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PROCEEDINGS
MR. VICE CHAIR: Everyone, before we go into the public meeting, we -- technically, we're in closed session. May I have a motion to open -- to close -- close session, please, and head into open.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So move.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you.
Okay. Second, please? Anyone?
FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.
MR. VICE CHAIR: All right. Roll call, please.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Sen.
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Rappa.
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mayor Prunty.
MAYOR PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Pedde.

MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo.
MR. NORDELO: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Motion carries.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you.
Welcome, everyone, to this evening's regularly scheduled planning board meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 2022, at 8:15 p.m. in Room 108 at the municipal building, 8 Springfield Avenue, Cranford, New Jersey.

This meeting is in compliance with the open public meetings act, as adequate notice of this meeting has been provided to the Westfield Leader and the Star Ledger with the agenda specifying the time, place, and matters to be heard, having been posted on a bulletin board in the Town Hall reserved for such announcements and the filing of said agenda with the township clerk of Cranford. Formal action may be taken at this meeting.

May we all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the

United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Roll call please.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Sen.
MS. SEN: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Rappa.
MS. RAPPA: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mayor Prunty.
MAYOR PRUNTY: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Pedde.
MS. PEDDE: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordello.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. German.
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Ms. GERMAN: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Dickerson.
MR. DICKERSON: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: And I am here.
Let the record show Ms. Kellett has recused herself and Ms. Didzbalis is out -absent.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Prior to starting tonight's application -- continued application with Hartz Mountain, 750 Walnut.

Mr. Drill, there's an announcement on the 201 Walnut Avenue application?

MR. DRILL: Yes. There's a letter sent in today from Jason Tuvel, the applicant's attorney, 201 Walnut Avenue LLC and Iron Ore Properties LLC. And it's addressed to Ms. Lenahan. And it says, "As you were aware, this office represents the applicant in connection with the application for preliminary and final major site plan approval for the abovereferenced property. This letter shall serve as a formal request that the application which is currently -- currently scheduled to be heard by the planning board tonight, December 7, be carried to the regular scheduled meeting of the
board on December 14 with no further notice to the public necessary. When the application is called, kindly note on the record the time, date, and place of the next scheduled meeting and at the application shall be carried thereto without further notice. And the applicant consents to any extension of time required for the board to hear and decide the application through January 6, 2023."

So that's the announcement. The hearing on 201 Walnut Avenue is going to be continued -- actually, it's going to be adjourned to start on December 14, 2022, with no need for further notice.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Drill.
Tonight, we will -- continuing from November 30, 2022, application number PB-22-002. The applicant being Hartz Mountain Industries Incorporated, 750 Walnut Avenue, Block 541, Lot 2. The applicant in this matter is seeking preliminary and final major subdivision, preliminary and final major site plan, residential and preliminary, and final major site plan nonresidential approval.

Mr. Kent-Smith.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of board.

Henry Kent-Smith, Fox Rothschild, on behalf of the applicant Hartz. This is the continued hearing that was last considered on November 30 before this board. I concluded most of my witnesses. And the board had certain questions that were raised at that hearing that I'd like to address. So for tonight, I have the landscape architect from Stonefield who is the landscape architect for the commercial side, who is also working with the landscape architect -architect David Liseberg on the residential side as well.

The board had a lot of issues and questions relative to the berm, the existing landscaping, what would be proposed. I will be calling Mr. DeVitto up to address that issue and introduce exhibit and request the board to consider a resolution of how we're going to supplement landscape planning on the berm.

MR. DRILL: What -- what is this witness's name?

MR. KENT-SMITH: It's Paul, D-e-v-i-t-t-o, DeVitto.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So we have to swear him in and qualify him.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MR. DRILL: All right. So where is he?
Can you come on up? Can you raise your right hand? And do you swear or affirm the testimony you're gonna give during this proceeding will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. DEVITTO: I do.
MR. DRILL: And what is your name again and spell your last name?

MR. DEVITTO: It's Paul DeVitto, D-e-v-i-t-t-o, with Stonefield Engineering and Design located at 92 Park Avenue, Rutherford, New Jersey.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And I will qualify him.

MR. DRILL: Right.
MR. KENT-SMITH: I just wanted to get into his -- --

MR. DRILL: You have a professional license, your LOA.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. I'm a licensed landscape architect in the state of New Jersey.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. So -- and then the last witness $I$ will have will be our professional planner, Kenan Hughes. So then why don't we go ahead and get started. You are sworn. I'm going to take the microphone. You can get yourself set up as you wish.

MR. DEVITTO: Yep.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So, Mr. DeVitto, could you please provide the board with your qualifications, professional licensure, experience in the area of landscape architect architecture and why you're qualified to testify as an expert?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. Absolutely. So I'm a licensed landscape architect in the state of New Jersey. I graduated from West Virginia University in 2010 with a Bachelor's of Science in landscape architecture. I've been accepted before prior planning, zoning land use boards throughout the state of New Jersey. And additionally, my license is in good standing. Also hold licenses in Florida, Michigan, and Ohio, which all licenses are in good standing.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And you are the
landscape architect who prepared the landscape plan relative to the commercial portion of the property.

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: I am submitting Mr. DeVitto as a professional landscape architect on this application.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Are there any
questions from our board members on his qualifications?

Any questions from members of the public on this (inaudible) qualifications?

I accept him as a witness.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you very much. So then, at request of the applicant, did you undertake further valuation of the proposed landscaping plan on the commercial property?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. A site visit was performed on December 6 to -- specifically to review the current state of the berm plantings with the intention to improve the berm and repair the functionality of the existing berm. This was not a tree-by-tree analysis, but rather a review of the existing conditions, provide general
recommendations, and a -- and a path to move forward.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And have you prepared an exhibit to show to the board of representation of what you had analyzed in your findings?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. The exhibit on the board or on the TV screens currently.

MR. DRILL: Let's get a paper copy of that and mark it as Exhibit A-28. I believe that's the next exhibit.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I am marking A-28.
MR. DRILL: And can you identify what does it say in the lower right-hand corner?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Just identify it for the record.

MR. DEVITTO: This is the overall site plan. Sheet C-4.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. But it's a color --
MR. DEVITTO: Yes. It's a markup. It's a color-coded mark above the berm conditions with our findings.

MR. DRILL: A color-coded markup of the berm condition on the overall site plan sheet -MR. DEVITTO: C-4.

MR. DRILL: C-4.
Okay. Kathy, you got that?
Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And I note again, just
for the record, the last -- the last revision date being, it looks like October 3, 2022?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. So please explain to the board what your analysis of the berm and landscaping in that area from your site visit?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So the -- the color-coded exhibit indicates good, fair, and areas in need of improvement with color over -overlays. So the green indicating areas in good condition; yellow, fair condition; and red as areas in need of improvement.

MALE SPEAKER: On the -- on the computer screen, can you zoom in a little bit better?

MR. DEVITTO: Zoom out or in?
MALE SPEAKER: Just make the actual berm larger.

Just give it a second. There we go.
MALE SPEAKER: Nick, you want to give
some assistance? Okay. Don't touch it. Let it load.

MR. DEVITTO: I'm not.
MALE SPEAKER: I'm not talking to you. I'm talking to him. Nick. Where's the mouse? No, we don't -- oh, the mouse is off. Ah, there we go.

MALE SPEAKER: Nick, you have the -well, wait. We don't have the --

MALE SPEAKER: Hold on. He doesn't have the Magic Touch yet. He almost did. Ah. Okay. Is that a good enough scale? Okay, good.

MR. DEVITTO: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: All right. Mr. DeVitto please continue.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So moving south to north at the intersection of Raritan Road --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Which way is south?
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So South would be plan to the left.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So when we're looking at the exhibit, South is to the left, North is to the right, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So starting from Raritan, the intersection of Raritan Road and

Walnut Avenue, which is right here on the screen, the berm was in good condition up until the first driveway entrance. And we categorize that as minimal earth berm plantings just in good condition, minimal spotting of evergreen trees to account for gaps in the berm.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I take that good is shown in green?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
Then moving towards the internal of the site, internal portions of the site, along the frontage of Walnut Avenue, this area was marked as fair. And this becomes spotty with dead trees, gaps, and gaps within the berm naturally occurring.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And that's color-coded yellow, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: That is color-coded yellow.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you. Continue.
MR. DEVITTO: Moving along, Walnut
Avenue towards the northern portion of the frontage, there was an area that required additional plantings. And then from there that transitioned into an area that --
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MR. KENT-SMITH: Wait, wait, wait.
That area is colored orange.
MR. DEVITTO: Yes, orange.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Orange means what?
MR. DEVITTO: That was -- that was the area that needed the most repair.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So if green is good and yellow was fair, is orange poor?

MR. DEVITTO: You could say that, sure.
And then that transitions into an area of the berm that was deemed healthy and in good condition. And that would close out the property frontage.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Now as a landscape architect in your analysis of the existing landscaping, what further observations did you make relative to the existing landscape?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So the areas in need of most attention were the white pines. They have a lot of loss due to --

MR. KENT-SMITH: They have a lot of what?

MR. DEVITTO: They have a lot of loss of their lower branches.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I thought you said
moss
MR. DEVITTO: Oh, sorry.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Mr. -- Mr. Drill, I believe our planners have a question. Sure.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Give him the microphone.

MALE SPEAKER: Just a question for clarification for those of us who don't speak landscape architect. Where it's talks about either spotting or leggy.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Good point.
MR. DEVITTO: So when -- when in
reference to a leggy tree, we're talking --
MR. DRILL: Leggy?
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So that's a tree -

- that's a mature tree that might be spotty or missing limbs on the lower portions of the tree. It might have a full -- full top or full crown where it's getting its sunlight from.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So leggy is missing limbs. What's spotty?

MR. DEVITTO: Spotty could also -- it could be used as a term for spots in the -- in the berm that are missing --

MR. DRILL: Missing vegetation?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah, missing vegetation.
MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. So -- but I have a -- in reference to legginess and buffering or what the -- what the value of that means, like, for the actual tree, does that it doesn't make it harder to buffer if it's leggy? Can you just explain what impact it has?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So -- so those trees are still valuable. They're still providing canopy cover for those higher, tall -and taller portions of the berm. But they can be supplemented with additional evergreen trees on the lower portions.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So in other words that like the street level or at the top of the berm, there would be visible gaps in the coverage of --

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So based on that --
MALE SPEAKER: Well, one more question. Yellow equals fair where the dead tree is spotty and leggy. So the orange poor, what's -- what do you see in that poor area? There just things that are as missing?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. It was just a little. It was in worse condition than -- than
that yellow portion. But it still had those same features, just a little more emphasized.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Although -- sorry. On your note, it says existing berm in good condition; however, due to tree removal, there will be a large gap in the screening for the orange section?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
FEMALE SPEAKER: That's removal of trees that are dead?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So -- so this area, it was -- it was both. It was a little. It was in fair condition. And then on top of that, it was the tree removal in that area anticipated it was going to be an area that was going to need to be buffered.

FEMALE SPEAKER: But my question is the trees are being removed because they're dead.

MR. DEVITTO: There are dead trees in this area, yes.

MR. VICE CHAIR: So you just said it was in good condition, but then at the same time, it's in poor condition. So can you just explain --

MR. DRILL: In other words, A-28 says
that red is in good condition. But you've just described it as poor condition. Is that a typo?

MR. DEVITTO: I believe it's a typo. I'm sorry. Yeah.

MR. DRILL: That should be poor.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So once and for all, just reiterate. It's in poor condition. And it needs additional plantings to improve the buffering because there's large gaps and they need to remove trees that are dead.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Correct?
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay.
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. That was -- that was the intention. I'm sorry for the confusion.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. Now as a result of the analysis that you've just gone through with existing conditions, what is your recommendation as landscape architect relative to plantings and supplemental landscaping for the berm?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So we recommend the removal and re- -- replacement of all the dead trees on -- on site within the berm. We'd also suggest the spotting of additional evergreen
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trees. And we --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, when you say spotty, or the planting --

MR. DEVITTO: Planting of.
MR. KENT-SMITH: -- evergreen trees in selected spots in order to cover the gap. Would that be better? More accurate --

MR. DEVITTO: That's correct.
And we would like to do this with native species, preferably deer-resistant species.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And --
MALE SPEAKER: When you -- when you -excuse me, when you when you're referring to that, are you referring to the color-coded yellow areas?

MR. DEVITTO: This would take -- this is a general recommendation for the entire berm.

MALE SPEAKER: Including the green areas?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, some -- some of the portions of the green area had trees that were dead that would need to be removed, but it wasn't -- it wasn't a dominant feature of this area.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
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MR. KENT-SMITH: So then --
MR. VICE CHAIR: I'm sorry, Mr. KentSmith. Just very quick. When you say "replanting," if you can get into this further, can you just define what that means that?

MALE SPEAKER: Exactly. Exactly.
Thank you, Mr. Kent-Smith.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So in the recommendation that you're making relative to the planting, walk the board through what it is you're exactly proposing to do, how it will be done, and verification that it was done in accordance with the direction of the board and its professionals

MR. DEVITTO: We think it'd be a good recommendation to walk the site with the Township's professionals; flag trees marked for removal, whether they're diseased or dead; and stake out additional spots that would be deemed beneficial to plant additional evergreen trees and then supplement that with agreeable species that the Township has.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And in this process, then, you would then locate, after you've done the walk with the board's landscape architect, a
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plan that would actually then specifically
identify trees to be removed, where the new trees are going to be planted, what the species will be and their height in order to provide the correct coverage?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So when you're replanting, to the height -- you know, again, I'm not a landscape architect -- but you're making sure that what you are replanting is of the same height to provide that adequate coverage.

Because, you know, trees -- are these mature trees that you're planning or just you're specifying to where the gaps are?

MR. DEVITTO: Well, that would be something that would also have to be worked on together. You wouldn't plant a tree that's -you wouldn't want to plant a tree that's 20 feet tall. It would -- it would be too arduous to actually physically get that tree into there. So we would want to plant a smaller-sized tree, something that would take to the ground and be hard -- be healthy and be a good -- good buffer tree for years to come

MR. KENT-SMITH: So is part of your
concern, then, that the replacement trees be planted at an appropriate height and location so that they don't get killed by the existing trees overly shaded and not grow properly, that they would be properly located at a suitable side to maximize their function as a screen.

MR. DEVITTO: Correct. Yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you.
FEMALE SPEAKER: And do you have a
sense of where the -- particularly the orange
that's in poor condition --
MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh.
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- what the sidewalks
look like and whether they're directly with the curb or where they are in relation to this? Do you have a diagram that shows where the sidewalks are? Cause we'd previously mentioned --

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. We can go to the next one.

MR. KENT-SMITH: We actually have a special exhibit on that specific area. So let's go ahead and get this identified and marked.

MR. DRILL: So that's going to be A-29.
And what is $A-29 ?$
MR. KENT-SMITH: Identify that.

MR. DEVITTO: This is the landscape plan sheet $\mathrm{C}-14$ with color-coded markup.

MR. DRILL: Sheet A-14?
MR. DEVITTO: I'm sorry. C-14.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And please describe what this exhibit is showing.

MR. DEVITTO: This is the current landscape plan with areas highlighted that we would like to supplement with additional plantings.

MALE SPEAKER: Can we -- I'm sorry. This computer didn't switch to the next exhibit for us. No. The other ones did, but this one still on the first -- the previous. Sorry.

MR. DRILL: No, we are. We are. He's not. Everyone else is.

MALE SPEAKER: Could I just, as a -- as a point of clarification, because you talked about selecting the tree. You know, it should be deer resistant, etc.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MALE SPEAKER: But $I$ think in answer to a question that Kent-Smith raised, you said that -- you said that the function was for screening.

I just want to be overt with that and make sure that that's on the record that the purpose of those plantings are primarily as a screen. Correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.
MALE SPEAKER: Do we have everything in order now?

MALE SPEAKER: Yep.
FEMALE SPEAKER: So -- so, now that you have the diagram, you know, I'm assuming are those orange piece -- pieces -- areas where the berm is poor and may need replacement?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. And how is that in contrast to the actual sidewalks?

