Right. You're not suggesting that's in our code, right?

MR. KAUKER: No, it's not. Those standards that differentiate.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Right. So, where can we find that?

MR. KAUKER: In part you can find it by the limitation to one structure on a site. Shopping centers are usually designed to accommodate multiple structures, particularly this day and age when --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Multiple structures meaning multiple retail?

MR. KAUKER: Multiple buildings. Multiple buildings.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Multiple buildings that can house even more multiple retail functions.

MR. KAUKER: Well, multiple buildings within a given one property. Multiple buildings on one property. In most instances in the central business area here you have essentially one building on each property, on average \(I\) would say. On -- in the majority.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, if this owner --

MR. KAUKER: So, size and multiple building characteristic would give rise to one's ability to identify Closter Plaza entity as a shopping center, as commonly regulated, identified and referred to in other ordinances. That level of detail and definition is not within Closter's ordinance. Mainly because Closter's ordinance was written to relate, more particularly, it appears to me, to the character and identity of Closter center. This center. Smaller lots. I think the minimum lot size is 6,000 square feet. Obviously this is 15 acres. So, we're -- we're talking about two different --

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, I understand that. But, again, I'd like to focus back on that building again on the corner of Lewis.

MR. KAUKER: Right. It's a single building with multiple uses.

CHAIR LIGNOS: With multiple uses. MR. KAUKER: And that fits the ordinance because the ordinance says one building on a lot.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, this -- this whole thing could be a non issue if the plaza came back with one building?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Connected it all and made it one very large building?

MR. KAUKER: It would then adhere to that. It would comply with that limitation.

CHAIR LIGNOS: If we made this plaza one building --

MR. KAUKER: Right.
CHAIR LIGNOS: It may not suit life safety issues like circulation for, you know, fire trucks, and things like that. Or it might. Who knows. But if it was one building --

MR. KAUKER: It could be a donut building with the core amenities and parking contained within the -- within the center.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Mr. Baboo, I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. BABOO: Okay. I'm sorry, it doesn't -- your supposition doesn't make any sense to me. But let's go into the retail store. But I ask anyway, you're also saying that the 45,000 maximum size applies to everything or every building? I'm just trying to get some more clarification on that. Basically, specifically I'm reading in here, it says it's for retail
stores.
MR. KAUKER: The thing that
triggers, it gives rise to my view, even though it seems impracticable, and in error, or difficult to understand, is, I associate the two regulations, the one building concept, and the 45,000 square feet, as being intimately related. And only on that basis do I end up with the view that the limit essentially is 25,000. Because you could have one retail in one building on one site.

MR. CHAGARIS: Forty.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Forty-five.
MR. KAUKER: 45,000. So, when I -when I -- when I pull all that together that's how I arrive at that view.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, we could have a million square foot building, but \(I\) can have a 45,000 -- as long as I don't go over 45,000 in its one retail function?

MR. KAUKER: Yes, you could.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay.
MR. SINOWITZ: It's one store.
CHAIR LIGNOS: One store 45.
MR. BABOO: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Ms. Stella.

MS. STELLA: Pass.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Nyfenger.
MR. NYFENGER: I don't want to beat a dead horse, but my question was the exact same one as Mr. Baboo.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Was it answered?
MR. NYFENGER: Well, I'm not sure I'm satisfied with the answer. Is a square a rectangle?

MR. KAUKER: Well, you're going back to geometry. I believe it is.

MR. NYFENGER: A square is a type of rectangle.

MR. KAUKER: Yes.
MR. NYFENGER: A shopping center is a type of retail use?

MR. KAUKER: That's correct.
MR. NYFENGER: I don't know that our founding fathers in the 70 's needed to worry about putting the exact type of retail that the existing plaza was at the time.

MR. KAUKER: Let me give you an example. If I were, objectively, as a planner, asked to look at the dichotomy between Closter Plaza and the downtown center, for which I believe
the ordinance was written, I would create two zones instead of having the personality and nature of one zone, essentially limit and not relate to a macro use, such as Closter Plaza, that deserves, or should be regulated within an entirely different zoning -- set of zoning regulations. Maybe that gives you a perspective on the -- on the problems that \(I\) had with this application. CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Nyfenger, do you have anything else? MR. NYFENGER: No. CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Pialtos. MR. PIALTOS: Nothing. CHAIR LIGNOS: Ms. Isacoff. MS. ISACOFF: No. CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Sinowitz. MR. SINOWITZ: No. CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. DeNicola. MR. DENICOLA: No. CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Chagaris. MR. CHAGARIS: No. CHAIR LIGNOS: I have nothing
further. Mr. Basralian.
MR. BASRALIAN: Is there anyone in
the audience?

