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(Time noted 7:33 p.m.) MR. GERMINARIO: All right. So we're going to next move into the v-Fee Mendham Apartments application, but this is not the application for the development itself, it's an application for interpretation of the ordinance as it applies to this development in terms of what variances are and are not needed.

So it's not going to be -- we're not going to be deciding anything or hearing any testimony about the development, itself, except as it relates to that issue, the issue of ordinance interpretation.

Because we're doing ordinance interpretation, this is part of the joint land use board jurisdiction that falls under what is traditionally called the zoning board of adjustment.

And so you'll see on this case that Mayor Glassner and Councilman Andrew will not participate in this application tonight.

I just want to remind you of the rules of public participation. You will have the opportunity after each witness to ask questions and again, bear in mind that your questions have to be
relevant to what we're doing tonight, which is the ordinance interpretation.

So if you have questions involving the development, itself, that don't pertain to this particular very narrow set of questions, I'm going to have to rule you out of order.

So just, you know, try and keep your mind on what is relevant to the proceeding we have tonight.

So after every witness, you'll be able to question the witness on their particular testimony. At the end of the entire case that the applicant will present, you will have the opportunity if you have testimony of your own and again, this is factual. We're not asking for your opinion one way or another, we're asking if you have facts that bear upon the issues that you're going to hear about tonight. And that will come only after all the testimony and documents that have been submitted by the applicant have run their course.

So that being said, I see the
applicant's attorney lurking behind the pillar. If he wants to come over, go ahead.

MS. SMITH: I thought we were doing completeness first.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Just to be clear on the agenda, we're moving a couple of items. Number 5 -- excuse me -- Number 6 and 7, those -- the discussion item and the resolution, we're going to move later in the agenda to just before the executive session.

Right now we're going to do the completeness review, the Kuchinski application at 24 Franklin Road.
(Whereupon, the Joint Land Use Board conducts agenda items.)

CHAIRMAN RITGER: All right.
Next up is the V-Fee Mendham
Apartments, LLC, and I believe there's representation here.

MR. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just give me a minute to get set up here.

Okay. Can everybody hear me?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes.
MR. ORTH: All right, great.
Thank you.
MR. GERMINARIO: Before you get
started, Derek, I've just for the board's information, I've reviewed your public notice and it is adequate with jurisdiction on the board.

So you may proceed.
MR. ORTH: Thank you.
So good evening.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you speak up? We can barely hear. I don't know if it's, like, you have to speak into the microphone.

MR. GERMINARIO: Oh, okay.
What I just said was I have reviewed the public notice for this application and it is in order and we can proceed with the hearing tonight.

MR. ORTH: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, my name is Derek Orth.

And it's a pleasure to be here with you in beautiful Mendham this evening.

I'm here on behalf of the applicant, V-Fee Mendham Apartments, LLC. The property that is the subject of this application is known as 84-90 East Main Street, Mendham, New Jersey and is more particularly referred to as Block 801, Lot 20 on Mendham's official tax map.

I'm sure that everyone on the board and those in the audience better know this property as the Kings shopping center.

There's a little bit of history to this
application, Mr. Chairman. So bear with me because my opening remarks are going to be a little bit more lengthy than they otherwise normally would be. Tonight we are here before you on a limited basis. As Mr. Germinario mentioned, we're requesting an interpretation of your land use ordinance as applied to the proposed development of the subject property. This is a power that is vested in the zoning board under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(b), it provides the zoning board of adjustment with the power to hear and decide requests for interpretation of the zoning map or ordinance. Sometimes this is referred to as a B variance, but in reality, it's just a simple request that the zoning board interpret the land use ordinance of the municipality.

These types of applications are somewhat rare in the land use context, but they're not unheard of. They commonly arise during due diligence investigations by a prospective contract purchaser or as here, when there is some disagreement as to whether a proposed use implicates a variance. And the latter is exactly what we are requesting of the board this evening.

I'd like to put this matter into
context, Mr. Chairman, so I'm going to provide a little bit of history for the benefit of the board and for the public.

Basically how we got to where we are today, as that will inform the board's deliberations this evening.