MR. DEVITTO: The berm would be -- is proposed on -- to be placed on the backside of the sidewalk on the site side. So there'd be no -- no plantings between the curb and the sidewalk. It'd be on the sidewalks or it'd be on the site side.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Because earlier, there was an exhibit -- I believe it was like C-19 and was like photo 7 and photo 8, where
there was a drop off. So it went from sidewalk straight to the curb --

MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh.
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- of the street. Do we have -- do we know --

MR. DRILL: So on this map, it doesn't go that far. North or to the right. So this is -- still has the green between the sidewalk and the street line. The sidewalk doesn't move -- it actually is not shown on this exhibit.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. So do you know what the condition of the berm is in photo 7 and $8 ?$

MR. KENT-SMITH: Like further north -like down that sidewalk that? Yeah, so it was in good condition there, the berm.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So the berm didn't have any dead trees or need any replacement.

MR. DEVITTO: It would -- it would need a -- a minor -- a walk-through to identify any dead trees. But for the most part, it was dense, and the evergreens were full.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So just so everybody's clear, going back to $A-28$, you have shown in green next to the orange area, that's what you
were just referencing.
MR. DEVITTO: That is that portion of the site, yes.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay.
MR. DEVITTO: Like, yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Does your computer have the ability to pull up Google Street View? Because it shows pretty clearly what it looks like.

MR. DRILL: Nick -- let's let Nick pull up a Google Street View or attempt to pull up a Google Street View. He just needs an outside line.

MALE SPEAKER: Is there -- ahh.
MR. DEVITTO: Thank you.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. So we -- we -you now see Street View, correct? So where do you want me to draw?

MR. DRILL: I think he wants you to start on the north --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Towards the railroad.
MR. DRILL: -- towards the railroad and work back --

MR. KENT-SMITH: So go all the way down to the railroad and then come back down towards
the south.
MR. DRILL: Right. Nice and slow.
MALE SPEAKER: Sure. That sounds fine.
MR. DRILL: Nice and slow. I mean, get down to the railroad first. But then when you come back, come slow.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And then orient that -- there we -- there we go.

MALE SPEAKER: That is what we --
MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Don't start doing it yet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: No?
MR. DRILL: Get back to the railroad. Someone -- okay.

MR. KENT-SMITH: That's the railroad.
MR. DRILL: Stop. Stop right there. Where would the railroad be on Exhibit $A-28$ ? Not A-29.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So here's the railroad tracks, right?

MALE SPEAKER: That's A-29. Go to A28. Right.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So here are the railroad tracks. Coming down. Coming down. Coming down. Here's where the bridge is over
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Walnut at the edge of the map at the end of where it showed green at the north corner of the property.

MR. DRILL: So let me ask you this. It looks like there's a concrete retaining wall that's triangular in shape.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MALE SPEAKER: Is that -- any part of that retaining wall on the applicant's property or not?

MR. KENT-SMITH: I don't believe so. I think all of that is within the right-of-way.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. So the only part of what --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Just for the record, Mr. Drill -- just so -- the -- the area that is shown in the green. There's a dotted line, which I believe that dotted line represents a county easement. That is appurtenant to the slope -it's a slope easement. So just -- just so you understand. We may own it, but it's subject to the slope rights that are related to this crossing.

MR. DRILL: All right. Right. So if, hypothetically, the board wanted the sidewalk to
be increased in that location, from the current, I believe we said, it's four feet to eight feet, you'd have to cut into that slope, and then you'd have to construct your own retaining wall, correct.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, and quite honestly, we'd have to have county approval because of the slope easement.

MR. DRILL: I -- I -- I understand. It would be subject to county approval.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
FEMALE SPEAKER: But I -- I think we need actual testimony. I don't think counsel can -- can give that information. I would think we need an expert or at least some assessment that's official.

MR. DRILL: Well, put it this way. I was just asking him legally, not factually --

MALE SPEAKER: Right.
MR. DRILL: -- if the sidewalk is four
feet wide, because that's what they testi- --
they had someone testify to that --
MALE SPEAKER: Show on the exhibit. I don't know where your property line is.

MR. DRILL: -- if you increase it to
eight feet, I believe their engineer testified they'd have to cut into the slope. So I'm asking him legally if they had to cut into the slope, okay, it would be subject to county approval, but is there any reason that that couldn't be done? That's my question. Legally, is there any reason why that couldn't be done? So this is for the -MR. KENT-SMITH: The legal reason is that it would be subject to slope preservation rights that $I$ don't know we would have the authority and, quite frankly, it'd have to be modified with the -- with the county.

MR. DRILL: Right. But -- that -- I'm saying.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Subject to county approval, assume -- look, if the county said no, and they had some slope, well, okay. But if the county said yes, is there some legal reason that $I$ don't know about that if the county said, "Yes, you could go into our slope easement," assuming they have one there, is there any other legal reason of why it couldn't be done?

MR. KENT-SMITH: The answer is I don't know of any leet direct legal impediment. I will
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state this, that this area is subject to existing slope easement. It is subject to the county's ownership and authority. There are utility poles and other obstructions in the way. This is an affordable housing project that is subject to limitations on cost generation. And in an issue such as this where we are dealing with an affordable housing project with cost generation limits, I will tell you to go through that exercise and implement that expanded sidewalk in this specific area would be cost generated.

MR. DRILL: I disagree with you on that. Because the way $I$ read the cost generation cases, it's if you had some other ordinance provision, some general ordinance provision in the Township that you needed relief from the cases say the board has to be flexible with that. But this is a tailor-made redevelopment plan. And the cost generation cases go to the ordinance is either cost-generative or not, not the board granting relief from a tailor-made redevelopment plan. So my opinion on that is that this would not be a cost-generative requirement, if that's where the board's gonna go.

```
If you want to make -- get some
```

witnesses and make an argument that, you know, there's a utility pole in the way, you have some sort of --

MR. KENT-SMITH: We've already provided that testimony, Mr. Drill.

MR. DRILL: I understand. But I'm saying if the board doesn't agree with that, I just wanted to bring this to the fore. I don't -- in my opinion, this would not be considered cost-generative where it's a tailor-made redevelopment plan for this affordable housing project. It's not some general ordinance requirement. So we have a difference of opinion on that. But that's -- I represent the board. That's my opinion to the board.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So then -- is there any other issues relative to --

MR. DRILL: Mr. Kent-Smith -- Mr. KentSmith -- Ms. Dirmann?

MR. VICE CHAIR: Ms. Dirmann.
MS. DIRMANN: So --
MR. DRILL: Microphone.
MS. DIRMANN: I don't know. I don't see your civil engineer here. But $I$ was just scrolling through the plans. It looks like
there's a dimension on the plan that shows the existing sidewalk at over seven feet in width in that area, in front of the berm.

MR. DRILL: Hmm.
MS. DIRMANN: Sheet $\mathrm{C}-5$. I don't know
if --

MR. DRILL: Well, this is --
MS. DIRMANN: So --
MR. DRILL: Now Ms Sen's comment is --
is absolutely correct. If -- I was talking
hypothetically, right? If it's factual, they need some expert. It can't be Mr. Kent-Smith. And the en- -- their engineer would be the best person to do it and if he's not here, I don't know what to say.

MS. DIRMANN: That's what's shown on your plan. I just scaled it off of my elect- -you know, my PDF.

MR. DRILL: Can you go over to their plan and take a look?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yeah. That shows seven feet.

MS. DIRMANN: That's not what your exhibit shows.

MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).

MS. DIRMANN: No. The -- the exhibit from last meeting. I thought you had indicated that was four.

MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
MS. DIRMANN: Four or five.
MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
But it is dimensions. The plan does -the plan does state seven feet is the dimension on the -- on $\mathrm{C}-7$.

MR. DRILL: Let me just add one other thing. Let's assume that you're correct -- I don't think you are, but assume you're correct about cost-gen- -- that would only apply to the residential side. That wouldn't apply to the commercial side. Right?

MR. KENT-SMITH: All I am saying is this: That the way that $I$ think we should be able to resolve this is, first, let's get the facts accurate.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Correct. I agree with that.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And to the extent that, factually, it's seven feet and we're talking about one feet, that's an entirely different discussion.

MR. DRILL: I also agree with that. I bet you could get to one foot without all the problem. I bet you can get -- add one more foot to get to eight feet without the problems you'd have if you had to add four feet to get to eight feet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I think that's pretty accurate statement.

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So let's do this, as -

- what I would ask the board's indulgence, because this would require just the -- and -- and this is leading back to landscape architect, that there will be a site visit with the Township's engineer and landscape architect to go through the berm, that that also be directed to fully and accurately measure the sidewalk dimensions. And to the extent feasible, for example, seven feet to eight feet -- foot, the answer is: That's something we can accommodate. But I want to make sure we get it factually accurate first. We cannot do that until $I$ have our engineer surveyor at the property with the Township so everybody takes a tape measure and agrees on the measurements so there's no issues there.

MR. DRILL: So put it this way: Let's assume that the applicant wraps up its case this evening, before the deliberation that has to get done. That that -- the sidewalk issue, because you're applying for an exception, that can't be the condition of approval. That would have to get done between now and next week.

MR. KENT-SMITH: May I ask Ms. Dirmann and her office, would we be able within the next week with our availability to do this with your office?

```
MS. DIRMANN: (Inaudible).
    MR. KENT-SMITH: I don't -- it doesn't
```

make sense for us to unilaterally do this.

MS. DIRMANN: Right. No. I -- I
understand that, but $I$ just want you to know that the testimony has been very clear by your witnesses that it's four feet. So I do think if there is a factual issue, we need to make sure that that's clear because the record is conflicting.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And, Ms. Sen, I think it's a hundred percent things that need to be done that should be done in consultation with your own staff so that there's a second set of
eyes verifying.
MS. SEN: As long as its objective. I mean, it's one of these things where, you know --

MALE SPEAKER: If you --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Right.
MALE SPEAKER: -- reposition the Street View, you get a better look at the sidewalk and then, to me, it does not appear to be seven feet in width.

MR. DRILL: Look, I can't -- obviously, you can't testify. I certainly can't testify. But my recollection from the notes was that it said seven feet, the engineer said no, they went out and took a look. It was actually four feet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So I think we have to clarify that.

MR. DRILL: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And I don't think it can be clarified tonight. So again, as -provided that we can make an arrangement with Colliers that we would have one of their representatives there, we can schedule that to be completed next week.

MR. VICE CHAIR: And you'll schedule
that ahead of --

MR. DRILL: It has to be --
MR. VICE CHAIR: -- has to be ahead of this next meeting.

MR. DRILL: -- by next Wednesday.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kent-Smith.

MR. DRILL: You can proceed.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So is there anything more that you wanted to add on your testimony, Mr. Devitto?

MR. DEVITTO: No, I was complete.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Excuse me. So just -I just have a concern. Why wasn't all that measuring done before tonight's meeting?

MR. KENT-SMITH: I believe it had been done. I don't understand why it wasn't done. I was led to believe it was. I don't have an answer for you because I don't know.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Uh-huh. Okay.
MR. TAYLOR: On the Street View we're looking at now, can you go closer to the sidewalk in question?

MR. DRILL: Again, I don't think -Mr. Taylor, $I$ don't think it's possible for us to make that determination.

MR. TAYLOR: I agree. But I just wanted to take a view, a different perspective.

MR. KENT-SMITH: You know, the answer is: We'll find the -- the correct answer. And if there was an inaccuracy one way or the other, the plan or the testimony, we have to get resolved.

MS. SEN: Okay. Thank you. And I just wanted to be clear. If we could do that for the entire sidewalk, right, because there's a lot of testimony. In fact, I think it was the traffic expert -- I forgot his name.

MR. DRILL: Mr. Seckler.
MS. SEN: -- that he said he measured it and was exactly four feet everywhere. So the difference is, you know, $I$ just want to be clear. Because we have one issue of what is the actual width today, right, which we're obviously going to measure, which we appreciate. And then the second part is, what is the plan? If the plan drawn says seven feet, well, that's very different from what your expert testified --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Understood.
MS. SEN: -- is four feet. So we want to just make sure that we know. And I want to
make sure that we know for the entire sidewalk, not just one little section.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, this is why I think that with Colliers, you know, your consultant along with ours, we can make sure the whole site is walked, maybe not do all the landscape location, but at least identify and verify areas where we're going to then have a more focused analysis for the landscaping. And that can all be done between now and next Wednesday.

MS. SEN: Thank you.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So I have no further questions for Mr. DeVitto.

MR. VICE CHAIR: I have a question. So on the area facing Walnut Avenue, where there are purportedly not that many evergreen trees and you're talking about the supplemental plantings that needs to take place to provide adequate coverage, so you'll ensure that it's not just ornamental shrubs or -- or tall grasses -- you'll ensure that they are the proper height to provide sufficient buffering and sufficient coverage, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. We'll -- we'll
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MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.
Before I move on to questions from the public for this witness, do our professionals have any outstanding questions --

MR. TAYLOR: Well -- well, before we do that --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Or member of the board. I'm sorry.

MR. TAYLOR: I was really hoping for the benefit of the public that you use the Street View to go along the sidewalk to show the berm and the condition of the plantings.

MR. VICE CHAIR: My apologies, Mr. Taylor. Correct.

MR. DRILL: All right. So you're going -- you're using Street View, not for the sidewalk with issue. You're using Street View so everyone can see what the -- what the berm looks like from the railroad trestle all the way down.

MR. TAYLOR: So I have a question on -on -- so the view that we have right here, you classified that as a green, which means it's in good condition. Help me with that.

MR. DEVITTO: Well, this -- this portion of the site, it's going to remain undisturbed. And then coming back into this area, it's -- there's no development happening in this -- in this corner.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. He's -- what he's asking is take a look on the right-hand side of the screen. Right there where that little pointer is. He's saying that that doesn't look lke it should be green. That looks like it should be --

MALE SPEAKER: Yellow --
MR. DRILL: -- yellow or orange, because you have bare spots in there. That's what he's asking about.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, that's not -again, $I$ don't know where the Conrail right-ofway is. But it's awful, doggone close that utility pole.

MR. TAYLOR: Look to the south of that. Look -- look further down Walnut Avenue to the left side of your screen. I mean, it's not.

That's north. That's north. The other direction. Yeah. I mean, it's -- I'm just struggling with if -- if that's --
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MR. KENT-SMITH: You might be at that point in the curve of the road beginning to hit this orange area here.

MR. TAYLOR: But I guess --
MR. KENT-SMITH: In that view from where that car is and that utility pole, you're getting -- you're getting -- yeah.

MR. TAYLOR: I guess -- I guess my point.

MR. KENT-SMITH: You're getting close to the orange area.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't see anywhere from this entire view all the way down to the railroad track that I -- and I'm not a landscape architect --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MR. TAYLOR: -- I'll give you that -would -- would classify as green. It all looks like it should be, at minimum, a yellow, if not a red. So I'm just -- I'm struggling with that a little bit. Maybe you can help me.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So we felt coming down from this way from this -- from this road that it was just, you know, nice -- nice trees in here, mature shade trees, scrub shrubs. And then
as we're moving -- as we're moving north.
MR. TAYLOR: Well, if the goal -- if the goal as you said previously to me is to be a screen, shrubs and scrub and deciduous trees aren't really providing a screen.

MR. DEVITTO: Well, yeah, we can -- we can take a look into that area a little bit more. As we move a little bit closer to the site where the development will be happening, you can see this condition is fairly dense. And this is really where the buildings are -- are going to be focused.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, in fact, they're gonna be focused further to the south from where your finger is pointing. The second utility pole where that car is located --

MALE SPEAKER: You can't (inaudible) --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, I'm just giving into the context.

MR. DRILL: I know. But ask him that -- don't you.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Is this area that you're showing on the screen right now with the trees and the utility, the grade differential in landscaping, I am now going to point in the
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transition area between the orange and the green. Do you believe that to be approximate location of the area we're looking?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, it's the approximate area.

MS. SEN: And how do you have that knowledge? Have you actually been to the site? Have you looked it along with your assessment?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. This was on a site visit based off of December 6, so yesterday.