CHAIR LIGNOS: Oh, I actually asked them. Well, anyone in the audience that has a question of this witness?

MR. ISACCSON: Sure. Why not.
CHAIR LIGNOS: I could tell you a lot of reasons why not.

MR. ISACCSON: Steve Isaacson, 97
Columbus. Are all shopping centers the same? I mean does the law sort of make it like all shopping centers?

MR. KAUKER: No, they're not all
exactly alike, but they do have common characteristics.

MR. ISACCSON: Right. Because I go up to Tice Corners a lot, where the apple store is, and there's no supermarket there.

MR. KAUKER: Right.
MR. ISACCSON: Their traffic flow, their parking needs are different from the parking needs of a shopping center with a supermarket, correct?

MR. KAUKER: Not really. Retail is retial, and that's a broad category, and that's a common category that is assigned a certain parking ratio. For instance, parking ratio differentiated
among an office category would typically require more parking for a doctor's office as opposed to an attorney's office. But retial is retail. MR. ISACCSON: So, you don't feel
that a supermarket needs more parking than a retail store? Just a regular -- I mean like if you have a Sleepy's, that place that's filled with mattresses, and maybe there's two people that go in there everyday.

MR. KAUKER: Well --
MR. ISACCSON: Or a furniture store that maybe 15 people go in a day.

MR. KAUKER: Most supermarkets are significant from a point of view that they are multiple times larger than virtually any other comparable retail use. That's why they are identified, in many ordinances, as a separate entities, i.e., shopping centers.

MR. ISACCSON: And also, in your opinion, do you feel -- I mean I know it's been talked here that Whole Foods is not a regional supermarket. But would you feel that the draw for a supermarket, such as Whole Foods, extends beyond a 4-mile area?

MR. KAUKER: That's kind of a
marketing question. And I'm, you know, hard pressed to be able to give you an informed expert answer to that question.

MR. ISACCSON: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Anyone else in the audience have any questions of this witness?

Mr. Basralian.
THE REPORTER: Can we take five minutes?

CHAIR LIGNOS: We'll take five minutes, if it's okay, if we take five minutes.

MR. BASRALIAN: Sure.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay, the time now is 9:27. We're gonna be back here at 9:35.
(A recess was taken.)
CHAIR LIGNOS: The time now is 9:35, and I call this meeting back to order. Before I hand it over to Mr. Basralian, Mr. Kauker, what I wanted to do --

MR. KAUKER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: And I thank you very much for outlining the pages during the recess, you handed back to me the master plan, and it is exactly how I remembered it. You outlined page 13
and 14. The general gist of pages 13 and 14 basically talk to the need for the revitalization of our downtown.

MR. KAUKER: Yes, sir.
CHAIR LIGNOS: And in particular, and I just want to put this, as a kind of a summation of what \(I\) read through 13 and 14 , please correct me if you read some differently,
"Revitalization of the Closter Plaza will provide a strong anchor and a huge draw to shoppers outside of Closter, increasing the vibrancy and attractiveness is both Closter Plaza and the downtown, and provide the impetuous for improvements, which currently don't appear to be economically justifiable or feasible.

Now, when it comes to the, too much retail, as you said, \(I\) go to page 24 , item No. 6, specifically our master plan, and this was brought up in a previous application on this particular site, the master plan talks, particularly to Piermont Road. Piermont Road between High Street and Homans. The plaza, as we know it, does not exist on Piermont Road between High Street and Homans. But what it says under that, and \(I\) won't read the whole thing to bore you, but it says,
first, based upon the condition of retail uses throughout Closter, it is evident that Closter may have an imbalance --

MR. KAUKER: Yes.
CHAIR LIGNOS: -- between the
residentially zoned land, and the land zoned for retail use, with too much land zoned for retail use. This, though, sir, speaks specifically to Piermont Road between High Streets and Homans, more in keeping with what is in our town, an Annie Sez, a bank and our Closter Commons.