So as the board may be aware, back in 2015, Mendham filed an action in superior court seeking a declaration that it was compliant with its affordable housing obligation arising through the years 1999 through 2025.

As part of that process, the superior court required Mendham to evaluate several sites including the subject property, which had been proposed for inclusionary housing.

Now, when $I$ say "the subject property," I want everyone to understand that we are referring to the portion of the site which is behind the Kings shopping center.

In other words, the portion of the site which was developed with the now defunct racquet club.

So just to be clear, we're not removing the Kings shopping center. To the contrary, we are actually proposing, not as part of this
interpretation application but as part of the site plan application, some nice architectural updates to the center, which you will see later on when we reach our witnesses. So everyone can continue shopping at the Kings, as you otherwise have been.

Going back to the court process,
Mendham and the applicant negotiated for years regarding the proposed multifamily development of the rear portion of the site. Mendham's elected officials fought hard for their constituents and ultimately entered into a settlement agreement with V-Fee in which Mendham agreed to rezone the site to permit a 75-unit inclusionary community.

This settlement agreement was executed on or about December 23rd, 2019, by both parties and subsequently approved by the superior court at a fairness hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I had previously
submitted this settlement agreement as Exhibit A-1 to Ms. Smith, I premarked it in that fashion, and I respectfully request that it be entered into the record accordingly.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Fair enough.
MR. ORTH: Thank you.
(Whereupon, Settlement Agreement is
marked as Exhibit A-1 for identification.) MR. ORTH: The settlement agreement provides for a number of things. In relevant part, Mendham agreed that the site was suitable, available, developable, and approvable. Mendham also agreed to adopt a zoning ordinance amendment which would permit the construction of a 75-unit inclusionary development consisting of 60 market-rate units and 15 affordable units.

The parties also agreed to work cooperatively to draft use and bulk standards in connection with this ordinance. The parties agreed that this ordinance would not only permit the 75 -unit project, but also, and I quote, "permit the existing uses on the property to remain as a permitted use," and that language is found on page 5 of the settlement agreement.

Ultimately Mendham and V-Fee worked together to craft this ordinance as stipulated in the settlement agreement. The end result of that cooperation was Ordinance No. 09-2020.

This ordinance was introduced by the governing body on July 15th, 2020, and adopted on August 11th, 2020, following a public hearing. Mr. Chairman, I probably didn't have to
do this given that it's an ordinance, but for the avoidance of that, $I$ did submit a copy of Ordinance 09-2020, I premarked that as Exhibit A-2, and I also respectfully request that it be entered into the record.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Sounds fair. MR. ORTH: Thank you.
(Whereupon, Ordinance 09-2020 is marked as Exhibit A-2 for identification.)

MR. GERMINARIO: That's fine.
MR. ORTH: Thank you.
The whereas clauses in this ordinance specifically reference the settlement agreement and state that the ordinance was being adopted in accordance with this court-approved settlement.

So right there we have a statement of intent by the governing body to effectuate the terms and conditions of the settlement agreement, one of which was to permit the existing uses on the property to remain as a permitted use.

Section 5 of that ordinance also states that all ordinances of the Borough of Mendham that are inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency, and we'll talk a little bit more about
that as we get through the bulk of our presentation here tonight.

Following the adoption of that ordinance, V-Fee worked over the next several years to develop a site plan for the project. The applicant hired a team of professionals, some of whom you're going to meet tonight, and ultimately we filed an application for preliminary and final major site plan approval with minor bulk variance relief on or about November 2nd, 2022.

That application, which I am going to refer to as the site plan application, was reviewed by the board's professionals on a number of occasions and ultimately scheduled for a completeness review on March 21st, 2023.

As the board will recall, at that hearing the board deemed the application incomplete because the board's professionals suggested that the site plan application might require $D-1$ variance relief and/or D-3 variance relief.

The potential $D-1$ variance was associated with the proposed use of what I have referred to as the premium parking building, which is part of the site plan application.

Essentially, the board and the
professionals noted that in our initial planning report had made a reference to the potential use of this building, including climate controlled automobile storage, which in the abstract standing alone is potentially not a permitted use.

Second, the board found that a D-3
conditional use variance may also be required because the proposed residential building is located within 250 feet of an existing cell tower in the rear of the site.