MS. SEN: So in your professional opinion, what did you do? You walked along the berm and you decided what looked good and what didn't look good. And you marked it on a map?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. SEN: And you could remember exactly where that is looking at the picture on Google Maps.

MR. DEVITTO: So I think this is.
MS. SEN: I can't -- I can't see how that's possible honestly. But $I$ don't have a sense of direction.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So this was the area that we were starting to the edge of the green. And then as we were moving forward, we
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felt like this area, you can see some spottings in here.

MS. SEN: Did you measure at all?
MR. DEVITTO: No.
MS. SEN: So when you were doing colorcoded, did you measure that from here to here, it's green; and from here to here, it's -- it's orange?

MR. DEVITTO: It was a --
MS. SEN: And then you made demarcations of where --

MR. DEVITTO: It was a general pacing. This wasn't --

MS. SEN: What does that mean?
MR. DEVITTO: -- the site -- just kind of pace off.

MS. SEN: There's a represent --
MR. DEVITTO: It was an estimation. It wasn't an exact tree-by-tree analysis, which would be fairly intense in which we're looking to do with the Township.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right.
MS. SEN: But how are you certain that what you did at that day, you could replicate exactly on another day if you didn't mark it in a
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scientific way?
MR. KENT-SMITH: That's what the whole point of the condition that we're proffering to this board is about.

MS. SEN: Okay. I would like to hear from the witness, sir.

MR. KENT-SMITH: It is to do precisely that so that your consultants, our consultants, can then do a actual measured, plotted and then surveyed and planned landscape plan to supplement the berm as a condition of approval. That's what we're proffering.

MR. DRILL: But the question that she's asking to you --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MR. DRILL: Let's start at some basics. Did you prepare yourself Exhibit A-28 or someone else?

MR. DEVITTO: No, that was me.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So what her question really is, is did you prepare that out in the field as you were pacing off or did you prepare that back in your office?

MR. DEVITTO: Well, I -- I did the markup in the office.

MR. DRILL: Right. So what she wants to know is if you didn't take any notes, right -you went out in the field, you paced it off. If you didn't take any notes and you didn't mark up anything out there, how long after you did the walk-through did you get to your office to do that? an hour? a day? a week?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. So I went out to the site, walked it, took notes on a site plan, went back to the office, later that afternoon, completed the -- completed the markup. So it's the same day.

MR. DRILL: So she's questioning how can you assure the board that $A-28$ is accurate if you didn't actually take measurements and you were just doing general markings? That's really what her -- that's really what your --

MS. SEN: Yes.
MR. DRILL: -- question is, correct?
MS. SEN: Yes. And -- and also, like, can you do the same thing and have the exact result? And the question is, If yes, how?

MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh.
MS. SEN: Obviously, I understand from counsel that you all are going to endeavor to do
this. And if it's, "we didn't do it, and now we're going to do it," I understand that and I appreciate that.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah.
MS. SEN: But I want to see -- I mean, you're an expert doing landscaping. You're saying that the actual video is -- is of an area that's either green or orange. And I'm just wondering, how is that possible? And then also, can you replicate it again, if you went today -MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh -MS. SEN: -- or tomorrow when it's bright, would you have the same exact diagram?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. I think we'd have a -- an even better diagram, especially working with the professionals. I didn't go tree by tree. But when we -- when we do that, we're actually going to mark and mark off -- we'll tape. We'll flag. So while these are general approximations, general guidelines, if there's a small pocket within that green, that there's three trees or so that needs to be removed, like we'll -- we'll do that. So I am confident we'll be able to not only replicate it, but get an --

MR. DRILL: Get a more accurate --

MR. DEVITTO: -- a much more accurate representation of what's -- of what's happening. And I'm confident making a good berm.

MR. DRILL: Conceding the fact that the exhibit A-28, let's just say, you can't rely on it to be an accurate depiction of what's out there. That's why they're proposing this method of getting an accurate.

MS. SEN: Okay. Absolutely.
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. Correct.
MS. SEN: And -- and -- and I thank you, you know, for -- for doing it again.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. It's just -- this is just a general guideline to show the board -present to the board we went out there, we looked at it, this area's in fair condition. We know we need to go out here focus on it and --

MALE SPEAKER: You bring the view to -I think it's Behnert. Go to that intersection and then see the berm from that vantage point.

MALE SPEAKER: Where's that? Keep going down. I think Behnert's next.

MALE SPEAKER: The first street you come to.

MALE SPEAKER: Lexington is first.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Go to Lexington first.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Go back. Go back. Lexington is the first street you come to. That's Lexington right there.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay.
MALE SPEAKER: When you are at the intersection of Lexington looking into the site, that is what you're seeing.

MR. DRILL: And is this A-28 -- does this have the aerial properly coordinated with the site plan?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes. This -- yes, it does. This is Lexington coming in it. It then doglegs into where we're looking at this plan view now? Behnert is here. And that will be aligned with the main access road into the residential portion. So we're looking now at Lexington.

MS. SEN: Okay. And can we have the witness do it? I'm just -- I want to make sure the witness knows. I mean, you're -- you're testifying --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MS. SEN: -- that you did this and that
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MALE SPEAKER: Can you just go a little closer on this view?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, this is -- this -- these -- this line of questioning factually, isn't -- this a new witness, hasn't been following the proceeding, doesn't know all the exhibits. I'm just giving you an assistance to guide you to make sure you're in the right plan view.

MS. SEN: Right. But what we have is we have a situation, right, and I'm just -- where we have conflicting testimony between experts, right? One expert says it's four feet. The other one says it's seven feet. Then we don't know; we're gonna look right.

And then what we're doing is we're wanting to look at the berm, right, and we want to look at the sidewalk, and we want to know -because, you know, we want to know, one, what is Hartz asking us to do? Because the plan says there's eight feet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Uh-huh.
MS. SEN: So if they're asking us to
move it one feet, that's one thing. Hartz's expert has stated that it cannot expand the sidewalk because of the berm and vegetate -vegetation and the slope. So that is why it's relevant. And so I'm asking you if you know, since you're testifying, you know, how does the sidewalk relate to the berm and its condition? Because if the condition is bad and it needs to be replaced, and obviously the sidewalk can't be expanded.

MR. DEVITTO: Right. Without knowing any -- any easements, setbacks --

MR. VICE CHAIR: We can -- we just
focus -- I'm sorry. Let's focus -- so we already have a resolution point on the sidewalk. Let's just focus for these -- and I appreciate that concern, but just on the berm itself, because that's what we're contending with.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Go ahead.
MR. DRILL: So Mr. Taylor asked that's the view from Lexington. So you want him to continue to move --

MR. TAYLOR: Continue south.
MR. DRILL: Continue south nice and
slow. And then when you get down to Behnert, stop again. Correct?

MR. TAYLOR: Sure.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Can I ask you another question while you're -- I'm sorry to while you're moving it. But did you as the -- as an architect -- as a landscape architect, did you look at the, like, physical dirt berm or did you look at the trees and shrubs and planting on the berm.

MR. DEVITTO: I observed the berm just to see if it was -- if there were signs of erosion. It didn't -- did not seem to be especially in these areas that we're kind of getting into. So the berm seems to be in -- in fair condition.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: The physical berm itself.

MR. DEVITTO: The physical berm, the actual mound.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes. That'd be better.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So there's the -there's the view from Bernard. And let's ask the witness to take that microphone that Mr. KentSmith is holding and go over to A-28 and point
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out where Behnert -- Behnert is. MR. DEVITTO: Sure. It's the line -MR. DRILL: Don't worry. Just shout. MR. DEVITTO: It's the line with the main axis.

MR. DRILL: Right there. All right.
You want to -- Mr. Taylor, I assume you want him to go all the -- continue to go south to the end of the property, correct?

MR. TAYLOR: That's fine. The only thing I'd like to mention -- or he can mention is the date of the Street View that's shown on there.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. It's June 2022.
MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.
MR. DEVITTO: So this past summer.
MR. DRILL: Okay. When all the leaves are on the trees is your point?

MR. TAYLOR: Yep.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MALE SPEAKER: Another question. I
know we had testimony the last hearing from a landscape architect who was responsible for the residential side?

MR. KENT-SMITH: That's correct.

MALE SPEAKER: You're testifying tonight that you or your firm is going to be responsible for the plantings on the berm on both the commercial and residential side or just are -- is your firm only responsible for the commercial side?

MR. DEVITTO: When you say the residential side, that's the boundary between the residential and the commercial right --

MR. DRILL: Right. There was testi- --
MR. DEVITTO: -- within -- within the property.

MR. DRILL: -- there was testimony that the commercial side is going to be responsible for maintaining the whole berm. So his question is, are you going to be responsible for designing supplementing whatever the whole berm?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Thank you.
MR. DRILL: I'm the interpreter of questions apparently.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Are they still going down, Mr. Taylor?

MR. DRILL: Yeah, well -- Mr. Taylor wants to continue all the way down from the end.

MR. TAYLOR: From these -- from these
viewpoints, like right there --
MR. DRILL: Stop --
MR. TAYLOR: -- just stop and take a
look at the berm here and give me your professional opinion as to its condition. Point out what's good and what's bad about it.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So you -- you're starting to see some the white pines on the berm in these -- these trees kind of coming up right here --

MR. TAYLOR: Yep.
MR. DEVITTO: -- you can -- you can see the leggy nature, which means that the branching on the lower portions is -- is absent. And those are -- those are the types of trees that we're looking to supplement.

MR. DRILL: And where do you think this is? Go back up to A-28 with the microphone and point to the board where you think the area that's shown now on Google Street View is.

MR. DEVITTO: It's approximately.
MR. DRILL: So it's in that yellow area, we're still in the approximate location of Behnert, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct.

MR. TAYLOR: And how about the berm itself at that location and the grass cover?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So I was looking at -- at this. It seems to be pine needles on -on the berm. It did not appear to be exposed soil.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Just practically speaking. So let's just say you went out there and you identified this current condition --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MR. VICE CHAIR: -- and you were trying to increase the -- the screening and buffering to supplement that. How many -- how many trees or -- or plants would you have to -- to put there to address that?

MR. DRILL: He's asking to screen the development --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MR. DRILL: -- from the people on the other side, just in this Google view, how many evergreens do you think you'd have to plant?

MR. VICE CHAIR: Because it looks
sparse? I mean, yeah.
MR. DRILL: That's your question?
MR. VICE CHAIR: Yeah. That is my
question.
MR. DRILL: Want me to tell you his guess? Or why don't we hear your -- your answer?

MR. DEVITTO: It -- it -- it's tough to estimate from this perspective. I will say probably six to seven in that range? It -- it would -- it would -- it would vary.

MR. VICE CHAIR: And I'm not a
landscape architect. But it -- I would -- I would think more than that. So --

MR. DEVITTO: It's -- it's tricky in a situation like this, where there's an -- it's mature canopy. There's roots we have to contend with. This is a very difficult view to give a general estimate like that. This -- that's why it's best to do this in the field with actual stakes. I don't fully feel comfortable giving out a number.

MR. DRILL: He's just asking for an estimate. He's not asking to have you precise.

MR. DEVITTO: It -- it's -- it's a tricky -- it's a tricky estimate.

MR. VICE CHAIR: But there are certain, obviously, processes that you engage in to ensure whatever that number is to ensure that that
coverage is met and that screening is met?
MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay.
MS. SEN: And I was just curious, like, what's the difference between this that you've assessed as yellow versus something that's orange? How do you make that determination? MR. DEVITTO: It was just -- it was just an eye test. It wasn't a scientific obser--- or -- or process to get that. So yeah. I -I don't want us to get too hung up in the colors. I think what's more important is the actual on site investigation and the results that come from that.

MS. SEN: Thank you.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So moving --
Mr. Taylor, you want to keep moving? MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MR. DRILL: So keep on heading south. MALE SPEAKER: Quick -- quick question. On these trees that we just saw, would you remove them when you replace them or would you supplement them? How -- how would you deal with those -- those sparse trees.

MR. DEVITTO: It would -- it would
depend on the condition of each tree. There might be some situations where the tree is not really outputting a canopy, and it's -- there's no branches on it. So in that case, you'd probably want to remove it. But there might be some trees that are just little leggy that have a nice canopy, you would want to -- you would want to keep that tree.

MALE SPEAKER: Are you thinking white pines again? Because they're always leggy.

MR. DEVITTO: No. I would not recommend white pines.

So this is an area that -- I believe we're in the green portion of the body intersection, the southern intersection. You can see these evergreens in here a lot -- a lot more full. They're dense, and they're mature. So that's -- that's -- this is what we're looking for. But even still, there are some dead trees in here that will have to just be removed. I would -- I would say in this area more minor supplementing. But yeah, that's -- that's kind of what $I$-- what we're looking for.

MALE SPEAKER: Well, that's actually not our property.
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MALE SPEAKER: That's the golf course.
MALE SPEAKER: You went too far south.
MR. DEVITTO: This is approximate.
MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. I think that was helpful.

MR. VICE CHAIR: And we've ended in the green, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other questions from our board members?

MALE SPEAKER: I -- I just had a
general question. There were a number of times during your testimony that you refer to as -- or referred to as with the Township or with -- with our experts. Who -- who do you envision that being from the Township?

MR. DEVITTO: The Township's professionals and then from their firm --

MR. DRILL: The guy sitting in the plaid shirt right behind Jackie. Okay. Well, he's for sidewalk. Who's for trees? Who's -who's the landscape?

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: So it's going to be
someone --

MALE SPEAKER: Someone from Colliers.
MR. DRILL: -- from Colliers.
MALE SPEAKER: Understood. Thank you.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Before Mr. Kent-Smith
-- just to reiterate what was -- we got into a discussion here. But two things before I move to members of the public with questions. So we're going to measure and handle the measurement issue of the sidewalk?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MR. VICE CHAIR: And then upon
completion, we're going to work with officials to do some sort of inventory of the existing berm and its conditions --

MR. DRILL: To make a better exhibit that the board can see and feel more comfortable with.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So the first -- the measurements, we can resolve before next Wednesday. The second which would be the actual plan layout, determining plant species and location, we would ask --

MR. DRILL: Not -- not the proposed. The proposed, you're right, that could be -- but the actual condition of the berm. So it's not
just -- I'm looking at Exhibit A-28 as like an estimate. So the board -- I think what you're hearing the board asking for is something more definitive.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So would you with somebody from Stonefield and Colliers be able to walk through with A-28 to get a more accurate assessment of quality and areas of concern?

MR. DRILL: Again, someone -- your landscape architect to witness, he -- he would be doing it. But that's what they're asking you if you -- if you think you could maybe -- you know, if the guy's available. I don't know.
(Indiscernible cross-talk.)
MR. DRILL: Nick's gonna text him and it's either gonna be yes or no.

MR. VICE CHAIR: So depending on that -- okay, I understand.

Thank you, Mr. Kent-Smith.
We're good.
Okay. Our professionals, we're okay with any questions of this witness?

Okay. We'll now move on to members of the public questions of this witness and this witness's testimony. Please state your name and
address for the record.
Ms. Esposito, how are you? Welcome back.

MS. ESPOSITO: Christine Esposito, 11
Behnert Place. In your expert opinion, as a landscape --

MR. DRILL: Can you do us a favor?
MS. ESPOSITO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Even though we don't have a court reporter, if you come over here, when he answers the questions, he's answering them facing the board, and we can also hear you better asking your questions from there.

MS. ESPOSITO: Do you need me to -Christine Esposito, 11 Behnert Place. In your expert opinion as a landscape architect, can you tell me what the role of a berm is in landscape design?

MR. DEVITTO: A berm is used to aid in screening,

MS. ESPOSITO: Screening. Do you -- is that just visual? Is it also sound screening?

MR. DEVITTO: It's mainly visual.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. Can you show us on the site plan where the proposed driveway
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 866-339-2608location is? And also, can you also show us on this Google view where the current -- the proposed residential --

MR. DRILL: Do you want him to show you on the site plan, or do you want him to show you on Exhibit A-28?

