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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. All right.

Good evening, everybody. We are going to get started.

It is 7:02 p.m. on Wednesday, March 9th. This is the City of Hoboken Subdivision and Site Plan Review Committee.

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

Daisy, please call the roll.

MS. AMATO: Holtzman?

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Here.

MS. AMATO: Magaletta?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Here.

MS. AMATO: McKenzie?

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Not here.

MS. AMATO: Peene?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: Here.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

(Continue on next page)
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JENSEN VASIL	9
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The first item on our agenda is 306 Park Ave.

MR. MATULE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and Board members.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Good evening, Mr. Matule.

MR. MATULE: Robert Matule, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

This is 306-308 Park Avenue. This matter was before the Board in December, and we received approvals to renovate an existing six residential unit building with a restaurant on the ground floor into four residential units.

The plan was to rehab and reuse the existing brick facade on the building.

As Mr. Vasil indicated in his letter, they ran into some problems once they took the brickface covering that was on top of there off, but I think it would be better if we get him under oath, and he can give you the specifics.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. LEIMBACH: Please raise your right hand.

Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you
God?

MR. VASIL: I do.

JENSEN VASIL, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. LEIMBACH: Please state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Jensen Vasil.

MR. LEIMBACH: Please spell your last name.

THE WITNESS: V, as in Victor, a-s-i-l.

MR. LEIMBACH: Thank you.

MR. MATULE: Mr. Vasil, you were the architect for this project when it was presented to the Board?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. MATULE: And can you just give the members a little background as to exactly what is occurring here and what the proposed solution is?

THE WITNESS: Sure.

So there was a brickface that was applied over the original brick, and in past projects we have had some success when removing it to get the brick to be restored. However, in this particular instance, the face of the brick was pretty deteriorated. In fact, it was beyond repair.
So when the brickface came off, the face of the brick came off with it.

The bricks themselves, structurally they are fine, but the base of the brick is improper, so we were not able to restore it.

There is another picture from the side --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And just so we can make sure the record is clear, Mr. Vasil is showing us some images from his letter that we received, it looks like February 12th. There is a letter that we received from Jensen Vasil, and this is to the Hoboken Planning Board, just so we can reference what he's referring to.

MR. HIPOLIT: That is also attached and referenced in my letter, in my February 17th, 2016 letter.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Great.

Thank you.

MR. MATULE: So what is the proposal?

THE WITNESS: So we were able to take this to a masonry yard and actually get a brick that is virtually identical to the same brick. So what we would like to do is to remove the brick that cannot be salvaged and to replace it with a brick
that is identical in color, size, texture, and otherwise virtually indistinguishable from the original.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Hipolit, you had a response letter to the architect's letter?

MR. HIPOLIT: I did.

So we did a letter, again, dated February 17th, 2016. It was really for resolution compliance. There was a few items we answered, but nothing that was a big flag, and then their report came in.

So the report kind of covered this issue, and we were a little bit unsure of how you would rectify the issue because leaving that brickface was part of your approval.

I think really the issue is how the Board views replacing that brickface with a brand new brickface. When they take off the brick that was there, plus the brick facing, and then build a new brick facade in front of it.

How is the structure behind it?

THE WITNESS: The structure behind it is fine. It's just the face brick that's a problem. So this is two sides of the brick. It is three and five at the lowest floor, and then two up above.
MR. HIPOLIT: Two back to back?

THE WITNESS: Two that interlocked, pretty typical of that row house style.

MR. HIPOLIT: Do you have to take both bricks out?

THE WITNESS: We can keep the working core as the face, but what we prefer to do, if possible, is to replace it with block and a face brick, which is a better method, more modern method to do it.

MR. HIPOLIT: I think the issue, it is really a Board issue, but I think the issue is, my remembrance of the original testimony was you were keeping this face as part of the building, and then because of all of the variances and other issues you had on this site were going to remain because you were kind of keeping this building intact, and just kind of doing a rehabilitation of it.

The question really is for you guys, if you are now taking this front wall in its entirety out, it may be a planning issue, are you actually rehabbing the building any more or are you actually building a new building.

MR. MATULE: Well, I mean --

MR. HIPOLIT: I mean, how does that
vary with their variances?

    MR. MATULE: -- I have to let the
architect respond to that because there are still
other parts of the building, a lot of other parts of
the building that I understand are still being used,
the sidewalks.

    And I know the floor-to-floor heights,
are they being changed?

    THE WITNESS: Changed.

    MR. MATULE: They are being changed.

    But I mean, the other alternative we
looked at would be taking all of the brickface off
and then stuccoing over this and putting like a faux
brownstone or something on there.

    CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes, but that is
not what was approved, Mr. Matule.

    MR. MATULE: But we don't want to do
that either. We don't think that that is a -- I
mean, that would save the existing brick, but I
mean --

    CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. The problem
is really quite simple I think. You are unable at
this point to comply with the conditions of your
approval.

    MR. MATULE: Correct, several of them.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So while you might volunteer to do these other things, they would also not be within the scope of what was approved, additional brickface or some other suggestions that you were making.

MR. MATULE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I say that your architecture suggestions should stay tempered for sure.

But if you can't comply with the conditions of this approval, I will throw this to my Commissioners as well, I think what we have is you are dead in the water, and you need to go back to square one, design a new building, and make a new application because you cannot proceed because you are telling us it is impossible to comply.

MR. MATULE: Well, I understand, but respectfully, I think we have a solution that can get us to effectively to what was presented to the Board without going back to square one.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioners?

MR. MATULE: I mean, we are not going to tear the whole building down, and we're not going to create a vacant lot there.

MR. HIPOLIT: But you're taking --
you're taking -- in the approval you are taking the floors out because you are changing your floor heights, right?

MR. MATULE: The floor heights, we're changing.

MR. HIPOLIT: So your floors are coming out.

MR. MATULE: Right.

MR. HIPOLIT: The roof is coming out. Now the front wall is coming out also.

MR. MATULE: Well, a portion of it.

The lower portion is going to remain.

THE WITNESS: Correct. Yes, the lowest level is --

MR. MATULE: The lowest level is going to remain unchanged. This is just on the upper floors.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah. But if the idea is to save that brickface, you cannot save that brickface, so part of that, which I think is a significant portion of the rehab, is gone. So I think you may have -- I think I would agree with Commissioner Holtzman that it is a new application I think.

I understand what you are going to do.
I really do, and I understand you're trying to be creative, but it's a different app -- it's a different creature now which you are creating I think.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the exact same brick.

MR. MATULE: Well, I would agree that --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It's not the same brick. It's a different brick.

MR. MATULE: -- perhaps we could come back to the Board, to the full Board, you know, for an amended approval --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene, did you want to offer any --

MR. MATULE: -- of what was previously approved. But I just think to go back to square one as if we had an empty lot there at this point seems excessive.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So what is it that you would like to do?

You would like to come to the Board to pitch your case?

MR. MATULE: I think based on the comments I am getting, we will come to the Board.
We will explain what happened, and we will ask for amended approvals to replace the face of the building with the new brick.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: I am with Frank, Commissioner Magaletta and Commissioner Holtzman here. It just seems like it is an entirely new building without -- outside the scope of the resolution.

I just have a question for Mr. Vasil.

How did this not come up throughout your due diligence on this building prior?

THE WITNESS: We successfully restored brickface off of, you know, a brick so, you know, we didn't take it off until we started -- we actually had approvals for construction. We didn't really know the conditions of it --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So you didn't do any due diligence on this building, but you were relying on, well, historically, we have done it, and it's been okay.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I mean, I would say there is a pretty good track record of buildings in Hoboken, even historic buildings, where we've taken brickface off, and it's been fine --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So let's, just to be clear, you did no research prior to deciding to keep all of the building walls in this specific case?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

My problem with this whole thing is, I think that some place between either your incompetence or the developer trying to pull one over on the Board, some place in the middle of that is the truth.

So I am not sure what we will do here, but perhaps we will contact you through our attorney and decide whether we would like you to come to the Board to plead your case. But as it stands now, you are unable to proceed since you are unable to comply with the conditions of your resolution.

MR. MATULE: I understand your position.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

MR. MATULE: Thank you.

(The matter concluded.)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Next up is 1000 Jefferson.

Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Yes. Good evening.

Unfortunately I got a call from my architect. He is running late. I would ask if you could put somebody ahead of us. I mean, we were here before, which is the main thing. But I do have people from the management company --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's do it one time.

Please sit down.

MR. HALL: So, thank you.
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: 713 Monroe, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good evening.

Jim Burke representing the applicant.

We were here last month --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yup.

