

CITY OF HOBOKEN
PLANNING BOARD

----- X
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOBOKEN : July 7, 2015
PLANNING BOARD : 7:15 pm
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

Chairman Gary Holtzman
Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
Commissioner Brandy Forbes
Commissioner Jim Doyle
Commissioner Ann Graham
Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
Commisioner Ryan Peene

A L S O P R E S E N T:

David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
Board Planner

Joseph A. Pomante, PE
Acting Board Engineer

Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER
(732) 735-4522

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

LAW OFFICE OF DENNIS M. GALVIN
730 Brewers Bridge Road
Jackson, New Jersey 08527
(732) 364-3011
BY: STEVEN M. GLEASON, ESQ.
Attorneys for the Board.

I N D E X

1		
2		
3		PAGE
4		
5	BOARD BUSINESS	1
6		
7	RESOLUTION:	
8		
9	420 Adams Street	5
10		
11	Western Edge Redevelopment Plan	101
12		
13	HEARINGS:	
14		
15	536 Washington Street	7
16		
17	461 11th Street	61
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Good
2 evening, everybody.

3 Thank you.

4 This is the City of Hoboken Planning
5 Board Meeting. It is Tuesday, July 7th, at 7:15
6 p.m.

7 I would like to advise all of those
8 present that notice of this meeting has been
9 provided to the public in accordance with the
10 provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, and that
11 notice was published in The Jersey Journal and on
12 the city's website. Copies were also provided to
13 The Star-Ledger, The Record, and also placed on the
14 bulletin board in the lobby of City Hall.

15 Pat, please call the roll.

16 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

17 COMMISSIONER HOLTZMAN: Here.

18 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Here.

20 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

21 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Here.

22 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Here.

24 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

25 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Here.

1 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Here.

3 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner McKenzie is
4 absent.

5 Commissioner Pinchevsky is absent.

6 Commissioner Peene?

7 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Here.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great. We're all
9 set. Thank you.

10 Our first order of business is to offer
11 our congratulations to our Commissioner Caleb
12 Stratton on his recent marriage.

13 (Applause)

14 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: "Recent," one of
15 many?

16 (Laughter)

17 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The first item we
19 are going to take care of is a resolution for
20 approval of 420 Adams Street.

21 You should have received a copy of this
22 resolution in your packets, Commissioners.

23 Were there any questions or comments on
24 any language or anything?

25 No? No comments, questions. If there

1 are none, is there a motion to accept the
2 resolution?

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So moved.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is there a second?

5 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I'll second it.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

7 Pat, please call the vote on that.

8 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

9 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

10 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

11 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

12 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

14 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

15 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

16 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

18 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

19 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

20 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

22 Thank you.

23 (Continue on next page)

24

25

CITY OF HOBOKEN PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - X
 RE: 536 Washington Street : July 7, 2015
 Block 204, Lot 24.02 : 7:20 pm.
 Applicant: Grace & Lily, Inc. :
 Conditional use approval :
 - - - - - X

Held At: 94 Washington Street
 Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Chairman Gary Holtzman
- Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
- Commissioner Brandy Forbes
- Commissioner Jim Doyle
- Commissioner Ann Graham
- Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
- Commisioner Ryan Peene

A L S O P R E S E N T:

- David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
Board Planner
- Joseph A. Pomante, PE
Acting Board Engineer
- Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS
 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
 CERTIFIED REALTIME COURT REPORTER
 (732) 735-4522

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

LAW OFFICE OF DENNIS M. GALVIN
730 Brewers Bridge Road
Jackson, New Jersey 08527
732-364-3011
BY: STEVEN M. GLEASON, ESQ.
Attorneys for the Board.

JAMES J. BURKE, ESQ.
235 Hudson Street
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030
Attorney for the Applicant.

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

WITNESS

PAGE

Janine Glatt

12

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The second item is
2 known as Kung Fu Tea.

3 Are those folks here?

4 MR. BURKE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Oh, here they are.

6 I guess the applicant is Grace & Lily,
7 Mr. Burke?

8 MR. BURKE: That's correct.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you. Known
10 as Kung Fu Tea.

11 MR. BURKE: Jim Burke representing the
12 applicant, Grace & Lily, Inc.

13 The applicant is seeking a conditional
14 use approval.

15 The use is out of a beverage retail
16 business, specifically teas, hot and cold teas on
17 Washington Street.

18 I have one witness, and it will be
19 brief.

20 Under 196-33, the applicant must meet
21 three criteria in order for the Board to grant a
22 conditional use approval, and to my left is Janine
23 Glatt, the architect. I would like to have her
24 sworn in, please.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Could you just

1 state your name?

2 MS. GLATT: Janine Glatt.

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Talk up, please.

4 MR. GLEASON: First of all, I'll swear
5 you in first.

6 Can you raise your right hand?

7 Do you swear or affirm that the
8 testimony you're about to give is the truth, the
9 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

10 MS. GLATT: Yes.

11 J A N I N E G L A T T, Architect, having been duly
12 sworn, testified as follows:

13 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Please state your
14 full name and spell your last name for the record.

15 THE WITNESS: Janine Glatt,
16 J-a-n-i-n-e, G-l-a-t-t.

17 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you over
18 there. You'll have to come over here.

19 How do you spell it?

20 THE WITNESS: Janine Glatt,
21 J-a-n-i-n-e, G-l-a-t-t.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

23 MR. BURKE: Ms. Glatt, this is your
24 first appearance before the Board, correct?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 MR. BURKE: All right. So just give us
2 a one-minute summary of your educational background
3 and state whether you are a licensed architect in
4 the State of New Jersey.

5 THE WITNESS: I am a licensed architect
6 in the State of New Jersey. I graduated from NJIT,
7 and I'm licensed architect in New Jersey. I'm also
8 the architect for Union City.

9 MR. BURKE: This is your first
10 appearance before this Board, but you worked with
11 the Building Department on projects here in town?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 MR. BURKE: And how long have you been
14 a licensed architect?

15 THE WITNESS: Five years.

16 MR. BURKE: Five years.

17 All right. I would ask that she be
18 accepted as an expert in architecture.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. Thank you.

20 MR. BURKE: Thank you.

21 All right. Just give a brief summary
22 of what the applicant is seeking, and then I am
23 going to ask you three questions about what I
24 mentioned before, the criteria under 196-33.

25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Basically --

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: She has to talk
2 towards us and speak as loud as possible.

3 THE WITNESS: This is basically a
4 renovation of a housewares shop, and he is going to
5 be selling teas only from this location.

6 This is the renovation. This is the
7 before and after.

8 MR. BURKE: And there is no food being
9 served in the shop, right?

10 THE WITNESS: No food.

11 And they requested at the other meeting
12 that we do an elevation. This was approved by the
13 Historic Commission. It's just a signage.

14 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

15 MR. BURKE: The Historic Commission
16 approved the signage.

17 THE WITNESS: The signage.

18 It has gooseneck lamps, and that is
19 about it.

20 MR. BURKE: And the proof of approval
21 was submitted to the Board as part of the
22 application.

23 So there are three criteria under
24 196-33. One is whether the block frontage has two
25 other retail businesses.

1 Does it?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 MR. BURKE: It does.

4 All right. And then the service
5 entrance is on the ground floor?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 MR. BURKE: All right.

8 And then the service area is no more
9 than 1000 square feet, is that correct?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

11 MR. BURKE: Okay. That is it.

12 Do you have any questions about the
13 application?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Do any of the
15 Commissioners have any questions specific about this
16 build-out of the housewares store turning into a tea
17 shop? And it's been noted numerous times and at our
18 previous subcommittee meeting, that there will be no
19 food service whatsoever here.

20 MR. BURKE: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I would like to
22 offer one potential condition that says that the
23 there is no food service associated with the
24 approval that could be presented this evening, and
25 if the applicant wanted to have food service, it is

1 not that the Board would necessarily have any
2 negative influence on that, but that we would like
3 to, you know, have them come back and seek a change
4 in what they are preparing.

5 MR. BURKE: That condition is accepted.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Are there any other
7 questions or comments, Frank?

8 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Any questions or
10 comments, Dave?

11 I know you did have a review letter.
12 It was pretty straightforward.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

14 So really an update, Mr. Chairman, to
15 the review letter what was given to the
16 Subcommittee.

17 What we did after having reviewed the
18 minutes and having been at the meeting was just
19 summarize a couple of things that the committee
20 asked for, which have been provided.

21 The documentation of the approval from
22 the Historic Preservation Commission, as well as the
23 elevation that goes along, that the applicant just
24 referred to, and we had also recommended in our
25 letter that there be effectively a condition, just

1 as you had proposed regarding the food service, and
2 that was pretty much it. They do meet the three
3 conditions.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

5 Anything else, Commissioners?

6 It seems pretty simple.

7 Is there a motion to accept this?

8 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Motion.

9 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Vote.

11 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

13 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

14 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

15 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

16 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

17 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

18 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

19 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

20 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

21 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

22 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

23 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

25 MR. BURKE: Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Mr.

2 Burke.

3 (The matter concluded.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, a Certified Court Reporter, Certified Realtime Court Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel to any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300
Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
My commission expires 11/5/2015.
Dated: 7/8/15
This transcript was prepared in accordance with
NJAC 13:43-5.9.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Burke, we're
2 going to take you. We'll give you a back to back
3 here. We will take 461 11th Street, Lorien Lofts.

4 (Board members confer.)

5 MR. BURKE: Excuse me one second.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes, Mr. Burke.

7 (Discussion held off the record.)

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I'm sorry, Mr.
9 Burke. We are waiting on one engineer, so I am
10 going to ask you guys to step off for a second.
11 I'm sorry to mess you up.

12 MR. BURKE: No, that's okay.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: John, we are going
14 to take the folks at PSE&G, please.

15 Noreen, do you have your team together
16 for us?

17 We are waiting for everybody to get set
18 up.

19 (Continue on next page)

20

21

22

23

24

25

CITY OF HOBOKEN PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - X
 RE: 1622 Clinton Avenue : July 7, 2015
 Block 140, Lots 1-30 & Block 141, :
 Lots 12-19 :
 Applicant: Public Service Electric : 7:20 pm
 & Gas :
 Resolution of Approval Amendment :
 - - - - - X

Held At: 94 Washington Street
 Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

Chairman Gary Holtzman
 Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
 Commissioner Brandy Forbes
 Commissioner Jim Doyle
 Commissioner Ann Graham
 Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
 Commisioner Ryan Peene

A L S O P R E S E N T:

David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
 Board Planner

Joseph A. Pomante, PE
 Acting Board Engineer

Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS
 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
 CERTIFIED REALTIME COURT REPORTER
 (732) 735-4522

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 DENNIS M. GALVIN, ESQUIRE
3 730 Brewers Bridge Road
4 Jackson, New Jersey 08527
5 732-364-3011
6 Attorney for the Board.

7 CONNELL FOLEY, LLP
8 2510 Plaza Five
9 Jersey City, New Jersey 07311
10 (201 521-1000
11 BY: ROBERT A. VERDIBELLO, ESQ.
12 Attorney for the Applicant.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

WITNESS

PAGE

ERIC J. DAVIS, PE, Ph.D.

25

JENNIFER TAYLOR

35

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Good evening.

2 MR. VERDIBELLO: Good evening,
3 Commissioners.

4 Robert Verdibello from the law firm of
5 Connell Foley on behalf of the applicant, Public
6 Service Electric & Gas, PSE&G.

7 This is an administrative amendment
8 regarding a --in December of 2013, PSE&G was here
9 for the Clinton Avenue or what is otherwise known as
10 the Hoboken Substation. There were approvals
11 granted primarily for what was referred to as the
12 GIS Building, which is in a lot across Clinton
13 Street from the substation proper.

14 That work has been done. The GIS
15 Building has been built. What PSE&G has asked for
16 are amendments to the approvals concerning a couple
17 of items.

18 As part of that first set of approvals
19 in December 2013, there was also a discussion about
20 raising some of the equipment within the site, and
21 that part has already been underway. But in the
22 interim, the Board of Public Utilities has passed
23 what is known as the Energy Strong Program, which
24 allows us to raise the remainder of the equipment
25 above base flood elevation on the site.

1 So one of the reasons we are here
2 tonight is to amend the approval to account for the
3 fact that we are raising the remainder of the
4 equipment on the site to go above the flood
5 elevation.

6 The second aspect is with regard to the
7 decorative fence. As part of the prior approvals, a
8 decorative fence is to be installed around the GIS
9 Building, as we refer to it as. We still intend to
10 do that, but there was a request to have a
11 discussion about perhaps making the fence more
12 decorative than what we have already planned.

13 Furthermore, as part of the work that
14 we are doing at the substation, in order to keep the
15 substation proper and the GIS Building consistent,
16 we are also looking to amend the approval to now
17 include the decorative fence around the substation
18 proper, and those are primarily the reasons why we
19 are here asking for the amendment.

20 We appeared before the Subcommittee.
21 The question was whether or not this would be a good
22 administrative amendment. It was determined that it
23 would be. However, we are here, and we can give a
24 brief presentation for the Board's edification as
25 far as those particular items.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure. Take us
2 through just a synopsis of what it is.

3 MR. VERDIBELLO: Very good.

4 I have two witnesses here this evening.
5 I will call my first witness up.

6 Eric Davis, please.

7 MR. DAVIS: Good evening.

8 MR. GLEASON: Raise your right hand
9 please.

10 Do you swear or affirm that the
11 testimony you are about to give is the truth, the
12 whole truth and nothing but the truth?

13 MR. DAVIS: I do.

14 E R I C J . D A V I S, PE, Ph.D., having been
15 duly sworn, testified as follows:

16 MR. GLEASON: Can you please state your
17 full name and spell your last name for the record?

18 THE WITNESS: My name is Eric Davis,
19 D-a-v-i-s.

20 MR. VERDIBELLO: Mr. Davis, you have
21 not given testimony before the Hoboken Planning
22 Board before, have you?

23 THE WITNESS: That is correct. I have
24 not.

25 MR. VERDIBELLO: Could you please state

1 for the Board's edification your educational
2 background and experience?

3 THE WITNESS: I have a Ph.D. in
4 electrical engineering, and I have been in the
5 engineering field since I graduated with my
6 bachelor's degree in 1985.

7 I am a registered professional engineer
8 in several states, including the State of New
9 Jersey.

10 MR. VERDIBELLO: We would ask that Mr.
11 Davis be accepted as an expert.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. Thank you.

13 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: In what area?

14 MR. VERDIBELLO: I'm sorry?

15 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: In what area,
16 expert in what?

17 MR. VERDIBELLO: Expert in electrical
18 engineering.

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you.

20 MR. VERDIBELLO: Mr. Davis, if you
21 could please explain for the Board your role in this
22 project.

23 THE WITNESS: I am the project manager
24 for Burns McDonald, the architectural engineering
25 firm that is assisting PSE&G in the design.

1 MR. VERDIBELLO: And can you explain
2 for the Board the work, as far as the equipment that
3 is being done on the substation?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 The site plan is here on the board.

6 16th Street is here. That direction to
7 the right-hand side is to the north.

8 The GIS hall is back over here. The
9 sewerage plant is up towards the top of the drawing.

10 So on this drawing, we'll be elevating
11 the oil pump house enclosure, which is in this back
12 right-hand corner, and we will be elevating and
13 updating the switch gear, which is located in the
14 center portion of the substation.

15 MR. VERDIBELLO: And we will take it
16 one step at a time.

17 With respect to what is referred to as
18 the "pump house," just for clarification, because it
19 is not really a house, is it?

20 THE WITNESS: It is an equipment
21 enclosure. It is not intended for people to be
22 inside, other than just turning on the equipment or
23 turning it off.

24 MR. VERDIBELLO: Can you describe for
25 the Board --

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The pump house is
2 the one on 16th Street. Is that correct?

3 MR. VERDIBELLO: I'm sorry?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The pump house is
5 the building that is most near 16th Street. Is that
6 correct, just so we can cite it on the --

7 MR. VERDIBELLO: No.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- which one is
9 that?

10 THE WITNESS: The control house is the
11 building here on 16th Street. The pump house
12 enclosure is in the back left-hand corner, so 17th
13 Street and Grand Street.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. VERDIBELLO: Just for
16 clarification, is there any proposal with respect to
17 the control house that is on 16th Street?

18 THE WITNESS: The control house will
19 remain as it is, just some equipment will be
20 removed.

21 MR. VERDIBELLO: With respect to the
22 pump house, could you please explain to the Board
23 the size of what we are referring to as the new pump
24 house and the elevation of it?

25 THE WITNESS: Certainly.

1 The existing pump house is actually two
2 separate pieces. The updated version will be a
3 single piece. It is essentially the same size.
4 It's slightly taller.

5 The overall elevation will increase
6 about eight feet, and most of that is due to the
7 increase in the foundation for the elevation of the
8 foundation due to the flood levels.

9 MR. VERDIBELLO: Do you have a
10 depiction of the pump house?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 The top photo is the existing oil pump
13 house enclosure, and the bottom picture is a similar
14 pump house enclosure that is being installed at that
15 location.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

17 MR. VERDIBELLO: With respect to the
18 switch gear, can you explain the change in the size,
19 if any, of the switch gear and the change in the
20 elevation?

21 THE WITNESS: The switch gear currently
22 is spread over a little portion of the station. The
23 new switch gear will be more compact, essentially
24 about the same size, but just compressed together in
25 the center of the station.

1 From an elevation perspective, the new
2 switch gear will be about five and a half feet
3 taller than the existing switch gear. Most of that
4 again is due to the elevation required to get above
5 the flood elevation.

6 MR. VERDIBELLO: Any questions for Mr.
7 Davis?

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Any questions,
9 Commissioners?

10 I think we are good for now.

11 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Hold on.

12 On the old pump house, how much higher
13 will the proposed one be over the existing one?

14 THE WITNESS: It's approximately eight
15 feet taller.

16 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. What will
17 the total height be of the proposed --

18 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, sir?

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- what will the
20 total height be of the proposed oil pump house?

21 THE WITNESS: 20 feet 11 inches above
22 grade.

23 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: So when you say
25 "eight feet higher," is that the amount that it is

1 elevated, or is that just to the top of the building
2 versus the existing building?

3 THE WITNESS: The eight feet is the
4 current height above grade to the new height above
5 grade, so the tallest point above the ground.

6 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Difference in
7 height --

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I guess.

9 So do you know what the difference in
10 elevation is? In other words, the --

11 THE WITNESS: The grade is about five
12 foot six, so we are going from approximately 18 feet
13 up to about 21 feet five inches roughly.

14 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: You said the top
15 of the building was 21?

16 THE WITNESS: The top of the building
17 is 20 feet 11 inches above grade. Grade at that
18 point is about five and a half feet.

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Okay.

20 So what I am asking is: The bottom of
21 the structure, how high up is the bottom, not to the
22 20 feet at the top, but you are going from the
23 bottom, the base is going from grade to five?

24 THE WITNESS: The base of the equipment
25 enclosure?

1 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes. How far out
2 of the way --

3 THE WITNESS: Currently it is
4 approximately three feet above grade, and it will be
5 approximately seven and a half feet above grade when
6 we are done.

7 MR. VERDIBELLO: For clarification,
8 that is how far above the base flood elevation?

9 THE WITNESS: The bottom of the
10 enclosure will be one foot above the FEMA flood
11 elevation. The FEMA flood elevation is 12 feet for
12 this site.

13 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: So in the
14 building, it will be further elevated, right,
15 because you --

16 THE WITNESS: The base of the building
17 will be at 13 feet elevation above sea level, and
18 then that is where the enclosure starts.

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Oh, I see. Okay.
20 It's the difference between grade is somewhat above
21 sea level as well, okay.

22 THE WITNESS: Correct.

23 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. VERDIBELLO: If there are no

1 further questions for Mr. Davis, I will call my
2 second witness, Jennifer Taylor.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Please.

4 MR. GLEASON: Could you please raise
5 your right hand?

6 Do you swear or affirm that the
7 testimony you are about to give is the truth, the
8 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

9 MS. TAYLOR: Yes.

10 J E N N I F E R T A Y L O R, 4000 Hadley Road,
11 South Plainfield, New Jersey, having been duly
12 sworn, testified as follows:

13 MR. GLEASON: Can you please state your
14 full name and spell your last name for the record?

15 THE WITNESS: Jennifer Taylor,
16 T-a-y-l-o-r.

17 MR. VERDIBELLO: Ms. Taylor, have you
18 ever testified before the Hoboken Planning Board
19 before?

20 THE WITNESS: No.

21 MR. VERDIBELLO: Can you please state
22 for the Board's edification your educational
23 experience and background?

24 THE WITNESS: Sure.

25 I'm a licensed professional engineer in

1 the State of New Jersey. I have my bachelor of
2 science degree from Rutgers and a masters of
3 engineering from the University of Southern
4 California, and I have been working in civil
5 engineering since 2003.

6 MR. VERDIBELLO: What is your role with
7 respect to the project?

8 THE WITNESS: I am the civil
9 construction specialist in charge of the
10 construction on the site.

11 MR. VERDIBELLO: We would ask that Ms.
12 Taylor be accepted as a civil engineering expert.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes, thank you.

14 MR. VERDIBELLO: Ms. Taylor, as part of
15 the amendment here this evening, we are proposing
16 our -- as part of the original proposal, there was a
17 decorative fence that is to be installed around the
18 GIS building.

19 Can you explain the decorative fencing
20 that is being proposed?

21 THE WITNESS: Sure.

22 So the decorative fence that was
23 approved around the GIS Building is the black fence,
24 and it's a security fence. It is decorative in
25 nature, but it also provides the security required,

1 and it also includes concrete along the bottom, so
2 it doesn't prevent any entry. But the fence itself
3 is nine foot high total, and that includes the pales
4 on top that come to a point instead of the barbed
5 wire.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: How do you spell
7 that for the record?

8 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. P-a-l-e-s.

9 So our traditional fence, which is a
10 chain link fence with barbed wire across the top, so
11 this is the decorative alternative that has been
12 provided and approved in the original planning
13 approval, and this is already established to be
14 installed around the GIS Building.

15 The 16th Street side of the substation
16 also has that for the planning approval, and I guess
17 the question now is: Are we able to install it
18 around the other three sides of the substation, if
19 required, and to what extent should we increase the
20 decorative nature of the fence.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

22 MR. VERDIBELLO: When you say increase
23 the decorative nature, the fencing that was approved
24 around GIS is what, just black steel? Are there any
25 columns or anything?

1 THE WITNESS: No. It's just black
2 fence posts.

3 MR. VERDIBELLO: And if there is a more
4 decorative fence that is installed, where would we
5 be asking to install it, and what would the more
6 decorative nature of it be?

7 THE WITNESS: We would be looking to
8 install it, I believe it was along the Clinton
9 Street substation, so that is the east side of the
10 existing substation, and 16th Street of the existing
11 substation as well, and then in front of the GIS
12 Building on Clinton Street, so that would be the
13 west side of the GIS property.

14 MR. VERDIBELLO: Now I believe, and we
15 have aboard as well as part of your package, we have
16 the two fencing options. If you could take the
17 Board through that, Ms. Taylor.

18 THE WITNESS: So this is the existing
19 decorative fence that has been approved and is under
20 construction.

21 It goes very similarly with the nature
22 of the building and the structures that are already
23 installed. So this building and the GIS equipment
24 and stairs are already existing, and this is the
25 fence that is currently under construction.

1 The alternative is proposed to include
2 the brick pilasters in place of the fence at various
3 locations.

4 MR. VERDIBELLO: And what determines
5 the locations of the brick?

6 THE WITNESS: Well, the eight foot span
7 on the fence panels, so the determination is that we
8 would be installing them at every fence panel.

9 This drawing shows it located on the
10 gates.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. So
12 unfortunately, this rendering is not representative.

13 THE WITNESS: Right. It gives you an
14 idea of what it would look like as opposed to the
15 strictly black fence.

16 MR. VERDIBELLO: Do you have a
17 depiction of the fencing options with respect to the
18 substation?

19 THE WITNESS: So a similar fence that
20 was approved at the GIS, this is at the substation
21 property, this is 16th Street, so this is the
22 southern most property line on the GIS -- I'm
23 sorry -- on the Hoboken substation, and this is the
24 similar black fence again, just matching the
25 equipment in the yard.