MR. KAUKER: Right.
CHAIR LIGNOS: So, I didn't remember it, being that \(I\) have had the pleasure of serving on this board for 18 years, \(I\) don't re -- I didn't remember that the plaza itself was cited for having too much retail. But I do remember the plaza being cited for being aged and just kind of run down.

MR. KAUKER: Right. Obsolescent.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Exactly the word used here. So, I thank you, and I'm glad we're able to clarify it. Thank you.

Mr. Basralian, it's all your's.
MR. BASRALIAN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BASRALIAN:
Q Mr. Kauker, based upon what the chairman just read from the master plan at page 24, than your statement was incorrect as to too much retail, as it related to Closter Plaza?

A It was misdirected, that's correct.
Q Thank you.
Mr. Kauker, would you tell me the definition of building, as defined by the municipal land use law.

A If you have it in front of you. I don't have an absolute recall.

Q Okay. Referring to section
40:55(D) 3, definition, subsection A to C. Right here.

A It reads, a combination of materials to form a construction adapted to permanent, temporary or continuous occupancy and having a roof.

Q Where, in that definition, do you see any reference to the word use?
A There is none.

Q You kept saying, throughout your testimony, that Closter Plaza consists of a
    nonconforming use.
    A Yes, sir.
    Q Can you show me where any of the
        uses in Closter Plaza do not conform with the
        zoning ordinance for retail, as provided in that
        ordinance?
        A I don't believe there are nonconformities,
        as they're -- as related to the individual uses
        that are within Closter Plaza. I think they're
        all permitted as uses.
    Q Doesn't the municipal land use law
define nonconforming use, as one which is not
permitted in the zone for which it's located?
A That's correct.
    Q And the Closter Plaza contains uses
        which are within the zone?
        A Yes, it does.
            Q You referred to demolition. And in
        your opinion that demolition, as proposed by the
        applicant, would put the application before the
        board of adjustment. Show me in the Closter
        zoning ordinance where there are limitations on
        what percentage of the building can be demolished
        in connection with redevelopment.
        A I'm not familiar with that section if it
does exist.
Q Wouldn't there be a requirement that exists that an applicant would have to adhere to? A Not necessarily. I think -- I think the position that I've taken is based upon good planning principles existing in municipal land use law, and prior cases where demolition has been viewed to essentially create a clean slate. And any prior nonconforming rights associated with that portion, or with that demolition, essentially are extinguished.

Q Well --
A But it doesn't necessarily have to be essentially explicated within Closter's ordinance in order for that -- that -- that principle to be applicable.

Q Mr. Kauker, you testified you're a planner for 1970,43 years. The testimony which you referred to, that you were familiar with, about what would be demolished, left a portion of each building up, did it not?

A That's correct.
Q Isn't the rule of thumb in the courts, generally that so long as a part of a building has been demolished, remained, that the
rule of thumb utilizes that the rest can be reconstructed?

MR. SEGRETO: I object to the form of the question.

MR. CHAGARIS: It's
cross-examination. He can ask it.
MR. SEGRETO: I know but there's no case that talks about demolition. It talks about partial destruction. And in partial destruction, the cases specifically talk about, by design or by accident, fire, or some other kind of tragedy.

MR. BASRALIAN: I'm amazed that you have every case at your disposal, if there is none that refers to it --

MR. SEGRETO: No, I don't have every case.

MR. BASRALIAN: Then you're incorrect in your statement.

MR. CHAGARIS: All right, let's not have cross argument.

MR. SEGRETO: Believe me, I have researched the subject and none of them talk about criteria about how much you're going to demolish or not demolish.

MR. CHAGARIS: He can answer the
question.
MR. SEGRETO: He talks about partial destruction and total destruction. That's what our cases talk about. That's my objection.

MR. CHAGARIS: Your objection is noted for the record. A I'm not familiar with those particular cases, Mr. Basralian.

Q Now, you said you were familiar with the proposed renovations to Closter Plaza. Today the shopping center exists as a shopping center with four distinct buildings.

A That's correct.
Q Consisting and totaling 211,000 square feet with 720 parking spaces. Could that shopping center remain just the way it is and function as a shopping center if it were leased up with retail, with permitted uses within the zone? A Yes, it could.