MR. BURKE: -- and there was a review letter prepared by Mr. Hipolit.

(Background noise from the audience)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's let everybody settle down for a second.

I go first.

VICE CHAIRMAN MAGALETTA: I'm --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Magaletta?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- I am recused on it, so I am going to sit this out, this part of it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Great.

So Frank is stepping off for this item.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

(Vice Chair Magaletta recused)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So this is 713 Monroe, and you were here last month. And

unfortunately, you brought us your information and
did what our Board Secretary has to refer to as the Jim Burke Drop and Run on March 1st. That is when we received this information from you guys.

So our professionals have not had substantial -- enough time to review this, so this is now deemed incomplete, and we will see you next month.

MR. BURKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

MR. BURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The matter concluded)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: 86 Jeff.

MR. MINERVINI: Mr. Matule is still outside, but I think he is on his way in.

MR. MATULE: Excuse me. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Welcome back, Mr. Matule.

MR. MATULE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Robert Matule, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

This is an application for property at 86-90 Jefferson Street to construct four residential floors over one floor of parking, eight residential units with ten parking spaces.

The applicant is only requesting one C variance for 18 inches for height to achieve clearance in the garage.

We have received the Flood Plain Manager's review letter, and I have provided Mr. Hipolit with a copy of the -- I just provided it today, for the record -- a copy of the Phase I report. There were no conditions that were called out as a result of the report.

MR. HIPOLIT: Are you going -- are you going to be able to comply with the Flood Plain Manager's letter?
MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

MR. HIPOLIT: And then I know you only received my letter today, we did not review the LSRP, the Phase I report.

Did you look at my letter?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

MR. HIPOLIT: Do you have any issues with the letter because there wasn't --

MR. MINERVINI: No. All of those issues could be amended -- addressed --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Minervini, that is a rather extensive review letter that our engineer presented to you with I think a record breaking 50 callouts.

Are you trying to set a personal record here?

MR. MINERVINI: I could go through each one now, if you prefer.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I certainly do not --

MR. MINERVINI: No, neither do I.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- but I am troubled by the fact that there are so many callouts on this letter.

MR. MINERVINI: Well, there don't have
to be as many. There are -- some of those things
that are minor, and they don't have to be called
out, but that is what the engineer decided.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Hipolit?

MR. HIPOLIT: Generally on this
application, they actually were in pretty good
shape. We did call out of it. A lot of it more is
for the full-blown hearing and some of the stuff to
kind of tie it together, if you guys were actually
going to act to improve on it at the hearing.

In this letter, there is nothing that's
fatal, so nothing really for completeness. There
are a lot of issues. There is some stuff you got to
get together, but there's nothing crazy in this
letter --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Is there
anything significant or substantial?

MR. HIPOLIT: It's normal, regular
almost stuff, more for --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. So in
your opinion, it could be done within a reasonable
time?

MR. HIPOLIT: They could do all of this
within the time period. I don't know what day, but
that's my --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Roberts?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think we had six planning comments. Some of them had to do with things to reconcile the tabulation table or things maybe something on the zoning table. Probably I would think the most significant thing is probably something that they could easily correct, which is the floor plans, at least to us, it looked like there was a difference between the patterns of the bays on the elevations versus the floor plans.

The floor plans, it looked like to us like the third, fourth and fifth floor plans were shown as identical, but there were bays shown on the elevations that looked like they weren't shown on the floor plans.

So assuming that that does not require any relief, it is a matter of changing or fixing those plans, and I would think that is something that could be done in time for the hearing.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So these are things that seemed to have just dropped through the cracks, Mr. Minervini?

MR. MINERVINI: That is not fair. Actually the floor plans show two bays. Now, what is kind of odd about this or not typical
is that each floor has two bays, but they shifted it. So instead of shifting and you have them showing each floor plan making it look confusing, we showed it just in one location. So each floor, it is accurate, has two bays, but they shift a bit on successive floors.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. MINERVINI: I can try and make that more clear.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. That sounds like it's easy to fix, right?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

Commissioners?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Quick question -- two questions.

Will you have a stormwater calculation for us?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

And number two: I have one question because I am confused with respect to the building depth. Is it 70 feet or 60 feet, because I read two different places, one was 70 and one was 60.

Can you answer that, please?
MR. MINERVINI: The building is absolutely 60 feet, yes.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

MR. MINERVINI: Absolutely, and now we will have to correct these tabulation charts, I think that is one thing that Dave was referring to in his report --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you. All right, because that was the thing I --

MR. MINERVINI: -- it is absolutely 60 feet.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- all right.

Thank you.

And you will just correct them on the plan?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene, anything?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: No. No problem with them moving on.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

I did see just one small thing that if you tell me it is okay, I am okay with it. But when
I was looking at the grade level plan, it looked like the trash and recycling rooms were really kind of on the small side, and it looks like there is probably the ability to do something else with them, but with the amount of -- I don't know about everybody else -- but recycling is more than the trash in my apartment building now at this point, which is a good thing, but I think we need to just make sure we are accommodating for it.

MR. MINERVINI: Fair point.

And as I looked at the floor plan, I got space beneath the stairs that that closet could easily extend to, and I will correct that.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. If you say so, I mean, I'll take your lead on it, but it just looked small to me.

MR. MINERVINI: I understand the point.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioners, do you feel this application is sufficiently complete to move forward?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I do. I make a motion.

COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes, second.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So I am not sure how we are doing with the scheduling.
Daisy, did Pat give you any kind of input here in terms of our calendar?

MS. AMATO: No.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It wouldn't be until April anyway. Sometime late in April, right?

MR. HIPOLIT: It's going to be April.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So I think what we need to do is: This application is deemed complete, but I don't want to guess as to what kind of a date we can give you, because Pat is the master of this absurd calendar.

MR. MATULE: I was going to suggest we will wait for her return.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

MR. MATULE: As I understand it, there is a meeting later this month, and I believe the first week of April is the Regular Meeting, and I think they may already be spoken for, so --

MR. HIPOLIT: I think they're both full.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That is right.

That is why I suggested maybe late April, early May.

If we have a Special Meeting in April, possibly --

MR. MATULE: Right.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- but we have
to see where we are.

MR. MATULE: We will work that out. I will work that out with Ms. Carcone when she returns.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Thank you.

(The matter concluded.)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Next, what have we got here, 527 Monroe?

MR. MATULE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Good evening again.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Good evening.

MR. MATULE: 527-531 Monroe, again, this is an application.

The site is approximately 6,750 square feet, and the applicant is looking to construct an eight residential unit building with ten parking spaces. I believe under the density ordinance, ten residential units are permitted. The applicant is requesting a 3.4 percent lot coverage variance for balconies.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let me just pause there for a second, Mr. Matule.

Dave, in looking at the plan and in reading your review letter, I think the callout was a 64 percent lot coverage.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And I just want to make sure we are doing the math right, because I saw in one place a callout of 3.4 percent for balconies, but that left .6 percent for --

MR. ROBERTS: Right. I think that's --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- it just didn't add up, so that's what I'm trying to question.

MR. ROBERTS: -- 64 percent, but normally take that right off the zoning schedule.

MR. MATULE: That is what is on the zoning table, but I think where that is coming from, and Frank could talk to it more, but I know the first time I looked at this plan, I was confused because along the -- I believe it is the south property line -- we have a full width building, the full lot width, but then the four residential floors are slid over five feet because the building to the south of us has all lot line windows, and the applicant wants to allow the neighbor to keep them there. So consequently the residential portion of the building got a little narrower, but also --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The residential portion, you mean like from the second floor up, is that what you mean?

MR. MATULE: The four residential floors as opposed to the ground floor where the parking garage is.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. But lot coverage is based upon the grade level.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right, grade level.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It is, period.

MR. MATULE: Yes, and I think that is where the 64 percent is coming from, but you can speak to that --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, but my question was, there was a different -- the math isn't adding up to the what the callouts are.

At one point it says -- it is a matter of .6 percent, but it says 64 percent, and then there is 3.4 percent counted for balconies.

MR. MATULE: What that is all about is the ground floor is 64 percent, but then when you take the second through fifth floors that are 60 feet deep, but only 55 -- 45 feet wide approximately -- you know, I am not using hard numbers -- because that building is slid over five feet, the amount of lot coverage on the floors change.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's hear from him. Let's hear from him.

MR. MINERVINI: This design is purely in response -- a response to an existing condition, and our last sheet has photographs, so the building adjacent to us to the north, if you look at this particular photograph, its entire wall is filled
with windows.