1 And then the alternative would be to
2 have the brick pilasters, and this is shown at the
3 key posts, so this is the existing gate replaced in
4 the same location, so at each gate side, and then at
5 every fence post in place of using the black fence
6 post.

7 MR. VERDIBELLO: Now, are there some
8 limitations with installing the brick columns?

9 Are there any size limitations --

10 THE WITNESS: Well, it would increase
11 the size of the fence.

12 So right now the fence is proposed on
13 the property line at the GIS Building, it is nine
14 inches inset to the property, so that the entire
15 fence has that overhang for security protection. So
16 this nine-inch inset into the property line allows
17 the entire fence to be within our property.

18 The brick pilasters, we looked at the
19 dimensions that would be feasible, and a two-by-two
20 pilaster would be the -- what they come back with as
21 a recommendation, which would then increase the size
22 and potentially need to encroach in the
23 right-of-way. So in order to keep it in the
24 property line, we would have to shift the fence
25 back.

1 MR. VERDIBELLO: Are there any concerns
2 with respect to putting the -- what we referred to
3 as the more decorative fence around the GIS
4 Building?

5 THE WITNESS: Yes. So we have further
6 limitations around the GIS Building, on the sides of
7 the building.

8 So on the north side of the GIS
9 Building, we currently only have two foot nine from
10 the fence to the building. So increasing the fence
11 with the pilasters would make it unfeasible to have
12 any access along that side in case we needed it for
13 maintenance.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So that is the
15 eastern or that's the --

16 THE WITNESS: That is the northern side
17 of the GIS Building, which would be the 17th Street
18 side, so --

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Maybe we should
20 bring up -- can we get the site plan?

21 THE WITNESS: The site plan?

22 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: That is the west,
23 right?

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. There's kind
25 of a confusion there between what we are looking at

1 and what we're talking about.

2 MR. VERDIBELLO: Sure.

3 THE WITNESS: Our GIS property --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So let's talk about
5 where it is easy. Let's go with easy to hard, so
6 let's go easy.

7 THE WITNESS: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Easy is in terms of
9 the opportunity to get the nicer fence installed on
10 16th Street on the substation --

11 THE WITNESS: This side.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- along the
13 eastern side of Clinton Avenue --

14 THE WITNESS: Along the --

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- the western side
16 of Clinton Avenue, right?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Those are the easy
19 ones.

20 MR. VERDIBELLO: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The northern side
22 of the substation, there would be -- no, no -- yes,
23 but the western side, there is no need for anything
24 there because that backs on to the sewerage plant,
25 so it doesn't seem to make sense to spend the money

1 for the bricks to look at the sewerage plant, right?

2 THE WITNESS: That's not a pedestrian
3 access way --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

5 And then for the GIS Building, the part
6 that fronts Clinton is easy to work with?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Now we get into the
9 more difficult parts, right?

10 THE WITNESS: Not as easy to work with,
11 yes.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So the thing
13 that is important to understand is that the northern
14 part -- the northern section of Hoboken, the
15 northern part to your pieces of land, which is 17th
16 Street, which is not a real actual street, but a
17 dirt or paper street, or whatever you want to call
18 it, is nothing today, but hopefully with something
19 that we are going to start doing later this evening
20 with a redevelopment zone is hopefully one day going
21 to be part of a green beltway that is going to
22 encircle Hoboken.

23 So that green beltway is going to run
24 parallel to the light rail tracks, so that is
25 basically just to the north of you folks. So that

1 is why we also opened up the question in some of the
2 subcommittee conversations, gee, there is nothing
3 there now except weeds and dirt, but hopefully in
4 future it is going to be part of a park.

5 So the question really becomes: Can
6 the northern side of the substation block and the
7 northern side of the GIS block be included in this
8 option of the nicer decorative brick and metal
9 fence.

10 THE WITNESS: Okay.

11 The northern side of the substation
12 would not be an issue.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. You don't
14 have any clearance issues or no problems there.

15 THE WITNESS: Right.

16 And then the northern side of the
17 substation would become a maintenance issue against
18 the building since the building has been shifted as
19 further north as possible to allow for the access
20 drive. So what we potentially would do is put the
21 brick pillars on the corners, and then continue the
22 black decorative through the middle, where we are
23 not, you know, we're not running right against the
24 building.

25 Would that be an alternative?

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Joe, do you want to
2 jump in?

3 MR. POMANTE: I have a question.

4 Could you pull up the depiction of the
5 pilasters space that has the 16 foot centers?

6 With regard to the clearance on the
7 northern edge -- no, not that one. Go back to the
8 substation.

9 THE WITNESS: The substation?

10 MR. POMANTE: Yeah. I really just want
11 to see the pilasters, and I will explain why.

12 Notice you are going with two-by-two
13 pilasters, and it is shaded to the front of the
14 fence. If that was actually put to the center of
15 the fence line, could you then minimize your offset?

16 I mean, could you actually build
17 yourself in some space along the northern edge of
18 the GIS Building and/or because you have 16 foot
19 centers, could you possibly avoid any access points
20 or possibly put a gate in there?

21 I don't know if there is an overhead
22 door or any site plan --

23 THE WITNESS: There is conduits on that
24 side of the building that we need to maintain access
25 to.

1 MR. POMANTE: Are the conduit clustered
2 in one area as opposed to --

3 THE WITNESS: Yes. Towards the rear of
4 the building.

5 MR. POMANTE: -- would it be possible
6 to look at an orientation of these pilasters and
7 then maybe skip sections, so that --

8 THE WITNESS: In flexibility --

9 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you
10 repeat that?

11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

12 Yes. We could look at where to place
13 the pilasters, so that they would avoid any areas
14 that would require access.

15 And then another option would be to
16 shift the pilasters and the fence, so that it was on
17 the property line rather than having that nine inch
18 inset, and that means that we would be in the
19 right-of-way as opposed to keeping it a hundred
20 percent on the property.

21 MR. VERDIBELLO: Well, when you say
22 you'd be in the right-of-way, I would presume that
23 would mean that we would need to get permission from
24 the city and potentially a franchise ordinance.

25 THE WITNESS: I would not prefer to do

1 that.

2 MR. VERDIBELLO: Right.

3 MR. POMANTE: I don't know if I am
4 looking to entertain that as well.

5 I mean, is there a way to shy down the
6 pilasters, instead of two-by-two, make --

7 THE WITNESS: I'll look at it.

8 MR. POMANTE: -- you know, possibly
9 doing something a little different to make them a
10 little smaller and get some clearance that way?

11 THE WITNESS: We could look at that
12 with the engineers.

13 MR. VERDIBELLO: Yeah. I think that
14 would be one caveat is the fact that city
15 engineering would probably need to have input on
16 that to make sure there are clearances, and if
17 you're putting in -- and if the plan is to put in a
18 sidewalk, what the sidewalk widths are supposed to
19 be, if it is going to be a redevelopment. I don't
20 know if it stipulates in your redevelopment plan
21 that you're proposing whatever the widths are
22 supposed to be.

23 MR. POMANTE: At this point it is still
24 work in progress. So I mean, depending on what
25 occurs here, that could be incorporated into a

1 redevelopment plan at a future date. I mean, I
2 agree. The city engineer, we should talk to him
3 about incorporating it.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We'll let him know

5 MR. VERDIBELLO: It is always the
6 engineers.

7 MR. POMANTE: I don't have to go very
8 far.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So do any of the
11 Commissioners have any questions or comments with
12 regard to -- let's kind of take it one step at a
13 time -- with regards to the pump house or any of the
14 switching gear that is so nicely going to be raised
15 out of the flood waters hopefully in the future, are
16 there any questions or comments with regards to that
17 and the Jersey Strong money that PSE&G was able to
18 get and spend in our town?

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I just have one
20 question, which I think it is just a typo, but I
21 just wanted to -- in the Boswell --

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Review letter?

23 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: -- yes -- in 4A,
24 it says: As has been stated here, that the critical
25 equipment within the station would be elevated to

1 one foot above FEMA flood elevation.

2 And then 6, the second bullet of 6, it
3 says: The new equipment will be installed at 13
4 feet, and the building will be 14 feet above flood
5 elevation, base flood elevation, and I am just --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It won't be 14
7 above --

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: -- the building
9 won't be 14 feet above base flood. It would be one
10 foot above.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That's correct.

12 MR. POMANTE: That text was taken
13 directly from the previous resolution of the
14 approval, so --

15 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I'm not putting
16 you on -- but I just wanted to make sure the
17 building isn't going to be 14 feet above where it
18 needs to be.

19 MR. POMANTE: No, no. These are all
20 based on elevations above sea level.

21 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: So they mean sea
22 level probably when they say base flood elevation.

23 MR. POMANTE: That's correct.

24 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Okay. That's my
25 only question.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So is that an
2 issue?

3 I'm sorry, Jim. Is that something that
4 you are pointing out that's in the review letter, or
5 is that something that's also mentioned in a
6 previous resolution?

7 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, I don't have
8 the previous resolution. It is in the review letter
9 and --

10 MR. POMANTE: Right, and it is
11 referenced from the previous resolution, but the --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So does our
13 previous resolution say something that is confusing,
14 is that what the problem is here?

15 Because if that is the case, let's make
16 sure that when we pass something to make a
17 resolution for this, let's make sure we get it
18 right.

19 MR. POMANTE: Well, I think we can
20 clean it up to generically say one foot above the
21 flood elevation, if you've taken into account the
22 actual elevation.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

24 MR. POMANTE: I don't recall the site
25 drawings from the previous application --

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Do we have the
2 paperwork here?

3 MR. VERDIBELLO: We will have Mr. Davis
4 comment on that.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Why don't
6 you come on up, Mr. Davis.

7 Let's just make sure. We don't want a
8 conflict on the record here.

9 MR. DAVIS: The GIS hall, which has
10 been approved previously and is physically built,
11 the concrete is at 14 feet above sea level, so that
12 is physically where it is today.

13 MR. VERDIBELLO: That is not going to
14 change as part of anything we are doing here this
15 evening, correct?

16 MR. DAVIS: That's correct.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I don't think
18 anybody ever thought that that was the case. I
19 think it's a matter of we want to make sure that the
20 language is right, and that it looks like -- Joe
21 picked up a piece of language from a previous
22 resolution that looks like it's a little confusing.
23 So when we get something together for you guys for
24 this evening, let's just make sure that we resolve
25 that with the attorneys.

1 So as opposed to the engineers playing,
2 now you guys get to have your time, okay?

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. VERDIBELLO: Always appreciated.

5 MR. POMANTE: I think it can be
6 clarified by just expanding upon the 14 foot as the
7 actual elevation of the GIS Building --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

9 MR. POMANTE: -- just expand upon that.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Great.

11 Thanks, Jim, for pointing that out.

12 Were there any questions about any of
13 the switching gear, pump house or any of those types
14 of issues?

15 Okay. So with regard to the fencing,
16 any questions, comments?

17 Director Forbes?

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The only thing
19 would be, you know, conditioning if we are going to
20 go with this -- this -- which I think is an improved
21 look, if we are going to go with the brick, and it
22 is going to go into the city's right-of-way, that it
23 would just be that it would be conditioned to use
24 this based on the City Council's approval of the
25 easement rather than them having to come back just

1 to change the fence back, if the City Council
2 doesn't approve that easement.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So what's the
4 thinking, Joe?

5 I don't think anybody wants to go into
6 the public right-of-way. We want to avoid any of
7 that conflict. Nobody needs that.

8 MR. POMANTE: Yeah.

9 Well, I do not want to encroach upon
10 the right-of-way. At this point it just creates
11 problems down the road.

12 I think working with the engineers,
13 referring to Mack and PSE&G, we could come up with
14 an alternate design that minimizes the pilasters and
15 spreads them out so it assures that they have
16 access, and we provide that, and that comes back to
17 the Board at that point as a condition. You know,
18 we can move forward with an amendment conditioned
19 upon submission of a revised plan.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. So I think
21 it comes down to -- Frank, any questions or comments
22 with regard to the improved fencing? I know you
23 spoke about it previously. You thought it looked
24 certainly --

25 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It is certainly

1 an improvement for sure. Instead of using
2 two-by-twos, it seems to me make it two-by-one and a
3 half or something like that --

4 MR. POMANTE: There are structural
5 considerations, so I --

6 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Right, right.

7 MR. POMANTE: -- will temper that --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So basically it is
9 coming down to one stretch of potential for the
10 better fence that is the issue, and that is the
11 north side of the GIS Building.

12 Is that correct?

13 MR. POMANTE: That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So can we make this
15 a conditional approval, Frank?

16 Would you be comfortable with this kind
17 of a statement, something along the lines of moving
18 forward with the proposal as presented by PSE&G,
19 adding the brick spacers on the northern side of the
20 substation block, and that the engineers will do
21 their best to resolve the issue of the brick spacers
22 on the northern side of the GIS Building, and the
23 worst case scenario, like we had our planner testify
24 to, they can at least get the brick spacers on the
25 corners, maybe not the interim, but we will let

1 those guys work it out if they can fit it in there.

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Something along
3 those lines is fine with me.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: What?

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Something along
6 those lines is fine with me.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Something along
8 those lines.

9 (Laughter)

10 MR. POMANTE: Do we want to at least
11 specify minimum spacing?

12 I mean, we are showing 16 here. In the
13 areas that are easily accessible, so that we have
14 some symmetry?

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think we need to
16 specify that because there was one drawing that is
17 inaccurate that they presented to us.

18 So what is the norm on this type of
19 stuff? I think there was a precedent that you had
20 showed us that they had used in Jersey City
21 previously and --

22 MR. POMANTE: Well, the 16 was the --

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- so 16 feet on
24 center for the brick?

25 MR. POMANTE: Yeah. I think what you

1 are going to end up finding is that you will be able
2 to get 16 feet on center around predominantly most
3 of the building except for the north side of the
4 GIS, we may end up skipping a section or something
5 along those lines.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Does that work with
7 the way that your fencing lengths come?

8 I mean, we want to make it -- we don't
9 want to make it difficult for you by just picking a
10 number off the top of our head.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 16 -- 16 foot spacing, the fence panels
13 are eight foot panels, so we can work with 16.

14 MR. POMANTE: Right. The material
15 posts in between the two pilasters, so there may be
16 an area at the GIS, where you end up with 32. It
17 will be all nominal, either fours or eights. It
18 won't be one and a half foot. Kind of work together
19 to limit the issues on spacing.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

21 THE WITNESS: The gates are 16 feet, so
22 that would be appropriate along the frontage.

23 MR. POMANTE: Kind of makes it
24 consistent.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

1 Any other questions or comments for the
2 PSE&G folks that have testified here?

3 Steve, do you have a couple of
4 conditions here?

5 Maybe you can just read them off and
6 we'll see what the Commissioners think.

7 MR. GLEASON: Sure.

8 Applicant shall submit a revised plan
9 for the elevations and fencing. No fencing that
10 encroaches into the public right-of-way shall be
11 permitted.

12 2. Applicant shall consult with the
13 city engineer regarding the placement of the brick
14 columns of the fence on the northern side of the
15 substation and the GIS Building.

16 Condition 3: The brick column shall be
17 spaced -- shall have a minimum spacing of 16 feet on
18 center.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: In terms of point
20 two, the northern side of the substation is
21 resolved. They are okay with that. It is really
22 the only issue that needs to be worked out is the
23 northern side of the GIS Building.

24 MR. GLEASON: Okay. Got it.

25 MR. VERDIBELLO: One other point of

1 clarification just to get back to the easy part.

2 The other area that we were asking not
3 to put the more decorative fence -- or two areas, if
4 we go back to the site plan, and I will let Ms.
5 Taylor testify.

6 Around the GIS Building, there were two
7 other areas that we were not looking to put the more
8 decorative fence, if you could just explain.

9 THE WITNESS: Right.

10 So the southern side of the GIS
11 property abuts the existing sewerage facility, and
12 then the eastern side abuts the north property, and
13 that's Willow Street. Those would be infeasible for
14 the installation of the --

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's make a note
16 of the parts that are the regular metal fence, so
17 the regular metal fence will be on, just call them
18 out again on the GIS block.

19 THE WITNESS: The southern property
20 line, which is adjacent to the sewerage facility and
21 the eastern property line, which is adjacent to
22 Willow Street.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And then on the
24 substation?

25 THE WITNESS: The substation is the

1 western side, which is the sewer authority and Grand
2 Street.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Period.

4 THE WTINESS: Yes.

5 (Laughter)

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay, great.

7 Okay. So we are going to put together
8 a resolution for that, even though we don't have
9 anything in front of us at the moment.

10 Any other questions or comments on that
11 before -- just adding that additional point of which
12 sections will have the standard metal fence?

13 So is there a motion to accept this
14 proposal from PSE&G?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So moved.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is there a second?

17 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Terrific.

19 Pat, please call the vote.

20 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

21 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

22 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

23 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

24 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

1 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

2 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

3 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

5 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

6 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

7 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

9 MR. VERDIBELLO: One other just
10 housekeeping part on this.

11 There was an amended -- a second
12 resolution that was passed in connection with our
13 initial approval that allowed for additional time to
14 do work for extended work hours.

15 We were asking that that be
16 incorporated into any new resolution that gets
17 passed.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.
19 Unfortunately, that is not the jurisdiction of the
20 Planning Board. You would need to take that to the
21 City Council.

22 MR. VERDIBELLO: Okay. We were just
23 confused because the last time it did come before
24 you --

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It did not. You

1 asked for it to come here, and we sent you upstairs.

2 But that's okay, we can do that again.

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. VERDIBELLO: Okay. We just seem to
5 have a resolution from the Board, so --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No problem.

7 Thank you.

8 Thanks, Noreen, and thanks to
9 everybody.

10 (The matter concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, a Certified Court Reporter, Certified Realtime Court Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel to any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300
 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
 My commission expires 11/5/2015.
 Dated: 7/8/15
 This transcript was prepared in accordance with
 NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN PLANNING BOARD

1
 2 - - - - - X
 RE: 461 11th Street : July 7, 2015
 3 Block 100, Lot 10 : 8:15 pm
 Applicant: F. Pasquale Limited :
 4 Partnership :
 Minor Site Plan Review :
 5 - - - - - X

6
 Held At: 94 Washington Street
 7 Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

8
 9
 Chairman Gary Holtzman
 10 Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
 Commissioner Brandy Forbes
 11 Commissioner Jim Doyle
 Commissioner Ann Graham
 12 Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
 Commisioner Ryan Peene
 13

A L S O P R E S E N T:

14
 15 David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
 16 Board Planner
 17 Andrew R. Hipolit, PE, PP, CME
 Board Engineer
 18
 19 Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

20
 21 PHYLLIS T. LEWIS
 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
 22 CERTIFIED REALTIME COURT REPORTER
 (732) 735-4522
 23
 24
 25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 LAW OFFICE OF DENNIS M. GALVIN
3 730 Brewers Bridge Road
4 Jackson, New Jersey 08527
5 732-364-3011
6 BY: STEVEN M. GLEASON, ESQ.
7 Attorneys for the Board.

8 JAMES J. BURKE, ESQ.
9 235 Hudson Street
10 Hoboken, New Jersey 07030
11 Attorney for the Applicant.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

I N D E X

1

2

3 WITNESS

PAGE

4

5 JOHN NASTASI

63 & 86

6

JOHN SISTI

82

7

8

9

E X H I B I T S

10

11 EXHIBIT NO.

DESCRIPTION

PAGE

12

13 A-1

Adams Street Elevation

73

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Hipolit is
2 here.

3 Mr. Burke, we are back to you. We have
4 our engineer now.

5 MR. BURKE: Mr. Hipolit is here.

6 (Discussion held off the record.)

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right.

8 Mr. Burke, we are going to get started
9 here with the Lorien Lofts.

10 MR. BURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
11 and Board.

12 Jim Burke representing Frank Pasquale
13 Limited Partnership.

14 This application involves 461 11th
15 Street, Block 100, Lot 10.

16 The application is for a ten-unit new
17 building that will be -- the building will be 79
18 feet in height, and it will also have parking.

19 By way of background, the applicant was
20 approved as a redeveloper by the City of Hoboken,
21 and a Redevelopment Agreement was signed by the
22 applicant and Mayor Zimmer.

23 Since this site is located in a
24 redevelopment zone, the applicant must meet the
25 standards set forth in the ordinance. We believe

1 this application meets those standards. We are here
2 for preliminary and final site plan approval only,
3 unless a deviation arises in our discussion, but we
4 do not believe one exists.

5 This project -- I have been involved in
6 a number of projects here in town, and this project
7 is very exciting in that it presents a number of
8 cutting edge environmental techniques. Mr. Nastasi
9 will explain those to you as he walks through the
10 project.

11 To my left is John Nastasi. He is the
12 architect of record.

13 I would ask Mr. Gleason to swear him
14 in.

15 MR. GLEASON: Do you swear or affirm
16 that the testimony you're about to give is the
17 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

18 MR. NASTASI: I do.

19 J O H N N A S T A S I, having been duly sworn,
20 testified as follows:

21 MR. GLEASON: Just state your full name
22 and spell your last name for the record

23 THE WITNESS: John Nastasi,
24 N-a-s-t-a-s-i.

25 MR. BURKE: I would ask the Chairman to

1 accept him as an expert. He has appeared here many
2 times.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. We accept Mr.
4 Nastasi.

5 MR. BURKE: Thank you.

6 All right. Mr. Nastasi, please walk
7 through the project and point out the various
8 environmental elements that are encompassed into the
9 design.

10 THE WITNESS: Okay. I will be as
11 efficient and brief as possible.

12 The property's address is 461 11th
13 Street. It sits on the intersection of Adams and
14 11th, and it is a dead end street. Adams at this
15 point is a dead end, the north side of the end zone
16 a football stadium.

17 Mr. Pasquale's building, which is
18 Frank's father's building, is the existing two-story
19 building that's there now.

20 This proposal is for a complete new
21 structure.

22 Before we dive into the building, I
23 just want to get you oriented with the site. The
24 new building will exist on the corner. It is a dead
25 end street. All utilities will be coming in from

1 11th Street, so we have electric, fire, domestic
2 water, gas coming in off of 11th.

3 And on the dead end, Adams Street, we
4 have storm and sanitary exit the building, and we
5 are utilizing the dead end street in having the
6 garage door into the parking at ground level on the
7 dead end street as opposed to the slightly more busy
8 11th Street.

9 So the project from its inception has
10 been designed -- has been set out to be a
11 state-of-the-art progressive environmentally sound
12 building, and we are building a seven-story
13 ten-unit, ten residential unit building that will
14 meet Passivhaus certification out of Garmstadt,
15 G-a-r-m-s-t-a-d-t, Germany.

16 And what we are looking to do is create
17 probably one of the most progressive mid-rise
18 buildings that have been built in the country.

19 The Passivhaus Institute out of Germany
20 has been around since the early 1990s. I have done
21 a lot of research. I have been teaching this stuff
22 for quite some time. I have built three Passivhaus
23 private residences on the water, at Stevens, and the
24 third one is going up right now. But essentially
25 what it is, it is a state-of-the-art building size

1 that reduces the energy consumption of a building by
2 80 percent.

3 So we can get into the building
4 science, and I will give you some of the details,
5 but this is a ten-unit building. It consumes the
6 same amount of energy as a two-family house, and it
7 does it by a series of things, very straightforward
8 things.

9 The building envelope is high R value
10 with low thermal conductivity. So, in other words,
11 lots of insulation, no thermal bridging. So it is
12 building science. It's studying the gaps and the
13 infiltration. There is a tremendous amount of R
14 value in the envelope with no thermal bridging and
15 air tightness.

16 So very quickly, if you all lived in a
17 single-family house in Hoboken, you have ten to 12
18 air changes per hour in your house. If you live in
19 a condo, seven air changes per hour. This is .6 air
20 changes per hour.

21 We are filling up the house on the
22 water as we speak with air for Stevens, and we are
23 at .64 air changes per hour.