In this regard, Section 215 of Mendham code sets forth standards for cell tower applications which are treated as condition uses and one of the conditions associated with a cell tower application requires them to be set back 250 feet from residential dwellings. As a result, the board deemed the site plan application incomplete.

Now, reasonable minds can differ and we respectfully differed with the board's incompleteness determination. And to bring resolution to this issue and to help clarify this issue, we filed the instant interpretation application that is before you this evening.

In connection with the interpretation application, we submitted an updated planning report
from our planner, Topology, Philip Abramson, who is also here tonight, and that report is dated March 8th, 2023.

The updated report clarifies that the use of the premium parking building is limited to auto sales and services, which is a permitted principal use in the zone and accessory uses for the tenants of the residential building, including accessory parking, tenant storage and bicycle parking.

So in response to that submission, we received a memorandum from the board attorney dated May 2nd, 2023, and also the report from the board planner dated May 5th, 2023, and we're hoping to change your opinions tonight after we present our testimony.

So what we submitted after we submitted the updated Topology report, we also submitted that report in connection with the site plan application. We stipulated to the uses in that report, and we amended our application, that being the site plan application, accordingly.

So just to be clear, there will be no third-party vehicle storage provided on-site in connection with this project.

So with that stipulation in the record, I believe and $I$ respectfully submit that the potential $D-1$ variance is eliminated.

And when I finish up with my opening statement, I'm going to ask Mr. Germinario and you, Mr. Board Chairman, to weigh in on that issue to see if we can limit the scope of, you know, presentation this evening.

So turning back for a moment to the potential D-3 variance, as noted, this arose because a cell tower had been previously approved and installed in the rear of the site. There was -- as this board is well aware, there was significant litigation over that cell tower starting in superior court going up to the appellate division, but ultimately, the cell tower was approved via board resolution memorialized on or about September 12th, 2017, and installed shortly thereafter, well prior to the execution of the settlement agreement.

My last exhibit in connection with my opening statement, Mr. Chairman, I have premarked as A-3, and that is the resolution of approval of the cell tower application from 2017 and I also respectfully request that that resolution be entered into the record as Exhibit A-3.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: No problem.
(Whereupon, Resolution of Approval of the Cell Tower Application from 2017 is marked as Exhibit A-3 for identification.)

MR. ORTH: Thank you.
It's our position, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, and the board is going to hear expert testimony on this topic, that no $D-3$ variance is required in connection with the site plan application. We're going to provide argument and testimony that such an interpretation is contrary to the expressed intent of both the settlement agreement and the ordinance and also from our perspective, a common sense interpretation of Mendham's land use ordinance.

In terms of witnesses, Mr. Chairman, I have two. That would be my architect Bruce Stieve from the premiere firm of MHS Architecture.

Mr. Stieve is going to provide a short presentation showing the proposed project, existing conditions, buildings, and identify the proposed layout of the site as well as the location of the cell tower.

After that $I$ intend to call my planner, Philip Abramson from Topology. Mr. Abramson is going to present planning proofs in support of our
interpretation request.
So that's my opening spiel,
Mr. Chairman, a little longer than normal, but I hope it was helpful in placing this interpretation application in context with where we are tonight. And if you don't have any questions, I'd like to inquire of Mr . Germinario and for the board, if given the stipulation as to the use of the premium parking building, which is in conformance with the land use ordinance, does the board agree that the potential D-1 variance is no longer at issue and we can simply focus on the $D-3$ tonight?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: I'd like to get a couple things clear before we do that.

You mentioned that the cell tower is at the rear of the site. I think you ought to be a little more specific on that, because it is not. MR. ORTH: That's one of the reasons we're going to call up Mr. Stieve, who is going to show where all the structures are located on the site.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: All right.
MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, I agree with counsel for the applicant that the issue of the D-1 variance, in light of their stipulation, is no longer
on the table, that their appearance is no longer required, and we can narrow this proceeding down to the $\mathrm{D}-3$ variance.

I assume the board's planner is okay with that?

MS. CALDWELL: Yes, we reviewed it and found that without the third-party vehicle storage and the other uses, vehicle car sales and accessory storage for the apartments were both permitted uses.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Jessica, help me out on this. There's list of uses. Which of these are individual uses and which ones are collective?