So what we have done, as opposed to the standard what we normally do in Hoboken is have two side walls at the property line, we have our ground floor covering the additional lot coverage, which is 65, point 6 of a difference, because there is no windows on the ground floor.

So at ground floor our building is bigger than it needs to be with the exception that we didn't want to leave an open void.

Floors, two, three, four, and five we set in off of the property line that has the windows --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I got it. I got it.

MR. MINERVINI: -- yes -- we didn't have to do that. This is I think in response --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, no. I understand. That is a good response to the neighbors. That is appreciated.

MR. MINERVINI: -- but that point six is the difference between what the first floor lot coverage is at 65 and then --

MR. MATULE: 64.

MR. MINERVINI: -- I'm sorry -- 64.6,
and then you get to two, three, four, and five --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MINERVINI: -- if the building is 60, the additional --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I want to believe you, but I would like to have our planner double check the math on this, just to make sure that we are adding it up correctly, and if we are signing off on a variance or not, that we get the number right for gosh sakes.

MR. ROBERTS: The ground floor -- I think the footprint of the ground floor is definitely a bit larger than the upper floor, so -- and we'll double check that.

MR. HIPOLIT: Did you -- did you guys turn in your certification of taxes, your disclosure statement?

MR. MATULE: I actually pulled them off the internet today, off the city's website.

MR. HIPOLIT: What about the disclosure statement?

MR. MATULE: Pardon?

MR. HIPOLIT: Contribution, disclosure statement?

MR. MATULE: Yes, they were filed.
That's a checklist item.

MR. HIPOLIT: The survey, we have
didn't have a good seal on it. Can you get
another --

MR. MATULE: Survey?
MR. HIPOLIT: -- can we get a better
one with a good seal on it?
You don't have to give it to us now.
if you have it, just --

MR. MATULE: Yeah. I mean --
MR. HIPOLIT: -- Pat just needs one for
the file. That's it.

MR. MATULE: -- I have to tell
Caulfield to squeeze a little harder.
(Laughter)

MR. HIPOLIT: Tell him to spend the 50
bucks to get a better seal.

MR. MATULE: But, yes, we can get you a
better sealed survey.

MR. ROBERTS: I guess, Mr. Chairman,
this would be a question for Frank.
On number seven on our letter, I am
wondering if this has to do with setbacks.
We asked about the roof appurtenances
because there is really like a three foot setback,
that's set back from the property line.

Is that because the building is inset?

MR. MATULE: Because the building is over five feet --

MR. MINERVINI: Already five feet --

MR. ROBERTS: So you will reply?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes, we --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Also the setback does not refer -- I mean, because we have had a conversation about this previously. I don't know if that is relative to this application. But like stairwell appurtenances or elevator bulkheads or things like that are okay on the side lot line lot --

MR. ROBERTS: On the side.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- right?

Because we had some issues where there was a question about that previously.

MR. ROBERTS: That had happened -- that had come up relatively recently on another application.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yeah. On another application. That's not what we are talking about here?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I don't think so.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: I think it was based on the fact that the appurtenances were right at the roof line, but the roof line is set back five feet from the property line, so they're actually complying with the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MATULE: It is the confusion by that ground floor design he's on --

MR. MINERVINI: Again, it is purely in response to the adjacent building. It would be much easier to come to this -- to design a building that is just rectangular and conforms in every way. In this case, we think it's is a better solution given the site condition.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think there was a callout on the curb cut, because obviously this is not going to be a scenario where we got traffic coming in and out simultaneously, so obviously we would like to keep the curb cuts to the minimum of ten feet, if possible --

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think we can do ten. We can do ten as a single.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. What we really
want is we want to keep the curb cuts as small as
you can by maximizing the on-street parking, so --

    MR. MINERVINI: Understood.
    MR. HIPOLIT: -- if you show that on
your plan --

    CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Stormwater calcs
will be delivered?

    MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.
    MR. MINERVINI: Yes.
    MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.

    CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Stormwater calcs
will be delivered, yes?

    MR. MINERVINI: Yes.
    MR. MATULE: If I might, also there was
a callout about an alleyway agreement shown on the
survey. As a practical matter, when the ownership
of all of the lots go into one person, there is a
merger, and that goes away --

    MR. HIPOLIT: Somehow you have to tie
that together for us.

    MR. MATULE: -- yes, we will.

And you also asked about the -- there
was a note on the survey about Riparian, and my
understanding is that there is an application being
processed with the Tide Lands Commission for a
Riparian grant by the former owner's title insurance
company, because apparently somebody missed it in
the chain of title --

MR. HIPOLIT: Missed it, okay, so --
MR. MATULE: -- but it is being -- it's
being processed with the State now.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. I mean, on both of
those items -- that's number nine in our letter --
on both of those items, just when you come to the
Board, bring that information to the Board, testify
to it, or present it in writing, or however you
want.

We just want to make sure it doesn't
get lost in any approval that is given, because that
stuff just disappears.

MR. MATULE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Phase I?

MR. HIPOLIT: I don't -- did you send
in a Phase I for this today or not?

I don't have a Phase I.

MR. MATULE: Yes, I did.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So it is in the
file in transit?

MR. MATULE: I emailed it to you
earlier and copied the Board Secretary --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right. All
right. So it hasn't made the distribution then.
Okay. All right.

MR. MATULE: -- but there were no
recognized areas of concern.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And, Dave, I think
there was a callout on your letter of there is a
requirement of three parking spots, but there is
ten?

Did I get that right, or did I write it
down wrong?

MR. ROBERTS: We have the -- it just
says if there is a -- the curb cut for ten spaces
seemed excessive, so not necessary --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So three is the
requirement, and ten is what is being proposed?

MR. MATULE: That's correct.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Three is
required, and you are providing ten.

MR. MINERVINI: And there is a reason
for that as well.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah.

MR. MINERVINI: The building is
permitted to have ten units, so when initially the
lot coverage was designed via this actual ordinance
and parking spaces contribute 200 or so square feet
per, the idea was that at 60 percent, you could fit
a number of -- at least one to one.

Here we have already got a reduction in
unit count from ten to eight, but still the larger
footprint at ground level.

The additional lot coverage that we've
got at ground level doesn't add our parking count.
If you look at the floor plan, it is basically just
a hallway and storage for those parking spaces, so
within the 60 percent, even if our ground floor was
at 60 percent, we would have ten spaces, so it
doesn't seem logical to us to have less parking
where we can fit it in without any variances.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MATULE: And you can't put anything
else there anyway.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Can't put anything
else there anyway, right.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That's for the
Board to decide, but thank you for the explanation.

MR. MINERVINI: Understood.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, that is good.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Before you go --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Go ahead.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: You are looking
for a few variances -- a few waivers -- excuse me --
hum -- on 31, a soil erosion and control plan, do
you want to make that a condition of the signoff, is
that what you want to do?

MR. MATULE: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Is that
something we usually do?

MR. HIPOLIT: No, that's normal.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I don't remember
seeing it. That's why I asked.

Also, for number 39, conditions for --
I'm sorry -- plan for off tract improvements, make
that a condition of signoff as well.

That is not a big deal, though, right?

MR. HIPOLIT: No.

So anything that the Board requires,
off tract will be a condition of approval, so they
don't necessarily know how much we are going to ask
for yet.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

MR. MATULE: Yeah. We typically ask at
this point for a waiver because we don't know what
our off tract improvement obligation will be at this
point.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That is why I
asked the question.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene, you were asking about?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yeah.

Number six on the Flood Plain Manager's letter has to do with the location of the gas main and the meters on page -- on Z-6 on the plans, and it said that there was a sprinkler in the electrical closet.

I've been trying to locate the utilities, and we've been trying to --

MR. MINERVINI: They are all going to be in that same location. I just have to label it. But the sprinkler valve room is bigger than it needs to be, so I could put it there, but all of the meters will be at that second floor in that location.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Great.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Did they allow you to put the sprinkler and the gas meter in the same room?

MR. MINERVINI: Yes, the sprinkler and gas can be.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MINERVINI: Electric and gas have
to have a separation.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

Frank, anything else?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No, that is it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene, anything else?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: No.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

And there were some callouts about the generator, which is all standard stuff, which we will address, right?

No big issue there.

Could you take me quickly through this, and it's more of a hearing type of an issue, but it is eight units, each one is four bedrooms?

MR. MINERVINI: The apartments have not been designed, but at 1870 square feet, they can be four-bedrooms --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MINERVINI: Just given our width of the property.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So this is stuff that's not detailed yet from your --

MR. MINERVINI: No, and generally, we don't give you a floor plan of the inner.
We would suggest it is the most dense use within that apartment. There may be three-bedrooms.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: In your write-up, you said there will be four units, so that may change --

MR. MINERVINI: Unit change --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- I mean, I'm sorry, four-bedroom units.