24 So Passivhaus creates air tight
25 enclosures, lots of insulation, no thermal bridging,

1 so the net of that is you just introduce very little
2 bits of energy to heat and cool the place without
3 having to fight the outside temperatures, whether
4 it's the summer or the winter, so it is a building
5 science that comes directly out of engineering in
6 Germany.

7 The most important aspect of this is to
8 tie indoor air quality, because you have this really
9 sealed and substantial building envelope, you filter
10 the air that comes in and out of the building
11 through filtration, but through energy recovery
12 ventilators, so you preheat the air that is coming
13 in in the winter, and you pre-cool the air that's
14 coming in in the summer, so that you are using all
15 of your exhaust from your appliances to preheat
16 through an energy recovery ventilator and vice
17 versa.

18 The technical requirements for the
19 building in order to meet certification is less than
20 15 kilowatts per meter squared, which means to heat
21 or cool a room of this size, you would need one of
22 those things and probably not all of those, and
23 certainly not all of the CFMs that are coming out of
24 there.

25 So this is kind of the energy standard

1 that everything will be moving to probably in five
2 or ten years time. There is only three mid-rise
3 Passivhaus buildings in the country right now.
4 There are lots of houses. We have done three, but
5 mid-rise, there are two in Brooklyn, and there's one
6 in Portland, and Hoboken will be the fourth.

7 Cornell University is planning
8 something on Governor's Island, which is a tower of
9 little micro units, and that is being planned for
10 Governor's Island, so within a year or two's time,
11 there may be five Passivhaus, mid-rise Passivhaus
12 buildings in the country, and, of course, we're
13 hoping that Hoboken will have this one, so this will
14 be the fourth.

15 When you get back to some local issues,
16 those are sort of the global science issues. The
17 local issues is that this building meets sort of the
18 objective of the master plan, family-friendly units.
19 There are ten units. All cater towards families.
20 There's one two-bedroom, seven three-bedrooms, and
21 two four-bedroom units, so obviously we are leaning
22 towards the bigger more family-friendly units.

23 And the building also is addressing
24 sort of a post Sandy Hoboken, where we are looking
25 at wet flood proofing for the garage, dry flood

1 proofing for the lobby, but because the building has
2 a covered loggia on 11th Street, a section of this
3 loggia will be dry flood proofed.

4 So in the event of the next storm, not
5 only can you exit the building in a dry flood
6 proofing scenario, but you can be in an area of
7 refuge outside protected from the storm, and then
8 get picked up by either a rescue vehicle or a kayak
9 or --

10 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Boat.

11 (Laughter)

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: What is the
13 percentage of the wet proofing, is dry versus wet
14 flood proofing --

15 THE WITNESS: All of this garage is wet
16 flood proofed --

17 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Percentage wise,
18 what is that, though? Could you give me a number?

19 THE WITNESS: If I were to guess --

20 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah, an
21 estimate.

22 THE WITNESS: -- this is probably less
23 than -- it's probably 15 percent, so that they
24 really want to use the garage to absorb water.

25 We, of course, have retention and

1 detention systems. We have storm harvesting tanks,
2 gray water recycling, co-generation on the roof,
3 solar panels, energy recovery ventilators. It is
4 pretty much a state-of-the-art building, and it
5 represents -- from having taught architecture for 25
6 years, this represents everything that is going on
7 right now in building science. I think there is no
8 methods or techniques really more advanced than this
9 building. It is really --

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: John, tell us about
11 any of the rainwater that falls on this building and
12 this site what happens to it.

13 THE WITNESS: We have rainwater
14 harvesting tanks below the slab. We collect all of
15 the stormwater that hits the roof. It gets
16 retained, and then we have a gray water recycling
17 system.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So that's 100
19 percent?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 The overflow, these tanks do have an
22 overflow, and when they overflow, they overflow to
23 the retention/detention system, which also detains
24 the water.

25 MR. BURKE: John, the building will

1 meet ADA requirements?

2 THE WITNESS: The building will meet
3 ADA. It will be LEED gold, and I think that is
4 pretty much the gist of the project, and the only
5 other thing I have is --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Why don't you take
7 us through the elevations?

8 THE WITNESS: The two main elevations
9 of the building I have on each side of me, and what
10 you see is a double-skin facade. The R 40 envelope
11 is behind a cementitious panel that wraps the
12 building --

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Behind a what?

14 THE WITNESS: -- cementitious, made of
15 cement, a concrete panel, on all four sides
16 including the roofing and floor.

17 And then the outer skin of the building
18 is a recycled glass rain screen, and that rain
19 screen keeps the UV off the facade. It self-shades
20 the building. It minimizes solar or radiation on
21 the building, so you will see where the balconies
22 are, it is prescreened, and then where the wall
23 comes out to the exterior, it is --

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Just tell us the
25 two exposures that we are looking at.

1 THE WITNESS: We're looking at on this
2 board --

3 MR. BURKE: I am going to mark this as
4 A-1.

5 (Exhibit A-1 marked.)

6 THE WITNESS: -- this is the Adams
7 Street elevation looking west.

8 This is an image looking southwest from
9 the intersection of 11th and Adams, so that on the
10 right is the 11th Street elevation, and on the left
11 is the Adams Street elevation.

12 MR. BURKE: John, there's no issues
13 with the utilities. The approvals that are needed
14 are either in place or will be in place?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 We received the reports from the
17 engineers. We're complying with all of them. We
18 have submitted a list of all the will-serve letters
19 and the PSE&G applications, and everything should be
20 up-to-date.

21 MR. BURKE: And your office addressed
22 the issues raised by Ms. Forbes regarding the
23 Redevelopment Agreement?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, we have.

25 MR. BURKE: Finally, you also sought

1 advice and approval from the city's flood plain
2 manager?

3 THE WITNESS: Yes. The wet and dry
4 hybrid plan was worked out in collaboration with Ms.
5 Holtzman.

6 MR. BURKE: Okay.

7 Any other thoughts or comments?

8 THE WITNESS: I think that is it.

9 MR. BURKE: Any questions?

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Hipolit?

11 MR. HIPOLIT: Just a couple of comments
12 for the Board.

13 The stormwater system and the
14 stormwater system catching the source of the rain
15 tank system, great design. Great for Hoboken. Wish
16 more buildings did it. Wish more builders came in
17 and did that, so I commend you. I think it's a
18 super job.

19 In this case, most of the times that
20 rain harvesting system will catch most of the water,
21 and there will be very little overflow, so we are
22 really going to see a significant decrease to the
23 storm system, saying that the storm system was also
24 designed for reductions, too. So even if it went
25 there, it's going to come out at a reduced rate, so

1 we are getting like double. I mean, they are really
2 going above and beyond, so I want to commend them on
3 that.

4 The second thing is they did provide
5 all of the utility and will-serve letters for the
6 utilities, which is great, so we have all of that.

7 I would like to hear a little bit from
8 you on anticipated traffic generation. I know the
9 numbers, but can you just run through them real
10 quick?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 The garage, because it is a ten-unit
13 building, we are showing 11 parking spaces,
14 including the handicapped van with a handicapped
15 striping.

16 We have placed the garage on the
17 quieter dead end street, and we're expecting minimal
18 use entering the building --

19 MR. HIPOLIT: Do you expect ten cars,
20 one per unit, or is there some number more than that
21 or somewhere less than that?

22 THE WITNESS: I think we expect a
23 maximum of ten cars. We don't expect more than one
24 car per unit, because we are not providing that. We
25 are assuming that it will be less than or equal to

1 one car --

2 MR. HIPOLIT: Is each unit assigned a
3 space?

4 THE WITNESS: I would say yes.

5 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Are they deeded?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Is this a condo
8 building?

9 THE WITNESS: It's a condominium.

10 MR. HIPOLIT: I was just -- I did
11 review the flood plain manager's letter. She made
12 some comments in there, and I think that should be
13 part of any approval the Board gives, and I would
14 just state that my letter, which they've addressed
15 most of it, should also be part of the approval as
16 well.

17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: But there were
18 other concerns on traffic, though?

19 MR. HIPOLIT: Not really. It's a dead
20 end. I just wanted to -- what I was concerned about
21 was that they have the spaces deeded to the units,
22 which they've agreed to, and what their anticipated
23 traffic is, and it's one car per unit, which is
24 pretty normal. I just wanted to make sure that they
25 weren't anticipating more than that, because of its

1 location, and he said he is not, so...

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Any electrical
3 utilities for hookup of vehicles?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 We are showing two interior electric
6 charging stations for the building.

7 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Can I ask a
8 couple of questions?

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure, Frank. Go
10 ahead.

11 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: What is the
12 property's address? Is it 11th Street or is it
13 Adams?

14 (Laughter)

15 THE WITNESS: That is a very good
16 question.

17 MR. BURKE: Both.

18 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Because the
19 elevation diagram data is Adams, and you guys are
20 saying 11th, so which is it?

21 THE WITNESS: I think there are
22 multiple addresses for the building, and I think
23 there's a bit of discrepancy, but we have been
24 working with 461 11th Street as the address.

25 My client is behind the board --

1 A VOICE: There are two addresses.

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah, but can
3 we --

4 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Two parcels --

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah, that's
6 what I'm trying to find out.

7 MR. HIPOLIT: The tax assessor is going
8 to have to ultimately assign an address. They will
9 decide whatever it is.

10 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: One parcel?

11 A VOICE: One parcel.

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: So that's one
13 question, and I think you need to straighten it out.

14 MR. BURKE: Historically, because it is
15 a corner lot, there has been some confusion as to
16 what it is called, but we will straighten that out,
17 yes.

18 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: And it is a
19 hundred percent lot coverage right now, right?

20 THE WITNESS: Correct.

21 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: And it will be
22 when you are done, correct?

23 THE WITNESS: Correct.

24 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That's fine.

25 What was the issue with respect to the

1 window openings? Has that been ironed out?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. How was
4 it resolved?

5 THE WITNESS: The issue was there is a
6 minimal sized window for the building of the size
7 ordinance in Hoboken, and where the discrepancy was
8 actually the garage, but not in the residential part
9 of the building. That has all been worked out, and
10 we don't have -- in the latest engineer's report, we
11 comply.

12 MR. BURKE: The windows were larger for
13 venting purposes, right?

14 THE WITNESS: Right, to meet the
15 greater than 50 percent ventilation component.

16 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: If there is a
17 football game, can I go up on the roof and watch,
18 because you guys can see it, right?

19 THE WITNESS: There is a building to
20 our south --

21 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah, but you
22 should be above it, right?

23 How big is the building to the south?
24 What's the height relative to the top of yours?

25 THE WITNESS: Five-story building.

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: With the
2 actual --

3 THE WITNESS: In the numerical height,
4 but it is below us.

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: By about how
6 much, do you know?

7 THE WITNESS: One story or one and a
8 half stories.

9 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: So maybe about
10 ten feet or so?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I think that's
13 all of the questions I had.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner
15 Graham?

16 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Is this building
17 higher than the buildings surrounding, like the one
18 across the street or the one --

19 THE WITNESS: We have a partial seventh
20 floor that is set back from the street, and that
21 projects up above the other neighbors, but the
22 base -- the primary structure of the building aligns
23 with the neighborhood.

24 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: You said three
25 and four-bedroom units?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: What has made you
3 determine that three and four-bedroom units are
4 going to be marketable --

5 THE WITNESS: We --

6 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: -- three-bedrooms
7 I hear a lot about, that's just because I hear
8 people wish. But exactly what have you looked at,
9 any studies, that have shown you people are going to
10 buy three or four-bedroom units?

11 THE WITNESS: We have working very
12 closely for the past six months with Hudson Place
13 Realty. I don't know if he's still here.

14 John Sisti from Hudson Place Realty is
15 here, and he has been working very closely with us,
16 laying out the units, making sure we are appealing
17 to the needs of the Hoboken community, and it is
18 based on all of that research that we have set the
19 bedroom --

20 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And what research
21 is that?

22 MR. SISTI: Market data --

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: If we're going to
24 have comments, John, if we're going to have comments
25 from you, we need you to come on up.

1 We have not met him yet, so we need to
2 meet him.

3 MR. GLEASON: Can you raise your right
4 hand?

5 Do you swear or affirm that the
6 testimony you are about to give is the truth, the
7 whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

8 MR. SISTI: I do.

9 J O H N S I S T I, having been duly sworn,
10 testified as follows:

11 MR. GLEASON: Can you please state your
12 full name and spell your last name for the record?

13 THE WITNESS: John Sisti, S-i-s-t-i.

14 I am the broker of Hudson Place Realty.

15 MR. BURKE: John, you heard the
16 question.

17 Could you give the Board an explanation
18 as to why there are so many units and so many
19 bedrooms in each unit?

20 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I want to know
21 what research has been done, what kind of research
22 and how.

23 THE WITNESS: Market data that we are
24 working with, current market conditions, and current
25 buyers and current sales.

1 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So this is more
2 just people coming in and saying this is what they
3 want, not really ongoing research and studies of the
4 community?

5 THE WITNESS: Well, it's based on
6 sales, sales data, and interest in the marketplace,
7 what is selling, what people are looking for.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, I am familiar
9 with some of the brokers that work in your office,
10 and it seems like recently you had some rather large
11 single-family homes that are five, 7,000 square
12 feet, so obviously it seems like there's a very nice
13 healthy market for very large properties --

14 THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- regardless of
16 the price tag that may go with them.

17 THE WITNESS: That's true.

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: How many square
19 feet would be a four-bedroom unit be, and a
20 three-bedroom unit?

21 THE WITNESS: If you could give me one
22 second.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure. Take a
24 moment.

25 (Witness confers)

1 THE WITNESS: The largest unit of four
2 bedrooms are about 3500 square feet. There are two
3 of them.

4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Two
5 four-bedrooms?

6 MR. NASTASI: Yes, that are about plus
7 or minus 3500 square feet each.

8 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And the
9 three-bedroom unit, how many square feet?

10 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Seven?

11 MR. NASTASI: About 1800 square feet
12 for the three-bedrooms.

13 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: That's a
14 significant difference between the two.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Did we have any
16 other questions for our local broker authority?

17 (Laughter)

18 Anything else for John, otherwise we
19 will have him sit down.

20 Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER PEENE: I have one
22 question for John.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure.

24 COMMISSIONER PEENE: I know a lot has
25 gone into this, you know, meeting with the neighbors

1 and meeting with the community because of the extra,
2 you know --

3 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Which John?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Which John do you
5 want?

6 COMMISSIONER PEENE: I wanted John.
7 That John. I'm sorry.

8 First off, I'd like to compliment the
9 openness and the transparency of this process. I
10 know that the developer has met in community
11 meetings and met with the neighbors, and any time
12 your view, you know, so to speak, is getting
13 blocked, I would say it is traumatic to some people,
14 but for a building like that, I would like to thank
15 you guys for working on it.

16 My question had to do on Page A-206
17 with the new plans for the solar array in regard to,
18 you know, the height issue.

19 Will that be blocked out -- actually I
20 would like to know about what kind of panels you are
21 using, and this might be a question for the
22 developer, whether the power is being used to
23 generate, you know, the building or it's sold back
24 to the grid --

25 MR. BURKE: Interesting, and I will let

1 John talk more about this, but from what I
2 understand, the building doesn't need them. But
3 because we agreed to put them in in the
4 Redevelopment Agreement, we are following through.

5 Is that correct, John?

6 J O H N N A S T A S I, having been duly sworn,
7 testified further as follows:

8 THE WITNESS: Yes. We have met
9 Passivhaus certification without it. But because we
10 have that in our developer's agreement, we are
11 adding the array, which probably means that we will
12 have a surplus of energy.

13 These panels are flat on the roof,
14 okay, and they are mono-crystal glass panels, and
15 the array is set right here.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So as opposed to
17 the typical that we often see at some type of a
18 30-degree angle or something like that, these are
19 not that type of a setup?

20 THE WITNESS: They are tipped to the
21 south, but mounted on the roof in a rack that's down
22 on the roof --

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. You said
24 flat. That's why I want to understand that.

25 THE WITNESS: They are not on a super

1 structure, but they're mounted on the roof with a
2 (indicating).

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the panel itself
4 is angled?

5 THE WITNESS: It's angled.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But you're saying
7 it's down on the roof. It's not up on some metal
8 super structure?

9 THE WITNESS: Exactly. Exactly.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

11 THE WITNESS: It is not a super
12 structure.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Chairman, I just have one
14 question, and if you like, I will summarize our
15 letter.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Please do.

17 MR. ROBERTS: John, I noticed in going
18 back to the ground level again, there is a roof set
19 aside for storage, and it indicates flood panel
20 storage.

21 Is that room also large enough for
22 bicycle storage, or how does that -- clarify how
23 that's going to be handled, or are they going to be
24 stored in the individual units because they're
25 larger? How does that --

1 THE WITNESS: We are thinking that --
2 we're thinking that bicycles -- we have excess space
3 here in excess of what is required for the
4 handicapped van, and we have excess space here, so
5 we're --

6 MR. ROBERTS: Racks.

7 THE WITNESS: -- so racks, or we'll
8 definitely have bicycle racks down at the garage
9 level.

10 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. I was just going
11 to say you had everything else. I almost didn't
12 even think about it. I just assumed they were
13 there.

14 Mr. Chairman, the only other thing I
15 was going to mention sort of in terms of our letter
16 is it has been referenced that this is part of the
17 redevelopment plan. There's a Redevelopment
18 Agreement.

19 The Board might remember about a year
20 ago, we amended the Northwest Redevelopment Plan,
21 and the gist of the amendment was to allow for a
22 smaller lot size, and part of it was, or it may be
23 entirely for this site, you might recall or probably
24 know very well that the building on the site has
25 been something that the city has been hoping that

1 something positive would happen for a while, so this
2 is actually now the culmination of that. So the
3 plan was amended about a year ago, and now we are
4 seeing the actual redevelopment project.

5 There was a lot of vetting through the
6 Redevelopment Agreement process, so there wasn't a
7 whole lot for us to do, but just to give the Board a
8 little context that what we are seeing is the
9 product of all of that, and just to put it in
10 context, and that was really all.

11 In our letter, we effectively
12 summarized that and verified that with the amendment
13 that was made during the review process, that it is
14 fully compliant, and I know Brandy looked at it very
15 thoroughly as well.

16 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If I can.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Go ahead, Director.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The one thing I
19 would do is make sure there is a condition that this
20 application must comply with the Redevelopment
21 Agreement, just so that it is in there.

22 I did my review letter based on what
23 the Redevelopment Agreement requires, but just that
24 way it is in there as well.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Question.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Just one second.

3 John, could you give us an estimate on
4 just I wanted to try to clarify Mr. Peene's
5 question, which was about the solar panels, even
6 though they are sitting on the roof and they are
7 going to be tipped at some angle, can you give us a
8 ballpark as to how high they are off the --

9 THE WITNESS: At the highest point of
10 the angle?

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- at the highest
12 part of the panel.

13 THE WITNESS: 12 inches.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So it's
15 pretty minimal.

16 THE WITNESS: They're literally roof
17 mounted and tipped down.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

19 Mr. Peene, are you satisfied with
20 everything on that solar issue?

21 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes. Any time
22 people think of solar panels nowadays, you think of
23 the ones down at Rutgers or --

24 THE WITNESS: As a matter of fact, the
25 racks that we will be using are already mounted on

1 the roof down at Stevens for the house that we are
2 building, and you can't see them.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Councilman?

4 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Thank you.

5 I guess this might be for Commissioner
6 Forbes as well, but in your June 2nd letter, you
7 raised a question on page two about the project
8 data, and I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but on
9 page 8, double O -- triple O, under project data it
10 gets into the FAR calculation.

11 There was a question of a FAR of 4.7.
12 It says this is not the same as the amount noted on
13 page double A-1, that would equate to a FAR of 4.87.

14 Was this rectified somehow?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes. We sat down
16 and went through the FAR calculations. It was
17 actually incorrect on the original plan that they
18 had submitted, and it was different on two different
19 pages, one where it complied, and one where didn't.

20 They actually submitted as well a
21 response letter that addresses that, and then my
22 letter, dated June 4th, shows that they did comply
23 with that.

24 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Okay. Great.
25 Thank you.

1 It is 4.58, is that -- yes --

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Uh-huh.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner
4 Magaletta?

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

6 On the dry flood proofing, what is the
7 actual mechanism? So you have to put panels down,
8 is that what it is?

9 THE WITNESS: They're pre-engineered
10 flood panels.

11 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: How long does it
12 take to install them?

13 If you had a flood, how quickly can you
14 do that whole process?

15 THE WITNESS: I don't clearly know the
16 answer to that, but they are readily available
17 panels that are pre-made tracks --

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So it is a panel
19 per door, is that correct?

20 MR. HIPOLIT: I mean, I can speak to
21 it. They are made to go in relatively quick. You
22 know, granted if the water is already three feet up,
23 but when there is a storm coming or some urgent
24 flood, you know it is coming, you would install the
25 panels. It's over. It's done. You leave it. They

1 work great. I mean, they are made for quick
2 installation and quick removal.

3 You just can't put them in, or it is
4 very hard to put them in once you have water that is
5 already so high --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But you could
7 actually put it in?

8 MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, but it's just hard.
9 It's hard to put it in.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But you could?

11 MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, you can.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And then you'd stop
13 the five feet of water. You would still have three,
14 but you would stop the five?

15 MR. HIPOLIT: Correct. You can put it
16 in. It's just hard. I've been to a number of
17 seminars on these panels, and they want them in
18 before it comes. That's the --

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: No pushes from the
20 back side as well, is that --

21 MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Then, Mr. Burke,
23 I have a question for you.

24 Is there a low income housing trust
25 contribution or is there any kind of obligation at

1 all?

2 MR. BURKE: There was a financial
3 obligation. It is in the Redevelopment Agreement.
4 I think the number was 43,000 --

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think it is
6 40,000.

7 MR. BURKE: -- \$40,000.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's why I want
9 to make sure that we're just making a note that they
10 comply with the Redevelopment Agreement.

11 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: I have a quick
13 question.

14 On Page A-2 of 1.2, the brick planting
15 strip, did you guys consider doing a planted
16 planting strip to reduce impervious surface around
17 the facility?

18 THE WITNESS: Are you referring to this
19 area here?

20 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: Would we consider a
22 semi-pervious planting strip?

23 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Anything to
24 reduce impervious surfaces because that is not being
25 collected by your system, it would be a benefit.

1 THE WITNESS: We would consider that, a
2 semi-pervious, hybrid planting strip.

3 MR. HIPOLIT: I mean, it would be
4 cheaper, and you would be saving money.

5 THE WITNESS: That would be the only
6 thing we would be saving money on.

7 (Laughter)

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Your client is
9 right here.

10 A VOICE: Can you take the solar studs
11 off?

12 (Laughter)

13 THE WITNESS: Yes. We would definitely
14 consider that.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great. Good
16 call-out.

17 Any other questions, comments?

18 MR. HIPOLIT: Just for the Board's
19 purposes, if you are to approve this, there is
20 obviously a significant number of improvements on
21 the two streets, so we are going to need a
22 performance bond posted and some type of agreement
23 that indicates that they have to do the work, and
24 they will get the money back once it is inspected.

25 MR. BURKE: That is agreed.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We will see if
2 there's any questions from the public.

3 We will open this up to the public.
4 Are there any questions or comments from the public
5 with regard to this application, questions for the
6 architect, the attorney, or any comments anybody
7 wants to make?

8 Okay. Seeing there are none, we will
9 close the public portion.

10 Are there any additional questions or
11 comments from the Commissioners or our
12 professionals?

13 Steve, you have a couple of quick
14 conditions here. Could you read them off for us?

15 MR. GLEASON: Of course.

16 Condition 1: Applicant shall comply
17 with the requirements and revisions identified in
18 the Flood Plain Administrator's letter, dated June
19 29th, 2015.

20 Condition 2: The parking spaces shall
21 be deeded to the units.

22 Condition 3: Applicant must comply
23 with all aspects of the Redevelopment Agreement it
24 entered into with the city.