Okay. So we have car sales, car service. Car storage is no longer on the list, but tenant storage is, pool storage is. We have EV chargers, are all of those individuals or which ones are not?

MS. CALDWELL: If you mean principal uses, some of them are accessory --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes, principal versus accessory.

MS. CALDWELL: So the car sales and service is one principal use.

The parking, the premium parking is an accessory, they're proposing it as an accessory to
the apartments, so it wouldn't be able to be used by the public, that's where we found that it was a different type of use that wasn't contemplated by the zone where it would just be premium parking that anyone can come and rent a space there.

So it's just for -- the way the application now states, it's just for tenants of the building to use that space.

And then there's car sales and service and electric vehicle charging stations are accessory to any of the uses, I suppose, on the site.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Pool storage?
MS. CALDWELL: Pool storage?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Pool storage, that's on the first floor.

MS. CALDWELL: You mean storage for the pool would be accessory to -- the pool is accessory to the apartments, which would be an accessory use to the apartments.

And I think all of, you know, the board may not agree with everything the applicant's asked for with respect to the building and how they would like to sort of be flexible on how much space is used for what, but all of that can be determined through the process of site plan application.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: And just to go on record, bike storage is also accessory?

MS. CALDWELL: That would be an accessory use to the apartments.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Okay.
MS. CALDWELL: So all of those things I think have to be flushed out a little bit further during the site plan process, but this is just to get them to that process.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Right, okay.
All right. Proceed.
MR. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Now that the $D-1$ is no longer an issue, $I$ just would like to call my first witness, Mr. Bruce Stieve, have him sworn in and qualified.

Should -- let's see. We don't have another microphone, do we? I can speak very closely into this.

MS. SMITH: You can pick that one up.
MR. ORTH: Can I pick this one up?
MS. SMITH: Either way.
MR. GERMINARIO: Mr. Stieve, do you swear that your testimony this evening will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. STIEVE: I do.

BRUCESTIEVE, RA
1225 Willow Avenue, Hoboken, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. GERMINARIO: You want to qualify
him?
MR. ORTH: Oh, yes.
THE COURT REPORTER: Can you just have
him spell his last name?
MR. ORTH: Oh, yes, and just before I get going, I just want to introduce our stenographer tonight, she's here next to me. She's here just to keep a record of the proceedings.

Mr. Stieve, why don't you spell -- I think we all know how to spell Bruce. Why don't you please spell your last name.

MR. STIEVE: Sure.
My last name is Stieve, $\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{E}$.
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
BY MR. ORTH:
Q. And why don't you provide the board with a brief overview of your professional qualifications, confirming your pertinent licenses are still in effect and where you've been qualified as an expert in the field of architecture in the
past?
A.

Sure.
So again, my name is Bruce Stieve. I'm a principal in the firm Marchetto, Higgins, Stieve, MHS Architecture. We're located in Hoboken, New Jersey.

I have a master's degree in
architecture, as well as a bachelor degree of architecture, and I've been licensed in the state of New Jersey since 1996.

And my license is current and in good standing.
Q. Hold on one second, Bruce.

MR. ORTH: With that, Mr. Chairman, I proffer Mr . Stieve as an expert in the field of architecture and request that he be recognized as such by the board.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anybody have any objection?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Fair enough.
MR. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Stieve does have a -- you have a map and exhibit there, right, Bruce?

THE WITNESS: I do, yes.

MR. ORTH: Before he gets into that, I just wanted to deal with the marking of that exhibit. This is not something that was presubmitted to the board nor was it premarked.

It's one packet. I have printed out, you know, hand packets that I could distribute to the board if you so like.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: That would be helpful. There are some that can't see that board, so that would be very helpful.

MR. ORTH: So if I may approach the table.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: This is A-4?
MR. ORTH: I would like to mark the whole packet as A-4 instead of going --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: No, that's fine.
MR. ORTH: Okay, great.
(Whereupon, Conceptual Overview of the Project, 14 Sheets, is marked as Exhibit A-4 for identification.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ORTH:
Q. Okay. Bruce, before you get going, did you premark it as A-4?
A. I did.
Q. Okay.