MR. MINERVINI: Yeah. At its maximum, so everything that we write is at a maximum. If it is three, and if someone presents and wants giant bedrooms, then I think that should be a fair option to have.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: So when you come before the full Board, will you have a determination if it is three-bedroom or four-bedroom?

MR. MINERVINI: If the Board wants me to, I can certainly talk to the applicant and have a determination.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I think we need that.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. The one thing you can't have is an eight-unit building that now you split it up and make it a nine-unit building.
MR. MINERVINI: Understood. Certainly
I understand this long enough, and I have been doing
this long enough to know we would be back here --
no, we wouldn't be here actually, we'd be at the
Zoning Board.

COMMISSIONER PEENE: Knowing some of
the Commissioners, they like the details of how many
bedrooms in each unit. You are experienced in that.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So is it that you
are kind of keeping it in flux because it is going
to be a condominium type building, and you might
have an owner that wants to change the layout or
something?

MR. MINERVINI: I just gave that as a
possibility that has happened in the past.

There is no particular reason that it
couldn't be four-bedrooms, and it just may be.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. MATULE: Historically, it has been
the recommendation of the prior Board's planners
that we don't detail that stuff because --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And generally, you
know that we generally don't drill down into the
micro managing on that. Other things we will micro
manage to death for sure.
But I guess my only concern is, and I think this is important for your presentation about this to the Board is that we are also not creating a building of dormitory rooms, which I am sure that we are not.

MR. MINERVINI: At 1870 square feet, even at four bedrooms, you're not going to --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But I think you need to kind of walk us through --

MR. MINERVINI: Understood.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- this isn't six bedrooms that are, you know, a hundred square feet each or something like that.

MR. MINERVINI: No, understood.

And if you would like, I could bring a very simple sketch of a typical apartment, if that helps.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: There you go.

MR. MINERVINI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Does that sound like a good --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That is fine with me.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Anything else, gentlemen?
VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Andy?
Dave?
MR. HIPOLIT: No.
MR. ROBERTS: No, they're all --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Everything seems fairly in order?
MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.
MR. ROBERTS: I think really everything in the letters are addressed, and we would be ready for it.
MR. HIPOLIT: We agree, too.
VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I think we will deem them complete.
COMMISSIONER PEENE: Second.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.
MR. MATULE: Very good. Thank you.
As in the previous application, I will check in with Ms. Carcone --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We will await Ms. Carcone's --
MR. MATULE: -- when she returns.
(The matter concluded)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Next up is 1000 Jefferson.

Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Yes. Good evening.

Unfortunately I got a call from my architect. He is running late. I would ask if you could put somebody ahead of us. I mean, we were here before, which is the main thing. But I do have people from the management company --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's do it one time.

Please sit down.

MR. HALL: So, thank you.

(Other matters heard before the Board)

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, our witness is now here.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Who is that?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: 1000 --

MR. HALL: 1000 Jefferson Street.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Sure.

Why don't you guys come on up?

Just give me a second here for some paperwork.

(Board members confer)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So we are
back to 1000 Jefferson. This is Mr. Hall, correct?

MR. HALL: Yes. Thank you, and thank you for your understanding.

We were here back in December. We heard your input. In response, we obtained a review of the materials for the 57 Garden Street project that was different, but it was a tough project.

We revised the plans, submitted revisions a couple of weeks ago, and hopefully we think we addressed everything that you raised and asked, and I have my architect here again.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. HALL: I did speak with Mr. Roberts early on briefly and counsel, but I will defer to him.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure.

Mr. Roberts, can you start us off with your review letter?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hall has not received a copy of this in advance probably because we were sending them out in bulk, rather than trying to send out review letters to individual attorneys, unless they ask for it.

But I did go over some of the comments
I had, and basically what had happened is they in
their submission, their revised submission, they had
letters from the architect, that Mr. Geitz that went
through all of our review letters item by item, and
so I went through and checked those items.

There are a couple of things that we
asked for clarification on, like an ownership
disclosure letter. There are a number of
organizations listed, and we wanted to -- we asked
for them to identify anyone that owned ten percent
in that, but for the most part --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Was there some
problem in getting that information?

I know that went back and forth. Was
that --

MR. ROBERTS: Well, we did get the
ownership disclosure letter, but we were looking for
some additional information --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. We got some
information, but it seems not a hundred percent?

MR. HALL: Well, I just didn't say
there is no other -- there are no others, so I think
it was just --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's make sure --

MR. HALL: -- the form said disclose
the first level, the second level, and there is only one level, so we can confirm that for you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's just confirm it, just so we make sure that we're --

MR. HALL: That's fine. But that's a misunderstanding I think. That's all.

MR. ROBERTS: And we did, Mr. Chairman, ask for a number of things that had to do with the percentage of the coverage of the roof and a lot of the things that we have been checking on lately. Given the size of this building and the size of the roof, and we did ask for things, for example, like string dimensions, so we could calculate those areas, and we were able to calculate in our letter some of the numbers that we didn't have, so I think we have a much better idea of how big this deck is. It was reduced in size from the original proposal, how it is being laid out, and how it is being accessed.

There was also a management plan that we had requested at the last SSP meeting that gets into operational and access to the hours of operation and things like that.

So in terms of information that the Board would need to be able to evaluate this
application, I think we were satisfied that they have responded to our initial points.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

I know the first time we saw them there was an issue also with the pergola. Is the pergola gone?

MR. HALL: It's gone, yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right?

MR. HIPOLIT: It's gone.

MR. HALL: I don't think there is any height issue now.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I know that the --

I won't try to be too snarky about this, but we got fire pits, grills, sinks, ice makers, bar seating, a misting system, shuffleboard, fooseball, billiards, outdoor showers and TVs, and I saved that one for last because we definitely have an issue with amplified sounds outside.

So there's going to be TVs with no sound or --

MR. GEITZ: Just to --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- so before we even get any further down the line with the TVs --

MR. GEITZ: -- sure.

If I could, the redesign of what we
have come up with has done a number of things.
Gaming has been taken out of the venue, okay? So no
shuffleboard, no pool table, no fooseball tables.
It is literally lounge socialization space.

We have reduced the footprint by 647
square feet. In doing that, we have --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So what are we at
now?

MR. GEITZ: We are at 3,086. We were
at 3733 in our first review.

We have omitted the light posts because
they were related to the shuffleboard court. We
were trying to illuminate that, so that is no longer
part of the project. We are only proposing bollard
lighting, which is down low, as you know, and it is
strictly to code for egress as well.

We have omitted one of the fire pits
that we had before. We had three. We are proposing
two right now.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Let's stop
right there.

Mr. Hipolit, I think in your review
letter there was a specific callout about timers --

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- and 30 minutes
versus hour timers, and you guys saw that in the
review letter?

MR. GEITZ: Yes. We have addressed

that --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is that -- do we

know where --

MR. GEITZ: -- yes, we have addressed

that.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. Which would

be the same thing on timers on barbecues or anything

else, right?

MR. GEITZ: Exactly, exactly.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

The specifications, we submitted

engineering documents that also had cut sheets on

the timers, both grills and fire pits, as part of

our package that went in.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. GEITZ: And in regards to the

television, the televisions are still proposed at

this time. The sound that would come from them is

simply from the televisions themselves. They are

inboard on the roof. They are set at eye level for

viewing at this type of distance, and that is what

is still proposed at this time.
We don't see that as anything up on the roof with the parapet walls all around us as any issue of noise being let go to other properties that might be bordering us.

MR. HIPOLIT: I think if the TVs are left, and the Board so sees fit, there would need be a condition about no modifications to the speakers or amplification --

MR. GEITZ: I agree.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- so a regular TV doesn't get that loud, but if you added other speakers, like an O-System or something like that, I could make my TV a hundred times louder, so that's where the problem is.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yeah. I believe it is in conflict with our noise ordinance.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's definitely.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I believe it is in conflict with our noise ordinance about amplified music, or sound or anything else. Because what I -- and the Board can make the decision, but this is my opinion. I think it is in conflict with our noise ordinance. We will have our planner pull it out to
the letter of the law to review it.

Because what I can envision up here is a bunch of guys sitting up there for a game, and what ends up happening is like we have in some of our outdoor cafes that have the TVs, the crowd hanging around, and the cheering and shouting and yelling is louder than the TV, and now this is sound, and everything else coming off the rooftop of a deck.

MR. HALL: We will revisit that.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That's my personal opinion.