25 Condition 4: Applicant shall post a

1 performance bond for all improvements.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think we wanted
3 to add there to include Andy's letter as part of the
4 documentation as well. It is kind of standard, but
5 it is not on the list --

6 MR. GLEASON: Okay.

7 MR. HIPOLIT: And the bike racks, too.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And the bike racks,
9 right.

10 MR. HIPOLIT: The only other thing I
11 would say is where feasible or where possible, they
12 are going to try to put a green strip along Adams,
13 if you can put that in.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

15 So we will add to comply with the
16 engineer's letter and examine the opportunity to put
17 a pervious surface along Adams Street.

18 MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I make a motion
20 to accept the application with those conditions.

21 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Second from Mr.
23 Peene.

24 Pat, please call the roll.

25 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

2 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

3 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

4 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

6 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

7 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

8 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

9 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

10 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

11 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

12 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

14 MR. BURKE: Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Mr.

16 Burke.

17 Thank you, Mr. Nastasi.

18 MS. CARCONE: Want to take a break?

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. We are going

20 to take a break now.

21 (Recess taken)

22 (The matter concluded.)

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, a Certified Court Reporter, Certified Realtime Court Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel to any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300
 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
 My commission expires 11/5/2015.
 Dated: 7/8/15
 This transcript was prepared in accordance with
 NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING

----- X
RE: WESTERN EDGE REDEVELOPMENT : July 7, 2015
PLAN, dated May 26, 2015, Review : 9:15 pm
and Recommendation :
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

Chairman Gary Holtzman
Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
Commissioner Brandy Forbes
Commissioner Jim Doyle
Commissioner Ann Graham
Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
Commisioner Ryan Peene

A L S O P R E S E N T:

David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
Board Planner

Andrew R. Hipolit, PE, PP, CME
Board Engineer

Jessica Giorgianni, Conflict Planner

Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

PHYLLIS T. LEWIS
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
CERTIFIED REALTIME COURT REPORTER
(732) 735-4522

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2 LAW OFFICE OF DENNIS M. GALVIN
3 730 Brewers Bridge Road
4 Jackson, New Jersey 08527
5 732-364-3011
6 BY: STEVEN M. GLEASON, ESQ.
7 Attorneys for the Board.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right. We are
2 going to get started here, Mr. Curley.

3 Well, I think what, we will make a
4 motion to close the meeting, or is that where we
5 are?

6 (Laughter)

7 Okay. Moving right along.

8 We have Western Edge Redevelopment
9 Zone, the highlight of the evening.

10 Mr. Roberts, would you like to get us
11 started here?

12 MR. ROBERTS: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

13 This presentation is really for -- I
14 know a lot of folks have seen most, if not all of
15 it, not only folks in the audience, but a number of
16 Planning Board members that I know were at the
17 community meeting that we held back in May. I
18 believe it was May 21st, where we effectively
19 presented the same presentation.

20 The purpose of it is really to give you
21 just a summary of the highlights. We won't get into
22 the depth, and we will have a chance to hopefully go
23 through the plan. I know a number of Board members
24 have been through quite a lot of detail, and really
25 just give that overall overview.

1 Also, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would
2 also like to actually go right into Jessica's
3 review. She really went through the master plan.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yeah. Let's make
5 sure we know who all of the players are here because
6 we have a little bit of a change of what jobs we are
7 all doing.

8 So Dave Roberts with Maser actually
9 worked with the City and the City Council in the
10 development of this plan that we have before us. So
11 being that you worked on the development of the
12 plan, we brought in our conflict planner, Jessica,
13 so Jessica will be joining us on the dais, and has
14 written a terrific review letter of Dave's report,
15 so that's really the change of the personnel.

16 MR. ROBERTS: Everybody else is the
17 same.

18 And I thought that it might be helpful
19 to respond to some of the suggestions that Jessica
20 made, and then I think there may be some of the
21 things that are in that review letter that the Board
22 might want to consider in terms of comments or
23 recommendations on the plan itself, so with that I
24 will jump right in.

25 The area that we are talking about was

1 previously designated probably around 2007, I
2 believe, as an area of redevelopment, so this is not
3 a rehab area. This is a redevelopment area.

4 You will see on this first slide, and
5 by the way, I apologize for not pointing out that I
6 left a hard copy of the slides in front of all Board
7 members, so you can follow along as I go.

8 And this first slide, and I apologize
9 to the public for my back, but hopefully you can see
10 the screen, it's just an overview of the area. It
11 is really divided into four subareas, and we kind of
12 summarized that over in the -- and the four subareas
13 are named in the upper right-hand corner.

14 We call them Lower Monroe, which is
15 effectively 900 Monroe. It is the property that's
16 under construction currently. It was approved with
17 a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
18 Even though it is in the redevelopment area, since
19 it was previously approved and under construction,
20 we just incorporated it into the plan as approved.

21 The second subarea is called the Upper
22 Monroe Subarea, and it comprises the rest of the
23 Block 92, Lot 1.02, which initially was a number of
24 blocks and lots that were consolidated, and that
25 essentially runs from where the dead end street, I

1 believe at this point up to Monroe, and then up to
2 12th. It is kind of a web-shaped or arrow-shaped
3 parcel, so it's widest at its westerly point or
4 southerly point, and narrowest at its northerly
5 point.

6 At 12th Street, where Monroe kind of
7 sort of dead ends into the light rail or into
8 Palisades is the third subarea, which is Madison
9 Street Subarea.

10 And then the fourth subarea is
11 effectively an entire block, Block 112, which is
12 bounded by four streets, effectively 13th,
13 Jefferson, really the Viaduct and Madison, and so
14 that is the only block that doesn't back up against
15 the Palisades and the light rail.

16 The fact that three of the subareas do
17 back up against the light rail and then the
18 Palisades behind the light rail, that is actually
19 one of the things that was a driver in the plan, and
20 you will see why in a moment.

21 The areas of each of the subareas is
22 summarized in the lower left-hand corner of this
23 map.

24 One is that the existing subarea one,
25 900 Monroe, is 1.1 acres.

1 The largest of four subareas, Block 92,
2 Lot 1.02, which we call Upper Monroe, is 4.15 acres.

3 The second largest, which is subarea
4 three, upper or the Madison Street subarea, which is
5 Block 106, Lot 1, is 3.51 acres, so it is a little
6 more than a half an acre smaller than the Monroe
7 Street Subarea.

8 And then finally, Block 112, Lot 1,
9 which is the entire block, the Jefferson Street
10 Subarea, is 1.83 acres.

11 The total when you add in a portion of
12 the Monroe right-of-way, which is in part of subarea
13 three at .48 is 11.15 acres, so the entire area is a
14 little over 11 acres.

15 And in terms of the goals of these
16 plans, of the plan I mentioned, the light rail and
17 the area kind of behind those blocks, where those
18 streets kind of dead ended into the Palisades
19 because the grid comes at an odd angle to that side
20 of Hoboken, where the Palisades cuts across, cuts
21 the grid almost at an angle and creates those
22 triangular blocks.

23 One of the things that we used as a
24 guidepost for this has been some of the work that
25 the city has already done, and to some extent, for

1 better or worse, we can kind of thank Sandy for some
2 of that because some of that was precipitated -- the
3 green infrastructure plan was already intentional by
4 the city and had been suggested in the master plan,
5 but the Rebuild By Design was something that was
6 precipitated by Sandy, and through that the green
7 circuit, which had been recommended as far back as
8 the 2004 master plan took shape in the form of a
9 linear park recommendation, which was meant as one
10 of a number of strategies to try to retain and to
11 store stormwater to minimize flooding effects in the
12 case of future storms.

13 So the idea of the linear park came
14 from Rebuild By Design, and it became sort of where
15 we started from, where we started to organize the
16 blocks and the stepbacks from the light rail, so
17 that we could fit the park in.

18 So in this slide, you can see one of
19 the views over by 900 Monroe, sort of that undefined
20 space in the back that sort of runs along the light
21 rail, and as just an image to represent what the
22 thinking is as to what it could become, effectively
23 a linear park. We don't have any specific design
24 yet, because in order for it to be able to store
25 flood water, it is going to have to be engineered.

1 It's a very -- one of the common aspects of this
2 area is that it is very low lying, probably the
3 lowest lying part of the city, had originally been
4 marsh, you know, at the origins of the city, so
5 there are some challenges in terms of what you could
6 do. Probably we would have to build up that park,
7 so that it can store flood water, so that is a
8 design for the future.

9 But just these goals, goals one through
10 six: To increase the economic base of the
11 Redevelopment Area. Currently it is effectively a
12 reminder of a by-gone era. It is still
13 predominantly industrial in nature.

14 The buildings that are still there are
15 predominantly industrial in nature, but the master
16 plan and its reexam report it followed in 2010
17 suggested that there was going to need to be a
18 period of transition, where we would like to try and
19 retain as much of the industrial heritage as we can,
20 but we have to recognize especially with the light
21 rail, that there needs to be a way of making in some
22 of the mixed use that is best suited to proximity to
23 the light rail.

24 Also, to provide a pedestrian-friendly
25 street scape, and what we tried to build into the

1 plan were a number of opportunities in the framework
2 plan for pedestrians to be able to pass through, to
3 not have to walk very far from one part of the block
4 to another, to break the blocks up into almost sub
5 blocks, so that we can build in some permeability
6 for the pedestrians to be able to get to this linear
7 park that we are trying to incorporate in the back
8 effectively of these blocks.

9 To provide a suitable corridor for the
10 "green circuit," I think we have already covered
11 that.

12 Climate change mitigation, we kind of
13 mentioned that as well. It is not just the linear
14 park, it's the suggestions for the design of the
15 buildings themselves.

16 So in an urban area like Hoboken, where
17 we try to absorb rainwater, stormwater is through
18 the buildings, through green roofs through some of
19 the techniques that you just heard in that
20 application that preceded us, in terms of flood
21 capture or rainwater capture. And then wherever we
22 have open space on the ground, we want to be able to
23 try to use it for as much as flood storage as
24 possible, rain gardens, bioswales, all of those
25 techniques built into the project.

1 So also to promote sustainability in
2 the built environment, all of those things are built
3 into that, as well as the street grid that Hoboken
4 already has, taking advantage of that, and trying
5 to -- where we have been trying to do that in every
6 redevelopment project, try to restore the grid
7 whenever we have an opportunity, and you will see an
8 example of that in the next slide.

9 And then maximizing green space and
10 greening of the city, that is one thing the city has
11 been trying to achieve in every redevelopment
12 opportunity is trying to increase green space and
13 open space.

14 These are just the examples of the main
15 two main guideposts that we use, the green
16 infrastructure plan evidenced on the left, which
17 focuses on retention, infiltration and detention
18 through a variety of techniques, and then the linear
19 park that runs along the entire Palisades that is
20 recommended in the Rebuild By Design.

21 This is another example, when we talk
22 about trying to enhance the grid, allowing for at
23 this end of town, where the grid kind of runs into
24 the Palisades, there is a lot of either right
25 angles, where the streets just kind of stop, and

1 what we want to try to do is extend the movement
2 along those streets all the way to the linear park
3 that is being proposed, but they will be restricted
4 to pedestrians and bicycles.

5 The idea would be to use a portion of
6 these ends to feed the underground, the sort of back
7 of the house type spaces, parking, loading, things
8 like that, but to keep the street scapes, the
9 portions of the blocks that face the streets
10 activated and lively with retail.

11 But so the street ends sort of bringing
12 the grid to what we are proposing as that linear
13 park, so the linear park is effectively an extension
14 of the named streets that run north and south, and
15 the connections that would be through the block
16 would be coming from the number of streets that run
17 east and west.

18 Finally, we are at a framework plan,
19 and you can kind of see the illustration of that
20 where the streets kind of -- either extensions of
21 streets through the blocks or even breaking up the
22 blocks in half. Most of the blocks in Hoboken run
23 about 200 feet in width by about 425 or 410 feet in
24 length, so if you break that block in half, you have
25 effectively got a 200-by-200 foot area to work with.

1 What we did was in the rear beyond that
2 150 to 200 feet, what was left became the linear
3 park, and we actually stepped back from the park or
4 from the light rail because of the triangular
5 blocks, there is a greater setback sort of the wide
6 part of the block and a narrower at the narrower
7 part of the block, but wide enough, so that we could
8 fit the linear trail behind the buildings in that
9 space that would be created in the back and where we
10 have room, where the flood storage would be
11 contemplated.

12 And then finally, this is a graphic
13 to -- really on an existing tax map to kind of
14 illustrate where we think we can form reasonable
15 building blocks or building footprints shows kind of
16 the stub where this would be entrances to parking
17 and loading in the ground level, that these
18 buildings would be built up obviously for flood
19 protection purposes, and then the back portions of
20 the blocks would be where the sort of sawtooth
21 landscape configuration would take place, and when
22 you add all of these spaces together, it comes out
23 to about 4.15 acres.

24 This is finally the -- probably the
25 last really piece of highlight in terms of how the

1 plan was sort of contemplated, which is a number of
2 the other plans that have been proposed for this
3 area have not come to fruition mainly because of
4 concern about the fact whether they were
5 economically viable.

6 So effectively what we tried to do here
7 is, even though it is a redevelopment area, it was
8 clear, and I think it was this Board that really was
9 sort of championing this idea is that the
10 implementation of the plan should really be driven
11 by the property owners, not calling in a developer
12 from somewhere else, that the property owners would
13 be the redevelopers of their own parcels.

14 So as a result of that, one of our
15 first steps was to meet with the property owners and
16 get a sense of what they have had in addition for
17 their properties. A couple of them had actually
18 already developed plans and had applications already
19 pending in front of the Zoning Board, so they were
20 fairly well developed. In other cases they were
21 more conceptual.

22 We gathered up what we could from those
23 applications and from the concepts that we got from
24 the different property owners and we fed that
25 information to an economic consultant, Pamone Camoin

1 Associates, who evaluated square footages and came
2 up with an overall internal rate of return sort of
3 analysis based on what was proposed by all of them.

4 And then we worked through the Council
5 Subcommittee and started refining it from there, and
6 as a result of that we ended up with slightly
7 different floor area ratios for each subarea because
8 of the fact that there was different circumstances
9 with each block. Each subarea is a little different
10 than the other subareas, as I think I explained with
11 the first map.

12 So even though they are relatively
13 comparable when you look at the total base floor
14 area ratios for each of those subareas, they vary in
15 terms of nonresidential and residential, and the
16 main principle is that the residential is set as a
17 maximum, and the nonresidential is set as a minimum,
18 and part of the reason for that is when initially
19 there was a market study in terms of how much retail
20 and nonresidential can the area absorb, because
21 every area has its limits, it was felt that a lot of
22 what was proposed could be absorbed in terms of the
23 gaps of where spending was taking place outside of
24 the area and what would be supported, if it was in
25 the area.

1 And obviously, residential was seen,
2 and no surprise to anyone in this room, as the drier
3 economically. So we were trying to strike what was
4 the balance between the amount of residential that
5 would be needed to make the projects economically
6 viable and attractive and the amount of
7 nonresidential, retail, office, even industrial,
8 urban manufacturing, whatever form that might take,
9 to make sure we had a minimum of that, so that we
10 would have a balance of residential and
11 nonresidential in the area, so that is effectively
12 how this worked.

13 Probably the one thing to note is
14 because the nonresidential is a minimum, these FARs
15 could actually go up, if there was more commercial
16 space proposed than what that minimum is, so that
17 nonresidential is effectively a floor, and can go
18 up. The residential is a ceiling and is capped.

19 The only time that they could be
20 exceeded is if there was a bonus in terms of
21 amenities or other types of improvements,
22 infrastructure, whatever, that would be negotiated
23 as part of the redevelopment.

24 So all of the numbers can potentially
25 go up, but this is the base that we felt was

1 economically -- it was economically feasible, and
2 then in order to make the projects work with a
3 normal amount of improvements, public environment
4 improvements, and then they can go up with caps in
5 terms of building height, with additional
6 improvements that would be proposed and offered to
7 the city, and that would all be something that would
8 be negotiated in the Redevelopment Agreement because
9 it is much too complex to be able to anticipate it
10 at the point of redevelopment, so that is how the
11 building limitations were derived, and these are
12 just really illustrations as to how this would work.

13 One of the concepts in the plan is that
14 there would be for residential and nonresidential
15 typical mixed-use buildings, there would be setbacks
16 or stepbacks from the street side, because you have
17 the street side and then you have a park side in the
18 back along the light rail, but we tried to allow for
19 some of that square footage when we step it back
20 from the street to be compensated by cantilevering
21 over the park, so since it is private property in
22 some cases that this park will be occupying, we are
23 giving the developers the ability to get some of
24 that square footage back.

25 The other part of that is you can see

1 the light gray above the dark gray. The dark gray
2 would be the basic vertical dimension of what would
3 be allowed under the base, and then the light gray
4 would be what could be accomplished with bonuses,
5 but there's a cap. In the case of residential we
6 are assuming about a 16 foot base or pedestal level
7 for parking and nonresidential uses, retail, et
8 cetera, and then ten foot per floor.

9 And then for the nonresidential, it's
10 16 plus 11 feet per floor, allowing a little
11 additional height for things like office space and
12 flex space, and things like that.

13 So what this diagram shows is this blue
14 is not meant to show a body of water. It's just
15 meant to illustrate flood storage.

16 The green circuit or the bike
17 pedestrian pathways would be between the buildings
18 and the flood storage and then the light rail and
19 the Palisades, so that is effectively how the
20 profiles would work, and this is really the
21 difference. For the nonresidential, it allows
22 people to go a little higher. We are trying to
23 incentivize nonresidential, so that is how that
24 works.

25 Then these are just really

1 illustrations of the existing and the massing that
2 potentially could occur. Just for purposes of
3 illustration, this shows you, even though this is an
4 older -- this is now under construction, from here
5 over is the Upper Monroe area, and this kind of
6 illustrates the final massing of Lower and Upper
7 Monroe with a portion of the Upper Monroe area that
8 would effectively just be park because of its narrow
9 configuration, leading up to the next step, which
10 would be the northern half, this would be the
11 Madison Street subarea and the Jefferson subarea and
12 the massing there would resemble something like this
13 with the setbacks.

14 The white floors would be a bonus. The
15 yellow would be the base, and we showed -- one of
16 the things that we wanted to clarify, and I know it
17 was one of the questions that Jessica brought up in
18 her report is that these massing diagrams and the
19 framework plan are not prescriptive in terms of
20 dictating where the nonresidential and the
21 residential would go.

22 The plan, especially after we met with
23 the property owners sometime ago, since we don't
24 know for sure where different pieces of the puzzle
25 will go, and because the redevelopment plan is just

1 an outline, we make it clear in the plan that these
2 are guides and not prescriptive.

3 The point of showing it is that what we
4 were trying to accomplish other than the park was
5 making the most of the light rail.

6 There is already a station on 9th
7 Street on the south end of the development. On the
8 north end of the development is almost exactly a
9 half mile, and there is a proposal in both the
10 master plan and the reexam report of 2010 about
11 needing another station along the light rail, and
12 what we had suggested in this plan is that we would
13 support -- this plan supports another light rail at
14 15th Street, which would then allow for a quarter
15 mile walk from the center point where the park is to
16 either one of those two light rail stations.

17 So we tried to show the nonresidential
18 uses concentrated to the two light rail. That was
19 the concept that was trying to be portrayed and
20 described in the plan.

21 Then finally, this plan even though
22 it's very close in terms of hitting a lot of the
23 points in both the 2004 master plan and the 2010
24 reexam report was actually mostly guided by the
25 League for Neighborhood Development Rating System.

1 As it turns out, your master plan and your reexam
2 report are very much in sync with that rating
3 system, even though that rating system hadn't come
4 out at the point that those plans were developed.

5 It just so happens that the plans that
6 you had done in the past were in line with the
7 thinking that led up to LEED-ND.

8 So the point where you add them up,
9 there is a checklist in the back of the plan that is
10 taken from LEED-ND, and we effectively rated or
11 filled that in as a result of this plan, and the
12 plan could achieve a LEED silver or LEED-ND silver
13 just with the yes items, things that you can check
14 off in terms of connectivity and all of those other
15 types that point in a very detailed system.

16 There is a potential to get it up to
17 gold, you know, and those are the things that we
18 were not sure about yet, that would potentially be
19 negotiated project by project as the Redevelopment
20 Agreements are worked through, and that is where
21 some of the bonuses could potentially come from. It
22 could get you from your base compliance with LEED-ND
23 to your kind of advanced compliance, and the
24 checklist is really used as the measuring stick.

25 It would be the measuring stick for

1 this Board and for the Council as they evaluate and
2 negotiate the redevelopment plans in terms of all of
3 those sustainability items that we describe in
4 general in the plan, and this was one of the other
5 points that Jessica asked in her letter in terms of
6 more specificity. It is the checklist that actually
7 will be the -- kind of our rating system for each
8 project that comes before us.

9 Then finally, the new rating systems
10 have priority, regional priority credits, and when
11 you punch in the zip code for Hoboken, these are the
12 priority credits that come up. So these are the
13 areas of sustainability that USGBC feels are most
14 critical for Hoboken, and when you look at them, and
15 rainwater management is at the top of the list, so
16 that's no surprise.

17 Mixed income, diverse communities, so
18 that is something that the city is achieving through
19 its ten percent affordable, and the plan requires
20 ten percent affordable, and all of the economic
21 analysis factored in the ten percent affordable, so
22 those were all worked into the economic analysis.

23 The street network, transportation
24 demand and management, which is another major
25 emphasis, it's mandatory in the plan for every

1 project, that every project come in with a TMV plan
2 that could be evaluated by -- as part of the
3 Redevelopment Agreement, and that may require
4 certain justifications for the traffic impact
5 statements and all of those other things that we
6 looked at, and also by the way would require a
7 synchro model. You probably remember when we looked
8 at Maxwell Place and Sinatra Drive north, John
9 Jahr's demonstration was a synchro model that
10 analyzed different scenarios.

11 We would require that for every project
12 coming through, so we could study the impacts on the
13 street system. That is in the plan as well.

14 And then Brownfields redevelopment and
15 housing and job proximity, trying to put jobs and
16 residential close to transit and close to each
17 other.

18 So I think the plan effectively hits on
19 all of those points, so I think that is effectively
20 my overview, Mr. Chairman.

21 Just in terms of, with your permission,
22 just to try to kind of sort of give a little bit of
23 a preamble, I know Jessica may want to go through
24 her letter.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. We have a

1 tremendous letter that has been written here. I
2 want to commend Jessica on this review letter. It
3 is incredibly thorough, and I want to make sure that
4 we certainly make this a part of the documentation
5 and the recommendations that we send up to the City
6 Council a full copy of her report.

7 I hope that the Commissioners have had
8 a chance to read it. I thought it was great.

9 I am sure that you had a chance to read
10 it as well, Dave.

11 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I have.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I thought it was
13 telling that for the most part in my reading of it,
14 there were no significant call-outs in terms of
15 conflicts, which was certainly nice to see.

16 It seemed like the majority of the
17 detail in the letter was asking for more aggressive
18 action or specificity with regard to certain things,
19 and it is always an interesting balance as to how
20 specific to get versus we want to leave flexibility
21 in the plan, so that we get something that's
22 creative going on in the neighborhood.

23 So in most cases, I would probably ask
24 you to review your letter in depth for the Board,
25 but just in terms of trying to expedite the issue, I

1 am going to ask Dave to kind of give a little bit of
2 a highlight call-out on some of the key pointers.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Sure.

4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Again, I think, we would agree with you
6 wholeheartedly. A lot of the comments, I can
7 probably just sort of break them down into
8 suggestions for where the plan could be strengthened
9 in certain areas. Perhaps, for example, where we
10 talk about pedestrian mobility and so on, providing
11 cross-sections of what some of that might look like,
12 a street cross-section and things like that.

13 Again, part of it is a -- the balance
14 of part of that is the scope of the initial
15 contract, and part of it is that we are expecting,
16 because of the way that this plan was based on
17 property owners' proposals, that there was going to
18 be a lot of give and take in the Redevelopment
19 Agreement.

20 So a lot of that detail is being
21 deferred to the Redevelopment Agreement mainly
22 because that agreement allows the opportunity to
23 look at concept plans, to look at preliminary
24 designs and so on. A lot of that then falls on the
25 developer when they are negotiating rather than

1 putting it in terms of developing a plan.