Q You also indicated that the reconstruction of a shopping center has proposed, you were familiar with.

A \(\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{mm}\).
Q Are you familiar by the size of the shopping center as proposed with the
    reconstruction?
    A Yes, I am.
    Q And is it being reduced in size or
    increased in size?
    A I think it's being, in the aggregate, at
    the end of round -- phase II, slightly reduced, as
    I recall.
    Q You also indicated the parking
    spaces would be increased from 720 to 730.
    A Yes.
    Q At the end of phase II, which is
    part of the application, are you aware that the
    number of parking spaces will be increased by 100,
    from the current 720 to 820?
    A Yes, I am.
                            Q That goes to diminishing any
        nonconformity with respect to parking?
        A That is correct. But also it's affected
        by the, taking away the area which could support
        say 40 or 50 spaces on the subdivided lot.
            Q Well, I'm glad you raised that. You
        kept talking about an intensification of use.
        Doesn't intensification of use go to
        intensification of nonconforming uses, whereas
        what is being proposed really is a planning
element?
A It goes to intensification of nonconforming uses, which \(I\) believe this use is.

Q Your position is that the shopping center is a nonconforming use, and, therefore, subdividing out about approximately 22,000 square feet constitutes a intensification?

A Increases the degree of nonconformity, yes. Because the existing building mass has less land to support it.

Q Well, are you familiar with the ratio that's permitted under the zoning ordinance for buildings, building coverage?

A I don't recall that here.
Q Well, building coverage is maxed out at 35 percent.

A \(\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{mm}\).
Q Do you know what the building coverage is after completion of phase II? A No, I do not. I don't recall.

Q If it were -- if you reviewed the plans, you indicated you were familiar with them, building coverage at the completion of phase II will be 32.3 percent in accordance with the Omland plans submitted in connection with the
application. Now, for maximum permitted is 35 percent. And even with a subdivided lot, when it's completed will be 32.3 percent. How does that constitute intensification?

A It doesn't, as it relates to that particular requirement. But it reflects a minor reduction in aggregate, the overall size of the square footage on the property.

Q But the building coverage is less than the maximum permitted -A I had no issue with the building coverage.

Q Okay. Then if the building doesn't exceed the 35 maximum, how does that constitute an intensification?

A It constitutes an intensification because you still have the nonconformity as it relates to parking, which is produced as a product. There's an imbalance between the amount of building on the property, not withstanding the allowance of 35 percent, and it's ability to meet other key requirements of the ordinance, such as parking.

Q Even though the parking is increased by 200 -- a hundred parking spaces with a reduced size building over the current shopping center?

A You bring it into closer conformity but
there's still a substantial shortfall.
Q You also indicated tonight, I must admit that I didn't follow, necessarily, your rational, but that the zoning ordinance talks about, not building size, but the maximum size of any retail store.

A Yes.
Q And schedule A, which is referred to by Mr. DeNicola, says that maximum size of any retail store, square feet is 45,000. Are you familiar with it?

A Yes, I am.
Q Yet you continue to maintain that it was 45,000 square feet for a building. A Only because only one building is permitted on a site. And that really is what leads me to that position. Even as -- as difficult to understand, as it may be. But when you view the two requirements in combination with one another, the reality of the development on this site, as a shopping center, is that it has multiple buildings. Multiple buildings are not permitted in the zone.

Q But that you just told me that there are four buildings now. They're validly
nonconforming buildings in terms of number, and they could continue to exist the way they are.

A If they're not changed in any way.
Q If the three proposed buildings were connected, and deemed to be one building under the zoning ordinance, would that satisfy your criteria?

A Yes.
MR. SEGRETO: I object to the form of the question. He's asking hypotheticals of my witness, and I thought those were off limits for experts.

MR. CHAGARIS: Can you rephrase the question.

MR. BASRALIAN: I've heard a hell of a lot of hypothetical answers tonight. So, I'm trying to get Mr. Kauker to at least respond to one of them.

BY MR. BASRALIAN:
Q Mr. Kauker, the proposed redevelopment of the shopping center consists of three buildings. In your opinion, is the manner in which conformance with the code they could be made into one building?