MS. ESPOSITO: I'd like to -- I'd like to be able to see it on both. So first, if you can point it out on the --

MR. DRILL: A-28.
MS. ESPOSITO: -- on A-28 the proposed residential main driveway across from Behnert in the center of the berm. Okay. Can you -- now, on the Google Map, can you show us the view where that driveway location will be?

MR. DRILL: Opposite Behnert, right? We're going back to opposite Behnert, correct?

MS. ESPOSITO: Yes. Opposite Behnert where the proposed driveway is. That's --

MR. DRILL: Right. So now we want -you want it turned around, right? You want to view --

MS. ESPOSITO: I want the view where the driveway is from across --

MR. DRILL: You understand what she's
asking. She wants you to go into Behnert and then pull a 180 so you're looking at the berm. There you go.

MS. ESPOSITO: How would you describe is that the yellow area, is that the green area that you're observing across the street from Behnert?

MR. DEVITTO: We -- we had this as fair condition.

MS. ESPOSITO: Fair condition.
MR. DRILL: In other words --
MR. DEVITTO: There were some dead trees in there.

MR. DRILL: Right. But in other words, she asked you, would that be the yellow area, the green, or the red? Your answer is that would be the yellow area, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Shown on Exhibit A-28.
MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct.
MR. DRILL: With a driveway gap through the berm, obviously, to get the vehicles in and out, right?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct. Yes.
MS. ESPOSITO: So in other words, to
install that driveway, that fair area would actually have to be completely removed at 50 feet wide?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. This would be an access drive.

MS. ESPOSITO: So it would be a clear visual straight across and that screening would no longer be there?

MR. DEVITTO: There would be a visual; however, there is the park area. So it's not going to be a building that's directly up in front along this roadway. It's going to be substantially set back. There's going to be trees within the park. There's going to be the berm. I -- I don't -- in my professional opinion, I don't think that there's any -- any -the building is not going to be impeding on the residence from this side of the street in my professional opinion.

MS. ESPOSITO: But in your opinion, the -- the trees that we see there are going to be gone?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. ESPOSITO: And the hill -- and the berm itself.

MR. DEVITTO: A portion of these trees, correct?

MR. DRILL: Well, 50-foot -- at least a 5 --

MS. ESPOSITO: Feet wide.
MR. DRILL: -- 50-foot wide portion of the berm and the trees have to be removed, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: They have to be removed, correct.

MS. ESPOSITO: So that would be including the berm, which is that appears to be at least five to six feet tall?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: And all those mature
trees?
MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Can you now move down to where the current driveway location is to the right?

MR. DRILL: Okay. So kept -- so
heading north --
MS. ESPOSITO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: -- correct?
MS. ESPOSITO: To where that current
driveway is. And can we look at that?
MR. DRILL: And then she wants you to look into that driveway. Right.

MS. ESPOSITO: So in the proposed landscape plan, do you propose reinstalling the berm at that portion, building up a six -- five to six-foot berm and planting on top of that? Or is that to remain flat with nothing there?

MR. DEVITTO: I believe this area was just going to receive site -- general site grading, so no established berm. However, it would -- you know, when we walk out the site, it would have -- it would have proposed planting.

MR. DRILL: How can that be? How can that be? Can you pull out the site plan? That -- that -- that -- maybe you're right, but it doesn't make sense, at least to me. Let's see what the site plan shows.

MR. KENT-SMITH: That is the existing condition that you're looking at right now.

MR. DRILL: Correct. But we want to see the site plan showing what's the proposed condition when that driveway entrance gets removed?

MR. DEVITTO: Where -- where -- there
U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT 866-339-2608
we are right here.
MR. DRILL: So, Mr. Kent-Smith, if you can find an exhibit number and then give it to this witness to let the witness answer the question. Yeah. Can you go with Mr. KentSmith's?

MR. DEVITTO: This is Exhibit A-1, existing conditions.

MR. DRILL: Okay. But why --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Exhibit A-1, existing conditions, existing driveway opening that is to be removed with what is being proposed in this site --

MR. DRILL: On A-28?
MR. DEVITTO: This area is going to be green space now. The proposed condition -- the existing condition is a driveway, which will be removed and a green space in here.

MR. DRILL: But there's no berm?
MR. DEVITTO: There's going to be

```
site --
```

MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
MR. DEVITTO: That that's a -- a basin. Stormwater.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, $I$ don't know if

I have the survey.
MR. DRILL: Can we just look at -- can we just look at the grading plan, please?

MR. KENT-SMITH: The existing -- first, focusing on the existing condition again, looking at $A-2$, this is the driveway that I'm pointing to between Behnert and Lexington. That is the -that was on the aerial. And that is the driveway to be removed. And --

MR. DRILL: I think the problem is that I don't think this witness totally appreciate what's shown on those site plans. Okay. I'm not testifying, but I'm going to ask a question. If you could look at the plans and look to see how that basin is being designed. Because again, I'm not an engineer, and I'm not testifying, but when I look at the design of that basin, it sure looks like there's a thing that comes up that's higher than the existing berm. But I -- I could be wrong. But I need someone with actual knowledge so we can get the facts straight here.

MS. ESPOSITO: And then will there be plantings in that area?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Which is where at the base --

MS. ESPOSITO: Are we going to --
MR. DEVITTO: So there -- there will be a small -- small berm. Elevation about 71.

MALE SPEAKER: Compared to what?
MR. DRILL: What is the elevation in the street please? And what's the elevation on the existing berm that's going to remain?

MR. DEVITTO: It's about a three-foot berm in this area.

MR. DRILL: The existing berm is three feet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. And what's the proposed elevation compared to the three feet going to be in front of that basin?

MR. DEVITTO: It's also going to be three feet higher than the -- higher than the roadway.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So then what your testimony is, is that the street opening that exists today is going to replicate the elevation shown on the existing conditions of what's there now. So there'll be continuous berm across the existing driveway.

MS. SEN: And is that a yes or --
MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct.
MS. SEN: And how do you know?
MR. DEVITTO: Just by reviewing the grading.

MR. DRILL: By looking at the plan with him getting help, which we shouldn't be doing -but I mean, this witness, he doesn't know.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I -- with all due respect, Mr. Drill, he is a landscape architect. He does know grading. He does know elevation lines. To say he doesn't know is unfair and -and quite frankly --

MR. DRILL: Mr. Kent-Smith, if I didn't just ask the question like I did, and basically lead him to answering the question, he'd have no idea. He testified there was going to be no berm there. I'm helping the guy out, which I shouldn't do, because I feel bad. I'm trying to move this thing along, so don't criticize me.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Let's -- let's --
okay. So you said that the existing condition is three. You're going to replicate the existing condition.

And Ms. Esposito, back to your
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question. Does that answer your question?
MS. ESPOSITO: (Inaudible).
MR. VICE CHAIR: You believe that answers your question?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I'd like to follow up.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Well, Mr. Taylor --
MR. TAYLOR: As a landscape architect, can you raise that area and make the berm higher in your opinion?

MR. DEVITTO: Based on the site grading, no. It's
$\qquad$
MR. TAYLOR: And can you explain why?
MR. DEVITTO: For -- the contours are -

- it appears to be pretty tight in that area.

MR. TAYLOR: Because of -- because of the drainage?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
(Indiscernible cross-talk.)
MR. TAYLOR: Okay. So maybe you can explain that to the public --

MR. DEVITTO: There -- there appears to
be a --
MR. TAYLOR: -- so that they can
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understand what the constraints are and why it has to be the way it is. Can you do that, please?

MR. DEVITTO: Oh, yes. So along the frontage there is a drainage basin that is proposed. A berm is -- in this area is being reworked to be three-foot tall along the roadway and it's a continuous berm. Yeah. So it's -it's gonna be -- it's gonna be --

MR. TAYLOR: Is the width of the berm restricted by the roadway on one side and by the detention basin on the other side?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. TAYLOR: Okay. So therefore, you can't just have a straight up and down pile of dirt; is that correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. TAYLOR: And that's why the height of that berm is as what's shown on the site plan, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. TAYLOR: And so that explains why that's not a higher elevation on the grading plan, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.
MS. ESPOSITO: And so --
MR. TAYLOR: Sorry for interrupting you.

MS. ESPOSITO: So then the intent is then with that smaller berm area is to also add to the screening and plant there?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Can you explain to us when you do remove a large portion of an existing seven -- six- to seven-foot berm at 50 feet wide, what would happen to the root structure of some of the more healthy trees that are existing around that? Would they be compromised in any way?

MR. DEVITTO: The -- we would -- we would go through measures with root protection to go in there and make sure those are roped off and the soil disturbance is less than six to -- six feet within the critical root zone of those trees.

MS. ESPOSITO: So then, do I understand you that the driveway would be 50 feet wide, but then there's an additional six feet on each side where the roots would be disturbed so that would
cause some type of tree removal or --
MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. ESPOSITO: -- visual screen?
MR. DEVITTO: There would be some
disturbance that would be re-supplemented.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. So that would
require additional supplementation --
MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: -- than what is proposed now.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. I think that might have been all my questions. Let me -- oh, my question would be then, what is the stan- -you mentioned that you would replant with standard height evergreens? What is that? What is considered standard height evergreen?

MR. DEVITTO: Right now, we are proposing six- to seven-foot tall evergreen trees. Anywhere from there to seven-, eight-foot is -- is standard industry practice.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. And those would be what would be proposed in this plan across the entire complex?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
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MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. But just to follow up with an important question, Ms. Esposito. So standard industry practice saying you have average of these. But if you find in your walks that it requires a bigger height, you'll consider that correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay.
MS. ESPOSITO: And my last question is, is the walk-through that is proposed with the town planners with their landscape is that open to the public? Is that considered a planning board session? Is the public allowed to attend that in any way?

MR. DRILL: The only way -- I don't think anyone on the board -- I could be wrong. If I'm wrong, you tell me. Do -- any of the board members wanted to make that a site visit? Because if the board wanted to make a site visit, then it would have to be noticed and it would have to be open to the public.

If it's just experts from the applicant and experts from the board with no board members, then they could do their thing because you'd want the township and board professionals they're
basically as a check. Just like Mr. Kent-Smith wants them there as a check, we want them there as a check. Then, it wouldn't be open to board members or the public. But that's up to the board.

MR. VICE CHAIR: I mean, we could -- I -- I trust our professionals. And I -- I believe that there's an adequate check in place in both sides.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Any board members interested in doing a site visit when those people are out there?

MS. SEN: I think the difference is, you know, there's that question that Ms. Esposito asked. But then I think Ms. Esposito has the right to measure it herself, right?

MR. DRILL: Right. She has -- right -you can go out and --

MS. SEN: The public can measure and attend. But $I$ think she's just asking whether she or a member of the public can be there with the board professionals and the Hartz Mountain.

MR. DRILL: Put this -- put it this way, if it's set up as applicants, professionals, board professionals, it's a professional meeting.

If she wants to go out there herself and do her own thing, she can. If board members want to attend and it's noticed, then it's open to everybody. So my question is, do any board members want to attend?

MALE SPEAKER: No.
MR. DRILL: Why don't you do a straw poll? Do you want to attend?

MR. VICE CHAIR: I'm sorry, Mr. Drill. I need clarification. Because -- to Ms. Sen's question, so we're saying that if their professionals, our professionals go out there as is planned and they -- we are not participating, then Mr. Esposito cannot attend that?

MR. DRILL: It's a -- it's a private meeting between professional --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Two parties --
MR. DRILL: Unless our professionals or the applicant's professionals think that you could eliminate some questions and some time by inviting members of the public along?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, I don't -- I -at this --

MR. DRILL: If the board is not going, then it wouldn't be noticed.
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 866-339-2608MR. KENT-SMITH: At this juncture, we need this to be professionals because we need to have the professional analysis as the walk is going along and have a free and fair discussion between your professionals and our professionals so that we can come to a mutually-agreeable determination of what is going to be provided. That plan will then have to be prepared, submitted as a condition for -- for compliance. So that is what we're proposing.

MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. The plan you're talking about as a condition of compliance in case there's an approval is the proposed landscaping plan. What the board wants before they deliberate and vote is they want not an estimation. They want a more accurate depiction than Exhibit A-28 --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. Yeah.
MR. DRILL: -- of what the existing condition is of the landscaping and they want the accurate representation of the width of the sidewalk. So those are things -- if -- if they don't get them before next Wednesday, they're not going to deliberate.

MR. KENT-SMITH: All right. Then --
then it's even more imperative that this be just staff relative to those measurements and the information requested by the board. And we'll then move forward following that and the board's deliberation with a more detailed plan.

MR. DRILL: That's your request?
MR. KENT-SMITH: That is.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So we'll keep it to the professionals.

Ms. Esposito.
MS. ESPOSITO: I understand that, and I agree with that.

My second question as follow-up to that is then, would members of the Township's Environmental Committee also be involved in this meeting so they can speak to concerns related to the -- you know, the water that --

MR. DRILL: Are you on the
Environmental Commission?
MS. ESPOSITO: No.
MR. DRILL: Is anyone from the Environmental Commission here?

MS. ESPOSITO: You know, especially considering the removal of trees --

MR. DRILL: Is the Environmental
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Commission interested in having any representatives at that?

FEMALE SPEAKER: If a representative from the Township is going to be there doing their assessment, then I'm comfortable with that assessment.

MR. DRILL: Because as long as you didn't have a quorum of the environmental commission and as long as you didn't have a quorum of the planning board, the members of the environmental commission, anyone who wanted to go, as long as it's less than a quorum, could go with them. And it's still -- and it doesn't have to be noticed.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. DRILL: So maybe you can pick one at -- how many members are there on the Environmental Commission?

FEMALE SPEAKER: On -- in the entire Environmental Commission?

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm not sure.
MR. DRILL: As long as -- leave it to no more than two Environmental Commission members going with them, then we don't have to worry
about any notice issue.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. DRILL: But then, if the
Environmental Commission is going to go, they're going to be asked to either submit a report or something about it. And so you can't be -- any planning board member who's a member of the Environmental Commission cannot be preparing this report, because you can't have a planning board member become a witness.

So if the Environmental Commission wants to send people, you know what, it shouldn't be you two. It should be someone who's not a member of the planning board.

MALE SPEAKER: It will not be me.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
FEMALE SPEAKER: We can ask the chair.
MR. DRILL: Why don't you ask the chair
if the chair will go.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So does that sound good, Ms. Esposito?

MS. ESPOSITO: That's fine with me.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay.
MS. ESPOSITO: Thank you.
MR. VICE CHAIR: We're going to take a

15-minute bio break and adjourn, and we'll come back to public questions. Fifteen minutes.
(A recess is taken.)
MR. VICE CHAIR: Member of the public that would like to ask a question. Name, Address.

Ms. Labrutto?
MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, I'm sorry. Rita Labrutto, 104 Arlington Road. Yes. So I'd like to put these into evidence, if $I$ can. They're.

MR. DRILL: We're gonna do what we did with our truck driver.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: We're gonna mark them --
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: -- and you can ask him questions about them and --

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: So how many --
MS. LABRUTTO: There's seven.
MR. DRILL: Seven. So why don't we call these the L Exhibits. Do you know why?

MS. LABRUTTO: Landscaping?
MR. DRILL: Your last name?
MS. LABRUTTO: Oh. Okay.

MR. DRILL: Do you have these marked?
MS. LABRUTTO: I have them numbered 1 through 7.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So everyone put $L$ in front of the numbers.

MR. KENT-SMITH: There you go.
So one of the things I was -- as I was marking these, these are very informative photographs.

MR. DRILL: These are very what?
MR. KENT-SMITH: Informative
photographs. I have asked -- what's --
MS. LABRUTTO: Rita.
MR. KENT-SMITH: -- Rita if we could
take these photographs with us when we do our site visit?

MR. DRILL: Oh.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Is that acceptable?
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. We'll -- we will take --

MR. DRILL: You'll take one set. The other set's gonna stay with us.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. Yes. Thank you.

MR. DRILL: So take each photograph -this is L-1. Say when you took it, and then ask him whatever questions you're gonna ask him about it.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So I took it on December 1.

MR. DRILL: Microphone.
MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. DRILL: You got it, but you gotta use it.