2 MS. GIORGIANNI: Can I say something
3 real quick?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Go ahead, Jessica.

5 MS. GIORGIANNI: I was particularly
6 focused on the area of transportation because when
7 you are talking about circulation and street
8 improvements, I mean, that goes beyond property
9 owner boundaries, so I was just -- you know, is
10 there is a consistency in terms of your
11 recommendations for street scape throughout the
12 area.

13 I know you referenced the bike in the
14 master plan, but what was confusing to me, is that
15 the recommendations to coming out of the bike and
16 master plan requirements, and who is going to put
17 that in --

18 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah --

19 MS. GIORGIANNI: -- because this is
20 something that goes beyond just the property
21 boundary, you know, the length of an entire street
22 or just, you know, what would these pedestrian
23 corridors look like. You know, is it impervious
24 that you're recommending or some sort of pervious
25 mix, you know.

1 I was just looking for more specificity
2 there, wondering if there would be more specificity
3 because, again, these property boundaries --

4 MR. ROBERTS: Right. And I think,
5 again, because a lot of these pedestrian corridors
6 would be on private property as part of the
7 redevelopment project, they will be designed as part
8 of the overall open space or ground level
9 improvements, and so we don't have a design standard
10 for every single one in the plan partially because
11 there were limits on what we could do, but also
12 because each one of those would be something where
13 they will be design requirements at the time of the
14 redevelopment.

15 So the plan definitely requires
16 off-tract improvements, so whether it's pedestrian,
17 vehicular, transit, all of those things would have
18 to be modeled with much more detail at the time of
19 the redevelopment when we actually have a site --
20 not a site plan necessarily that would be ready for
21 this Board, but a much more advanced than our
22 massing diagrams, so that we can analyze a lot
23 carefully at that point.

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: May I?

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Go ahead, Director.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: One of the things
2 that was put in there was not just that they are
3 required to have a transportation demand management
4 plan, but we very specifically called out where
5 those problem areas are, the things that they are
6 going to need to address in that.

7 We recognize that the discounts that
8 are typically put into a traffic analysis for
9 transit really can't be here -- can't be used here
10 because we are at capacity with so many different of
11 our transit modes, so they are going to have to be
12 creative in that, and that is going to be, you know,
13 what we are really going to be focusing on in the
14 Redevelopment Agreement process.

15 MS. GIORGIANNI: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So to follow up on
17 Jessica's request for specificity, my question is
18 this:

19 How do we bake into the plan enough
20 detail, so that the elements that are in the public
21 interest, let's say, whether they are some type of a
22 pedestrian walkway or things of this nature that are
23 often in this case on private property, how do we
24 make sure that they actually happen as opposed to
25 historically things that have disappeared off the

1 page because somebody then said to us later, well,
2 you didn't give us enough specifics to make us do
3 it, so we're not doing it.

4 MR. ROBERTS: So, again, the
5 redevelopment plan in terms of what the statute
6 requires is just an outline, but there is a live
7 range of detail that goes into a variety of
8 redevelopment plans, and there is really no right
9 way or wrong way.

10 You could be very prescriptive, and you
11 could be very broad. This is somewhere in between.
12 I think I would characterize this plan, and normally
13 when that is the case and you have things like that
14 that need to be addressed, one of the first points
15 that the city sits across the table with, in this
16 case a property owner that's proposing a
17 redevelopment plan is, show us some concepts now,
18 like start to develop this, and then it effectively
19 becomes an iterative process back and forth.

20 So the design things like the
21 pedestrian walkways back to the park, if you have a
22 subarea, where you might have maybe one or two of
23 mid block breaks, until we know the design, since
24 they are so integrated with the design of the
25 buildings until you have the buildings, you're

1 probably not going to see what that will be, but you
2 will have a chance to react to it, and by the time
3 the Redevelopment Agreement gets signed, in most
4 cases there will be a concept plan incorporated with
5 it that becomes binding on the redeveloper and
6 effectively becomes the guidepost for the site plan
7 application that this Board will see.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And those site plan
9 applications would then come back to this Board, is
10 that correct?

11 MR. ROBERTS: Absolutely, yes.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So if we didn't
13 like the way that it smelled, we could push back.

14 MR. ROBERTS: Well, there is
15 flexibility in this plan for the Board, just like we
16 normally build into most redevelopment plans, so
17 that if there's a real -- it's a real site plan
18 technical thing, that it's much more in the weeds, I
19 guess you could say, than the bigger picture that
20 the Council might be looking at. As long as it
21 doesn't affect the overall framework of the plan
22 that the Council has approved, yes, then you can get
23 into that detail and things like you did tonight,
24 for example.

25 A good example of a site plan that came

1 after a redevelopment plan and Redevelopment
2 Agreement, where there was a suggestion to change
3 the plan to try to incorporate -- maybe replace some
4 of the brick with some plantings. That's certainly
5 within your purview in any of these redevelopment
6 projects that would come out of this plan, too.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great. Thank you.

8 Can you continue with your --

9 MR. ROBERTS: I think there were a
10 couple of items.

11 One of the other things, and I just
12 want to make sure I don't forget this, because there
13 has been some I guess refining of some of the
14 language in the plan as well, I know that the
15 Subcommittee has been continuing to work on that,
16 and I know at some point Brandy will probably be
17 addressing that.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Actually if you
19 wouldn't mind, I can go ahead right now, just
20 because I think it will address quite a few of the
21 questions that Jessica had. It is something that we
22 do want to have or I would like to have as a
23 recommendation.

24 When this was being introduced, there
25 were some City Council members that said, well, we

1 want to make sure that the height -- that it is
2 being measured from height, not stories. So, of
3 course, it was after it was introduced, so it was
4 something that we went back just to revisit, and
5 with the Subcommittee, really had a recommendation
6 for replacing on Page 28, "Buildings
7 Stories/Height," there was some back and forth on
8 whether it should be, you know, on height versus
9 stories, so this is the proposed language I provided
10 to --

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So just to call it
12 out, you are under 8.1, "Land Use & Development
13 Requirements," and then it's the subsection
14 "Buildings, Stories/Height," correct?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Correct. And it
16 would be replacing that section, that subsection,
17 "Buildings, Stories/Height" in its entirety to read:

18 "The maximum base height for all
19 mixed-use buildings with residential shall be 66
20 feet, approximately five stories residential
21 (typically of ten feet each) over one story of
22 approximately 16 feet for parking/retail.

23 "The maximum base height for all
24 nonresidential mixed-use buildings with uses such as
25 commercial, office, educational or hotel shall be 82

1 feet, composed of approximately six stories of
2 nonresidential (typically of 11 feet each) over one
3 story of approximately 16 feet for parking/retail.
4 Bonus FAR may be allowed as deemed appropriate by
5 the city through the negotiation of a Redevelopment
6 Agreement and evaluation of the project pro forma,
7 for the purpose of receiving improvements,
8 contributions or infrastructure from the redeveloper
9 that provide a benefit to the larger neighborhood of
10 the city in accordance with the provisions of a
11 Redevelopment Agreement.

12 "The bonus FAR may increase the
13 allowable height up to a maximum of 116 feet for
14 mixed-use buildings with residential (approximately
15 ten stories over one story of parking/retail) and up
16 to a maximum of 126 feet for nonresidential
17 mixed-use buildings (approximately ten stories over
18 one story of parking/retail).

19 "Height averaging may also be employed,
20 wherein a total square footage within the allowable
21 maximum base FAR and building height can be varied,
22 so that floor area from a building lower than the
23 maximum height can be added to a building in the
24 same subarea that is higher than the maximum base
25 height up to (but not exceeding) the maximum bonus

1 height level shown in Figures 13 and 14 and noted in
2 this subsection.

3 "Both the residential mixed-use
4 buildings and the nonresidential mixed-use buildings
5 are required to have an initial story for
6 parking/retail of approximately 16 feet. Since
7 parking and retail are permitted uses below the
8 design flood elevation pursuant to the Hoboken Flood
9 Damage Prevention Ordinance, the building height
10 shall be measured from the elevation of finished
11 grade surrounding the structure."

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That was a
13 mouthful.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

15 MR. ROBERTS: That basically, of
16 course, bonds with the Figures 13 and 14, that
17 Brandy just referred to, the language goes back to
18 these, so effectively because the --

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So we have a --

20 MR. ROBERTS: -- excuse me.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- that is quite a
22 specific call-out there. I got a couple of
23 scrunched up noses there in the audience.

24 We do have a couple of copies of this
25 for some folks that wanted to have a copy of it just

1 so you got it yourself. Pat has a couple of extra
2 copies here.

3 Okay. Go ahead, Dave.

4 MR. ROBERTS: Really just to summarize,
5 it is really about having the overall height
6 measured absolutely. It is almost similar to some
7 of the amendments that were in some of the changes
8 to 196, Chapter 196 that we talked about, about a
9 month ago, measuring not by stories, but by absolute
10 height. And this way you know what your threshold
11 is height-wise for residential and nonresidential,
12 and you have the general guidelines, and you know
13 where it's measured from, so that was the main
14 point.

15 In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I
16 think some of the other highlights I think, and we
17 thought it might be something that might be
18 recommendations for the Board, aside from some of
19 the suggestions or points or observations that were
20 made in Jessica's letter about strengthening certain
21 parts, which I think we covered in terms of
22 deferring to the Redevelopment Agreement, there were
23 a couple things that we thought we would highlight.

24 One is the recommendation in the master
25 plan that there be public art in more prominent

1 locations, and that just points out it's not really
2 mentioned at all in the plan, so that may be
3 something that the Board might recommend be
4 incorporated.

5 Also, the recommendation in the master
6 plan about encouraging rooftop gardens and urban
7 agriculture, while we talk about green roofs as part
8 of the sustainability measure, rooftop gardens is
9 kind of taking it one step further, which would be
10 to actually grow produce on the roof or somewhere on
11 the site and actually allow for agriculture as a
12 permitted use, which currently isn't specified in
13 the plan.

14 So that would be another suggestion
15 that we thought would not only be more in line with
16 the master plan, but also be a good thing for the
17 project.

18 Then I think some of the other issues
19 would have to do with specificity on parking. There
20 was the question about parking for nonresidential,
21 other than retail, and the plan had intended that
22 retail requirement really would apply to basically a
23 whole melting pot of uses. The only -- we put in a
24 requirement for residential, a requirement for
25 industrial, because industrial parking is going to

1 be less than other types of nonresidential uses, and
2 then we put in sort of a broad requirement, which we
3 call retail, which would exempt the first 10,000
4 square feet and then require one space per thousand
5 square feet above that, and the idea would be to
6 clarify that, so that it says nonresidential instead
7 of retail, and that would cover all of those other
8 uses. It's really a general standard that seems to
9 be reasonable for Hoboken.

10 I think those were the main ones. I
11 don't know if I maybe missed one.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Director?

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

14 There was one other on page 36, and it
15 was regarding that parking would be a reduction in
16 parking requirements --

17 MR. ROBERTS: Right, right.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- whereas it
19 right now says a reduction in residential parking
20 requirements, and it's really based on the TDM plan,
21 that Transportation Demand Management Plan, and to
22 be negotiated in a Redevelopment Agreement, so it
23 would just be striking "residential" from that.

24 If they were able to find that, you
25 know, they could strike it either from the

1 residential calculation and/or from the
2 nonresidential.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Right. Thank you,
4 Brandy.

5 I knew there was one more that I was
6 missing.

7 But the other thing that comes out of
8 that is that there were some other questions about
9 things like how we incorporated things like car
10 sharing and zip cars and things like that.

11 The way the plan contemplated that is
12 that as each project, since we are not sure what the
13 mix of uses will be, when we get into an actual
14 specific proposal, the requirement for a
15 Transportation Demand Management program would
16 incorporate things like zip cars and car sharing,
17 because each project is going to have a different
18 generation, and it's going to have a different
19 issue.

20 What we had found was in these
21 applications that have gone to the Zoning Board, and
22 in particular, there was a lot of deferral to the
23 availability of transit, so there were discounts put
24 into those traffic analyses based on the proximity
25 of transit, but our feeling was and the

1 Subcommittee's feeling was that it's an allusion to
2 some extent because the transit isn't always
3 available when it's needed, so you don't want to --
4 you have to qualify that discount, and it may be to
5 get you from the west side of the city to the east
6 side of the city, where the terminal is and the
7 ferry is, there may be other things that have to
8 happen rather than relying on the bus and relying on
9 light rail, such as adding more buses to the
10 shuttle, trying to create better bicycle pathways,
11 really -- or planning, so that you have lesser trips
12 coming from your project, and that is where the
13 Transportation Demand Management Plan will be
14 project specific and would probably incorporate
15 things like cars, car sharing, bike sharing, et
16 cetera.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We will open it up
18 to the --

19 MS. GIORGIANNI: I'm sorry.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- oh, go ahead.
21 What have you got for me?

22 MS. GIORGIANNI: I just wanted to -- in
23 general my comments -- I understand a lot of what --
24 a lot of the generalities are to be addressed in
25 negotiating the Redevelopment Agreement, but, you

1 know, my concern really was that there is enough
2 fodder in the plan to kind of direct those
3 negotiations because, you know, in the end it is
4 people who were negotiating the Redevelopment
5 Agreement, and different people may have different
6 ideas, but to have enough information kind of
7 codified in the Redevelopment Plan to really, you
8 know, direct those negotiations.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great. Thank you.

10 I will open it up to some of the
11 Commissioners.

12 Commissioner Graham?

13 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No. I would just
14 like to say I really appreciate your trying to
15 achieve more specificity.

16 I think it is a very well done plan for
17 the most part, but I think there is some vagueness
18 to it, some ambiguity, that I think Jessica
19 addressed very clearly, and we need to be able to
20 direct people to be -- to go that extra mile to look
21 at those specifics, and I think that overall, there
22 is too much for me a mix of residential and
23 commercial.

24 I think we really need to have more
25 commercial in the back part of the city. There are

1 too many taxpayers in this town that are residential
2 taxpayers that are fronting too much of the tax bill
3 that is increasing every year, and we really can't
4 afford that. We really need more commercial to be
5 able to sustain our tax base, and we really don't
6 have, you know, we talk about concerns for
7 transportation, and we talk about concerns for, you
8 know, all of the issues that are crowding there. If
9 we had more people going in and out every day and
10 not staying, instead of, you know, and providing
11 more for the tax base itself, I think we'd be much
12 better off.

13 Because I notice in your charts that
14 the mix of residential and commercial is pretty much
15 the same. I mean, it's a balance between the two,
16 and I think there should be more commercial, as I
17 was saying, because you talked -- I think you said
18 briefly at the beginning about the assumption for
19 need for residential as an economic driver. Then at
20 another point, you said we need to incentivize --

21 MR. ROBERTS: Commercial.

22 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: -- commercial.
23 but those two things seem to negate each other to
24 me.

25 MR. ROBERTS: Well, actually they don't

1 because the -- it's pretty obvious that most folks
2 want to go with residential. The pressure has been
3 how do we keep it under control.

4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Uh-huh. But this
5 to me does not keep it under control, okay?

6 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

7 Well, again, effectively when you look
8 at the overall amount of commercial, probably Table
9 3A, when you add it up, it's hundreds of thousands
10 of square feet of retail and nonresidential
11 development that doesn't exist today. But the other
12 part is you have to -- if you only relied on
13 commercial development and didn't allow any
14 residential development, the economic feasibility
15 that you're trying to start out with that caused
16 other plans to fail, you're basically in the same
17 position.

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I didn't say no
19 residential. I said a higher percentage of
20 commercial --

21 MR. ROBERTS: Right, and we --

22 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: -- and I think it
23 needs to be able to look at the relation to the rest
24 of the community. I mean, this is not an isolated
25 place, you know, by itself to have this, you know

1 equal balance between the two.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: You know, we
4 have -- this is only a mile square. There's a whole
5 community here that needs more commercial and needs
6 more good retail, not dry cleaners, not nail salons,
7 not, you know, the junk that's around this town.

8 MR. ROBERTS: I agree.

9 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: We need to have
10 better commercial and better retail, so that needs
11 to be emphasized because this is part of the
12 whole --

13 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

14 And I think just to address it, one
15 thing that is totally true, and one of the things we
16 started out with was recognizing that a lot of the
17 development that has already occurred in that
18 general area really hasn't done anything about
19 providing a diversity of services in the area. It's
20 effectively a desert --

21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Right.

22 MR. ROBERTS: -- and so but the other
23 thing we tried to do in terms of economic
24 feasibility is: We tried to max out how much
25 nonresidential we could incorporate, and we were

1 effectively told you can't -- the area can't absorb
2 any more than we are requiring as the minimum.
3 That's today.

4 That doesn't mean that that might not
5 change, so there is a certain amount of retail that
6 would be supported by the rest of the city in that
7 area that are leaving the city now to purchase
8 different goods and services, and a certain amount
9 of that, that's going to be supported by the new
10 residential that comes in with it, so that is the
11 balancing act.

12 Effectively what we tried to do is the
13 Subcommittee said, how much can we push the
14 residential down, how much can we build the
15 commercial up, and that is where the minimum and the
16 floor and the ceiling came in.

17 We can certainly absorb more
18 commercial, if the market changes, and it can be
19 supported, but we felt that the cap that we had on
20 the residential would make the projects work
21 financially with the commercial, and the pressure
22 was going to be to do more residential, and that is
23 when we saw when you added up all of the square
24 footage of residential and nonresidential that was
25 proposed initially by each of the individual

1 property owners and each individual project, you can
2 see in Table 3A how we reduced it by several
3 hundred-thousand square feet --

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: 3B was what --
5 the plan as 3A was what their proposal was --

6 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. So it's 3B.

7 So that is what the Subcommittee was
8 trying to accomplish. How much could we reduce the
9 residential.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So as a follow-up
11 on Commissioner Graham's point here, on my reading
12 on page 27, 8.1 permitted uses, basically on point
13 ten, it gives this very broad category of retail
14 businesses and services, and my concern to maybe
15 Commissioner Graham's question a little further is:
16 Is there a maximum or minimum size on these retail
17 spaces, because one of the problems that we had in
18 some of the other redevelopment zones is there were
19 these tiny little retail spaces that were created of
20 four and 500 square feet, and we end up with another
21 nail salon or a drop shop for a dry cleaner, and
22 nobody can put a restaurant or a cafe or anything
23 else in the neighborhood.

24 So how do we -- but conversely, nobody
25 needs another 500 square foot nail salon.

1 Conversely, I'm not sure that anybody wants to
2 entertain a 25,000 or 50,000 square foot, you know,
3 a big box store or something like that in the middle
4 of a residential mixed-use neighborhood as well.

5 So is there some specifics on that that
6 I didn't drill into?

7 MR. ROBERTS: We didn't break it down
8 into that level of detail in terms of, you know, you
9 can't have anything smaller than this or larger than
10 this.

11 But if you look at the figure on the
12 preceding page, Table 2, which basically breaks down
13 what the property owners originally proposed in each
14 of their projects, there was a lot of range in the
15 retail square footage, and even the plans that came
16 before the Zoning Board had spaces that ranged from
17 anywhere from a thousand to 2,000 square feet up to
18 close to 50,000 square feet in use, so --

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think some
20 language might be necessary with regards to this,
21 because one of the biggest problems that we've heard
22 from people in the community about the Northwest
23 Redevelopment Zone is the, you know, tiny little
24 retail spaces that have caused these people the need
25 to leave their neighborhood to go get any reasonable

1 goods and services, so I would request that
2 something needs to be added to that --

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Good point.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- along the same
5 line of Ann's issue with regard to taxes is point 13
6 under these permitted uses, which allows for
7 educational spaces.

8 My concern along those lines is that if
9 it's any type of an educational school or space that
10 goes in there, it's not going to be paying taxes as
11 well.

12 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So I am not sure
14 what the other Commissioners think about that, but
15 my personal view would be I am not sure that we
16 should be entertaining that in a redevelopment zone
17 because there certainly are enough public property
18 in the town that's already dedicated to educational
19 uses, but I will leave that for the team.

20 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Can I just
21 comment on one thing you said about -- I think we
22 did talk about when we did the master plan and we
23 did the reexamination plan, and I tried to find it,
24 but we did talk about the possibility of box stores
25 back there.

1 I mean, the ShopRite is certainly
2 large, and we know how much it is used. We don't
3 need another nail salon. We don't need another dry
4 cleaner, but we do need the kind of places where we
5 can go and buy certain kinds of goods, and it
6 doesn't have to be, you know, as large, so I think
7 that needs to be emphasized more.

8 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.

9 The only thing I could suggest, and
10 certainly there is no reason not to make that
11 recommendation, I think it is a reasonable one, but
12 one difference I think from what this plan requires
13 and what happened in the Northwest is there was an
14 actual restriction on the size of the retail, and
15 that is why they ended up in the corners of the
16 building, and you ended up with a void, effectively
17 a parking garage in between, so you had street voids
18 with a little bit of retail on the corners.

19 This plan requires retail along the
20 entire street frontage, so any frontage of the
21 building that fronts on -- and in some cases they
22 front on four streets, in the case of the Jefferson
23 Subarea, but at least the ones that back up to the
24 light rail, the primary frontage is Monroe, Madison,
25 et cetera, would have to have retail across the

1 entire frontage, so --

2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: One retail --

3 MR. ROBERTS: -- well, no, it's just
4 retail, but we don't define the sizes because that's
5 something that until it is designed by an architect,
6 I'm not sure.

7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And that will
8 create five different nail salons.

9 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. I think it's less
10 likely, but I mean it's certainly something that I
11 think as long as the square footages are flexible,
12 you know, I think it could be done, so that you
13 don't have -- we certainly don't want to have what
14 we had --

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

16 I am in the same category here on Page
17 28. There's also under mixed-use guidelines, there
18 is a call-out number five of child care and other
19 community facilities as contained within the
20 mixed-used building.

21 My confusion on the reading of this is
22 it tells me Lower Monroe Subarea, Upper Monroe,
23 Madison, Jefferson, and then it just lists this
24 point five for this child care call-out.

25 Is that supposed to be under one of

1 these subareas?

2 MR. ROBERTS: I think that -- I think
3 that effectively would be allowed any place. It's
4 not -- and even these -- this was one of the changes
5 that was actually clarified as a result of the
6 property owners meeting was that these were
7 encouraged or preferred locations for something work
8 related in terms of the upper, lower north and
9 south --

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the reason it is
11 not under a category is because you thought it was
12 universal, right?

13 MR. ROBERTS: Universal, right.

14 MS. GIORGIANNI: It probably should
15 just go under permitted uses.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

17 But I am going to add something to that
18 that I think is worth considering, which is that the
19 child care community, there's a huge demand for it
20 obviously in our town.

21 I think, though, that if we are trying
22 to make as much life on the street as possible, that
23 maybe child care facilities could be destined for
24 not on the grade level, and therefore, not take away
25 from the retail mercantile type of the street

1 traffic that we are trying to foster here.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner Peene?

4 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Part of the
5 problem with that is, though, some people don't want
6 child care on the first floor. For safety reasons,
7 I am just telling you that is an issue that might
8 happen. Whether people are going to live with it or
9 not, I'm just telling you that some people don't
10 want that.

11 As far as you talking about educational
12 facilities, my understanding is that there is a
13 facilities shortfall in this town. So when you say
14 no educational facilities, I think that might be an
15 issue as well, because there's a shortage of places
16 for classrooms and things like that.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And I think it
18 should be part of the conversation --

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- when we are
21 looking for a redevelopment plan to be an economic
22 driver as to how much are we going to potentially
23 take offline in terms of tax ratables, when that is
24 certainly a real consideration on wanting to move
25 forward with a plan like this.

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: The fewer
2 classes you have, the less desire for the town as
3 well, so it's got balance -- I understand, but I'm
4 saying there's a balance there.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Jessica, you had
6 something on that, or did you want to --

7 MS. GIORGIANNI: About the child care
8 really is -- I mean, having -- having it on the
9 first floor provides some benefits to easy and fast
10 dropoff, and then also being able to access if
11 there's any outdoor play area, something like that.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. It's
13 definitely a trade-off.