MR. HALL: I understand. I understand.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: I just wanted to state for the record that I live at the corner of 11th Street and Adams -- and Jefferson Street. My apartment is really 1100 Adams, and I live at that corner, and I look up on that rooftop, so I wanted to appreciate you going with the lower lighting --

MR. GEITZ: Sure.

COMMISSIONER PEENE: -- and anything that can be done to mitigate the effects in the area would be greatly appreciated for the neighbors.

MR. HIPOLIT: How are you handling the
trash and recycling on the roof?

MR. GEITZ: Excuse me?

MR. HIPOLIT: Trash and recycling on the roof.

MR. GEITZ: That would be through the management plan. We happen to have somebody here from --

MR. HIPOLIT: No, we don't need to --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, we don't want --

MR. HIPOLIT: -- necessarily have testimony. We just need some locations for receptacles.

MR. GEITZ: Receptacles are in fact located on the furniture plan, and management would, of course, take care of that on a daily basis.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Have we seen this management plan yet?

MR. HALL: It was submitted several weeks ago. I'm sorry, I don't know when it went out.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. I don't remember seeing a copy of it, but I think we need to make a fairly good compare and contrast with some of
the other management plans that we looked at for
apartment buildings, outdoor decks, so if we can
kind of be prepared for that.

Mr. Magaletta, anything else?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No. I just
wanted to make sure -- I understand you are trying
to answer all of the questions of the engineers, and
to have it in completely blue print, it was tough
for me to follow, but if they are satisfied, I think
we are okay.

Are you?

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. I think the
dominant issue is like testimony for you, so that
they testify to operations, how they control people
going on and off, shutting off the grills and
turning them up, how you're picking up the garbage
and trash, how you are controlling a crowd that gets
too irate and noisy up there. You know, they need
that. The operation of the deck is more of a
problem than the functional design.

I mean, I think they have answered a
lot of your hard questions.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: And those
responses will be -- my problem is this, because
when the Board members see there is a couple of
different sheets that have, you know, a couple of
different responses, will there be one document to
answer all of those questions?

MR. HIPOLIT: Should be.

MR. HALL: And there could be notes on
the plan. That's perhaps a common way to pull it
together.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Exactly. That's
what I'm looking for.

MR. HIPOLIT: You can put notes with a
little bubble around it or put a cloud around them,
so the Board knows what they are.

Again, and I think I told you this
before, we don't want our police department or fire
department --

MR. HALL: We don't want that either.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- to have to control the
noise, and everything that you do to show us that,
whether it be like patrolling like your grills and
gas things, your TV -- whatever it may be, the more
you can put on there, so we are not your police, the
better.

MR. HALL: Understood.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

MR. GEITZ: The management plan that
was submitted is quite detailed --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No, that I saw.

MR. GEITZ: Okay.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I don't mean that -- I mean on your reports in response to their reports, you put in blue print where your response is, and again, it is a lot to try to piece together what they said going back and forth --

MR. GEITZ: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- I like it in one spot, so when I read it, it is clear. It's linear. That's all.

MR. HALL: You prefer it on the plan and in the document or --

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, the more -- yes, the more you put on the plan, the better because --

MR. HALL: Yes, I know --

MR. HIPOLIT: -- the management plan will get lost when it comes to the outside --

MR. HALL: -- everything else gets lost, I know.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- right. The plans are always there. So when we pull them from the building department, the zoning --

MR. HALL: Exactly.
MR. HIPOLIT: -- so the more you can put on there for control purposes, the better.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: You are saying like put them in a little bubble cloud?

MR. HIPOLIT: A bubble or a cloud, yeah.

MR. HALL: To call them out for the purposes of your --

MR. HIPOLIT: Absolutely.

MR. GEITZ: Okay. No problem.

MR. HALL: I understand.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, just in response to your question, the management plan was prepared by Gray Star, who is the management company, dated February 19th, 2016, and it consists of about two and half pages itemized per item --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. All right.

MR. HALL: They have other buildings in town that are listed there --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. And they --

MR. HALL: -- and one last thing real quickly.

I think the one thing, and I tried to bring it up last time, we requested a waiver of doing the traffic plan. I don't think anybody
specifically said --

MR. HIPOLIT: No. I think what has to happen is because you have a roof deck, and the roof deck is for the use of your residents --

MR. HALL: Right.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- but unless you testify to that, and you talk about that, we don't know that you are not renting this deck out to somebody else.

MR. HALL: Okay. I understand. The people only --

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. You need to testify it's for your group only in your building, and that you're not going to have outside parties there, and that there will be no change in traffic.

That's --

MR. HALL: I understand.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No wedding receptions, right?

(Laughter)

MR. HALL: I just wanted to make sure for technical completeness reasons --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, no, no. Don't worry about it --

MR. HIPOLIT: If you were going to rent the deck out to outside agencies, it might have a
traffic impact.

MR. HALL: And even if you give us a waiver, obviously if an issue comes up, that doesn't prevent you from asking for us to do something.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. HALL: It's just so we can get to the full Board. That's all.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yup.

So are we okay with moving them forward, gentlemen?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I am, yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Peene?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: I just wanted to state for the record, I should probably abstain from this application given my --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, recuse yourself, yes.

MR. HALL: This isn't a formal hearing, so --

(Commissioners talking at once)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, no, don't worry about it --

COMMISSIONER PEENE: -- right. I know, but in the future, while I was not noticed, I know
I'm definitely within the --

(Commissioners talking at once.)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So you are somewhat aware of our crazed calendar and that --

MR. HALL: I heard about it from the other --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- our secretary is not here at the moment. She's on vacation --

MR. HALL: So we should check with her?

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- so we are going to probably have -- you should check with her.

Daisy, when does Pat get back?

MS. AMATO: I believe tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Oh, she's going to be up to her ears, I'm sure.

But, yeah, please check back with Pat.

MR. HALL: She has been very cooperative and responsive.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yeah, and I don't want to guess as to where things would fall on the calendar.

MR. HALL: That's fine. We'll check with her.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

Thank you, gentlemen.
MR. HALL: Thank you.

Have a good night.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: There was -- they had responded -- Andy and Dave, they had responded specifically, and I pulled it out with a response from the fire department. It was like one of their responses to fire marshal approval, where they attempted to get fire marshal approval, but they said that the fire marshal said we don't approve this.

MR. HIPOLIT: The fire marshal said in that email that we will review and approve it once the -- when the application for the building is submitted, we won't do it now.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So can we just make sure we make a note of that during the hearing and address that issue as to how that gets followed up on and whose jurisdiction that is?

MR. HIPOLIT: It would be fire marshal approval and jurisdiction, so when they submit an application -- every application that comes from the city is reviewed by the fire marshal a hundred percent.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

And also, we wanted -- I think we were
working on some different issues regarding the
occupancy.

MR. ROBERTS: 40 versus -- you know --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right? Let's make
sure we --

MR. ROBERTS: That is in the master
plan as well, 40 --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- pin that down,
so that's a hundred percent.

MR. HIPOLIT: He could put that on the
plan, so it is more clear.

(The matter concluded)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We're going to call
an audible here for a second.

Could I ask Mr. Minervini and Mr.
Matule to come up for a second?

MR. MINERVINI: You're taking a project
or --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No, just for your
lovely selves.

THE REPORTER: Is this on the record?

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yeah, sure. Why
not?

From the two previous applications that
were deemed complete, there was -- I am not trying
to be a pain in the neck, a lot of things on the
review letters, so what we are having a problem with
the Commissioners and with our professionals and
also other people that are picking these things up
is how are we keeping track of what is actually
getting addressed and what is not.

I am told that you do a pretty good job
of it because you put the things in the bubble as to
what is changing --

MR. MINERVINI: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- and I just want
to make sure that we are doing that, so that
everybody isn't seeing three versions of the same plans and getting lost in the sauce as to what was done, what wasn't done and trying to keep their own personal checklists.

MR. HALL: If I might add to that, what Mr. Minervini's office generally does, besides calling out the changes in the bubbles, is sometimes listing them on the first sheet of the plans, and they generally accompany it with a standalone memo that lists --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. HIPOLIT: Are you guys going --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I just wanted to make sure that we continue to do that because it is all getting to be a little too much for everybody.

Thank you.

MR. MATULE: Okay.

Thank you.

(Continue on next page)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Where are we?
We are at 462 Newark.

MR. MATULE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Matule.

MR. MATULE: Robert Matule, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

This is an application for actually demolition of an existing building and construction of a new building with four residential units over the existing commercial space, and Domino's is going to return to the space, assuming it is rebuilt.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

Where to start with this one, this one is a difficult one.