MS. LABRUTTO: All of them on
December 1.
MR. DRILL: All right. Great.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: L-1 through 7.
MS. LABRUTTO: L-1 through 7 on
December 1.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So on the first photograph, $I$ just wanted to confirm though I think they clarified it. But the berm starts at the railroad and goes to Raritan Road up to the Height Hills property.

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. And looking at
this photograph, so L --
MR. DRILL: L, will just give a
description. What is -- what does L-1 show? You took the picture?

MS. LABRUTTO: L-1 is a shot from Lexington down Walnut Avenue, and it shows the berm as far as $I$ could get.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Now, let's ask the witness. Do you agree that that's what is shown in Exhibit L-1?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Beautiful. Ask your question.

MS. LABRUTTO: So I think for these purposes, I'm not sure whether these are in the green, the red, the orange, purple, or anything else. But for all intents and purposes, would you say then that there are gaps?

MR. DEVITTO: On the lower side, yeah.
MS. LABRUTTO: On the lower side.
MR. DEVITTO: The lower -- lower branches, yes.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So L-2 is --
MR. DRILL: Right. L-2 shows what?
MS. LABRUTTO: Another shot of the berm
that is further up by Bannard.
MR. DRILL: Okay. The witness. You agree generally with that?

MR. DEVITTO: It's tough to tell. It's so close. But we'll have to think -- take her word for it.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Question. Go ahead.
MS. LABRUTTO: So the question I guess I have is with something like these trees, do they look dead to you would they be removed?

MR. DEVITTO: Those trees, they look -they look to be alive. However, their branching structure is -- is not ideal. So these are trees that would need to be pruned and then supplemented with new -- new evergreens.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So then the supplement as you can see here, this is one of the machines that Hartz is using to excavate.

MR. DRILL: Wait. This is still in picture $\mathrm{L}-2$ ?

MS. LABRUTTO: Yes. Still in picture L-2. So if you can see a machine like that, you clearly would be able to see a four-story building, right?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. This -- it needs a
little -- a little supplementing.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: It dropped off at the end.
It needs --
MR. DEVITTO: It needs supplementing.
MR. DRILL: Thank you.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: L-3.
MS. LABRUTTO: L-3 is a view from across the street at Lexington. And this is what, if you're standing on this side of Walnut, this is what the residential homes would see when they looked across the street.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Does the witness agree with that?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Ask your question.
MS. LABRUTTO: So my question is, since this is at Lexington and $I$ think on here that is where the driveway is going to be cut into the property?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So can I show you -- if I use this, I have -- it has to go as an
exhibit, or should I just show it on there?
MR. DRILL: Show it on the picture.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. It's the same thing that's up there. But -- so my question is, when you come into the driveway, which is here, there doesn't appear to be any planting -plantings on this elbow like, so wouldn't you agree that when you've pulled into the driveway, you would be able to see either -- there's a lawn there or the buildings here? I mean, wouldn't it be worthwhile.

MR. DEVITTO: Over here?
MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, yeah. Wait a minute.

MR. KENT-SMITH: No, no, no, no, no.
MS. LABRUTTO: We're at Lexington. Right.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. I think what you're --

MS. LABRUTTO: So here's -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. KENT-SMITH: No, no, no, no, no.
MS. LABRUTTO: So wouldn't it be worth -- like wouldn't it be advantageous to put some plantings on that corner so that when you look
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down the driveway, you didn't see the corner of the buildings or that --

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. We can increase some -- some buffer, some evergreen shrub plantings within that area.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right, you see here --
MR. DEVITTO: By the -- by the
industrial building.
MS. LABRUTTO: There's a Maple, I think.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right. So in this area?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Got it.
MS. LABRUTTO: So a Maple -- what does a Maple do in the winter, right?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. It's -- it's a
deciduous tree. Yeah, that's -- that's an agreeable position.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So --
MALE SPEAKER: Can you be a little bit more specific as to that location because I don't know what you're talking about?

MR. DRILL: Can $I$ just make a
suggestion?
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: One of my other boards, if -- if this board accept -- let's assume we get by next Wednesday, prior to that, there's some sort of accurate tree survey exhibit. And let's assume that there's also an accurate sidewalk with exhibit. Let's also assume that there's an approval. Let's assume the board is okay with Mr. Kent-Smith's suggestion for basically an onsite landscape committee going out there.

What my other -- the Bernards Township Planning Board that does this a lot, after an approval with a compliance condition, they invite any of the interested parties public to go on it to hear what the public wants. It's ultimately the -- the board professionals try to reach an agreement. If they can't, they come back to the board. But instead of trying to write up and find out exactly what they're talking about, which is going to take all night and it's going to be virtually impossible because we don't have those pictures, that's my suggestion on how to handle that.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I think that's a very
good suggestion. I do understand and it --
MS. ESPOSITO: On that committee. MR. KENT-SMITH: No. But -- but, Mr. Drill, again, this's why we want to take these photographs with us.

MR. DRILL: I understand.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: But $I$ want to find out do you think that's a good suggestion?

MS. ESPOSITO: Depends on who's on the committee.

MR. DRILL: Well, put it this way -no, no. It's anyone in the -- the board's not going to --

MS. LABRUTTO: Anyone in the public can come?

MR. DRILL: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah. Sure.
MR. DRILL: That's not before next
Wednesday. This is -- this is.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. But my concern
is I would think -- I would not want to see the board vote on this in the abstract form that it is now. I think there has to be a lot more --

MR. DRILL: Put it this way, that's
going to be --
MS. LABRUTTO: -- than 80 percent there type of thing. Right?

MR. DRILL: Right. Right. That's going to be your argument when you get to your sworn testimony. I didn't say that the board's going to accept his suggestion or not.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: But if they do, that's going to be my suggestion. If they accept his suggestion as to condition, my suggestions to the board is that that should be open to interested members of the public, not anyone, people who have participated by coming out and raising questions like this about landscaping.

MS. LABRUTTO: And do they then not get their -- what? -- CO if -- if there's a lot of spots?

MR. DRILL: Correct. Correct. Listen. If there's no agreement, they're gonna have to come back to the board and battle it out. Now, I'm not saying that the public has the right to tell them what to do, but the public has input.

MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Because, basically, the
applicant's professionals are going to have to get the board professionals to agree.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right. I mean, well,
this should have taken place.
MR. DRILL: Listen. Save it for your argument.

MS. LABRUTTO: I mean, I appreciate
that it's going on now --
MR. DRILL: Let's get back to the questions. Back to the questions.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: L-4.
MS. LABRUTTO: So on the drive -- like I said, just going into the driveway, just so when you don't -- when you look down the driveway, you don't see, you know, a big building and lights and everything else, anything that you could do to buffer that elbow area on each side, I think would be helpful.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. Thank you. So now we're at $L-4$. This is the area that $I$ was saying before by Behnert because there's the machinery again. And again, I -- I just -- would you agree that some of these are dead and laggy?
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MR. DEVITTO: And yeah, this is a better photo. Although little bit -- step back a little further from -- from L-2. And it does look like there is a dead -- dead tree or two within this photo.

MR. DRILL: So okay.
MR. DEVITTO: Yes, they would have to be removed and replaced.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. This was just -what was -- this is L-5. This is further down the berm beyond Behnert, before Lexington. But would you agree that there's still a lot of gaps in that berm?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, there are some gaps in this photo.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right. Okay. So this is a view of the berm at the railroad.

MR. DRILL: This is $\mathrm{L}-6 . \mathrm{L}-6$ is a view of the berm at the railroad --

MALE SPEAKER: Can I -- can we just go back to five?

MS. LABRUTTO: Sure.
MALE SPEAKER: There are gaps in the vegetation, not in the berm. Is that --

MS. LABRUTTO: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: -- correct?
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MALE SPEAKER: Is that --
MS. ESPOSITO: In the evergreen.
MR. DRILL: Right. And -- and he's correct. You said gaps in the berm. It's gaps in the -- right. Correct.

MALE SPEAKER: All right. I just want
to --
MR. DRILL: Good point.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes. That's true.
MR. DRILL: Yep. Yep. Yep. Good point.

MS. LABRUTTO: Yes. Good. And then we hit $\mathrm{L}-6$ as a view of the berm --

MR. DRILL: Can you just hold that view of the berm -- the view of the berm by the railroad up? L-6.

MS. LABRUTTO: Sure.
MR. DRILL: So when you say by the railroad, it's not the concrete embankment. It's before you get there?

MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah. It is.

MR. DRILL: I'm gonna say it's near -that's a view of the berm near the railroad and ask the witness: Would you agree that's a view of the berm near the railroad?

MS. LABRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: I'm asking the witness.
MR. DEVITTO: Oh, yes. It's tough to tell.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. DEVITTO: But it -- it looks like to be in this approximate area.

MS. LABRUTTO: I could've said "near" instead of "at." Okay. So again, just looking at this, lots of gaps.

MR. DEVITTO: There are some gaps, yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So my question is when you have gaps like that, and then you mentioned contending with roots, do you actually, like, pull the roots out so that you can put more trees in?

MR. DEVITTO: No. You would -- you would look to disturb the soil as little as possible. So in this circumstance, you would try to find an area that's or absence of large, mature roots. And that's how you would spot your
evergreens. And --
MR. DRILL: Just curious. If you ever
got to a situation where the trees were too big
and the roots were too spread out, and the only
way you could do plantings is -- is to remove the
trees, dig out the roots and then do your
planting, $I$ assume you would do that; is that
correct?
MR. DEVITTO: That's a possibility.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. Because they may
not. How -- how would you? How would you be
assured that you're filling the gap --
MR. DRILL: Right.
MS. LABRUTTO: -- if there was a big
clump of roots --
MR. DRILL: Roots.
MS. LABRUTTO: -- there, you'd have to
kind of --
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah, the field
conditions would -- would determine that right.
MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: L-7.
MS. LABRUTTO: L-7 is -- this is
actually at Behnert.
MR. DRILL: Can you flip that one
there? Okay. That's view of the berm with
landscaping across from Behnert?
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes, yes.
MR. DRILL: You agree with that?
MS. LABRUTTO: I wish I had taken the sign, but $I$ didn't.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. It appears so.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. So that's really where, again, it's going to be cut in. And just my general concern there is once you cut into the berm --

MR. DRILL: Can you put it into -- make it a question?

MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, okay. So would you -- would you think that once the driveway is put in at Behnert is there a way to shield those residential homes from seeing those buildings down the driveway?

MR. DEVITTO: We could -- we could just spot additional evergreens. Probably the best -best method.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. And then I just had some -- I'm sorry -- additional questions. So you may have said this already, what do you
think the appropriate height would be for new evergreen --

MR. DRILL: He answered that one.
MS. LABRUTTO: -- that are put it?
Three-foot?
MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Six to seven -- six to seven feet.

MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, six to seven feet. That's even better.

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MS. LABRUTTO: So I guess my general question is -- and you may not know this -really -- why would the county really care if you put extra vegetation in their area?

MR. DRILL: Do you know the answer to that question?

MS. LABRUTTO: No.
MR. DEVITTO: Well, the county is gonna have their own -- their own regulations and --

MR. DRILL: I understand. But listen. Her question was, why would the county care? If you don't know, just say, "I don't know."

MR. DEVITTO: All right. I'll -- I'll defer.

MR. DRILL: Well, not defer. If you're gonna defer, you're gonna find out. Do you know the answer?

MR. DEVITTO: No. I don't.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Great.
MS. LABRUTTO: So how would we go about getting permission from the county to clean up?

MR. DRILL: That's a legal question.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: You would make it subject to county approval, then they have to apply for approval.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. Same way we did with the driveways, right?

MR. DRILL: That's right.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah. And I guess just my general question was, would the public be able to see all of this prior to Planning Board voting?

MR. DRILL: Well, okay. That's going to be your argument. Because the -- the planning board has told them if they want -- first, they have to finish this thing. They got to finish the case tonight to have a deliberation next week. But if they -- the planning board has said
if you want a deliberation, we have to see an accurate depiction of the width of the sidewalk the whole length and we have to see an accurate depiction of what the existing condition of the berm is. Dave suggested the board hasn't weighed in on it yet that what the proposed will be would be a condition of approval.

Now, I will give a legal opinion. Certain things the -- the board cannot condition on. There are four essential elements of the development: Traffic, stormwater, potable water, and sewer. The court cases say even in an affordable housing case, unless the applicant can show that those things are feasible, the board cannot grant site plan approval. But things like landscaping, lighting, if the board has the authority, if it wants to exercise it, that it could grant approval subject to conditions. It's allowed to. Doesn't mean they have to. And that's what they're asking.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: And we'll see what happens.
MS. LABRUTTO: All right. On this site plan down here, $I$ guess that is C-14 --

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So on this, I've found about three evergreens. Is it your testimony, or was it your testimony most of these were Magnolia Maple?

MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh.
MS. LABRUTTO: Again, is -- you know, am I correct in thinking that in the winter, they really don't give you any screening or buffering?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct. And we'll work on adding additional evergreens.

MR. DRILL: And that goes to Mr. Taylor's question. If you recall, when we were looking at Street View, he asked for the date. What's the date of that Street View? And he said, "Oh, it's June 2022," I think the answer was. And the point was that's when all the leaves are out and right now, we're in December.

That was your point?
MR. TAYLOR: That was my point.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. But $I$ think on the initial plan, there was no berm there. It was just all Maple and Magnolia. So I'm -- just want to make sure. Just for -- there is a berm. The -- the actual grading, there is a berm.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.

MR. DEVITTO: It's just not -- there are shade trees incorporated into this area. So we'll -- we'll incorporate evergreen trees.

MS. LABRUTTO: So are you saying these Maples and Magnolias were existing already?

MR. DEVITTO: No. Those are proposed. Those are deciduous.

MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah. These were ever--- the -- if -- if this was the berm, these were all evergreens.

MR. DRILL: So again, put it -- put it this way.

MS. LABRUTTO: Is that correct?
MR. DRILL: Again, if the board -- if the board accepts the proposal -- if they got to the point they were willing to grant and you were out there, you would be advocating for evergreen, evergreen, evergreen, not deciduous.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right.
Okay. Now, does your plan -- will you be looking at irrigation on -- in -- on any of these?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah, for -- for
planting. For a landscape plan of this size, irrigation should be considered.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. And --
MR. KENT-SMITH: If I may -- cause I did look through this. In terms of what is it that your redevelopment plan does require. And the redevelopment plan actually has a specific statement relative to the use of irrigation.

MALE SPEAKER: Nick is gonna pull it up as well.

MR. DEVITTO: Thank you. And just give us the page on there, Mr . Kent-Smith.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Just --
MS. LABRUTTO: It was a very silly comment about using it sparingly or something.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes. You are correct.
MR. DRILL: Hold -- whoa, whoa. Hold on.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I'm just --
MR. DRILL: This is a legal response to your question about irrigation.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: Nick, do you know where it is?

MS. LABRUTTO: I do.
MR. DRILL: Because I don't know where it is. So --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes. I'm sorry. On page -- this is Section -- Subsection 3. My pagination is a little different. Because it's my page 33. But my pagination isn't the same as yours. It is relative to sub district one, under sustainability requirements, paragraph 5, under the sub -- no -- excuse me, paragraph B under subsection 3, landscaping --

MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa.
Paragraph what?
MR. KENT-SMITH: 4.6, J, 5, B, 3.
MR. DRILL: Okay. And what is it? Can you just read it verbatim?

MR. KENT-SMITH: I'm reading it verbatim. Avoid or minimize the use of irrigation to the extent possible. Consider alternative water sources to replace use of potable water for irrigation purposes. That's what we would propose to do. Not direct irrigation, but see, for example, some alternative that would --

MR. DRILL: The water bags or whatever. Okay.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes, that's --
MS. LABRUTTO: But also in the
redevelopment plan, it says.
MR. DRILL: You know where you are in
the redevelopment plan?
MS. LABRUTTO: Well, let me see here. I'm sorry, it was September 9, 2022, Hartz's response to our professionals. And it was number 18. It said landscape plan shall note any areas of irrigation.