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Well, I think a
15 child care facility could have a little outdoor
16 playground area and also be on the second floor. I
17 mean, you don't have to have everything on the first
18 floor.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner Peene?

20 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Well, you know, I
21 live on 14th and Clinton, and Hoboken in this
22 Redevelopment Plan, it's kind of like a mosaic, and
23 we're putting together the last piece of this
24 mosaic.

25 I know my wife and I, we find ourselves

1 going to Jersey City a lot now, and it's really
2 Unfortunate because, as you mentioned, Gary, a lot
3 of the new restaurants that are popping up in Jersey
4 City, there is no space for these great destinations
5 of food and drink to really set up shop in our town
6 with celebrity chefs, and these aren't only
7 restaurants, they're destinations for foodies, and
8 Hoboken is a destination for foodies, too.

9 What Jersey City did in 2011 was very,
10 very interesting. Mary Healey at the time, and you
11 know, Councilman Fulic, you know, worked together on
12 this issue downtown. They repealed -- they had a
13 520 foot rule between establishments with liquor
14 licenses. They repealed it because it was a
15 redevelopment area.

16 You know, in redevelopment areas, we
17 want to stimulate growth. We want to bring people
18 to the community. Well, a great way we can really
19 tie up the whole Western Edge Redevelopment Plan
20 with my community is by creating a restaurant row
21 type atmosphere in that neighborhood. It's
22 something that -- you know, Jersey City is kicking
23 our butt when it comes to doing those things, and I
24 think it would be a nice connector for the whole
25 City of Hoboken to really enjoy what's going on down

1 there across the river and bring that home.

2 I think that would be a really, really
3 good idea, and I think it's something we should
4 really consider here.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the
6 recommendation may be something along the lines to
7 try to foster a restaurant pro-type of an atmosphere
8 with perhaps in the redevelopment zone the
9 elimination of the 500 foot rule on the liquor
10 licenses?

11 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Only in the
12 redevelopment zone. I mean, I am not saying, you
13 know, I'm not saying go down to the state and
14 petition for one of those licenses like that, you
15 know, just licenses that are available right now,
16 if, you know --

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

18 So, again, this is to foster an
19 economic activity?

20 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That is a great
22 call-out.

23 Thank you.

24 Commissioners, anything else?

25 Ann?

1 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Well, I will say
2 more about the public art, which I think is
3 extremely important and I --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

5 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: -- the Chairman
6 asked me to look into that last month, and I did.

7 I am going to disagree with him,
8 though. I think that the City Council should
9 require redevelopers to apportion a minimum of one
10 percent of a certain -- of the total cost of each
11 redevelopment project for the installation and
12 creation of public art.

13 Most cities that require this, it is
14 one percent. If we set a minimum of one percent,
15 then it can be negotiated a little bit more, or you
16 could put in maybe a little bit less, but it should
17 be -- a percentage should be named, not to say
18 should require something. I think you have to be
19 specific.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I would agree with
21 that. I think we need to push a little harder.

22 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes, we do.

23 Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Gary, can I just
25 make one other comment?

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Absolutely.

2 COMMISSIONER PEENE: I just wanted to
3 thank -- there are people in this room who are
4 responsible for some of that vibrancy brought up
5 town, and I would like to thank you guys for that as
6 well.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

8 I had a question here on Page 28 about
9 "Building and Yard Requirements," and this area kind
10 of speaks about -- I'm sorry -- this area speaks
11 about the FAR, the setbacks, the heights, et cetera.

12 But what my question is, Dave, or
13 Director Forbes, is what happens if there is an
14 existing building that is going to be repurposed or
15 adapted, so there doesn't seem to be a statement in
16 there of an exception to those standards, if there
17 is an adaptive reuse.

18 Is that correct, or do we need to maybe
19 add that language?

20 MR. ROBERTS: I think we can look into
21 it, but I think that most of the existing buildings
22 are one story for the most part. They might be
23 higher floor to ceiling heights, but they're
24 relatively in older industrial buildings.

25 If they were going to be repurposed,

1 more than likely they will be either incorporated
2 into an in-fill building of some sort, so they may
3 or may not be able to accept additional building
4 height on top of them. There may have to be -- but
5 there's the height averaging in the plan that allows
6 you to go higher as long as you don't exceed that
7 116 or 126 feet, as long as you --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I am trying to keep
9 this a little bit more simple.

10 What happens if somebody wants to use
11 their building that is currently there, because in
12 part of the plan we talk about trying to keep some
13 of these industrial buildings and these uses and
14 things of this nature.

15 So if somebody wants to do that with
16 their property, I get if they want to build
17 something above, around, we understand that.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: My concern is,
20 though, does that language then somehow eliminate
21 the person's option by being able to do it because
22 it doesn't say there is an exception for adaptive
23 reuse?

24 MR. ROBERTS: Right. I think where I
25 could see that coming up, and I think now I see

1 where it could be an issue, if you were taking one
2 of the existing buildings that might be in the area,
3 which you would be looking for a park in the back,
4 you know, the building footprint is wide enough.

5 So that if you were going to try to
6 adhere that plan, for example, and try to have a 150
7 foot distance from the light rail on some of the
8 blocks, there may be a building there, that unless
9 the building is being replaced, it's going to be a
10 problem, so how do you handle that, because you want
11 to be able to keep the park contiguous, so that --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right. But out
13 of one corner of our mouth, we keep saying we would
14 like people to use and keep their buildings.

15 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

16 So I think that would be a situation,
17 where I think obviously there is going to be a
18 Redevelopment Agreement that's negotiated, but there
19 may be some need for relief from the plan or we need
20 to build that into the plan, so that is certainly
21 something that we can look at.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes. I think we
23 need to try to get some --

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If I may --

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- go ahead,

1 Director.

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- because I know
3 that that is an issue as far -- but that is why I
4 know one of Jessica's questions towards the end of
5 the report was about the front side, rear setbacks,
6 and that is why we had none required. So there's
7 not an actual setback requirement from the property
8 line, although there is that framework plan for
9 looking for that park, so I think that the width of
10 that park area is what is going to have that
11 flexibility and the negotiation of a Redevelopment
12 Agreement, but we had that there, because we don't
13 know if they are going to end up using their
14 buildings or not, and we didn't want to say, here is
15 the setback if, and here's the setback if it's, you
16 know, if they're going to do infill. But further
17 it's zero setback, but they do have to negotiate
18 that into there.

19 You know, the framework is to have that
20 park as the amenity and the stormwater storage.
21 Obviously, we want to have as much of that as
22 possible, but if there going to be the adaptive
23 reuse of the buildings, that's one possibility.

24 One thing to note on that is they can't
25 just keep the building there and let it dilapidate

1 as well just so that there's nothing, you know, that
2 they could be required to be providing that as well.
3 It would be something that they have to maintain
4 that building and upgrade it to whatever use is
5 being proposed.

6 MR. ROBERTS: So maybe we should think
7 about just making that clearer, and we might be able
8 to suggest some language that makes that clear.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right.

10 I don't want someone to sit there, I
11 can see a property owner sit there and go, you know
12 what? If I got asked for an exception to the rule
13 and go down that path of a variance and that
14 litigation and everything else, the hell with it,
15 tear the building down.

16 We don't want them to do that. We keep
17 saying we don't want them to do that. Unless we
18 don't care, then I think we need to give them the
19 "unless you are going to keep the building."

20 MR. ROBERTS: I think we can probably
21 insert a footnote or something in that section that
22 talks about the setback from the light rail and the
23 framework plan being a goal, and that to the extent
24 that an existing building --

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But it's not a

1 must.

2 MR. ROBERTS: -- it's not a must.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Along the same
4 lines, there's another one --

5 MS. GIORGIANNI: Well, is the linear
6 park a must?

7 And so having the pedestrian bike path
8 connect as a, you know, circuit park, I mean it
9 seems to be a bit in conflict with what --

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think --

11 MR. ROBERTS: We don't know that until
12 we see that --

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- it's just the
14 depth of what that park would be.

15 So we were looking at, for example, in
16 the Madison subarea, that building that is existing
17 on that site may go to a certain point, and it
18 doesn't hit 150 feet from the light rail property
19 line.

20 It may not hit 150 feet, but it may be
21 that it's 50 or 60, or 70 feet, so it provides for
22 that continuity of that park. It just may not hit
23 the width, if they're going to maintain that
24 building.

25 So I think Dave is right. It would be

1 something like let's make more of a recommendation
2 to clarify that in the plan, so that we can work on
3 that language to make that clear.

4 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

5 I just put the Upper Monroe building,
6 and it pretty much absorbs a lot of what I would
7 call the fat part of the block.

8 So more than likely what would happen
9 is you would keep the -- preserve some of the
10 building and infill some of the rest of the
11 building, and then this space in the back would have
12 to flex depending on what the developer and the city
13 agrees is the best solution, so it may be a
14 combination of the two.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So along the same
16 lines on Page 29 on "Building Bulk" and street grid,
17 we've got the same situation that comes up.

18 If someone is legitimately adapting an
19 existing building, we don't want them to have to put
20 a street also through the middle of their building
21 to keep their street grid, and there doesn't seem
22 again to be any exception to the statement of the
23 completion of the grid.

24 On the other hand, maybe there are
25 creative ways to create some type of a tunnel or

1 pedestrian walkway that might go through an existing
2 building to then still come out on the light rail
3 side.

4 MR. ROBERTS: Actually this was changed
5 after the meetings with the property owners, so that
6 the figures it talks about here, that the -- now I
7 lost it -- that figure of the framework plan is
8 intended to illustrate the building form, which
9 generally depicts the floor plan, and effectively we
10 made those -- these breaks between the buildings are
11 intended to be for pedestrian circulation, as well
12 as connectivity to the Palisades, but we didn't make
13 them restrictive, so there is flexibility built into
14 the plan.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

16 On Page 42, 8.7 on one of the "Guiding
17 Principals," I think we should also add on this,
18 because it talks about the signage standards and
19 things like that, the city is also undertaking a
20 wayfinding and signage proposal as opposed to
21 leaving this sort of open ended for the neighborhood
22 or developers of specific property.

23 I think we want to make sure that this
24 incorporates the city's new standards.

25 MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure, Brandy,

1 are those finished yet?

2 COMMISSIONER FORBES: They are not
3 finalized, but we can make a reference to that I
4 think --

5 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. As long as I have
6 a reference --

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We can just say
8 that -- right, yeah.

9 MR. ROBERTS: -- just like if there
10 were street scape standards that were now codified,
11 we would want to use them, too.

12 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Can we add that
13 recommendation for a complete street standards, or
14 reference to the complete street standards?

15 We just received money from NJTPA to
16 finish complete street standards and design
17 standards and an update and codification of those
18 two grids that will occur in the next year, so --

19 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. That may not go up
20 under signage, but we might be able to incorporate
21 that somewhere else.

22 But, no, I mean seriously, if there is
23 something that's going to be maybe not on the books
24 now, but maybe on the books by the time the projects
25 come through, we want to at least anticipate it, if

1 we know what they are going to be, so I think that's
2 something -- we would just have to find the right
3 place to put it in.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Under signage,
5 though, one of the things that you call out in the
6 report, and Jessica seconds in a big way, is the
7 industrial relics and things like that. I think we
8 should make some effort with regards to that on the
9 signage, that maybe in this area we can also open up
10 the possibility for people to do a period industrial
11 type signage, like building paintings on the side or
12 old school neon signage, or something like that.

13 I don't have specifics on it. I just
14 think that maybe that should be incorporated into
15 keeping the industrial nature.

16 One of the things that's a signature
17 thing in Hoboken is the Neumann Leather smoke stack,
18 right?

19 MR. ROBERTS: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We don't have a
21 smoke stack in the area, but maybe there are other
22 types of things, like we have the ghost signs in
23 town that we make a big effort to protect, and maybe
24 we could have a new sign in this area that would be
25 very fitting in an industrial area.

1 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. I know in the
2 Neumann Leather venture that we're going to be
3 seeing soon, we actually pulled out those signs
4 because they are there.

5 In this case, we're not sure what those
6 signage areas might be, but you could always add
7 them. But the signage talks about historic signs
8 should be maintained and preserved as deemed
9 appropriate in the Redevelopment Agreement, and then
10 the guiding principals would be to preserve historic
11 signs, when appropriate, so that is as far as we
12 felt comfortable going, not knowing the specifics --
13 the specifics -- I can't talk -- the specifics of
14 the actual buildings that I am talking about. Yeah,
15 we definitely --

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

17 But unfortunately, one of the next
18 things that I am going to go into here, continuing
19 on the signage issue, because it is really important
20 is it references that the city's sign guidelines and
21 municipal code should be used as the default,
22 because we are not creating a new one here.

23 Part of the problem that I see is that
24 the city's signage requirements have, for example,
25 very definite maximums of like a hundred square foot

1 on the front of a building.

2 Well, that is great when it is a 25 or
3 a 50 foot building on Washington Street, and it
4 seems to make sense.

5 Here we have some buildings that could
6 be 400 feet long, so you could have a couple of
7 retail stores in it, and the guys could put in two
8 hundred square foot signs on a 400 foot long
9 building. It's going to be like a postage stamp on
10 the wall.

11 I'm not thinking that we should do
12 something that's extreme the other way, but I think
13 we need to have some consideration again that we
14 don't trigger a scenario, or maybe it's better that
15 we do trigger a scenario, where somebody wants to
16 put in some different type of signage, and they have
17 to come to us for a variance and an exception to the
18 rule. I think we could do better and acknowledge
19 the fact of the size of these buildings.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

21 So the concern would be if there was
22 any specifics in the plan, that you would default to
23 the underlying sign code, which might not be
24 appropriate --

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Which is completely

1 inappropriate for the size and the scale of these
2 buildings.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Good point.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I'll be quiet now.

5 Are there any Commissioners hopefully
6 that have something to say?

7 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, I mean, it
8 may not be completely inappropriate if there are 400
9 feet with a thousand square foot retail stores down
10 the line, but 25 stores, and so -- but to your
11 point, certainly if it's more than that, that's
12 fine.

13 When you were talking about preserving
14 the industrial historic character, I was a hundred
15 percent with you. But when you were talking about
16 creating now ghost signs, you know, I'm not sure if
17 that's really what you meant. I think there is a
18 difference between trying to make something look old
19 and saving something that is old, and the former, I
20 don't know that I am in favor of us, you know,
21 erecting brick walls and then distressing the paint
22 on that to make it look like it's an old brick wall.

23 But certainly the flexibility to either
24 move -- I'm not sure these buildings, I don't want
25 to offend anybody, but, you know, this is not

1 Neumann Leather. This is not the Monroe Center.
2 These buildings I don't have -- considering what
3 they are going to likely become, rather than being
4 one or two-story large structures, I don't know how
5 much the owners of these properties are going to be
6 willing to save, and I do agree that we should to
7 the extent give them as much incentive to do so.
8 But certainly taking, you know, there is no smoke
9 stack, but taking something and preserving it and
10 moving it somewhere else and making it public art,
11 or putting it on a new building, all of those things
12 would be I think very good to occur, so I guess take
13 that into consideration as you are rewriting the
14 signage section.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

16 We will open it up to the public to
17 take comment and then we will circle back.

18 Sure. This guy right here in the
19 front.

20 So everyone is going to come up. You
21 will just give us your name for the record, and then
22 you can make comments or ask us --

23 (Chairman and Mr. Gleason confer.)

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's see how it
25 goes. Come on up.

1 MR. WUILAMEY: Will Wuilamey.

2 Would you like me to spell the last
3 name?

4 THE REPORTER: Yes, please.

5 MR. WUILAMEY: W-u-i-l-a-m-e-y, 1239
6 Garden Street.

7 I would like to start by saying that it
8 is a good thing my wife is not here tonight, and you
9 are lucky my wife is not here tonight because if she
10 heard you disparaging nail salons the way you have
11 been doing tonight, she would have something to say
12 about it.

13 (Laughter)

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I frequent them.
15 You know, I'm not against nail salons. We just have
16 too many in this town.

17 MR. WUILAMEY: I am joking.

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

19 (Laughter)

20 MR. WUILAMEY: In any case, I have no
21 idea I would wait so long to speak tonight, and so I
22 truly respect what you do because I know you all put
23 in a full day, as I did, so I really tip my hat, and
24 I appreciate your services, so thank you. I want to
25 say that as well.

1 But I was happy to wait, and I felt
2 compelled to wait frankly because I am a parent, and
3 I am concerned about development in this town, and
4 how it is going to affect the quality of life for my
5 children, so I wanted to put in my two cents in
6 here, just so I can tell my sons that, you know,
7 daddy did try to do the right thing, you know.

8 But that being said, I am completely
9 out of my element here. This is not my thing. In
10 fact, I am happy to see Fred Baylor here tonight, my
11 neighbor from two doors down.

12 Fred, nice to see you. Thank you for
13 your services as well by the way, many years of fine
14 service.

15 In any case, as I said, I am not a
16 public speaker, so I wrote down some thoughts. With
17 my apologies and your indulgence, I would like to
18 read my little statement here, and then I'll be on
19 my merry way, so thank you.

20 My wife and I have two boys, four and
21 seven, and I know for a fact that I speak for lot of
22 parents in town because I have spoken with many of
23 them about this.

24 We are starving for more places in town
25 where we can take our kids for wholesome family fun

1 and entertainment.

2 Now, we certainly appreciate the parks,
3 and I personally thank the mayor and all concerned
4 who provided open space for us to enjoy. We
5 certainly welcome the proposal to convert some of
6 those vacant lots in the Western Edge into more park
7 space, but our parks for the most part can only be
8 enjoyed during the day, and there is only so much
9 fun a seven-year-old can soak out of a jungle gym.

10 About a year or so ago, there was a
11 proposal on the table to bring a bowling alley and a
12 rock climbing wall to the Western Edge and more
13 restaurants and retail stores and live music. This
14 would no doubt have brought that blighted area to
15 life and would have provided scores of Hoboken
16 families with a reliable source of family fun and
17 entertainment. Unfortunately, as we all know, that
18 proposal was shot down by the Zoning Board.

19 Tonight I am very encouraged and see
20 new hope now with this Western Edge Redevelopment
21 Plan, and thank you all once again for your efforts
22 in bringing this to this point, which appears to
23 call for a true mix of uses.

24 Once again, I thank the mayor and all
25 concerned who brought the process about.

1 However, I feel this process will once
2 again get bogged down by a very small but vocal
3 minority that historically has demonized development
4 in any shape or scope. It seems to me the raison
5 d'etre is to thwart any progress in town, solely
6 because their philosophy dictates that term
7 "development" is in and of itself a dirty word.

8 So I am here tonight again as a voice
9 of the majority I believe to strongly encourage you
10 to negotiate these challenges with respectful
11 strength and fortitude, so that we, the majority of
12 the community, might once and for all realize true
13 progress in this long neglected Western Edge of
14 town.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thanks, Will.

17 MR. WUILLAMEY: And I just wanted to
18 say, I think you spoke eloquently regarding the
19 restaurants and what you were doing there in Jersey
20 City, and I'm totally in line with your thoughts, so
21 thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

23 Mr. Soares?

24 MR. SOARES: Hi.

25 Do I have to put my name on the record?

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So we can know
2 where to find you, yes.

3 MR. SOARES: Tony Soares, Observer
4 Highway, Hoboken.

5 First of all, I am just clarifying.
6 Just so that you know, I am a real estate agent, and
7 we provided a lot of good and expert information
8 here tonight.

9 But the first thing is educational
10 centers and day care in many cases, the State
11 requires they must be on the ground floor. They
12 must have immediate access straight out for any
13 child who cannot walk, which includes people with
14 disabilities, which sometimes we forget about a lot.

15 So I just want to say for day care, you
16 can say, and I am all for saying, put them on the
17 side streets, put them on the -- you know, make sure
18 it is in an area with not the prominent corner.

19 That being said, I think what would
20 help with the retail is if you didn't -- making
21 retail start right into our feet is going to be a
22 problem. I mean, I think we did a great job with
23 the developers at 1414 Grand Street. If you look at
24 that, it has an industrial feel. You are four feet
25 up, roughly four feet, then you go in, and then

1 there is another four feet inside, and it's all ADA
2 compliant. But the street level, when you are
3 walking down the street there, it has flood
4 protection, and you look into retail windows.

5 So I think there should be no more meat
6 packing district kind of development. I think there
7 is a lot of really good elements to the plan, and I
8 think now it is time to let's not nibble around the
9 edges. Let's get it before the City Council. Let's
10 get developers to come back and start negotiating.

11 But one of the things I wanted to talk
12 about, too, is we talked about square footage
13 tonight. I think rather than say minimum and
14 maximum, I think you should kind of say must be
15 varied.

16 You know, if you say, well, you can do
17 600, 500 square foot as a minimum, does that mean --
18 you don't want everybody doing 500 square foot
19 storefronts.

20 So if you did, you have -- you must
21 vary like in other towns, where they say a street
22 front must be five stories, four stories, 12
23 stories. You know, so I think that you should give
24 the option and just say, you know, that they could
25 be varied or you could put three storefronts

1 together, which would give you, let's say, 1500 to
2 5000.

3 I also love the idea of Jersey City.
4 This gentleman over here is absolutely correct. I
5 do developments in Jersey City and Hoboken, and
6 Jersey City, some people look at Newport. We are
7 not talking about Newport. We are talking about the
8 Jersey City island neighborhood, the village
9 sections. Those sections of Jersey City are
10 thriving. They are even actually encouraging people
11 to do urban street art, so it continues the city
12 feeling, not to suburbanize and make it a vertical
13 suburb.

14 So I think that in this case, these
15 buildings, these industrial -- I agree with not
16 recreating fake industrial buildings. I think,
17 though, there should be incentives for people who if
18 you wanted to keep the Sawtooth Building, the
19 building beyond ShopRite, there should be bonuses
20 allowed for people to keep a historic building.

21 You know, and I don't think just
22 limiting it to, like you get an extra floor because
23 you give a little bit back to a greenway, I think,
24 you know, if we had a truly historically significant
25 building, you really shouldn't cut it up to provide

1 a walkway.

2 You know, and historically significant
3 is sort of the significance in the industrial past,
4 not architectural, so I think it is important to
5 think that way, but I don't think you should say you
6 can't, you know, modify it, but give people bonuses
7 for that, too.

8 Otherwise, I want to say, I think
9 retail is important.

10 In Red Bank, New Jersey, their main
11 street does not allow real estate offices. They do
12 not allow education on the ground floor. You could
13 do outside streets. You can do it like on our 14th
14 Street or our First Street, but you can't put any --
15 in a Redevelopment Zone, you can tell us where to
16 put everything, and it is working very well there.
17 Real estate does just as fine off of Washington
18 Street.

19 I mean, I never worked on one on
20 Washington Street, and I never think they should be,
21 and we have -- and I will tell you from the business
22 standpoint, I am constantly getting calls, people
23 who need office space in this town, but they also
24 want retail.

25 The first question they say is: Where

1 can I eat lunch, or where can I find an apartment.

2 So people are not -- I think it's key,
3 and you see this in northern California and you see
4 this on Google, you need residential when you build
5 a commercial development. You cannot just push for
6 commercial development. You have to have that mix
7 first for financing and most of all for the people
8 that we're going to bring who live here.

9 The president of Samsung is going to
10 open up in Hoboken or come to Hoboken, those
11 executives want an apartment in this area, or they
12 want to be able to tell their employees they need a
13 place to live.

14 We have a shortage of housing in
15 Hoboken. It is a fact people want to live here, and
16 that is sign of success, and I think we should
17 welcome that success, or we're going to end up like
18 General Motors and wondering what happened when
19 everybody went to the town next to us or to Asbury
20 or to, you know, Red Bank.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you,
23 Councilman.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Anybody else?

25 Mr. Curley?

1 We don't expect a presentation from you
2 tonight, sir.

3 MR. CURLEY: No, no presentation.

4 Thank you for the opportunity to
5 address the Board. There are only two points I
6 wanted to make, and that has to do with
7 recommendations that I would suggest you wish to
8 make to City Council.