Mr. Hipolit, would you like to start us off at some point?

MR. HIPOLIT: If you want me to.

So you have our March 4th letter?

MR. MATULE: Pardon?

MR. MC NEIGHT: Yes.

MR. MATULE: I have your March 4th letter, and I have Mr. Roberts' March 3rd letter, and I also have the Flood Plain Administrator's March 2nd letter, all of which indicate some tidying
up is in order.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That would be an understatement, Mr. Matule.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. There are a number of items.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The thing that struck me that was most troubling was the complete disregard for our flood hazard mitigation ordinance in the planning and design of this building whatsoever. It would seem that Mr. McNeight either chose to ignore it or has not brushed up yet on our flood ordinance.

MR. MATULE: I will let Mr. McNeight respond to that.

MR. MC NEIGHT: We will address the flood coordinator's comments.

MR. MATULE: I know my client has had some conversations with the Flood Plain Administrator about a couple of the items in her letter that are moving targets right now in terms of like the things under the stairwell and that, and they are working those out.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, the complete lack of any flood design issues for retail space, specifically a restaurant space, whether it was
going to and would need to be dry flood proofed for a restaurant.

Also, the fact that we have to have our professionals call out that the architect even got the scale wrong on the plans, I would think that was day one in architecture school to get that right.

MR. MATULE: I understand.

MR. HIPOLIT: I think -- I think different than some of the applications that you just had five minutes ago, if you look at some of the other plans we saw and some of the other applications, a lot of this stuff is tied together from the Flood Plain Manager's comments, they're relatively minor, a lot of our comments are there, but they are all addressable.

These comments are a lot from her letter to our letter and I'm sure Dave's letter, the comments are a lot bigger. I think you need to -- in my opinion, I think you need to address these before being heard. The calendar is full anyway.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, the other problem is that the callouts here on all three of our professionals' letters are substantial enough, where to resolve --

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. It could
change --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- callouts, they definitely are going to. Not maybe --
MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- they are going to change the design of the building --
MR. HIPOLIT: I agree.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- otherwise, this thing doesn't get off first base.
MR. HIPOLIT: I agree with that.
MR. MATULE: Yes. I think we definitely need to revise the plans to respond to these letters and come back to the work session next month --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.
Thanks.
VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you.
MR. MATULE: -- which we will do.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.
(The matter concluded.)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: 118 Madison.

Mr. Curley, good evening.

MR. CURLEY: Good evening.

John J. Curley, C-u-r-l-e-y, for the applicant.

Chairman, we are back with the same property with a different design.

It is a 50 by 100 lot. The proposal is to have four dwelling units on it with parking on the lower level.

There are two variances being sought. One has to do with the facade ordinance, and the second one has to do with the height and the accessibility of the handicapped van, the need for a little bit of head room to park it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. CURLEY: Other than that, I think that the application is complete.

We have not yet received any comment letters.

MR. HIPOLIT: You didn't get our March 4th letter?

MR. CURLEY: Excuse me?

MR. HIPOLIT: You didn't get our March 4th letter?
MR. MINERVINI: I didn't get a March 4th letter.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I have three professional review letters on this application.

MR. MINERVINI: I do have the Flood Plain Administrator's.

MR. CURLEY: That is the only one I have.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Roberts?

MR. ROBERTS: Again, Mr. Chairman, I think we sent all of these letters out in bulk, all of the letters that we did for this entire meeting. We did copy Pat, but we didn't put every single attorney on that email because then they would get all of the letters --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: -- we did do a letter, but --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Minervini, if you are just receiving it, please don't try to read through it at this point.

MR. MINERVINI: As you were speaking, I thought I would catch up.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Unfortunately, this
letter has -- all of the letters have it seems a
great deal of concern, and I think in this case it
might actually be sloppy work because what it seems
like in Mister --

MR. MINERVINI: I don't believe it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- right. I don't
believe it either.

MR. MINERVINI: I really don't believe
it --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I believe that it
is -- well, from the professionals' letters that I
read, it seems like what we have is a scenario where
we took the last application, and we did a lot of
chopping and cutting and pasting, and a lot of the
things from the previous application still got left
on the page.

MR. MINERVINI: And what point
specifically makes you think that?

I have not read this yet, so --

MR. HIPOLIT: I think if you look more
to the latter letter, like in the 30s pages, let's
go back to like page 7 and keep going there. There
is just a lot of inconsistency. It's nothing crazy,
but a lot of stuff that is just inconsistent.

Again, at least in my opinion, I think
with reference to this application, you have
enough -- your agenda is so busy --

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I mean, he is
just getting the letters now.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. He's just getting
the letter now --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And he is just
getting the letters now. It is not fair to them.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- it's not fair to them.

And I think if they just schedule it for the next
work session, they could clean this up, at least
from my perspective, and I don't know what Dave's
perspective is, and you can clean it up with respect
to Ann's letter, the Flood Plain Administrator's
letter, I think it would be good. And I think you'd
be able to schedule it for a hearing right away.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, your letter
goes into a great deal of concern regarding
environmental issues.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And we never got
that far the last time we were dealing with this
property.

So what is it that we need to resolve
here because this was -- obviously this is
acknowledged as a previous industrial site of a
couple of different uses of the site, and there are
reports that show --

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah. There's a --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- definite

contamination of different issues like lead and --

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah.

Comment 28 in our letter covers some

pretty tough stuff on this site. I'm not saying you
can't -- you can't hurdle it, but I think it would
be great for the board to have a little more detail
on what that is, because it covers everything from
lead to all kinds of good stuff in there, and we
have --

MR. CURLEY: I don't recall which

reports you got the last time.

Have you kept them or do you need new

ones?

MR. HIPOLIT: Joe -- you know, you met

Joe Torlucci from our office, and then Joe Torlucci

from our office, our LSRP, reviewed it. He had some

concerns. There's definitely -- we outlined it in

(a) through (g) in this letter, so it would be 28(a)

through (g).

I think you guys really should look
into that and come back with that, at least some
more information. I think you need -- it looks like
you needed a more detailed environmental report for
this site, in my opinion, but I mean, the comments
are there. You can clarify them --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And come back to
us. We have had sites previously, where there was
still serious contamination, but there were
obviously solutions with capping, so the Board is,
you know, pretty well versed in this, and we have
got a team that is very well versed in this and --

MR. HIPOLIT: You may have -- you know
what ISRA is, ISRA issues, you may have some ISRA
issues on that site. You might have some issues
with that with respect to what you actually followed
or didn't follow and were supposed to follow or not.

MR. CURLEY: I think perhaps if you
could send me an email telling me what reports you
have.

MR. HIPOLIT: I have that in the letter
I just gave him. I believe he calls it out, but let
me -- I will get you that. I'll get it.

MR. CURLEY: See, we didn't get far
enough into the environmental the last time. There
were other reports.
MR. HIPOLIT: Okay.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: So what did you say? You didn't get far enough -- and what was that?

MR. CURLEY: Excuse me?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I didn't hear the rest of that sentence. What did you say?

You didn't get far into the hearing --

MR. CURLEY: We didn't get far enough to go through the environmental at the last application. There are additional reports that I don't think Mr. Hipolit has.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

And the professional's letter calls out issues of previously gas and oil tanks on the site, a carpet dying concern, and lead in the soil, so we need to figure out what this is, and if there is capping that is required.

MR. HIPOLIT: And how do you cap it and why.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Show us and tell us, yeah.

MR. HIPOLIT: I mean, Joe looked at this. He had a Phase I for the site, so he looked
at the Phase I provided by you guys, I'm assuming. I'll look in here and see if we have it, and then he also -- Joe would go onto the DEP websites and go through all of the OPRA cases you have on it, so he talked about all those, too. There is a lot. I mean, actually this is the most we ever had for any site, other than Hoboken Cove. That is the most we had.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. So we need to really get that buttoned up.

What about this wall that still stands, that doesn't seem to serve, unless there is something that I am missing, that does not seem to serve any purpose since it doesn't make your previous argument of retaining some part of the structure, that ship has sailed. We are on to a new application, so let's try to treat it as such.

MR. MINERVINI: The thought process with this application was after hearing at the last hearing the adjacent neighbor to the north coming and really wants us to keep that section of the brick wall, that is her -- right now it's her privacy, but it is a 20 foot high wall, we thought we would keep it just to be a good neighbor, but we certainly don't have to, and there is no requirement
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right. The fence maximum height is six feet.

MR. MINERVINI: Understood.

Understood.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So would that then mean that it makes everybody's life easier, and the wall goes away?