MR. SEGRETO: At their current
sizes? Is that what you're trying to say?
MR. CHAGARIS: I'm sorry, the
question is very clear I think.
MR. BASRALIAN: That's not the question.

A That could be done. That could be done.
Q Would that satisfy all of your concerns, and all of your statements, and all of your opinions, regarding whether or not this board has jurisdiction?

A No, it would not. You still have a parking shortage.

Q How does that go to jurisdiction to the board?

A Oh, relative to the jurisdictional issue?
Q Right.
A Wow. Okay. I believe it would.
Q You referred to, through your testimony, to section 200-32 off-street parking. A Yes.

Q And as I understood your testimony, because that section referred to the site plan ordinance, you said that it really incorporated the site plan ordinance provision into the zoning ordinance. And, therefore, this should be a
variance.
A Variance, yes. I recall that.
Q Now, if that same section also referred to compliance with DEP regulations, and health and safety regulations, would all of the DEP regulations and safety regulations, and safety incorporated by reference into the zoning ordinance, because it said, by the way, parking is under -- or parking or DEP regulations or health regulations or refer to someplace else?

MR. SEGRETO: Objection. The ordinance doesn't state that. It talks specifically about incorporating your site plan requirements.

MR. CHAGARIS: Yeah but actually though the ordinance itself incorporates the parking into totally a different zone. I don't know why we're going into this area. It has nothing to do with this zone at all. If you can answer the question, answer the question. A That's a separate jurisdiction. I don't know if your example is applicable.

Q How about local department of health provisions under the ordinance?

MR. SEGRETO: Same objection.

A That would be separate. They have the separate jurisdictional powers. The zoning code is the zoning code. Development regulations include; site plan and zoning code. And that -that kind of distinguishes the situation, even though it is in fact prescribed for one zone, the incorporation, and that's clear in the ordinance.

Q Well, it seems to me you raised the issue, and you're the one who said that, by virtue of its reference it should be incorporated under the zoning ordinance, and, therefore, a variance. Why wouldn't all of those other things be incorporated if they were ever referenced? You raised the issue. Not me.

MR. SEGRETO: And my objection is
that your zoning ordinance doesn't talk about DEP regulations or health regulations. The section that we're talking about specifically talks about the parking requirements as set forth in chapter 173.

MR. CHAGARIS: I think the point is made. Everyone understands what the issue is.

MR. BASRALIAN: No further questions.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Segreto, anything
further?
MR. SEGRETO: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. At this point, we have concluded our witness for this evening. Sir -- I already have -- I opened up the meeting for the public for questions prior to this.

MR. ROSENBLUME: But on this dialogue?

CHAIR LIGNOS: How does that work?
MR. CHAGARIS: You really need to -go ahead, ask the question. If you have a question.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Jessie Rosenblume, 65 Knickerbocker Road.

CHAIR LIGNOS: You're asking it of the witness?

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Mr. Kauker, if I told you that most of the structures, buildings on Main Street, were pre-1940, would you believe that?

MR. CHAGARIS: That really has no relevance. We're not talking about buildings on

Main Street. We're talking about this application.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Okay.
Mr. Kauker, the zoning ordinance was adopted in December 1940. Have you looked at the definition of lot, L-O-T? It's in section 200-5.

MR. KAUKER: No, I haven't.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Okay. If I told you that it states, a lot shall have only one building, do you know of other towns that have such a restriction?

MR. KAUKER: Typically they do, yes. But for many ordinances that recognize and regulate shopping centers have different criteria.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. Because I've noticed that also.

MR. KAUKER: Right.
MR. ROSENBLUME: So, what would be -- as a planner, what would be the significance of having a 1940 ordinance that says, one building per lot, and then you have Closter shopping center being built in 1960, 20 years later, and completely ignoring the 1940 ordinance for lot, which was never changed. Although reviewed many times, it was never changed. How would you
explain that?
MR. KAUKER: I can't explain it.
MR. CHAGARIS: That's really not before the board.

MR. KAUKER: I can't explain it. I can't explain it.

MR. ROSENBLUME: You can't explain it because --

MR. CHAGARIS: No, no, no, no, you can only ask questions. You can't give an answer.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Okay. Therefore, wouldn't you consider that plaza to be, not a prior nonconforming, but an illegal nonconforming?