MR. DRILL: Shall note them, if there is any. What they're saying is they're not proposing any way. That's -- any. That's why it's not noted.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So my question is, you're a landscape architect, you have a green space area, that's one.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MS. LABRUTTO: How do you keep that green in the summer without irrigation?

MR. DEVITTO: That area would just be, you know, watered by -- by the rain. You can use cisterns. You can do some stuff like that. But for the most part, we were not proposing irrigation out there.

MS. LABRUTTO: And what about all the flowers that are planted there and everything
else?
MR. DEVITTO: They're largely native in nature. So they would be able to sustain or live in this -- in this region.

MS. LABRUTTO: So the berm -- I guess my question is: Are you aware that Cranford would have an ordinance or will there be a condition that says Hartz needs to maintain the berm in perpetuity, so that we don't get to the point where we have these leggy gaps and everything else going on as years progress.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So normally, what would be imposed relative to things like a berm would be a conservation easement.

MR. DRILL: That would do it.
MS. ESPOSITO: I don't know what --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Effectively, as long as the use is as approved by the board and as proposed, as long as that's there, there would be effectively a covenant made by --

MR. DRILL: It's not going to be a conservation easement. Because if it's a convert- -- conservation easement, you can't touch it. It's going to be some sort of maintenance easement. Correct. And that would
be in perpetuity.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, for as long as
the use is as
--
MR. DRILL: As long as the thing is used as what it was approved for.

MS. LABRUTTO: Right. So would you agree that if there was a --

MR. DRILL: Listen. Mr. -- Mr. KentSmith just agreed to that.

MS. LABRUTTO: I -- I know that.
MR. DRILL: I would go to your next point.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. My next point, I -- my next point had to do to sign variance. Are you familiar -- you wouldn't be doing any of that right?

MR. DRILL: No. Wrong guy. MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah. All right.

MR. DRILL: That's the planner.
MS. LABRUTTO: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: All right.
MR. VICE CHAIR: May we have our -- are there any members, additional members of the public have a question of this witness?
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Please come up, sir. She'll give you the microphone.

Ms. Labrutto.
MS. LABRUTTO: Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Just your name --
MR. DRILL: You want -- you're keeping a set of those pictures. We already have ours.

MR. KENT-SMITH: The marked set goes --
MR. DRILL: Are they both marked?
MR. KENT-SMITH: You have the marked set?

MR. DRILL: Right. We have the marked set.

MS. LABRUTTO: Those are the marked.
MR. KENT-SMITH: These are the marked set.

MR. DRILL: Switch them, please.
MR. KENT-SMITH: These are the marked set.

MR. VICE CHAIR: I'm sorry, sir. Just one second.

MR. SMITH: Sure.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: And can -- you know the routine. You're going to come right up in here.

MR. SMITH: Yep. Got it.
MR. DRILL: We can hear you better.
MR. SMITH: Yep.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Name and address for the record.

MR. SMITH: Don Smith, 187 Gibson Boulevard, and Clark. I've got experience from my father sitting in the back. So a little experience there.

So my question to you is: So you said that you are the landscape architect for both the commercial and the residential; is that correct?

MR. DEVITTO: The areas around the residential. Around the resident.

MR. SMITH: Okay. So my -- I want to zoom in towards the back. Do you have responsibility for behind the commercial building along the railroad tracks there? Is that -- any of that -- will that any of that be landscaped in any capacity?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, these -- these portions or these regions are -- are proposed with landscaping.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And what types of trees are you looking for that? And again, the
reason I ask is because those homes there that are behind it, there's houses on Chester Lang as well as Aberdeen Court. I'm sure there's going to be some sort of security lights that are going to be along the back of that building and $24 / 7$ with those lights, at least that night.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah.
MR. SMITH: You're gonna look out your -- your property, you know, look out the back. I understand those people who bought those places, probably 30, 40 years ago, knew the railroad track was there, but they had no idea that something like this, maybe was going to show up. MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So along that property line, there's going to be a pretty dense buffer of evergreen trees with also a mixture of shrubs in there. So you'll have your headlights screening, and then also as the trees mature, they'll -- they'll buffer the building.

MR. SMITH: Okay. So now you -- as you say, as they mature. So, you know, for our friends there, again, on Aberdeen Court and on Chester Lang, I mean, are they going to have to wait 15 years for those streets to come up to -to not have those lights?
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MR. DRILL: Could -- can I just -- not to --

MR. SMITH: I -- I --
MR. DRILL: Hold on. He wasn't here
last time. But last time, the other landscape architect -- we have a bunch of notes, my notes to -- that they agreed to supplement the landscaping back there as well.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right. And it -- just for your edification, if you would look at Exhibit $A-2$, which is existing conditions --

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Just walk right over there.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And you will see a tree line that is actually right on the property line between Conrail -- yes.

MR. SMITH: Right there.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So those are the existing trees. To the extent that there are issues or concerns that relate to dead trees, etc, that will get addressed. But the intent was to try it to the extent maximum, if it's good, keep it.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. DRILL: Just so you understand.
But -- but my recollection from my notes is that they said -- you guys said that you would supplement, not just if they were needed if you had to add stuff along with the --
(Indiscernible cross-talk.)
MR. KENT-SMITH: Talking about the backside by the train --

MR. DRILL: Oh.
MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
MR. SMITH: That's where I'm talking about that's right along the railroad tracks there, which actually goes back past Lexington.

MR. DRILL: Put it this way, is the applicant willing to supplement that as well?

MR. KENT-SMITH: When you say supplement, again, if they're dead trees, we'll place them. If there are gaps --

MR. DRILL: If there are gaps?
MR. KENT-SMITH: -- we discussed we will plant.

MR. SMITH: Understood. And then in the actual complex where the warehousing is, or the facility is, whatever we're calling it, is
there any landscaping that's going to be done in that particular area, either in the parking lots or are there going to be any kind of trees that are --

MR. DEVITTO: So there is a dense -dense plantings in between the residential and the warehouses.

MR. SMITH: So then the residence if -if I'm going to spend 2500, or 3000 , we don't know what the numbers are for an apartment there, and I got a balcony and I'm looking over, am I going to see any of that? Am I going to be looking at trucks and everything else coming in and out all the time? I mean --

MR. DEVITTO: When the berm or the plantings mature, eventually you will not see that.

MR. SMITH: And so the maturity date on the -- the maturity date of these plantings, what are we looking at? Like 10 years? 15 years?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah, 10 -- 10 to 15.
MR. SMITH: So then if I rent an apartment there, and you go -- and I get a balcony or whatever, I'm more than likely going to be looking at some sort of warehousing for
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probably the good part of 5 or 10 years?
MR. DEVITTO: For -- yeah, for some -yeah. For some time.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. DEVITTO: That is just the nature of -- of trees and how they grow.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, again, I just -- in some ways, I hope that gets represented too.

MALE SPEAKER: Are there balconies?
MR. SMITH: I don't know. I'm just
saying --
MR. DRILL: Okay. Just so factually, yeah --

MR. SMITH: Or even if you look out the window.

MR. DRILL: Let me ask one of our -Let me ask our planner or engineer. Are their balconies proposed?

MALE SPEAKER: No.
MR. DRILL: No. Okay.
MR. SMITH: Okay. So then, even if you look at your window, if I'm in my bedroom, or whatever, I'm looking out -- the potential is I could be looking at an entire warehouse complex
if $I$ have my apartment on that side.
MR. DRILL: That's correct.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. I just want to make sure that is --

MR. DRILL: Is everyone -- everyone is aware of that, correct?

Yeah, the planning board is aware of that.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And then you're also going to be responsible for that landscaping that's along the golf course, all the way down to the --

MR. KENT-SMITH: No.
MR. SMITH: No?
MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, that landscaping is actually --

MR. DRILL: This is a legal -- this is a legal issue that they went into last time.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right, exactly. That landscaping is actually on the golf course property. I did reach out. The owner-operator of the golf course is a company called Troon, T-r-o-o-n. I reached out to the manager who is responsible for this. We're trying to set up the meeting to talk about the net, but it's also
their landscaping. It's not ours.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Very good.
MR. SMITH: And then my final question is --

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Excuse me. To go back to what we -- the last meeting, I think -didn't you have a colloquy with the other landscape architect that there was one little piece that they were going to supplement?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. Behind the residential, yes.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right. You'll see on the plan, Mr. Taylor, what we were talking about is the -- the curvature of the parking on the northern -- northeastern end behind the residential allows for planting on our property. It's area large enough to sustain that. But the majority of the existing trees that you see are actually on the golf course property.

MR. SMITH: I have actually two questions. Again, the second one, whether it is for this witness, $I$ don't know but I'll ask the -

MR. DRILL: We'll find out.
MR. SMITH: Yes. Okay. So my first
question is, any of the materials, will there be any kind of a push for greener materials as either the upkeep or, you know, the RSA
fertilizer or any kind of organic type stuff. So
that runoff water doesn't come into the -- you know, into the system that if you're using chemicals, or is there any thoughts about that?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So within the project specifications, it's -- we can take a look at that and make sure we're proposing, you know, fertilizers with less phosphorus and, you know, just green -- green-friendly products.

MR. SMITH: And, again -- actually, I had two more questions now that you just made that point. So again, this may not be for this witness, but the landscaping that's along the berm there and so forth, it -- was any of that taken into account to the traffic study as well? Because when you come out of those driveways trying to make a left, which honestly to the entire board is gonna be almost impossible at like five o'clock at night. It's already difficult as it is already, but that's traffic --

MR. DRILL: Were you here when the traffic guy was testifying?

MR. SMITH: I was not. Unfortunately, I was not there.

MR. DRILL: So this is not the right -he's going to have no idea.

MR. SMITH: But I didn't know whether his planning for those trees and the berm, does he consult with the traffic consultant at all in any capacity?

MR. KENT-SMITH: So as a legal principle, the county has what's called a sight triangle easement that the county dictates is clear sight. And there are strict rules that prohibit any plantings that would obstruct sight lines in the sight triangle easement. There will be sight triangle easements that will be imposed by the county. So to answer your question, that county assures there's clear visibility.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That's what I want to know.

And then my final question is, is once the -- you decide on what kind of trees and so forth that you want for the berm, and even inside the complex, when everything kind of goes hot and we go into the construction phase and then you start marketing this, will that be an accurate
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representation of what you put in to the marketing? Again, this may not be for this witness, but the only reason $I$ say that is because Woodmont on South Avenue in all the materials for selling that property online, they took out the Raritan Valley line that ran right behind it. Literally was all green grass behind it.

MR. KENT-SMITH: But that -- that's not
-- yeah. they can't.
MR. DRILL: That's a planning board
issue. It's not even a --
MR. SMITH: Okay. I'm just saying, you
know, in a year's time from now when $I$ look at the plant --

MR. DRILL: Do it at public comment, even though it might even be relevant for that, but it's certainly not a question.

MR. SMITH: Fine. That's fine. Okay. Thank you.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Do we have any additional members of the public? Go ahead.

Ms. LEARY: Angela Leary, 4 Behnert Place. In your expert opinion, what caused the trees on the berm to become what they are today,
leggy, sparse?
MR. DEVITTO: It just -- it's just happens with age with certain species. So we're seeing it with light -- white pine a lot. And that's just as they mature, their canopy is pushing higher. They're looking for sunlight. And as a result, the pine needles below, they start to kind of die out. Those branches become weaker. And it stops supporting kind of those -those branches. So that's why you see a lot of fall hazards and -- and items like that.

MR. DRILL: That's why Rita, by the way, asked for the maintenance and perpetuity.

Ms. LEARY: And I'd just like to go back to a question that $I$ asked probably one of our very first meetings: Who is going to maintain that berm? Which entity is maintaining that berm?

MR. DRILL: It's asked and answered. It -- it's been answered.

MR. KENT-SMITH: We've answered it, but it's the commercial entity.

MR. DRILL: Right. That's what they said.

Ms. LEARY: Will we have a phone
number?
MR. DRILL: Listen.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. Are there any other members of the public?

MR. DRILL: Before you ask a second question, let's see if there's any other members of the public that want to ask a first question.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Anyone?
Okay. Ms. Labrutto.
MR. DRILL: So you're the last question of this witness.

MS. LABRUTTO: Rita Labrutto, 104
Arlington Road. Can I just ask you? There's a little triangle which I'm trying to find. Here, you see how that green goes down? That -- that one stops at the orange here. So what's going to go in this portion? Or will there be trees there?

MR. DEVITTO: This area would -- was going to remain undisturbed from -- from -- from construction. So it would be in its more original state.

MR. DRILL: Can you get closer to that microphone to answer that question?

MR. DEVITTO: The area pointed out by
the railroad along the property frontage.
MR. DRILL: The angle in the northern
corner of the property.
MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. Right where that
is.
MR. DEVITTO: This area was -- was aimed to be largely undisturbed.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LABRUTTO: Right. But there's a line against the railroad that $I$ don't see any -any trees at all.

MR. DEVITTO: This line right here.
MS. LABRUTTO: Up --
MR. DEVITTO: Oh, this right here?
MS. LABRUTTO: Yeah.
MR. DEVITTO: That's a setback.
MS. LABRUTTO: No.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, no, there's an easement. What your hand's on is an easement.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. There's easements and setbacks.

MS. LABRUTTO: Over here.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MS. LABRUTTO: Yes.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So what you're looking at is actually the dotted line of a right-of-way, which I believe this township is going to vacate. Once the town vacates the right-of-way, then we can do whatever we want to. But until we get that vacation, it's -- it's actually the township's right-of-way.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. So that's that piece?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: What you want to ask him is they proposed putting landscaping in there after the easement is vacated?

MS. LABRUTTO: Right. Would you propose putting landscaping in the after the easement is vacated?

MR. DEVITTO: Oh, yes. We'll -- we'll observe that area during our sidewalk.

MS. LABRUTTO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Any other members of public? Going once. all right.

All right. Mr. Kent-Smith, thank you, sir.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you very much.
My last witness is Mr. Hughes, our
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professional planner.
MR. DRILL: I know he's been sworn in.
I just forget if he's ever been qualified.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Did we qualify him?
MR. KENT-SMITH: I don't believe he has.

So Mr. Hughes, if you would, please, give the board your professional education, qualifications, experience, and prior experience on testifying on the pace -- professional planning testimony for boards?

Mr. HUGHES: Sure. I don't know that I have been sworn in actually.

MR. DRILL: No. You were sworn in. I have you marked down. I'll swear you in again. Raise your right hand, just in case.

Do you swear, again, if $I$ didn't swear you in the first time that the testimony you're gonna give in this matter is gonna be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. So by way of background, my name is Keenan Hughes. I'm a licensed professional planner in the state and a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. I am a principal of Philips Priess,
which is a planning firm based in Hoboken. I represent municipalities and private clients throughout New Jersey on planning and land use matters, and frequently appear as an extra witness before boards. And I have previously testified before the Cranford Planning Board.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And, Mr. Hughes, your licensure is still in place?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And you have reviewed and evaluated the application before the board tonight prior to presenting your testimony?

Mr. HUGHES: I have.
MR. KENT-SMITH: I am submitting Mr. Hughes as a professional planner providing planning testimony in support of the application.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Are there any questions from any other board members as to the qualifications?

Professionals?
Members of the public?
I accept you as a witness.
Mr. HUGHES: Thank you.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you.
Mr. Hughes, if you would please,
explain to the board what it is you've evaluated and then provide your assessment and opinion relative to the relief requested by the applicant on this application.

MR. DRILL: You have a list. I mean, Mr. Kent-Smith has submitted something. Do you have an up-to-date list of all the relief that's required?

Mr. HUGHES: I'll be going through that.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
Mr. HUGHES: So just by way of background, I do have experience on this property extending back to the original rezoning application in the context of this site plan application. I was asked to review it from a planning perspective with an emphasis on the relief that's being requested. That'll be the focus of my testimony this evening. So we are requesting two variances from the redevelopment plan. The first that I'll start with is for the front yard setback.

Now, both of these variances are C-type variances and that can be justified on a C-2 basis. The front yard setback, this is the
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dimension basically in between the -- the southerly industrial building to the proposed subdivision line in between Subdistricts 1 and Subdistrict 2. One hundred feet is the requirement whereas 63.2 feet is proposed.