MR. MINERVINI: I think it would certainly make the applicant's life easier, and the architect's life easier, yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And the construction official as well, who doesn't like the way it smells either.

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the chimney still stands, and this becomes more of an esthetic issue I guess at this point.

MR. MINERVINI: Purely esthetic.

MR. CHARTIER: Can I say something?

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Identify yourself, please.

MR. CHARTIER: The chimney and the walls are planned to be demolished. We were just
waiting for direction from you guys.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay. That makes the LSRP's concern easier also because his concern was that you had a chimney and what the heck got burned up in it, and what's underneath the chimney, you know, soil and things like that, so that makes everybody's life easier.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, then I have a question because the funnelation appeared to be very similar or if not exactly the same as the last application --

MR. MINERVINI: It's staying as is. The plan is to -- not the chimney --

MR. CHARTIER: No. We are demolishing it.

MR. MINERVINI: -- yes, I understand. The elevation is staying the same. We are planning to design it, so that as if the chimney were still there.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the brick that we see on the elevation plan is like a simulated chimney?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It's brand new?

MR. MINERVINI: It's all new.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But it's not an
actual chimney.

MR. MINERVINI: It's not an actual chimney, purely architectural.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So it's simulating what was there --

MR. MINERVINI: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- to give some reflection to the past, right?

MR. MINERVINI: Correct. That is the concept.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: So then our points before, which Frank obviously hasn't seen yet, has the chimney, and we can disregard that because now we know it is not being --

MR. MINERVINI: Okay.

MR. HIPOLIT: The report we have is Atlantic Environmental, July 2013, Phase I, so Joe will have that report and then he pulled off the DEP website a whole host of --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So have you guys provided them with the same references from what these open DEP cases are?

MR. HIPOLIT: Joe's letter outlines them all.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Joe's letter outlines them all.

MR. HIPOLIT: Joe outlines them. If you want more information, I can put you in touch with Joe, and your guy can talk to him directly, but I mean, I have 20 files in my server, where he pulled stuff off of the DEP tracking. There is a lot of them.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, just one more thing. I will give my letter to Frank as well. Again, my apologies to you, with Pat not being here, a lot of follow-up with the applicants didn't happen that normally does.

But there was really only one callout that I thought I would make while they're here, and that had to do with the green roof and the deck calculations, and that's why -- especially since we have an application for the Hoboken Cove, which we spent a lot of time talking about the roof, the green roof over the mechanical penthouse.

Frank had proposed and actually broken out, there are green roofs over the bulkhead. There is also a green roof on the upper deck -- on the upper roof. He has calculated them separately, and
I just wanted to confirm that 52 percent in the calculation, it was much more helpful than we had at Hoboken Cove, is whether it includes the bulkhead roof or that bulkhead calculation is separate from the --

MR. MINERVINI: That is included in the total 52 percent.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Because we kind of came to a conclusion at the last hearing that anything that is not on the upper roof surface, even though it might be green, whether that would be counted or not. I think the Board kind of moved towards we should not count it.

MR. MINERVINI: I, of course, was at that meeting. What I took out of that meeting, and by the way, these plans were certainly in much before that meeting --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. MINERVINI: -- and what I took out of that meeting was in that particular case, where the bulkheads were used for more than just mechanical uses, then they should not be allowed to be used, but in this case they are the appurtenances that are required. You got the roof for the elevator as well as the single stair. Also, I --
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Frank, we're talking about like two per -- is it 50 percent on the roof and two percent on the bulkheads?

MR. MINERVINI: It's slightly more than that, but not much more than that.

And just to continue, when we started doing these calculations, I had a discussion with the Zoning Officer, because I wasn't very clear, and this was the direction that was given, and I think it still makes sense with this type of a project. I certainly get the Board's interpretation to a project where it's is not really a bulkhead. It's living space.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: So I guess the issue is to make sure this is nailed down before the hearing, so that we know because I believe you have more than 30 percent roof deck.

MR. MINERVINI: Yes, we do.

MR. ROBERTS: So we want to make sure that you have 50 percent.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right.

We have some Commissioners that are very focused on this, as you saw that evening, so it would be great to make sure that you are within your
comfort on this, if there is 50 percent on the roof deck itself.

Is that a possibility?

I mean, we are talking about then potentially needing to reduce your decks by two percent. Is that too much to ask?

Because I would rather not have the darn conversation about it at the hearing, so if you come to us with it laid out, that it's 50 percent on the roof deck, and we got a bonus of an extra two or three percent on the appurtenances, that is going --

MR. HIPOLIT: It's easy.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- that makes it easy.

MR. MINERVINI: I will have that discussion with the applicant, and he's heard everything you said.

MR. CHARTIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That makes it easy.

Let's make it easy.

MR. MINERVINI: So for future reference, I am not -- we architects are not to include any bulkheads as part of that calculation?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: You should avoid that, yes.
MR. ROBERTS: Effectively what that does, Frank, it is like it's so close, that it becomes an issue.

MR. MINERVINI: Well, these aren't decisions I get to make, but effectively what it's going to do is the reality is that you will lessen the green roof. That is going to be the reality. I don't control those things, but I think --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That's correct. And the other part -- the other deal that is in motion, our ordinance is being drafted and defined so these things can be worked out.

MR. MINERVINI: Got it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So I would rather, and I think you would rather the hearing be easier --

MR. MINERVINI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- and then we can decide how it goes in the future.

MR. MINERVINI: Understood. I get the picture.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

I do think there are a considerable number of callouts on these review letters, and you know the seriousness of the environmental concerns
with our Board, and I personally think this application needs to be deemed incomplete at this point.

My main concern is not that these things are not solvable, barring the environmental issue, which I think you need to get with Andy's team and get this squared away. Because if the environmental issues become substantial, that may have some very serious impact on the design of this building.

So we will deem these guys incomplete.

Is that in agreement, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER PEENE: Correct.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

Thank you, guys.

(Board members confer).

(The matter concluded)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Burke, 1313 Jefferson, which this always messes me up because then it's 1312 Adams Storage.

I keep picking it up and thinking I got the wrong file.

1312, 1313, I'm like it's opposite sides of the street. How is that possible?

Good evening, Mr. Burke.

MR. BURKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Jim Burke representing the applicant.

As the Board knows, this application was approved for preliminary site plan approval and a number of C variances, and now the submission has been made for final site plan.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So I have a question for you first, and perhaps any of the other legal team or executives from your applicant as to we can't figure out why you are here.

We can't figure out why we did not have an application that was a preliminary and a final at the same time. This is certainly not some type of a phased buildout or housing subdivision type of a thing. So now our team, our professionals, and your applicant, it looks like to me, have only spent more money and spent another three months, so can you
help me understand this?

MR. BURKE: There were a number of conversations about whether final and preliminary should be applied for at one time, which it was decided not to primarily because there were a number of issues involved, including the contamination of the site and other factors, which it was decided to apply for preliminary and see if the C variances --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: This is you and your team? You and your applicant?

MR. BURKE: My team, yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

MR. BURKE: And then to apply for final after, to secure preliminary site plan, and as the Chairman knows, you know, you do not have to apply simultaneously. You can apply separately, so --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: You can apply separately. On the other hand, it is our normal course of business here in Hoboken, since we would like to try to be as business friendly as possible, to try to expedite these types of things.

MR. BURKE: Well, I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but there were a number of variables that in essence, if we had done that, I think we would have had a number of hearings and now we have
achieved one step, and we are here for the second step.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yet, there are no changes in the second step.

MR. BURKE: Well, there are. I mean, there were a number of issues that had to be resolved and a number of conditions that had to be met and --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: But there are no changes. All you are doing is you are meeting the conditions of your approval, which you would have to do any way.

MR. BURKE: Well, that's correct. But I don't think we would have been given preliminary site plan approval whether the Board liked it or not because of the number of conditions that were in the application based on concerns that were expressed about the environment, the status of the environment in the ground and other factors, such as the green wall and the mural. So it was a decision to secure preliminary site plan approval first and then come back to the Board.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Anything to offer, Mr. Magaletta, or I've made my point?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That's fine. It
is just the process they have chosen. It is their choice.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

All right. What do you have for us, Mr. Burke?

MR. BURKE: Well, we have received a letter from Mr. Hipolit pointing out a number of items that needed to be addressed, and the project team is here. Those items we have addressed, I believe most, if not all, and we had submitted that letter back to the Board and back to Mr. Hipolit.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah.

So I think the issues or the items you draw from the letter from the preliminary to the final could all be addressed, so I don't think that's an issue. I think it could be scheduled from that perspective.

What I would really like to talk is the bonding issue.