9 One is that there is a firm called
10 Camoin Associates, which does financial analyses.
11 Their name is on the plan. If you look in the plan
12 on page 24, there is a discussion of financial
13 feasibility and internal rates of returns and things
14 of that nature and how they implement or how they
15 impact the FAR numbers given for each of the
16 properties.

17 We don't have any reports from Camoin
18 Associates, and numerous requests have been made.
19 This analysis is part of the fabric of the
20 Redevelopment Plan as being presented, and I would
21 suggest to you that without those reports and
22 without their analysis, it would be difficult for
23 the City Council and the public or the Planning
24 Board to evaluate the conclusions reached in the
25 plan, so I would recommend that you recommend to the

1 City Council that that analysis be supplied.

2 The second recommendation has to do
3 with the way the plan works giving a bonus density,
4 plus additional density based upon negotiation of a
5 Redevelopment Agreement.

6 The problem with that scenario is that
7 there are no standards. There are no milestones or
8 anything that control the scope of the negotiation
9 with the city once one of the property owners, and
10 there are only three, one is already building with a
11 D variance, but once the property owner sits down
12 with the city, there is nothing that restrains the
13 city from asking for things that are completely
14 unrelated to the redevelopment project, and I would
15 recommend that the language on page 52 of the plan
16 be stricken, and I will read it to you.

17 It says: "Nothing in this Plan shall
18 limit the ability of the City to negotiate a
19 Redevelopment Agreement with the designated
20 redeveloper that requires that the designated
21 redeveloper will provide benefits and amenities for
22 the City that do not directly relate to the needs
23 generated by its redevelopment project."

24 This is throwing out the law as it
25 respects impacts created by land development and how

1 off-tract improvements can be related to those
2 impacts and paid for by developers.

3 Now, the counter argument will be that
4 this is a Redevelopment Plan in a redevelopment
5 area, and that therefore any negotiation goes, and
6 after all, it is an agreement.

7 The doctrine that addresses this is
8 called the unconstitutional condition, and that is
9 where a property owner is required to give up
10 something in order to get something else that he
11 ought not to have given up due to the lack of a
12 connection or nexus, an impact from what is proposed
13 or proportionality in dealing with this.

14 The Redevelopment Plan, unlike many
15 others, gives no guidance as to the limits that the
16 City could request in terms of its negotiation of a
17 Redevelopment Agreement, so that it becomes and it
18 resembles zoning for sale, which is clearly illegal
19 in New Jersey and everywhere else in the United
20 States.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Mr.
23 Curley.

24 Unfortunately, it seems like perhaps
25 either yourself or your client comes from the glass

1 is half empty approach, and you speak about, it
2 sounds like that your client is being asked for
3 unreasonable things, where as there doesn't seem to
4 have been a conversation yet since there is no
5 approved plan.

6 I am just surprised by the negativity
7 that you seem to be approaching the situation is
8 that you don't allow for the process to move
9 forward, that a plan might be implemented. You and
10 your client might be able to sit down with the
11 administration and the City Council and come to
12 something that's very reasonable. I am just
13 surprised that you already think that you are being
14 bent over backwards and made to accept conditions
15 that are unreasonable.

16 MR. CURLEY: It is an opportunity, if
17 that can be eliminated by just removing certain
18 language from the plan, so that there is at least
19 some connection with what is being developed and
20 what's being requested. When you lack that
21 connection, then there is no limitation, and it
22 would be very difficult.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And the opportunity
24 could easily move forward if your client was to take
25 down its litigation and sit at the table with the

1 administration.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. CURLEY: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is there anyone
5 else in the public?

6 MR. VILLAMAR: My name is Mark
7 Villamar. That's V, as in Victor, i-l-l-a-m-a-r. I
8 am a Hoboken resident.

9 Basically what I wanted to do is ask a
10 few questions of the planner, Mr. Roberts, and the
11 first one I wanted to ask about relates to Director
12 Forbes' suggested changes to the language on page
13 28.

14 The final statement in that suggested
15 change says that the building height shall be
16 measured from the elevation of the finished grade.

17 I think that is inconsistent with the
18 ordinance that the city has regarding flood
19 mitigation. Would this supersede the previous
20 litigation -- previous ordinance?

21 MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Redevelopment
22 Plan would, unless it refers to a preexisting
23 ordinance. It does require consistency with the
24 flood intervention ordinance, but in this particular
25 case, the feeling was since there was a need for

1 more clarity in terms of where the distance would be
2 measured from, that it would be -- since the ground
3 level is already allowed at 16 feet or above, it's
4 not set in stone, that it would be easier and more
5 clear since the flood hazard -- since flood height
6 varies from block to block and place and place, to
7 be able to set the standard if it was measured from
8 grade, so that was something that was actually
9 coming out of other situations in town where height
10 was -- especially height as it relates to number of
11 stories was a concern.

12 So the idea was in order to bring this
13 plan into kind of a consistent pattern with the way
14 the height was being dealt with in other parts of the
15 city, the average grade would be a point of
16 measurement, and we just took the absolute height
17 instead of worrying about the number of stories, and
18 that would be a clear way of being able to establish
19 what that distance is from the grade to the top of
20 the building.

21 MR. VILLAMAR: So this is also in
22 conflict with the recent zoning changes with zones
23 R-1, 2 and 3.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Actually it is more
25 consistent because it does -- the one place it would

1 differ is in the R-1 and 2, it is measured from the
2 base flood elevation, actually the design flood
3 elevation.

4 But in this particular case, because
5 there would be some flexibility, you are not really
6 sure if the buildings are going to be differing
7 heights based on where you are measuring from. The
8 idea to establish that consistency was to measure
9 from grade.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Director Forbes is
11 going to jump in here a second.

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If I may, so
13 there are a couple of things here.

14 It would be consistent with the flood
15 damage prevention ordinance because the things that
16 are allowed on that first level are retail and
17 parking, and those are actually per the flood damage
18 prevention ordinance. Those are permitted below the
19 design flood elevation.

20 As far as the residential districts,
21 this we are talking about again the nonresidential
22 retail uses on that level, so -- and as well it is
23 being measured from that grade level, but we are
24 talking about the height. We're not saying -- that
25 is why we took out that there is a requirement for

1 how many floors, but rather what the height is and
2 then as well there's, you know, the bonus height,
3 but nothing would be exceeding the maximum height.

4 MR. VILLAMAR: This does not have,
5 though, in effect have the necessity of having your
6 retail in what is it five feet, five and a half
7 feet --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Four.

9 MR. VILLAMAR: -- above sea level?

10 MR. ROBERTS: I am not exactly sure
11 where it is block by block, but that's probably
12 pretty close.

13 MR. VILLAMAR: And what kind of retail
14 would be able to operate?

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: This is not
16 requiring that you have to build that retail in that
17 flood level. I think Mr. Soares made a good point
18 of you could have the access at that street level
19 and then elevate.

20 We are not saying that you could only
21 have that one floor within the 16 feet measured from
22 grade.

23 What we are saying is that you could
24 have that access at grade and allow for that where
25 you could have the interior elevated within that

1 retail space. The point being as our flood damage
2 prevention ordinance does allow for retail that
3 could be wet proofed. It could be meeting the
4 certain design guidelines of that ordinance versus
5 you would not be allowed to put residential in that
6 area.

7 MR. VILLAMAR: You got a ceiling now of
8 116, 126 feet, so if you are raising the bottom to
9 get most of your retail out of the flood zone, you
10 are going to lose probably a floor from what was
11 originally in the document. Isn't that correct?

12 MR. ROBERTS: I think it is hard to
13 guess based on the not doing an actual design, but
14 the plan does say that it is approximately 16 feet,
15 so there is flex in there.

16 As far as the cap, the 116 and 126,
17 that is pretty firm, but I think the concern we had
18 was that cap, if it was measured from the design
19 flood elevation, it could vary, so you are not going
20 to have any kind of a real flood cap. It's going to
21 flex --

22 MR. VILLAMAR: A little variation.

23 MR. ROBERTS: -- a little variation.

24 But I think that the main thing is that the
25 individual stories are no longer set, they are no

1 longer established, and the heights per story are
2 approximate, so it is really just giving you a
3 three-dimensional building envelope to work with --

4 MR. VILLAMAR: With that ceiling being
5 so rigid by having that measurement come off the
6 grade really hurts the capacity to fulfill your FAR,
7 which would be my next question.

8 In terms of your report and your work,
9 you show a lateral park that obviously can reduce
10 the land that is available for development alongside
11 the light rail.

12 Have you been able to calculate whether
13 all of that FAR can actually be built in the
14 remaining part of the land that isn't?

15 MR. ROBERTS: We have estimated --
16 again, we are not doing architectural designs to
17 that level of specificity, but basically using the
18 general philosophy they're 200 by 150, 200 by 100,
19 multiplying it times the approximate number of
20 stories based on ten stories, 16 feet, that you can
21 accomplish those FAR within the base FARs, and you
22 can accomplish -- you can add on to it with
23 development.

24 So I think we don't have -- it is not,
25 you know, architecturally designed, but we are

1 fairly comfortable that the FAR will be achieved
2 within the three-dimensional --

3 MR. VILLAMAR: When I did a little work
4 along those lines, I found that I was limited to
5 something that had no possibility of architectural
6 variety or innovation. It was going to be a box or
7 a cube or some kind of rectangle space that really
8 limits you -- if you want to achieve the FAR, you
9 can get a lower FAR, of course, by not building as
10 much, but then you impact your economic analysis so
11 adversely, that it doesn't make it feasible.

12 I fear it would become another plan for
13 this area that may look good on paper, may even get
14 through the City Council, but will not be buildable,
15 and that concern is an important one because we
16 already have an area that has not been given the
17 benefit of a Redevelopment Plan for almost nine
18 years.

19 If this plan doesn't get adopted or it
20 doesn't build out, what is left for the people who
21 owned the property, and Mr. Curley mentioned there
22 is only two of us really. The available I-1 uses
23 consist basically of office now.

24 There is no real industrial needs for
25 the City of Hoboken. I know because I have been

1 trying to find someone for two years, but there is a
2 demand for office, and what you have as of right in
3 this area, in this area without this plan is an
4 eight foot building, presumably out of the flood
5 plain, which would be about ten feet and about 65
6 percent lot coverage, with the possibility of an
7 auxiliary building of another ten percent of the
8 lot, which would be a pretty unappealing site in
9 this area. So I hope, as someone once said at our
10 zoning hearing, you don't make perfect the enemy of
11 good.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I have a question
13 for you, Mark.

14 So I would hope that you acknowledge
15 the fact that flood prevention and safety are
16 important, and that we shouldn't do away with our
17 flood prevention ordinance in order to make your
18 life easier to build a building. I would hope that
19 you would agree with me on that fact, that the flood
20 prevention ordinance is a good thing.

21 MR. VILLAMAR: I do agree without any
22 reservation.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Terrific. I
24 thought that you would -- I knew that you would.

25 So that being said, is there something

1 that you can offer as to how to resolve the issue of
2 keeping within the flood ordinance, so that we are
3 building safer buildings and not putting people in
4 retail spaces and everything else in harm's way,
5 which there is the option of wet proofing retail
6 spaces and acceptable usage below the designed flood
7 elevation?

8 Is there an alternative, is there
9 another objective, or another way to approach it?

10 It seems like you have done your
11 research and your homework on this as you always do.

12 MR. VILLAMAR: There are really two
13 ways of addressing the issue.

14 One is the developer that will just
15 bring the building up out of the flood plain, don't
16 use the lowest floor, use it just for parking,
17 forget the retail completely. That is very
18 detrimental to the street life of the city.

19 The second approach is the one that we
20 use in the building in the I-1 zone. It's known as
21 1414 Grand Street, where we were just about to pull
22 our permits when Sandy hit. We had to go back and
23 redesign the entire building to accommodate the
24 reality of what we now know is possible in Hoboken.

25 What we did, not just attempted, but

1 actually constructed was this small section of
2 retail that is just high enough to get us into the
3 building to meet all of our ADA requirements, and
4 without taking any water during Sandy, but is not
5 outside of the current flood levels, so it gives you
6 this kind of retail feel. You walk by and see what
7 this space is, but most of the retail meets the
8 current flood requirements.

9 So that gives you both the retail
10 reality plus the substantial amount of area that's
11 outside of the floor plain. That is the model you
12 would use going forward in the Western Edge as well.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Your problem is
14 that that ends up taking a certain -- more of a
15 percentage of your overall height constraint. So
16 it's the overall height constraint that ends up
17 being the sacrifice?

18 MR. VILLAMAR: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, how high is
20 that first floor at 1414 Grand?

21 MR. VILLAMAR: The height is over 25
22 feet. Retail today is not, you know, 12 feet or 15
23 feet. It is high.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Ahmed?

3 MR. AHMED: Hany Ahmad, Hoboken.

4 If I may, I'm going to start with a
5 quote from Jane Jacobs in "The Death and Life of
6 Great American Cities.

7 A city street equipped to handle
8 strangers and to make a safety asset in itself, how
9 in the presence of strangers as the streets of
10 successful city neighborhoods always do must have
11 the following qualities:

12 There must be eyes upon the street,
13 eyes belonging to those we might call the natural
14 proprietors of the street. The buildings on the
15 street equipped to handle strangers and to ensure
16 the safety of both residents and strangers must be
17 oriented to the street. They cannot turn their
18 backs on the blank sides on it and leave it blind.
19 The sidewalk must have users on it fairly
20 continuously both to add the number of effective
21 eyes on the street and to induce the people in
22 buildings along the street to watch the sidewalks in
23 sufficient numbers. Nobody enjoys sitting on a
24 stoop or looking out a window at an empty street.
25 Almost nobody does such a thing. Large numbers of

1 people entertain themselves off and on by watching
2 street activity.

3 Now, the reason why I mention that
4 quote is because I am going back to the plan, and in
5 the plan we go on to discuss what Mr. Holtzman said
6 earlier.

7 In the plan we specifically say under
8 8-5, page 39: "The existing industrial buildings
9 within the Western Edge offer opportunities, through
10 rehabilitation, adaptive reuse and sensitive
11 redevelopment to support a sense of place and
12 history, enrich civic pride and develop collective
13 memory."

14 But the paragraph before it on 8-4,
15 where it clearly states: "The intention of this
16 Redevelopment Plan is to retain existing industrial
17 buildings and structure where they can"
18 "Successfully integrated" -- I'm sorry -- "can be
19 successfully integrated into mixed-use" building
20 "without impeding the primary objective of creating
21 the linear park..."

22 The reason why I bring that up is
23 because it says "primary objective." That means
24 above and beyond. That doesn't mean that they
25 coincide. It is clearly stating that that is the

1 objective.

2 Now, many of you may not know the
3 buildings that we have up there. But in one of the
4 buildings that we have in Block 106, which is on
5 Madison Street at the corner of 12th, we were lucky
6 enough to purchase a building that goes back to the
7 1880s. It's known as the Universal Folding Box
8 Factory, and in that, you have a factory building
9 that was built in the 1880s that still remains
10 today, that has wonderful features inside that we
11 intend on keeping, but once again, it comes close to
12 that line.

13 Now, I appreciate Director Forbes
14 mentioning that it shouldn't be a hard line and that
15 we should look at it, and that there should be some
16 flexibility in there, so I wanted to bring that up
17 to say that that is our intention.

18 Now, I am going to point to another
19 important point that Mr. Villamar just said and also
20 Mr. Soares mentioned.

21 With respect to the flood plain, this
22 is the lowest elevation in the City of Hoboken. We
23 are at Elevation 4. To those of who you don't
24 understand what that means, that's four feet above
25 that sea level. That means a good rainstorm could

1 get you. Now, a few blocks away, it's at Elevation
2 6.5, two and a half feet higher.

3 To say that 16 feet of retail built at
4 grade leaves you with to get out of the new
5 constructed flood is almost 14 feet above sea level,
6 that means you have a chance of ten feet of water at
7 grade. There is no waterproof system that could
8 hold that kind of water. It cannot be done. You
9 can't have a glass storefront and have an aluminum
10 panel that's going to take ten feet of pressure of
11 water. It will blow out.

12 So we can't kill it going out of the
13 gate, and I understand what Director Forbes said
14 that we are just limiting the height, and you could
15 really build it out of there.

16 Well, that's not what it says. It says
17 that you're going to measure from grade at 16 feet,
18 and we're well aware of the flood plain. We dealt
19 with this for many years, and we know how to work
20 around here. We have come up with a great plan at
21 1414 Grand, where we said the easy thing that was
22 North Hudson Sewer asked us, raise the building ten
23 feet. They said that's your retail.

24 We said that is not retail. That is an
25 office space some place. That's not retail. Retail

1 needs to connect to the street, so we found a way to
2 do it.

3 Now, the other thing that we are not
4 mentioning is the federal law, the American
5 Disabilities Act. I need to get people in the
6 building and out of the building safely, and I can't
7 use any mechanical units or any mechanical machinery
8 to get them into the building. It is not allowed.
9 I can't do anything outside of the building.

10 Now, this Board may tell me I can, but
11 I can't. I can't pull a permit that will let me do
12 that, so I need to get you in the building and
13 slowly rise out of the flood plain.

14 Now, there is another restriction I
15 have. I can only rise one inch per foot. If you
16 looked at any ADA ramp in the country, there is a
17 certain slope to it, and I can't go beyond that
18 slope. I can't ramp up sharply. So if we're not
19 looking for a maze of ramps and slopes all over the
20 city, it will destroy the street character of the
21 city.

22 We are looking to engage and create
23 retail, like Jane Jacobs says, eyes on the street,
24 people moving around. We want this plan to succeed.
25 So while it doesn't sound like a lot, like, well,

1 you can just shorten the building, but here is the
2 problem. I have two gallons. You left me with a
3 gallon left. How do I get it in?

4 When you are cutting behind the
5 building, and many of you may not know this, the way
6 that buildings work, you need light and air. There
7 is no such thing as a building that's a hundred foot
8 deep. That's an office building. It's not a
9 residential building.

10 Residential buildings at their deepest
11 are 65 feet, so you get a five foot hall in the
12 middle. You have a 30 foot apartment on this side,
13 and a 30 foot apartment on this side. We can't make
14 it 90. It fails. It does not work, and we know
15 that.

16 So we went back, and we crunched
17 numbers, and we saw the massing that got left.
18 There are many architects in this room that could
19 tell you, how do I get that square peg in a round
20 hole?

21 It doesn't work. It does not work. It
22 doesn't lend itself to residential development.
23 That is why we are respectfully saying, be mindful
24 of this, because a change may sound subtle and
25 minor, but the ramifications could be disastrous.

1 It could make a project go from possible to
2 impossible right away. These things have to pencil
3 out.

4 Banks don't lend money because I'm a
5 nice guy or I mean well. They don't work that way.
6 I have to sit in front of a board of bankers and
7 explain it somehow, and they're going to look at me
8 and go, you got a 100 by 100 foot residential
9 building, how is that going to work?

10 I don't have an architect that will say
11 it will.

12 So what we are asking to do is in this
13 plan, we saw a framework, and we hope that in that
14 framework we could work with our City Council
15 colleagues and the administration and find a way
16 around this, because we are still scratching our
17 heads.

18 There is an affordable component.
19 There's a flood prevention component. Then there's
20 the MOA, which nobody mentioned tonight, that we
21 have to operate with also.

22 There's all of these things, and you
23 have the physical geography that you have to deal
24 with. At some point, something breaks and doesn't
25 make sense, so we are not sure where this came from,

1 this measurement. And the flood plan, I know it
2 well and I've read it. The entire city is being
3 measured from an invisible line that says water
4 could come up to X, and that is where you measure
5 from.

6 This one zone, all of a sudden, we're
7 going to measure from negative X?

8 Why would it apply to only one section
9 of the entire city?

10 They just passed an ordinance two weeks
11 ago or three weeks ago upstairs that clearly said we
12 are measuring out of the flood hazard, and now
13 somebody wants to pull a tape measure into it?

14 It is damaging, and we don't know where
15 it came from. We've been working with Mr. Roberts
16 for 14 months. That is the first I heard of it
17 tonight, so I'm not sure I know where it came up,
18 but it sounds like something harmless that someone
19 was trying to hold this invisible line.

20 The Palisades is over 156 feet where we
21 stand. We're arguing over Union City's view,
22 that's what we're doing today?

23 So part of the plan wasn't perfect, but
24 we were willing to sit and say, hey, you know we got
25 fair people on the other side that we can negotiate

1 with. They're going to roll up their sleeves, and
2 we are going to roll up our sleeves, and we're going
3 to make this work, but I can't ask a bowling alley
4 operator to put a ten-million dollar investment in a
5 harmless way. He's not going to do it, or she's not
6 going to do it. That's simply not going to work.

7 So if we are going to apply something
8 to the city as a whole, this can't be the step.
9 You just say, all right, we're not going to apply
10 that rule to the section. We are saying just apply
11 it like you do in every other ground.

12 So I don't know if that one little
13 change is necessary at this point. It does more
14 damage than good, so please take that into
15 consideration as you send it up to the City Council
16 for consideration.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Ahmed, is there
19 a way for you to redesign the retail space and keep
20 those eyes on the street and keep the retail on the
21 street and still adhere to the flood plain
22 prevention ordinance?

23 Is there a way for you to do that?

24 MR. AHMED: There is a way, and the way
25 we do it is, just like this platform is here. This

1 is the street I am standing on, and I'm four feet
2 above sea level. In order to convince my retail
3 tenant to come, they want most of their equipment,
4 whether it's a restaurant, whether it's -- whatever
5 they have, their goods, they want it to be out of
6 harm's way.

7 So I got to gradually lift that
8 property. But if I'm measuring from a tape measure,
9 and I'm in this pressure of the 16 feet, I don't
10 have 16 feet when I start doing pretty much like a
11 step-up coming in. I'm going to end up with six
12 feet. What retail is going to take a six foot
13 ceiling?

14 See, retail is a little different than
15 regular residential than you guys think. When you
16 have a long run, that duct work, like this duct work
17 here, it grows inside. It's not like a residential
18 apartment where you have an 11-inch duct. It
19 becomes two, three, four feet the deeper you go, so
20 it impedes in the ceiling height, and you'll have
21 this monster trunk line coming in. 16 feet is
22 reasonable, if that's where you are measuring from
23 inside the space.

24 So what we're asking you is we need to
25 get people into the building, and I need to rise

1 coming off the street little by little, so that it
2 looks like retail, and it functions like retail.

3 It may have three step-ups. It may
4 have different platforms. You may come in, and
5 there may be a waiting area, or there may be a cash
6 register there, a coffee bar.

7 If you go up higher, there's a sitting
8 area or something, and then you go higher, and there
9 may be a kitchen because the kitchen I have to
10 protect. It's the most expensive part of an asset.

11 I could change, you know, if you lose a
12 couple of clothing racks or something below, and we
13 know how to wet design stuff, where we do it all in
14 concrete, no sheet rock, but you can't pull the tape
15 measure and start measuring here because I am going
16 to end up with a six foot ceiling in the majority of
17 the space, and that's not going to work.

18 What is going to happen, you are going
19 to have developers say, I'm just not going to do
20 that. I am going to take the easy route. I'm going
21 to put a parking garage. We have done this already.
22 We've seen this in the Northwest. We've seen city
23 blocks of parking garages with little corner stores
24 and residential above. That is what we are aiming
25 at. That's what we're going to get.

1 So I'm requesting that you give the
2 developer the flexibility to produce the eyes on the
3 street, the retail, by measuring from the
4 appropriate height that you give to the entire city
5 of Hoboken. If we measure up the flood in the
6 entire city, why would we do it differently here?

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think if I
8 understand this correct, and I certainly may not, I
9 don't it's really where you start to measure from,
10 because if you are dealing with design flood
11 elevation, it doesn't matter if you measure up or
12 you measure down, because we are still going to
13 measure to the same number.

14 I think what the constraint, though, is
15 that you have to bake it into 126 feet. And if you
16 had room on the height, does it give you the ability
17 to comply with the flood prevention ordinance and
18 still keep the retail on the street?

19 MR. AHMED: Yes, absolutely it does.

20 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But Commissioner
21 Forbes has indicated that the 16 can be more, so as
22 the Chairman is pointing out, you are just talking
23 about taking a haircut off the top, not that it is
24 impossible to comply with the flood control
25 ordinance, correct?