I will just say at the outset that the redevelopment plan is not well worded on this specific requirement. The language is somewhat convoluted. What the plan says relative to the placement of buildings within Subdistrict 2 is that a building's primary facade shall front on the property line between Subdistrict 1 and 2 and a second building shall front towards the Conrail line. The frontage shared with the residential development will serve as the front yard for Subdistrict 2 and be indicated through architectural treatment and site landscaping design in accordance with Section 4.6. Now there's a front yard setback minimum of 100 feet from what it says is the property line.

Clearly, the proposed site plan and the architecture before you has achieved the objectives of this section of the redevelopment plan in that the front portion of the industrial building is oriented to that property line.
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There's adequate landscaping. We've basically accommodated the intent being that the -- the front entrance, so to speak, of the industrial building is oriented towards the residential.

I would further note that the actual setback from the front property line along Walnut Avenue, which is typically what is considered the front yard, well exceeds the requirement, it's roughly 150 feet. There's no other specific requirement.

If this is the front yard in between Subdistricts 1 and 2, there's no specific front yard requirement for the separation of the building to Walnut Avenue. And as I said, it's 150 feet here.

So what I can also offer to the board is, having been involved with this project for a number of years and also participated in the drafting of the redevelopment plan itself, the orientation of these buildings has not changed. This is, in fact, the concept plan that was essentially attached to the settlement agreement with the Township. So I think here we're dealing with a matter of how the plan is being interpreted. We're clearly meeting the intent.

And for those reasons, I think the board can grant this variance on a C-2 basis, and that the benefits substantially outweigh the detriments, because granting this variance is really integral to facilitating the overall project, which would advance purposes $A$ and $G$ of the municipal land use law, particularly as it relates to advancing the general welfare to accommodate this proposed overall inclusionary development.

The second variance that we're being -that we're requesting from the board is for the elimination of the basketball court from the site plan. And we're really following the board's lead on this aspect of the proposal. As you are aware, the redevelopment plan requires the basketball court. But there has been prior testimony that by eliminating the basketball court, it will actually have the benefit of improving stormwater management facilities on the property.

And we've, of course, heard some feedback from the board that it's, you know, perhaps less comfortable with that -- the basketball court concept than when the plan was
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originally conceived by the governing body. So in that case, it's clear that the board can find that this results in a better zoning alternative for the site. And the board can then grant this variance again on a $C-2$ basis and that the benefits substantially outweigh any detriments.

MR. DRILL: And in fact, the board asked you guys to ask for that variance.

Mr. HUGHES: That's correct.
And then in terms of the negative criteria for both the C variances, I'll just note, as it relates to these specific two deviations, there's really no substantial detriments to the public good. As I pointed out, as it relates to the setback variance, we're clearly meeting the design intent of the plan in terms of the layout of the buildings as well as the architecture.

And then secondly, there's no substantial impairment to the redevelopment plan, the overall zone plan of the community because, in my opinion, we are still meeting the intent through development planning, of course, following the board's lead as it relates to the -- the basketball court.

Now turning the board's attention to the four design exceptions that we're requesting. These are exceptions, in my opinion, under sub -Subsection 51 of the Municipal Land Use Law. So the board here has the power to grant exceptions from the standards in the plan as may be reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions of the redevelopment plan in this case if the literal -- literal enforcement of one or more provisions of the ordinance is impracticable or will an exact undue hardship because of peculiar conditions pertaining to the land in question.

So the first one that I'll start with is sidewalk width. And there's been extensive discussion on this topic with the board over multiple hearings. As you are aware, the redevelopment plan requires a width of eight feet. For a number of reasons, six feet is the maximum width and can be achieved along the frontage of this property. It's simply impracticable to achieve eight feet in width without impacting the existing berm area, which we know from tonight's discussion is, of course, a very important priority in terms of creating a
visual barrier to the site, and also due to existing utilities and other infrastructure in this area.

So as you heard from Mr. Chaplin, the sidewalk is being widened to six feet wherever possible, which results in six-foot width of roughly 1200 linear feet across the frontage of the property. So I believe given the physical constraints that we're dealing with, we're satisfying the intent of the plan to the maximum extent possible. But we simply cannot achieve full compliance with the eight-foot standard without significant disturbance. So there's clearly -- while this is a design exception, I would say there's also a better zoning alternative aspect to this relief that we're requesting and that we are preserving the berm in the existing vegetation to the maximum extent.

MR. DRILL: Before you go to the next one, I have questions about this one. Because isn't this really -- this one's a question of money? Because --

Mr. HUGHES: No.
MR. DRILL: -- if -- but if you disturb
the berm and you'd have to take down some trees
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and then the board requires that additional trees be planted is that going to harm the structural integrity of the berm?

Mr. HUGHES: Based on the proposed site plan and, again, this plan is part of the overall settlement agreement with the Township, we don't have room to work with in terms of widening that berm along the frontage of the property due to the testimony that you heard from the site engineer relative to accommodating adequate stormwater management on the property as well as achieving the landscape buffering.

MR. DRILL: What does the -- the stormwater management, how does that come into the question of the sidewalk width? I understand that the applicant doesn't want to disturb any part of the berm. I understand they don't want to do that. I asked the engineer is it physically impossible? He said anything's possible. I said, If you disturb the berm to maintain the structural integrity of the berm, couldn't you put up a retaining wall? He said, Yes. And then couldn't you replant? He said, Yes. So based on those concessions from him, how can you say that it's physically impossible to do
it? Because --
Mr. HUGHES: That's not the standard, Mr. Drill. The standard is impracticable hardship.

MR. DRILL: That's one of the -- it's hardship or impracticable. How was it impracticable if it can be done if it's not financial?

Mr. HUGHES: Right, as I pointed out, there's clearly physical constraints. I thought his -- his testimony was crystal clear in that there are utility constraints, there are --

MR. DRILL: So stop. Let's go one by one.

Mr. HUGHES: There is the existing berm --

MR. DRILL: Let's go with the utility restraint.

Mr. HUGHES: -- as well as the existing vegetation that all pose physical constraints to fully achieving an eight-foot wide sidewalk along the frontage of the property.

MR. DRILL: Why is it --
Mr. HUGHES: So those factors provide the basis for the board to grant an exception in
that it's impracticable to achieve a full eightfoot width sidewalk along the frontage of the property.

MR. DRILL: Why removing some trees makes it impracticable?

Mr. HUGHES: It's not just a matter of moving trees. That was not his testimony.

MR. DRILL: Let's say the utility structure has to remain. They said, Well, can't you put it eight feet and in a couple places, the sidewalk's gonna have to be around a utility pole unless the utility company wants to move it. How is that -- so the utility pole. You have a couple of locations. How many utility poles are along the entire lineal footage of the sidewalk?

Mr. HUGHES: I'm relying upon the testimony from our civil engineer --

MR. DRILL: I am too.
Mr. HUGHES: -- who -- who clearly pointed out utility constraints. We have county specifications. We have the berm. Believe me, we would like to achieve an eight-foot sidewalk along the frontage of the property, but it's not practicable. It's simply not.

MR. DRILL: That's a conclusion: It's
not practicable. What's the factual basis? Besides you keep on saying that there's some utility poles, and you'd have to --

Mr. HUGHES: I'm relying on his
testimony, which I thought was crystal clear. It's in the record. We provided --

MR. DRILL: You're relying on a portion of his testimony and I believe the board could rely on another portion of his testimony.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Ms. Sen, my apologies.
Mr. -- Mr. Leber, you --
MR. LEBER: Just -- just one point. Utility poles are being moved to to relocate the driveways. So moving utility poles when it serve -- serves a purpose, can be done.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, Mr. Leber, we're talking about the one pole with the relocated driveway that will be fronting on Behnert. That will have an eight-foot sidewalk because we will be relocating the utility pole in conjunction -in conjunction with that entrance area because that connects into the main part of the site. That's the one area where we can do that.

MR. LEBER: No. But my point is that utility poles can be moved. You are doing that.

MR. DRILL: Legally, why can't you arrange to have the utility poles --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Legally, because, Mr. Drill, this is part of a settlement of an inclusionary development for affordable housing in which we have to deal with our affordable housing set aside in this development in conjunction with all of the other improvements that are being requested and required by the board.

MR. DRILL: Why -- why --
MR. KENT-SMITH: At some point --
MR. DRILL: -- why did you guys agree that --

MR. KENT-SMITH: -- Mr. Drill --
MR. DRILL: -- why did you agree on the redevelopment plan that said eight feet, then?

Mr. HUGHES: Well, I think whoever drafted this redevelopment plan did this in a vacuum. They said eight feet without actually having the benefit of an engineering evaluation of the site, which we now have, which now provides the board the basis of granting this relief.

MS. SEN: So -- so Mr. Hughes, I'm a
little concerned that you're summarizing other experts' testimonies, and I want to ask how you are qualified to do that being that you are only being admitted here for a planning -- as an expert as a planner?

MR. KENT-SMITH: And I just -- the rules of evidence are crystal clear when it comes to expert testimony, particularly --

MR. DRILL: Can $I$ come into this -listen, Mr. Kent, Rule 703 of the New Jersey rules of evidence allow this expert, especially planners, to rely on technically hearsay testimony from another expert. But in this case, it's not even hearsay testimony. He's relying on testimony that another expert gave. So legally, my opinion is totally allowable, for him to do this. In fact, that's what planners have to do.

The issue is he's relying on certain parts of the testimony, not all of it. I heard all the -- I don't vote. If the board heard other parts of the testimony, the board could disagree that the factual basis for his opinion was only based on some of the testimony. If -if the board wants to find that, it can. But the fact that he's relying on the other testimony,
he's supposed to.
MS. SEN: I'm concerned about -- what we're dealing with, you're -- you're testifying -- sorry. Apologies.

You're testifying as to the practicability, right? So that's the real issue, like, can these berm be moved? Can we move poles? About practicability. And I'm just asking what qualifications do you have to be able to testify about the practicability of extending a sidewalk?

Mr. HUGHES: I have nothing to add as to what Mr. Joe just said.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Can you just reiterate, I think, Mr. Pistol, just so why is it impractical and summarize that -- the physical --

Mr. HUGHES: Physical constraints.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Due to the physical constraints, it's impractical, correct?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: As far as the expenses that would be incurred and the fact that it's an affordable housing unit, isn't the concept behind the affordable housing unit that the developer
gets to build 80 percent of the properties at market rate and that subsidizes the 20 percent, so isn't there money there to operate infrastructure?

MR. KENT-SMITH: The jurisprudence relative to cost generation has been pretty well developed. It relates to the fact that in an inclusionary development, the aspect of profitability is subsidy compromised. By that, I mean subsidizing the creation of affordable housing creates a compromise to what would be or an ordinary market rate of return.

The courts have said it is an affirmative obligation of planning boards when they are reviewing inclusionary developments to fairly consider relief requested by an applicant. The intent of which is to reduce costs for the development. That is the well established from Mount Laurel 2 on jurisprudence relative to the request for, in this instance, a waiver from specific design standard, the purpose of which is to reduce costs to the development.

MR. DRILL: And Mr. Kent-Smith is partially correct, but he's partially incorrect. The -- the cost-generative features can't be in
an ordinance. Now, if they're saying that the eight-foot sidewalk requirement in the -- in the ordinance is cost-generative, that's between him and the township. What the COLA rules -- what the third round COLA rules say is the board when considering exceptions or variances, they have to be flexible and reasonable. So you do -- it's a slightly lessened standard for the residential side of the project, because there are affordable housing units there.

But if you want to make the argu- -- if you want to make the financial argument, then quite frankly, you're gonna show what it will cost then to --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, let's don't -(Indiscernible cross-talk.)

MR. DRILL: -- just saying it doesn't do it.

MR. KENT-SMITH: This board reached a covenant with my client when it resolved this litigation.

MR. DRILL: This board, you mean this township?

MR. KENT-SMITH: This township made the covenant. The township made a covenant relative
to this board and the processing of the application. And in that settlement agreement, it says that relief may be required and that the board would fairly consider that relief. It also said that these proceedings were to be expedited, such that there would not be undue delay in the processing of the application.

I think we are at a point here, where it is time for us to fairly consider the relief in the context of the application as presented, and let's move forward.

FEMALE SPEAKER: And I have another question related to this witness. I don't know if that's appropriate.

MR. DRILL: Well, if it's on this issue.

Mr. HUGHES: I'm -- I'm still finishing my testimony.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Okay.
MR. DRILL: I interpreted him --
FEMALE SPEAKER: Sure.
MR. DRILL: -- because on this one, this was like a -- I know that this was a big one with the board.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. I just had a
couple of questions. At the appropriate time, you can advise on the Community Impact Statement?

MR. DRILL: Yeah. That -- that's
right. I would say let him finish.
MR. VICE CHAIR: So Mr. Hughes, I
mean --
(Indiscernible cross-talk.)
Mr. HUGHES: The next exception we're requesting is for the height of the wall-mounted fixtures on the industrial buildings. So as you may recall from the prior testimony, these are wall-mounted fixtures within what I'll call the truck court area in between the two industrial buildings. The mounting height that's proposed is 25 feet where there's a limitation of 16 feet in height. It simply needed to adequately light the loading and circulation areas in between these two buildings.

Lowering the lights would not provide adequate illumination per the testimony of the Civil engineer. However, the lights are shielded, and they will not spill outside of the internal loading area. And they're also blocked by the buildings themselves, at least to the north and the south.

MR. DRILL: On this one, your argument is in practicality. Because to enforce that condition for the sake of enforcing it, when you can solve your safety and solve your, you know, aesthetics without enforcing it, that's impractical. That's your argument on this one?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, thank you. And then the next one is --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Mr. Taylor had a question.

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Staying on that, the -- I wouldn't even mind having another design exception for reducing the foot-candles for the lights. And I know you're not the expert in that. But it goes into planning in the sense that you're going to have a lot of light that's going to be visible, you know, between these commercial buildings and on both frontages which are going to be viewed from Walnut Avenue and from the residence on the opposite side of the train tracks. So part of the reason for the height increase of the lights in my understanding is to achieve the what $I$ consider an excessive --

MR. DRILL: Amount of light.
MR. TAYLOR: -- amount of light at the
-- at the lowest point within the parking lot. So if this is not --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, let me ask the question, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Drill. So the way I hear this is the board would have an inclination that it would permit the deviation from the . 5 minimum foot-candle illumination standard.

Mr. HUGHES: No, it's a 1.5 minimum.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. I want it to be . 5 because you can still see at .5. 1.5 is really bright. So then I think it would be appropriate because it's in the board's authority, that if the board so chose, it could authorize -- us in consultation, ultimately with your consultants on the final lighting plan to reduce from the 1.5 standard to -- and then got to set a floor.

MR. DRILL: So just so you understand, this will be similar to the basketball. I think the board should straw poll itself and see -right now, we're hearing from Mr. Taylor. Let's see how the board feels about that. Because if the board agrees, then I agree with Mr. Kent --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Prior -- prior to this straw poll, Mr. Taylor, just explain your point
again. You're saying that it's adequate light?
MR. TAYLOR: Industry -- industry
standards for the minimum lighting in a
commercial parking lot generally is . 5 footcandles. Cranford has an ordinance that says the minimum is 1.5 , which is three times --

MR. DRILL: Whatever you do, do not criticize the ordinance. Say in this particular case, because you have neighbors across the street and you don't want the extra light. Do not -- because you can't --

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.
MR. DRILL: -- say that the ordinance is no good; therefore, we're going to grant an exception.

MR. TAYLOR: Even with the lights being phased downward, the neighboring properties across from the railroad tracks and anyone driving down Walnut Avenue --

MR. DRILL: On a foggy night.
MR. TAYLOR: -- are going to see the glow of that illumination. And $I$ just think it would make a better project if the -- if the lights were not as intense.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So we use property,
may I suggest, Mr. Drill, you and I can work on this language.

MR. DRILL: I want the board to poll
itself to see if --
MR. KENT-SMITH: May I suggest, Mr. Drill, we've got to set the lower limit.