Myself and Mr. Burke had a conversation about the mural and about how it would be bonded.

We have thrown out some numbers out there, and they threw back a number of $15,000 for the mural.

We initially, don't fall over, we
initially thought it was about a hundred.

We have since then done some more
investigation and found that number would be closer
to $50,000 for a mural of that size based on what we
could research.

MR. BURKE: I will let -- I'll let Jeff
speak to that, but yes, the number -- the number --

MR. HIPOLIT: Their issue really is, is
whether the Board is going to want the mural bonded
or just have them cover it as part of their approval
and be a maintenance agreement and an agreement to
keep it forever.

We tend to think, and it's just me,
that because it was such a major part of the
application, we should get it bonded to guarantee it
ends up on that wall, and then once it's bonded,
they get their money back and then the maintenance
agreement be carried forward in perpetuity.

Mr. Burke doesn't agree with that.

That's the -- we are on two different sides. They
believe that their approval requires them to put it
up, and then the maintenance agreement carries it
through, and I think we should discuss that here.

That's really the biggest issue I have.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.
MR. LYNCH: So we also did further investigation --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could I just have your name?

MR. LYNCH: I'm sorry. Christopher Lynch with Storage Deluxe.

We also did an investigation afterwards into the cost of the mural, and we consulted with several mural people that have done work in the area, and we agree the cost is more closer to $50,000 than $15,000.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. So we're on the same page then.

MR. LYNCH: You know --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Right, because this particular site has some unusual constraints that Ms. Fallo was certainly not aware of, which is, this isn't a scenario where you can prop up a ladder against the wall. It gets a lot more complicated real quick. I think that's going to make it that much more impactful and iconic on the side of your building, but it certainly makes it a lot more complicated.

MR. LYNCH: It is very large mural, and we worked with the design team. We furthered our
design of the building to design a carrier rail system and a way for the artist to come and do the mural in every directive, so we figured out the system, and we factored all of these costs into it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

So do you want to address yourself personally to Mr. Hipolit's concern, because obviously the Board and the city wants to believe that you are a great corporate citizens, and we don't have to have guarantees, but then there is the real world, and we got to have guarantees.

So how do we make this work for everybody?

MR. LYNCH: We have no issue posting, including the cost of the mural and the bond work that we're going to do with the street.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

So then it's a green light, right, Mr. Hipolit?

MR. HIPOLIT: Green light.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Any issues, gentlemen?

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: No.

COMMISSIONER PEEENE: No.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So then we'll -- as
you heard previously, we will have you talk to Pat. Pat will circle back with you guys to get you on the agenda, but we can't give you a date off the top of our heads. We don't want to be, you know, misleading.

MR. HIPOLIT: So what I would say to you guys is, we know we had a discussion between us about the bond, and what I would do is I would get confirmation that the bond we agreed to, you're going to post it as part of your final, and then you can post it after you receive your final, and you post it -- you don't need to post it before, but let's get the items you're posting.

I would even submit the bond estimate as part of this submission for the hearing, so you can have it in your package, and we are good. There's no more discussion of it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So here is how I envision this going, so it's easy for everybody, is we had your hearing, and we memorialized your resolution as well, and I am hoping that this basically just gets to be basically a second memorialization for all intents and purposes, and that we are not going to start from square one. We don't want to hear about the project that we already
approved.

And there are additional callout items on the professionals' letters, so let's do everything possible to make sure that when you come back before the whole Board, it is basically tidying up some loose ends.

You guys can make testimony as to this was called out by the engineer. It's resolved. This was called out. There is a bond posted, call the vote, and let's get the heck out of here.

MR. LOYNCH: I like the way that sounds.

MR. BURKE: Mr. Chairman, just for the rules, because I just want to understand, my understanding under the Municipal Land Use Law is notice is not required for final site plan, and I checked the Hoboken ordinance, and I don't see it spelled out. So my understanding is if it's not specifically spelled out in the local ordinance, then you do not have to notice.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We will have our attorneys just double check that, and Andrew will get with Dennis, and let's make sure that we send Mr. Burke a confirmation of that.

MR. HIPOLIT: Sure.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It sounds like he is correct, but let's just make sure --

MR. HIPOLIT: That's what I understand but I will double check.

MR. BURKE: And as far as the appearance, I agree, Mr. Chairman, if everything has been done, it should be a fairly brief presentation for the final.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: It sure better be, Mr. Burke.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We will deem that complete, and pending you will get with our Board Secretary when she returns to get you guys scheduled.

MR. HIPOLIT: Just use our March 1st letter as your guide, for us --

MR. BURKE: Yes.

MR. HIPOLIT: -- that's all you need.

MR. BURKE: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So let's just, I know I am beating a dead horse here, but let's just make sure there is zero questions from Mr. Hipolit, from Mr. Roberts or from anybody else

MR. BURKE: Well, along those lines, if
there is anything, we have addressed it in writing,
we'd like to button it up in writing, so that there
is no misunderstanding.

MR. HIPOLIT: We have nothing further
than the March 1st letter -- the March 1st letter,
so that letter is that.

So if you can cover that letter,
respond to it --

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: If there's a
question about that letter, Mr. Burke --

MR. HIPOLIT: Get it to us right away.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- please call Mr.

Hipolit.

MR. BURKE: Well, we did, but
unfortunately it was just given yesterday, but it
was a March 8th letter from AKRF, and all of the
issues you raised were addressed, and I spoke to Mr.
Roberts earlier, so if there's anything else, please
just let me know succinctly --

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

And, Mr. Chairman, just for the record,
we had actually signed off on -- per the planning
comments and in terms of the comments that were
raised at hearing for preliminary. They had
addressed the comments that we raised several months
ago, so we had signed off for a resolution of compliance, and considering the final submission is basically the same submission, I don't anticipate that we really need to -- we won't have any additional comments to raise, and really at this point, there are really Andy's issues that are still open issues, and I think that that's why there wasn't a second round to this application.

MR. BURKE: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

I will ask you also to please be cognizant of making sure that the Board Secretary and our professionals get these things with plenty of comfort room before the hearing that it's scheduled for.

We just have -- you see what we're dealing with here. Everybody has got too much on their plate. They need to have adequate time to make sure these things are buttoned up.

I know that you have people that travel from far and wide to get here to make this, so let's make sure when we get you guys scheduled, that there are absolutely no surprises.

MR. BURKE: Of course. We will attend to that, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

MR. HIPOLIT: Thanks, guys.

(The matter concluded)
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CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: While we are still on the record, Dave and Andy, we had a couple of -- I mean, we had a number of applications here this evening that had egregiously long review letters. The review letters weren't egregious, the applications were egregious. I want to make sure that we're clear about that, and I appreciate both of your teams frustratingly going through these things and calling all of these things out.

I believe that Mr. Minervini will do a good job of responding to it. I don't think all of the applicants here, though, tonight are going to do a good job of responding in an organized fashion, and I am going to ask somebody, I guess this is Andy, to reach out to everybody to make sure. Let's set a standard, whether it is the --

MR. HIPOLIT: I'll do it.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- bump out little clouds or it's the responding to the review letter line by line, because there was an awful lot of things on this list.

Like Frank said, you have four different letters here. You can't keep it straight. There are 40 or 50 items. There are 50 items on some of these review letters, so it is not your
fault, but we need to make sure that we are being organized, so that we don't get snowed in, and something falls through the cracks.

VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yeah. I mean, what I have seen in the past is that on the first page of the plan is a renovation, so there is a chart, which shows everything that was updated, and that is helpful to have that in the beginning as well as throughout the plan, so --

MR. HIPOLIT: You know, what I said to Mr. Bob Matule and Frank, when they give us a response letter, it is great for us, and it's good for you. You're here and you can read the letter. Once it leaves here and your approval goes upstairs for building and construction, they never see that letter. So we would rather see -- we want the letter for the hearing and for the Board, but we want the plans to reflect the information right on there.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Because that's the only thing that's in the file.

MR. HIPOLIT: That's all the building guy sees or the girl sees.

CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And I can't tell you how, you know, the zoning officer picks up
something that was approved 20 years ago, and she is
looking at a plan, and I cannot tell you how many
times this happens, that the plan that is in the
file does not reflect the building that got built.
I'm talking about there's a difference
of floors. There's a difference of setbacks.
There's a difference of square footage. It is
staggering, so it just makes it a mess.
If there's nothing further, we'll --
VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: That is it.
Motion to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We have a motion to
adjourn.
COMMISSIONER PEENE: Second.
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All in favor, aye?
(All Board members answered in the
affirmative.).
CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.
(The meeting concluded at 8:30 p.m.)
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