1 MR. AHMED: You could comply with it,
2 but we are talking the 116 feet. But that is not
3 what we are talking about.

4 The average height is going to be 66,
5 which means you have 50 feet over retail. So now,
6 all of a sudden, if I start feeding into that number
7 in a measurement, do I have 66?

8 I don't have 66, do I? Because I am
9 going to have to lift that ten feet up. So if I add
10 the 16 to the ten, and I have 26 feet before I can
11 build a residential unit, so now you are telling me
12 I have 40 feet, and then you're also saying, we want
13 you to do affordable housing, and then you're also
14 saying we want you to make the contribution to X, Y
15 and Z, and then you also want this linear park.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And also one of the
17 key reasons for the need for the desire for a
18 redevelopment zone is for economic vitality.

19 So if we are limiting these guys to
20 creating another Northwest Redevelopment Zone of
21 five over one and parking, we accomplished
22 absolutely zero, and we shouldn't do a damn thing,
23 in my opinion.

24 On the other hand, the retail
25 consideration was one of the more significant

1 reasons for wanting to create a new redevelopment
2 zone because right next door to it, the Northwest
3 Redevelopment Zone has been acknowledged as being a
4 complete and unmitigated disaster by most people
5 that seem to live there, and there's a huge desire
6 for commercial and retail space.

7 So the last thing I think that we need
8 to do is to make it more difficult for these folks
9 to somehow build this retail into these plans.

10 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But this does not
11 in any way affect the ability to comply with the
12 flood prevention ordinance. You are not going to
13 have --

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think, if I
15 understand it, and, Andy, please jump in here, I
16 think if I understand this, he can comply with it,
17 but he just lost all kinds of square footage above
18 it.

19 MR. HIPOLIT: He lost all floor units,
20 so he's losing his economics. It is about
21 economics --

22 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But there is also
23 bonus density that's available.

24 MR. AHMED: To give you just an aerial
25 shot of this, if you look at a typical city block of

1 80,000 feet, let's use the Northwest Redevelopment
2 Zone, we have five over one.

3 If you are looking to cut a trail
4 behind a building, just like Leggo blocks, break an
5 "L" off and add it on the other side. You are going
6 to end up with a 12-story structure. You didn't
7 increase a single foot. You just took Leggos from
8 one side and put them on the other.

9 We no longer can do that, because now
10 you have a glass ceiling that I can't go through.
11 So what is the incentive to build on one side of the
12 street creating this trail that the city wants, if I
13 can't physically get the space back?

14 Forget the economics that a 12-story
15 building costs, you know, 35 percent more to build
16 than a six-story building. If you turn your back,
17 everybody would just build a six-story building with
18 parking. That's what we're forced to get, and I
19 thought the intent started with Dave Roberts over 14
20 months ago was: We are going to do something
21 different here.

22 But I feel like we're going right back
23 to the same circle, and we wonder how do we get
24 there, but we always end up there.

25 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: You just spoke of

1 66 feet. You did not speak of 116 or 126 being the
2 problem height. So if you're saying at 66 feet, I
3 can't make it work, if you come in and say, I need
4 76 feet because I just lost ten feet to get into the
5 building, the plan certainly allows you to come in
6 and negotiate a deal for 76 feet or 86 feet or 96
7 feet, up to 116 or 126, depending on the use, so
8 that is where I am -- you know, this gloom and doom,
9 it's all or nothing, it doesn't make sense to me.

10 MR. AHMED: I didn't say that.

11 If you didn't have this objective to
12 cut the back of the property, if that did not exist,
13 you are going to get five over one.

14 They don't need the 66. They'll build
15 it at 60, and they are not going to give you the
16 retail. They are going to say, "Oh, it doesn't
17 work."

18 That's the point I'm trying to make.
19 It's not that I'm saying I don't trust the people I
20 am negotiating with, but how are they to negotiate
21 if they're handcuffed coming in. If you come with
22 this glass ceiling, you can't negotiate that well.
23 What am I going to ask you for that you can give?

24 So that is why we're saying, wait a
25 minute. If you're measuring out of the flood, then

1 just measure out of the flood. And if you want me
2 to pull a building back or off the street, I can do
3 that. I can take part of a building and add it on
4 to another part. Well, we have to measure the
5 proper way. We can't measure from the grade.

6 So I could probably do it for you, if I
7 show you a demonstration of it, it is just math.
8 I'm not arguing intention. This is just math, and
9 at some point the math won't make sense.

10 MR. HIPOLIT: What height do you want?

11 MR. AHMED: It's not a height that I
12 want. I mean, we're fine with the 66. You guys are
13 okay with that --

14 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: You just don't
15 want -- it is the linear path. It's not the height.

16 MR. AHMED: It's the linear -- the
17 pressure that is caused by the linear path is
18 causing this. Everybody would build just a 66 foot
19 building. It's less expensive. It's more
20 economical, but to ask for the linear path, and
21 you're saying, wait a minute, you're putting
22 pressure on a building going up, and you can't leave
23 it -- a city block is 200 by 400 feet. That's the
24 normal depth, so you get the donut. The donut is
25 really nothing but 65 feet on this side, 65 feet on

1 the opposite side, and 70 feet of light and air in
2 the middle. It is not better if you end up with 90
3 feet, you can't use it. So you may end up with
4 something that you have a technical FAR, but it's
5 unusable.

6 MR. HIPOLIT: Why can't you have
7 apartments facing the linear park and have them face
8 both ways?

9 MR. AHMED: Well, you can, but you end
10 up with a deeper building that you can't use.

11 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: He is saying you
12 have a 50 foot deep park with no light other than --

13 MR. AHMED: No light and air. An
14 office building could be 200 by 200, a full acre,
15 because you don't need light and air. If you have a
16 cubical, the poor guy sits in the middle and never
17 sees the light of day. But residential buildings
18 don't work that way. Somebody gets that cubical
19 unfortunately, but with residential, you need light
20 and air to make bedrooms, to make the place
21 function.

22 We can prove it on paper. I'm not
23 concerned with that. I am just giving you guys a
24 heads-up that what I don't want to see is an easier
25 path to do for someone to do something that you guys

1 don't want to see. That's all I'm saying.

2 We can build it within that, but I am
3 just nervous that you're going to encourage bad
4 behavior rather than what you really want, so I just
5 wanted to point that out.

6 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But I am not
7 following you because your insistence that, you
8 know, just measure from -- so if it says, okay, you
9 can have instead of 66 feet, you could have 56 feet,
10 and put that on top of the base flood elevation or
11 design flood elevation, it is where you start
12 measuring from is wherever it is, and so --

13 MR. AHMED: It's not going to be 16
14 feet. Maybe I am not making myself clear --

15 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I understand.

16 MR. AHMED: -- the retail won't be 16
17 feet, if you're trying to get out of the flood.
18 You're going to end up with a 26 foot retail, and
19 any of you are welcome to come. We did that on 1414
20 Grand. If you step into the space and look up, you
21 see 26 feet. If you walk 15 feet into the space,
22 and walk up a bunch of steps to go six more feet up,
23 and you have a 19 foot space, which is normal
24 retail.

25 MR. HIPOLIT: That's not going to

1 change on donation area. You're still going to --
2 the flood elevation in the ordinance doesn't change,
3 no matter what --

4 MR. AHMED: I will say it differently.

5 The floor you stand on is my second
6 floor, which is 30 feet off the ground. My second
7 floor is 30 feet off the ground. So if you give me
8 66 feet, I have three and half stories.

9 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: You come in and
10 say, "give me another floor," and we say, "It sounds
11 good."

12 You know, when you come in and
13 negotiate --

14 MR. AHMED: Well, we're saying you have
15 that now. The change is actually making us come and
16 ask that, but you already had it before you made the
17 change. That's all I'm saying.

18 The change tonight makes me come to you
19 and say that or it's going to make someone else say,
20 I'm not going to you, I'm just going to --

21 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But you are saying
22 height isn't that important, but now you are saying
23 it is.

24 MR. AHMED: It is economically
25 important. I am saying that. It's important.

1 If you want retail, what we want to do,
2 we want our partners to help negotiate and help us
3 get it. We don't want to make it where it's easier
4 not to build retail. We want to see retail in
5 zoning.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. I am going
7 to offer up something.

8 Obviously, this is a significant issue.
9 I don't think we're going to -- we are not going to
10 resolve it this evening or at this Board.

11 I would like to offer up a
12 recommendation to the City Council that they
13 re-examine this change of the design flood elevation
14 versus grade and where it is measured from, as well
15 as that they take into consideration to re-examine
16 the impact on the developer being able to actualize
17 perhaps his FAR with the constraint of the height of
18 the building.

19 I am not sure if that says it exactly,
20 you know, but that the city Council obviously needs
21 to take a secondary look at it.

22 I think Mr. Ahmed and Mr. Villamar have
23 made very valid points that need additional
24 consideration that we again are not able to resolve
25 or conclude here this evening, so I think we just

1 need to kick it back to you guys on the Council, and
2 you need to hash this out because it's not -- there
3 is enough here that it needs resolution.

4 Thank you, Mr. Ahmed.

5 Anyone else?

6 MR. MANDELBAUM: I'll be very, very
7 quick because I know it's really longer --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Sure.

9 MR. MANDELBAUM: Jeff Mandelbaum,
10 M-a-n-d-e-l-b-a-u-m.

11 I'll only stick to one or two points
12 because it's so late.

13 But I support what he said. This
14 really needs to be looked at as to design and build
15 ability, because I don't think you can use the FAR
16 the way it is laid out and designed, and as you make
17 it tighter and narrower, as you have parks on all
18 sides, you're going to need not only the first
19 floor, but your second floor is going to be parking
20 to accommodate this.

21 And you talk about the height, and you
22 are going to have such little ability to build the
23 residential that you have with what is left, it is
24 not economically feasible, and the problem is we are
25 sitting here because what has been proposed before

1 is not economically feasible, and this is going in
2 the same way. And part of that what we've asked is
3 the IRR calculations and also understanding what
4 goes into, because then we can have meaningful
5 discussion about what is assumed as far as what's
6 being done and built.

7 You know, half of our land is being
8 given as a park, and who is paying for that?

9 Is that in the IRR calculation, because
10 otherwise, we have something that's not economically
11 feasible.

12 It's never going to get done. Nobody
13 will get the retail, which I support, and you do
14 have a little bit of a tug back and forth, because
15 the more park you have, the less area you have to do
16 some meaningful retail or two-story retail.

17 You know, we have great properties.
18 4.15 acres, three and a half acres, that you can do
19 something long and meaningful and really make
20 this -- you have ShopRite. You have the 9th rail
21 station. This is a great location for amenities,
22 but the way it is being built with the cut-throughs
23 and breaking it up into small buildings, you're not
24 going to get what you want.

25 So, you know, I ask that there is some

1 more transparency that this does get looked at and
2 talked about in a meaningful way. We can all sit
3 down, and we know what we are doing to talk about
4 doing box layouts, doing IRR, sitting down and
5 discussing it, and I also ask that this Board have
6 the counselor look into why there is a disparity in
7 the FARs between properties.

8 If the assumptions they have said is
9 land costs are similar, building costs are similar,
10 why are some properties being treated completely
11 differently than others and have substantially less
12 FAR, but yet are considered economically feasible,
13 and a lower FAR, where other properties need a
14 higher one?

15 You know, everybody wants to be
16 transparent, fair. This should be an open process.
17 The way it is being handled, it is not, and there
18 is, you know, we just want to understand the reasons
19 why some property is being treated differently,
20 because I know that Hoboken doesn't work that way
21 today.

22 We had issues in the past with --
23 people would take our properties by eminent domain,
24 and that has left a bad taste, and there is a
25 history here, and I think we need extra transparency

1 behind what is going on because what's ways
2 happening doesn't feel just, and I know that's not
3 Hoboken.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

5 It's five to eleven. Phyllis needs to
6 take a break for sure.

7 Do we want to continue afterward?

8 What do the Commissioners want to do?

9 Frank, do you have an opinion?

10 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I am fine
11 continuing.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Let's take
13 five minutes for Phyllis and all of us.

14 Thank you.

15 (Recess taken)

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. We are going
17 to get back on the record, guys.

18 I think we have one more person from
19 the public that wanted to speak. I saw one more
20 hand.

21 Dave Roberts.

22 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

24 (Laughter)

25 MS. EHRGOTT: Kristen Ehrgott,

1 K-r-i-s-t-e-n, E-h-r-g-o-t-t.

2 I own and operate a business office
3 space at 1422 Grand Street.

4 My employees have nowhere to go for
5 lunch. We always have to order out or leave the
6 office and go to the other side of town. There is
7 also no retail around there.

8 The problem is that the retail won't
9 come in without office space and residential to
10 support that.

11 And when it comes to the retail, they
12 also need -- and the commercial and the residential,
13 the public transportation needs to be there, and it
14 all needs to work together.

15 One thing I have not heard mentioned is
16 I don't know if there has been a consideration to
17 hire a commercial broker to represent tenants.

18 I know, for example, at 1450 Washington
19 Street, the Toll Brothers Building, there was no
20 broker hired in the planning of that building
21 obviously because they had a lot of trouble leasing
22 space on the retail level, because it doesn't meet
23 the requirements of a lot of the Class A tenants,
24 so they are kind of stuck in a hard place where they
25 can't leave that space because it wasn't planned

1 properly for the correct retail tenants to go into
2 that space.

3 So, you know, I think it would be a
4 great benefit to get a tenant-broker involved in the
5 planning in the master plan, so that there is
6 allowances for the correct mix of retail spaces and
7 the correct type of spaces to support these retail
8 tenants.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

10 MS. EHRGOTT: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Director --

12 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Gary, just to
13 comment on what Kristen said.

14 Organizations like the International
15 Council of Shopping Centers, which is the big retail
16 conglomerate lobby, it might make sense to even take
17 back to the Council to maybe do a Hoboken day with
18 the Western Edge at some place --

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: It's scheduled for
20 July 15th.

21 (Laughter)

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

23 Director Forbes, you have some changes
24 for us on some of this proposed language that we
25 introduced earlier.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

2 I know that the -- you know, I
3 appreciate the comments from the public for the
4 building story heights.

5 What we are looking at as a revision
6 would be to what I had read before would be instead
7 of having that measured from the finished grade,
8 crossing out that last sentence and saying "The
9 building height shall be measured from the design
10 flood elevation as established in the Hoboken Flood
11 Damage Prevention Ordinance."

12 With that, it would be the bonus FAR
13 that would have an allowable height of a maximum of
14 106 feet for mixed-use buildings with residential
15 and a maximum of 116 feet for nonresidential
16 mixed-use buildings.

17 It is not changing what the maximum
18 base height that would be allowed, but rather that
19 bonus height would be limited to 106 feet as
20 measured from the design elevation for residential
21 and 116 feet as measured from design flood elevation
22 for non residential.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So because we
24 didn't have this change also available for handing
25 out, so the people can get this right, Director

1 Forbes will get a copy of this over to Pat in the
2 Planning Board Office, so that you guys can get an
3 actual copy of the actual language for your own
4 review.

5 MS. STOFFEL: Can I speak?

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure. Come on up.

7 MS. STOFFEL: I will be fast.

8 My name is Sabrina Stoffel,
9 S-t-o-f-f-e-l.

10 I am the president of the Board of the
11 Mile Square Theater.

12 We have a space at 1408 Clinton Street,
13 and the Zoning Board gave a conditional approval to
14 a new Bijou property building at Grand and Adams,
15 also on 14th Street, so we will have two spaces.

16 So right in the same area as where
17 Kristen's space is, and I really feel like it is so
18 closely related to what is going on in the Western
19 Edge, that I just want to encourage all of the
20 street life that's possible because our theater will
21 grow and prosper when there is a lot of activity and
22 eyes and people around and people living there and
23 people coming in and out of stores and restaurants,
24 and we do really well when there is people around.

25 So I just wanted to - besides flood

1 mitigation - make that the functionally --
2 functionally point out that that is the thing that I
3 think that the people who live here functionally are
4 looking for.

5 They totally don't want to be flooded,
6 though. I don't want to take that out of being
7 important, so that is why I am looking for as the
8 president of the Board, but also just as person who
9 lives here.

10 I want to stay here, and I want to
11 spend my money here on the small businesses and to
12 those people who give back to the organizations,
13 that volunteer their time and then put culture and
14 art in here. So I just want to bring you back to
15 focus on art and entertainment as activities that
16 will foster community growth in the Western Edge.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you,
18 Kristen -- Sabrina.

19 It's a little late. Sorry about that,
20 Sabrina.

21 Steve has a number of conditions here.
22 Could you please read through them?

23 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Could I just make
24 one point, Chairman?

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Of course.

1 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I know this is not
2 lost on -- I suspect it was not lost on Mr. Ahmed
3 and Mr. Villamar, but what Brandy was pointing out
4 is that the base would go up ten feet. It's not
5 unchanged from what we were discussing earlier.

6 So if you were getting the design flood
7 elevation as the starting point, and you have 66
8 feet, and you have 82 feet respectively, then the
9 base is from grade ten to 11, 12, whatever the DFE
10 is higher. But the 106 and the 116 versus 116
11 versus 126 means the max stays where we are talking
12 about, just so it is clear.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

14 Steve, you are up.

15 MR. GLEASON: Okay. So the Board has
16 the following recommendations that it is going to
17 pass on to City Council.

18 Recommendation 1: City Council should
19 require redevelopers to apportion a minimum of one
20 percent of the cost of each redevelopment project
21 for the installation and creation of public art.

22 2: City Council should foster a
23 restaurant row within the Western Edge Redevelopment
24 Zone by exempting that from the 500 foot rule
25 articulated in City Code Section 68-7.

1 3: City Council should excise the
2 language in Section 8.1 Subsection entitled
3 "Building Stories/Height" on Page 28 of the plan,
4 and replace it with the language in Exhibit B
5 attached hereto.

6 Exhibit B will be what Commissioner
7 Forbes has spoke of earlier and revised.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Revised.

9 MR. GLEASON: Recommendation 4: City
10 Council should create minimum and maximum square
11 footage for retail spaces in order to foster
12 diversity in the kinds of retail servicing the area
13 and consider mapping what kinds of retail would work
14 best in certain areas.

15 Recommendation 5: City Council should
16 encourage child care facilities on upper levels
17 rather than having them predominantly on the ground
18 floor in order to encourage a more active street
19 life.

20 6: City Council should add language
21 permitting leniency and complying with the upper
22 floor step-back guidelines along the proposed green
23 space and the street grid guidelines, so as not to
24 discourage any adaptive reuses that might conflict
25 with these guidelines.

1 7: City Council should incorporate the
2 new complete street standards and design standards
3 in some section of the plan.

4 8: City Council should add provisions
5 encouraging signage that fits with and recalls
6 Hoboken's industrial heritage. City Council should
7 also consider permitting larger signage, given the
8 larger size and scale of the kinds of buildings that
9 will be developed on these lots.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Any --

11 MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman?

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Go ahead.

13 MR. ROBERTS: Just one more thing.

14 I think also there was a suggestion
15 that there is a wayfinding signage that is about
16 ready to be -- that we want to make reference to as
17 well.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So we want to make
19 sure that this plan incorporates the city's new
20 wayfinding and signage standards.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Right. It would be in
22 the same sections, the same signage section.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

24 Go ahead, Director.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

1 I had also to consider adding rooftop
2 gardens and urban agriculture as a permitted use.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I am going to put
5 this here just because it is a recommendation from
6 the Planning Board, would be to change Map 1 to
7 reflect the map --

8 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: -- that was in
10 the presentation to address Jessica's comment about
11 having a map that is reflective of the properties.

12 With parking, make a clarification that
13 retail is also the same -- the standards for retail
14 will also be the same for the nonresidential
15 non-industrial uses.

16 As well for parking on page 35, strike
17 that it is a reduction in residential parking
18 requirements, but rather just a reduction in parking
19 requirements may be negotiated.

20 I think that is it.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner
22 Graham?

23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Were you done?

24 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. I just

1 want to go back on that child care.

2 I don't think we should be so strict
3 that it has to be on the second floor. I know that
4 is a concern with parents dropping off children, and
5 I think there should be flexibility about how to
6 accommodate on the second floor --

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It doesn't say that
8 it is not permitted. It just says that it
9 encourages use on other floors.

10 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

11 MR. SOARES: It is not legal in the
12 State of New Jersey.

13 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: That's not really
14 what he said.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Obviously, if it's
16 not legal, we can't do it --

17 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Just say "to the
18 extent allowed by law" --

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- so you have to
20 change the language to the --

21 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That's fine. To
22 the extent allowed by law.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's get back to
24 that one, "to the extent allowed by law."

25 Again, that also deals with the other

1 call-out point, which was regarding the call-out of
2 potential mapping, where retail uses or any uses
3 could be, so that you could say, like Tony Soares
4 pointed out, maybe those can be on more side
5 streets, not predominantly avenue streets, so that
6 is kind of the point there.

7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Also the issue
8 about mapping out retail, but I also want this issue
9 of encouraging more commercial and maybe commercial
10 and retail and encouraging more commercial is I
11 think because of the taxes --

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: When you say
13 "commercial," you mean office?

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Office. I'm not
15 sure, how do you define "commercial"?

16 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: How can you
17 encourage it?

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Pardon me?

19 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: How can you
20 encourage it?

21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Well, I just
22 think we ought to be encouraging developers to plan
23 for more commercial and retail rather than
24 residential -- rather than residential.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioner

1 Magaletta?

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: One other point.

3 We should incorporate the
4 recommendations in the June -- I'm sorry -- July 2,
5 2015 memo, page 2N, authored by Ms. Giorgianni.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, we'll add the
7 report to the -- yes, add the report.

8 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Are we expressly
10 going to be recommending every one of them or are we
11 saying recommend that you consider them?

12 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I would say we're
13 adding the report --

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Adding the report
15 for the review.

16 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah, and for
17 consideration of the recommendations set forth
18 there --

19 MS. GIORGIANNI: Well, because you are
20 already picking out the recommendations that you are
21 interested in and these conditions, so I don't think
22 you need --

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think it is
24 more for, you know, to represent that the whole
25 point that we are here for, which is the consistency

1 with the master plan and master plan reexamination.

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Anything else,
4 Frank?

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That is it for
6 me.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

8 Anything else, Commissioners?

9 Okay. So we have a couple of
10 additional conditions that Steve is typing up. I
11 think that we do have the gist of them, though.

12 Is everyone comfortable proceeding at
13 this point?

14 Is there a motion on the floor to
15 accept the --

16 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: What is Steve
17 writing?

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: He's writing the
19 ones that -- I'm sorry -- just the ones that Brandy
20 had read off.

21 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Are you comfortable
23 proceeding, or would you like to wait?

24 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I am. We can
25 go. If he is doing what she said, that is fine.

1 (Laughter)

2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: What all of us
3 said I hope, not just --

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: It's urban
6 agriculture.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: This included
8 Dave's call-out of the signage being consistent with
9 the city's new wayfinding and signage plan, the
10 agriculture as a permitted use.

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The map change.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The changing map
13 one.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The parking, the
15 two comments on parking.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Eliminating the
17 parking being designated as retail parking or
18 residential parking.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Having the retail
20 be designating all nonresidential, so it is
21 incorporating all nonresidential.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

23 Is there a motion on the floor to
24 accept these recommendations?

25 COMMISSIONER PEENE: So moved.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is there a second?

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Frank.

4 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: You are welcome.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Please call it.

6 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

7 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

8 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

9 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

10 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

12 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

13 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

14 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

15 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Ann.

17 (Laughter)

18 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

19 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

20 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Holtzman?

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

22 Okay. That concludes our meeting this

23 evening.

24 Is there a motion to close this

25 meeting?

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: A second?

3 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

5 All in favor?

6 (All Board members answered in the
7 affirmative.)

8 (The meeting concluded at 11:25 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, a Certified Court Reporter, Certified Realtime Court Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel to any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

 PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300
 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
 My commission expires 11/5/2015.
 Dated: 7/15/15
 This transcript was prepared in accordance with
 NJAC 13:43-5.9.