MR. DRILL: .5, he said.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Oh . 5.
MR. DRILL: He wants to go from 1.5 to . 5.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And just -- -- just for the record, the minimum of a street would be .5. So it's -- it's just for the -- it's the parking area that is --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. And then I understand that Mr. Kent-Smith, . 5 would --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Would be a permissible lower limit.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay. So Ms. Lenahan, we need a straw poll on whether they would like to go from 1.5 to . 5 on board members.

MR. DRILL: The straw poll is whether the board would be in favor of even though they didn't apply for it just like with the basketball court, telling them to apply for an exception to
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MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, I would like to have it arranged, Mr. Drill, because I don't know if we can go all the way down to .5. But between 1.5 and .5, we will work with your board consultants to identify the appropriate lumination.

MR. DRILL: And this is only in the commercial parking lot, correct?

MALE SPEAKER: I think that's the only place that applies.

MR. DRILL: Okay. That's the straw poll question.

It's a "yes" or a "no."
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Can I ask a question before we take a straw poll? The other relief that they were looking for from 25 and 16 feet, your suggestion, does the height matter?

MR. TAYLOR: They would have to -their engineer would have to redo the lighting plan. And it may resolve the one -- you may be able to put lights lower. I don't know. You can't -- you'd have to do the --

MR. DRILL: We can't --

MR. TAYLOR: So I would still --
MR. DRILL: We're already complicating it. I don't want to --

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: My -- my question just to Mr. Taylor since it was his suggestion is does -- does the reduced elimination have an effect on how high or low you mount the lights? That -- that -- that's my question.

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, it would. And it may -- it also may affect the quantity. Like you may have to add a light, but it wouldn't be in a different location or have -- but that would be up to your -- your expert.

MS. LENAHAN: Are we ready?
MR. DRILL: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Yes is to indicate that -- again, just a straw poll. You'd be in favor of an exception to go from 1.5 to as close to . 5 as possible.

MS. LENAHAN: In the commercial parking area.

MR. DRILL: In the commercial parking area.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. Loading -- loading
zone or no?
MALE SPEAKER: In the commercial zone where it applies.

MR. DRILL: Commercial parking lot,
that's what he said.
MS. LENAHAN: Asking about the
loading --
FEMALE SPEAKER: The loading --
MS. LENAHAN: You have to be -- you have to be on a mic.

MR. DRILL: You gotta get a microphone.
MR. TAYLOR: I believe it is. Although it may also
-- I think it's between the two buildings, but it may --

MR. DRILL: What he's talking about is the area between the two buildings.

MR. TAYLOR: But also if it -- I don't have the plan in front of me, so I don't know what the lighting is on the front sides of the building. So I wouldn't want those to be 1.5 of the property line.

MS. LENAHAN: Did you say commercial property?

MR. TAYLOR: That's what $I$ just said.

Commercial property.
MS. LENAHAN: But not just commercial parking area? You had said commercial parking.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, it's commercial parking -- no. Property. Property.

MS. LENAHAN: Commercial property.
MR. TAYLOR: Commercial property. Correct.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Kent-Smith. Okay. Good to go. Okay.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Does that change the testimony about number two about asking for 25 to 16, meaning will you not be making that request for that specific --

MR. KENT-SMITH: He's not going to know. He's not going to know.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: But if you don't know, you can't make the request is what I'm saying. He's -- he's -- he just asked to be --

MR. DRILL: Right. They applied because their plans show them at 25 feet.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Right.
MR. DRILL: The straw poll could be that you want to grant to grant an exception to go from 1.5 foot-candles to as close to five
[sic] foot-candles as possible. And if possible, lower the heights of the fixtures on the building.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Right. But what I'm saying is you don't -- you -- you won't know that now.

MR. DRILL: That's right.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: So how can you ask for it if you don't know it?

MR. DRILL: Because they know they're going to need the relief? And --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, we're trying to accommodate the board's concern.

MR. DRILL: Right.
MR. KENT-SMITH: We're fine with the existing ordinance standard. If the board wants in its discretionary authority to grant us leeway, that's what we're asking.

MR. DRILL: Right.
MS. LENAHAN: We're ready?
MR. DRILL: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: All right.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: All right. Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: I would -- I think that we
should ask our planner and engineer, the town planner and engineer, what they think.

MR. DRILL: Well, listen. We can. But this is -- as I understand, Mr. Taylor, this is a subjective type of thing, which is for a board member. It's not a scientific thing. He's trying to lower --

MR. PISTOL: Well, no. I understand that but I will -- I would like their advice --

MALE SPEAKER: I think it makes sense for our engineer to comment.

MR. PISTOL: -- what they say.
FEMALE SPEAKER: But I would -- I would agree with Mr. Taylor. Usually, the other -ordinances usually require . 5 foot-candle --

MR. PISTOL: Okay.
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- in parking areas.
MR. PISTOL: Okay.
FEMALE SPEAKER: That and the fact is
that this area is going to be elevated. You could see from the street. It's higher than the street level.

MR. PISTOL: Okay.
FEMALE SPEAKER: So that kind of -while there's a berm, it's still higher, so
you'll see it more. So it does make sense.
MR. PISTOL: Okay. Okay. Then, yes.
Thank you.
MS. LENAHAN: Yes?
Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Sen.
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mayor Prunty?
MAYOR PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: And Mr. Nordelo?
Mr. NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So we're going to add that one to the list. And I think at this point, you don't have to testify about that. We just ground that one, beat it like a dead horse. So instead of having four, you now have five. So
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you're now -- you're number three is now my number four.

Mr. HUGHES: All right. So the next one is the commercial building signs facing residential. This is a standard that actually comes from the existing $C-3$ zoning which the redevelopment plan defers to. And what this is referencing is the anticipated wall signs along the frontage of the northerly industrial building that faces the rail line.

The -- the $\mathrm{C}-3$ residential zone line is essentially within the middle of the rail right-of-way. And the distance from the facade of the northerly industrial building to that zone line is approximately 100 feet. So 150 feet is not possible to achieve based on this concept plan.

The signs as we have testified to previously will otherwise comply with the ordinance requirements for commercial signage. And I would further point out that while the zone district boundary is less than 150 feet away, the actual distance to residential properties is significantly greater than that. And it's also partially screened by existing vegetation, which we will be supplementing along that property
line, as well as just the sheer distance from the industrial building itself to the residential properties on the opposite side of the rail line. So --

MR. DRILL: Can you just tell everyone exactly what's the requirement and what's the exception -- what's the deviation that you're seeking?

Mr. HUGHES: 150 feet to the zone line, whereas we're proposing approximate 100 feet to the zone line.

MR. DRILL: But the -- okay. The size of the sign complies, but it's the distance to the zone line?

Mr. HUGHES: Correct.
MR. DRILL: And which zone line? So if you -- I don't know which exhibit you want to use.

Mr. HUGHES: It's the zone line within the rail right-of-way.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So this is
(inaudible).
Mr. HUGHES: It's --
MR. KENT-SMITH: This is the
residential R1. Zone line goes right down the
tracks. Our building signage facing the tracks approximately 100 feet from that zone line where (inaudible).

MR. DRILL: Is that the only area on the property where you need this exception.

Mr. HUGHES: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, let me just, again, clarify for the record. So relative to the internal layout of the property, there are two subdistricts. Subdistrict 2 and Subdistrict 1, under the redevelopment plan. The ordinance standard that you're referring to is a zoning standard, correct?

Mr. HUGHES: Correct. And it's specific to commercial building science.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So in your opinion as it relates to the internal setback between the residential Subdistrict 1 and residential and commercial --

MR. DRILL: I'm talking about the building sign.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right. Right. But I'm just saying is there's no relief required relative to those sides and that --

Mr. Dickerson, unless you (inaudible) -

MR. DICKERSON: Can you just clarify?
I was just looking at the last time.
MR. DRILL: And I didn't understand what you were talking about.

MR. KENT-SMITH: The question relative to the (inaudible) just so that we're all clear.

MR. DRILL: A-28.
MR. KENT-SMITH: A-28. Just
referencing $A-28$, the question is that what we've established is we need to variance relative to the (inaudible) boundary and the building facing the rail, because that's 100 feet to 150 feet, correct?

Mr. HUGHES: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. My only question, just so that we're all clear, if currently they're in the redevelopment plan, there is a subdistrict for residential --

MR. DRILL: But is that a zone boundary?

MR. KENT-SMITH: No. (inaudible) exactly --

MR. DRILL: So why don't you just ask him: Do you need it anywhere else? And the

> answer's no.

Mr. HUGHES: No.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. You agree,
right?
Mr. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: There we go.
Mr. HUGHES: All right. The final
exception requesting is for -- you'll recall in the last meeting there was a deviation requested for ground floor transparency on the residential buildings, which I think is another one where the board took a straw poll and --

MR. DRILL: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Mr. HUGHES: -- supported the idea of not getting including --

MR. DRILL: That's with the -- that's with the --

Mr. HUGHES: -- windows within the -the residential buildings and Subdistrict 1.

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
Mr. HUGHES: So I think technically an exception is needed from that.

MR. DRILL: And it was just the ground floor. It wasn't anything else.

Mr. HUGHES: Correct. We would be
avoiding the faux -- the two faux windows within the ground floor of both residential buildings. Again, first floor only. And as it was pointed out on the upper floors, we're actually exceeding the transparency requirements. So I think that's another one taking the board's direction. We can respectfully request that exception.

MR. VICE CHAIR: Mr. Dickerson, your comment or question on this? No, you're good. All right.

Mr. HUGHES: And that will conclude my direct testimony.

MALE SPEAKER: Just two questions concerning the exceptions. Based on my list, there were the two freestanding signs that were shown on the site plans that seem to exceed the maximum height and, I believe, maximum area. I know that there was in previous testimony that there would be compliance but it looked like the revised plans didn't show that.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So yes, the intent is to comply.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay. So those are not needed.

MR. DRILL: Yes.
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MALE SPEAKER: And the only other exception in my notes would just relate to the parking, which would just be the de minimis exception required.

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MALE SPEAKER: That's correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes. So again, Mr. Hughes, you're aware that as part of the relief requested, we will be making a de minimis exception relief from the RSIS standards relative to the number of parking spaces for the residential?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And again, that would be something that would be addressed through the -- was it DCA? What is it?

MR. DRILL: If it's -- if it's de minimus, is it a waiver? Or is it because if it's --

MR. KENT-SMITH: The de minimis exception from the residential site and permit standard.

MR. DRILL: The -- the planning board can grant that. Then you have to report it down to the DCA. It's only if you need -- so you have
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to add that -- let's add that to the list.
MR. KENT-SMITH: That's -- yeah. Let's do that, Mr. Hughes.

MR. DRILL: This RSIS relief for the number of residential parking space.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MR. DRILL: And just refresh our recollection. What does RSIS require? What does the redevelopment plan require and what's being proposed?

MR. KENT-SMITH: It was my understanding that the RSIS standard would result in a 1.8 per unit standard --

MR. DRILL: Yeah, I actually believe that that's correct. And what's the redevelopment plan?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, that's what I'm trying to find.

Mr. HUGHES: Well, let me -- let me just clarify. The redevelopment plan requires 1.8 spaces per dwelling unit, whereas RSIS is a greater number.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
Mr. HUGHES: 1.8 for one bedroom, 2 for two-bedroom and 2.1 for three bedrooms.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Does anyone have a calculation of under RSIS how many parking spaces would be required? And I assume, but I want someone to be able to testify that the number of parking spaces you have is $X$ and that complies with the redevelopment plan standard.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Oh, yes.
Mr. HUGHES: Well, I can testify that 450 spaces are required by the redevelopment plan and --

MR. DRILL: 400 --
Mr. HUGHES: 450 are provided for the residential.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So all we needs to know is the RSIS requirement, how many spaces that would be?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Again, I'm looking at the plan and I don't see the RSIS calculation on the plan. I'll look.

MALE SPEAKER: Does that meet it, like, exactly or is there --

MR. DRILL: No. It's an exact amount.
MALE SPEAKER: It's an exact?
MR. DRILL: Yeah. It's an exact amount and it has different things depending on the
different number of bedrooms. And I'm sure their engineer testified about it. But see if I can find it --

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. 1.8 per unit.
MR. DRILL: No. 1.8 pre unit is what the redevelopment plan requires.

MALE SPEAKER: And that's what they're meeting.

MR. DRILL: I understand. But the RSIS
$\qquad$
MALE SPEAKER: Oh. I understand that, but I wanted to make sure that the one -- the 40 -- 50 wasn't 1.83.

MR. DRILL: Oh, I get it. I get it.
Mr. HUGHES: I mean, is this something
that can be provided as part of perhaps drafting the resolution? Or do we need to --

MR. DRILL: It can be provided --
listen.
MR. KENT-SMITH: We can definitely provide by next meet.

MR. DRILL: Listen. Just so you understand, this next meeting --

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.

MR. DRILL: He hasn't been crossexamined yet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: No.
MR. DRILL: Okay. And the public has the right to ask questions of the board's two experts. And at least one member of the public has told me that she intended to do that.

And I just saw George Collins walk in with a bunch of exhibits. Now, he doesn't have questions for the planner, but he's going to be presenting, you know, testimony.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right.
MR. DRILL: So this thing is absolutely going to be continued without need for further notice to December 14.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MR. DRILL: You're gonna have to get a hold of -- ask for the extension from 201. You're going to ask them for the end of February because this thing is going on -- and I owe you a six-pack of soda.

Okay. I made a bet. I figured that we'd be done tonight and we'd be deliberating next week. I lost the bet.

Now your application --

MR. KENT-SMITH: That's not a bad bet.
MR. DRILL: You should see what she wanted. But your -- your application? What -what's the extension?

FEMALE SPEAKER: What was that you said?

MR. DRILL: (Inaudible) What's the extension date?

FEMALE SPEAKER: It was December 31.
MR. DRILL: Yeah, so we're gonna also need an extension from you to January --

FEMALE SPEAKER: 31st.
MR. DRILL: -- 31st.
MR. KENT-SMITH: January 31. Will you send me the form, Kathy? Or do you have a form that you use or have I've been sending you my --

MS. LENAHAN: Just been sending a letter.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Great.
FEMALE SPEAKER: And -- and just to confirm that Mr. Hughes will be available to answer questions.

MR. DRILL: Say again.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Just to confirm that Mr. Hughes will be available the next hearing to
answer questions on the --
MR. DRILL: He has to be --
FEMALE SPEAKER: -- community impact statement. Okay. Perfect.

MR. DRILL: He has to be because if he doesn't, then the board cannot consider any of this testimony.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. DRILL: So Mr. Kent -- okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: We have a -- again, Mr. Hughes does have a conflict for the 14th. My question to the board is that -- you still have to introduce your CIS too. Could we extend this at least to complete your direct relative to --

Mr. HUGHES: I'm done with direct.
MR. DRILL: His direct is done, Henry?
MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay.
MR. DRILL: He's -- he's ready for cross.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. So, I mean, again, if -- if at least for cross examination --

MR. VICE CHAIR: Mr. Kent-Smith, we're gonna -- we're not -- we're gonna have to continue.

MR. DRILL: The board said they'd go
past 10:30 with a hard stop at 11.
How many people in the public want to ask questions of the planner? Just raise your hand.

All right. One, two, three, four.
MR. VICE CHAIR: All right.
MALE SPEAKER: And board questions prior.

MR. DRILL: And board questions prior to that. So that's not going to happen. So you got to see if you can resolve your conflict, otherwise --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Understood.
MR. DRILL: -- we'll have to figure out what to do about it.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Understood.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So again, the hearing's continued to December 14. No need for further notice. The applicant has agreed to extend the time the board has to decide the case to January 31.

MS. LENAHAN: Correct.
MR. VICE CHAIR: That being said, may I have a -- Kathy, we're good?

We're gonna -- may $I$ have a motion to
adjourn.
FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Second?
MALE SPEAKER: Second.
MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you. Meeting adjourned.
(End of audio-recorded proceeding.)

| adjourn. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved. |
|  | MR. VICE CHAIR: Second? |
|  | MALE SPEAKER: Second. |
| MR. VICE CHAIR: Thank you. Meeting |  |
| adjourned. |  |
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