MR. KAUKER: It's a possibility, but based upon -- based upon the criteria that's set forth --

MR. ROSENBLUME: Right. So, basically, how can one explain why the plaza was built with multiple buildings despite the ordinance stating only one building per lot?

MR. KAUKER: I honestly don't know because \(I\) wasn't there at the time.

MR. CHAGARIS: That's not before the board here.

MR. ROSENBLUME: But my point is,
the board, according to many cases in law, the board is supposed to know their own regulations.

MR. CHAGARIS: But -- Jessie,
Mr. Rosenblume, the definition of lot in the zoning code of the Borough of Closter says, a partial land occupied, which may be occupied by a building and accessory buildings, and including open space required by this chapter. It doesn't say, one building.

MR. ROSENBLUME: I don't want to talk law, but case law states "a" means one.

MR. CHAGARIS: Just ask the question of the witness though.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Okay. Okay. Well, in the way you read it --

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Rosenblume. Mr. Rosenblume, hold on. Please hold on for a second here. Because everything was going well until the insinuation that the board must know their regulations, and being that I'm the chairman of such board, I have to tell you that I took a deep breathe and now \(I\) can answer. Are you trying to tell me that this board, or any board that followed, prior to this, did not give an approval for this plaza?

MR. ROSENBLUME: I would like to
know --
CHAIR LIGNOS: Historically.
MR. ROSENBLUME: -- how could they
have done it --
MR. CHAGARIS: Wait, wait, you're -CHAIR LIGNOS: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on.
MR. CHAGARIS: -- you're going
really far afield. That's not before this board. That application is not before -- the history is not before the board.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Mr. Chagaris, I understand that perfectly. But the witness said that it could have been done illegally. Hold on. He could -- he didn't say it was -- so, my point is, did you know, sir, for a fact, did you know that this board, or a board, a planning board in this town did not grant approval for that plaza?

MR. KAUKER: No. What I was referring to was a prior testimony set forth on the record, that seemed to suggest that the plaza was constructed in the 50's, late 50 's. I'm trying to recall. Because it's in the transcript. It might have been information promulgated by
yourself. And based upon that, it appears to me, that that would be prior to the date of the history of the ordinance, which essentially is 12/22/67.

CHAIR LIGNOS: So, therefore, sir, that -- those regulations that Mr. Rosenblume --

MR. KAUKER: I don't know where he comes from, from 1940.

CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you.
That's all I want to put that on. Thank you.
MR. ROSENBLUME: Again, you're
looking at -- your question is a little off the mark because we're not saying it was illegal. Many boards --

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, sir, you used actually that word.

MR. ROSENBLUME: Yeah, but many boards have approved something without thinking about it. They did it in error.

CHAIR LIGNOS: I can't tell you what a board did in the past. I'm sorry. But as far as I'm concerned, I'm worrying about this application at this time.

Any other questions of this witness, sir?

MR. ROSENBLUME: No.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Thank you. Okay.
MR. BASRALIAN: If you would be so kind, since we've concluded, announce that we will meet on next Thursday, the 21st.

CHAIR LIGNOS: As I said at the beginning of the meeting, that this matter will continue at our next meeting, which will be next Thursday.

Now, Mr. Segreto, at 8 o'clock you will have those two witnesses next week?

MR. SEGRETO: Yes. They have indicated to me, yes.

MR. CHAGARIS: Okay. Well, we're giving you a reasonable opportunity --

MR. SEGRETO: Yeah, I -- I understand that. Of course. Okay. I wanted to have him here tonight.

CHAIR LIGNOS: No, I understand. So you understand that we're trying to get all these people here. I want to make sure that their --

MR. SEGRETO: I understand that.
CHAIR LIGNOS: Okay. Thank you. If there's no further business before the board, the chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. Made so
by Dr. Maddaloni. Seconded by Mr. Nyfenger. Any discussion? Seeing none. All in favor? I see no objection, therefore, this meeting is now adjourned at 10:02.
(Meeting adjourned.)
by Dr. Maddaloni. Seconded by Mr. Nyfenger. Any 100
discussion? Seeing none. All in favor? I see no
objection, therefore, this meeting is now
adjourned at 10:02.
(Meeting adjourned.)
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