Why don't you just describe what this is now that it's been premarked so that our stenographer could keep a note of it?
A. Sure.

So this is a package, I believe it's about 14 sheets, it represents a conceptual overview of the project. It includes some existing condition photographs, aerial photographs. It includes some concept site plan drawings, it includes some conceptual rendering of the projects, just to give a flavor and an idea of how the project is laid out and configured on the site.
Q. Right.

And this is undated, but this was prepared by today's date, correct, Bruce?
A. That's correct.

There's a series of drawings that have been prepared over the last couple of months that we've been working on the project, I should say a couple of years that we've been working on the project. So it's just a compilation that was compiled today.
Q. Thank you, Bruce. Why don't you just walk us through what you have prepared.
A. Sure.

So I just wanted to give a brief overview. I didn't mention some of the boards that I've testified in front of before, but we've done -we're an architecture firm that specializes in multifamily residential buildings, mixed-use projects, and a lot of downtown projects.

We've worked in Morristown. We've got quite a few projects that were completed in Morristown. We've got a project in Florham Park that was recently completed. Parsippany, Montclair, South Orange. So we work in a lot of the larger downtown neighborhoods in this area.

And so we were approached to take a look at this project on Main Street and we realized early on that there was some unique site conditions that we were going to be working with.

So I'm going to turn to the second sheet of the package that you have in front of you. This is --

MR. FERRIERO: Mr. Orth, if I could just make a suggestion, because nobody in the audience can actually see this.

MR. ORTH: Sorry, folks.
MR. FERRIERO: Maybe before you start
to speak about it, you can show it to the audience so they have some idea of what you're talking about and as necessary, move back and forth.

MR. ORTH: Sure.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Before we go there, is there anybody that would be put off if we simply had him turn that around permanently? I think we have what we need.

Yeah, you can turn that around, that would be fine.

MR. FERRIERO: You're going to have to move it, I think all the way back behind the columns. Further.

THE WITNESS: Can I move the --
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yeah, move the mike, that's fine, it's wireless.

THE WITNESS: So the first image that I'm sharing is an aerial photograph, it was taken by a drone, and we're actually hovering over the racket club at the rear of the site.

And you can see at the very front of the site is the cell tower, it's the white pole that's sticking up in the middle of the parking lot area there (inaudible).

And then immediately in front of that
is the shopping center that faces on Main Street (inaudible).

And so a couple things that we started looking at that were challenges for the site we started to identify.

So we have the cell tower. We have the service areas for the Kings supermarket. We have the service areas for the shopping centers on the sides of the site. And we had the parking field that surrounded the retail center.

So those are things that we were considering about when we started to think about the layout of the site and the project.

The next image is actually a
GoogleEarth image, it's a GoogleEarth image at the eastern entrance to the site. This is a road that leads back to the racket club, it serviced the access to the racket club, but it also services a few of the industrial uses that are -- or the manufacturing uses that are at the rear of the site, and it services the loading and the trash collection areas for the retail center on the site.

So we look at this, again, as not an ideal way to access a residential project at the back of the site, so we wanted to look at ways that we
could reconfigure the parking area in front of the building to provide a better approach to the residential project at the rear of the site.

I'll also note that you can see the cell tower that's the point of discussion tonight sticking up at the back. It's not at the back of the site, but it's at the back of the retail portion of the site.

The next sheet that I'm going to share
is, again, a GoogleEarth image. This was taken a view looking towards the existing current entry point to the site for the retail center. And you can see this gets sort of the character of the retail center.

One of the things that we -- it's a -it has a unique design to it. It's kind of -- we call -- started to think about it, it has this rural suburban sort of I'll call it equestrian or a farm look to the shopping center, and that's something that we were looking at as an idea generator for the design of the multifamily building at the back of the site.

And as I mentioned, one of the things that we were thinking about is how if you were to live at this project, how would you approach the project and what would that process be. And you can
see that this access route, not quite on access, goes directly back to the back of the site.

So that's something that started the thoughts of how we would introduce a residential building to the site.

This next image is I'll call this a very conceptual site plan. This is a site plan sketch that, again, started to help us inform how we would configure the site to contain a residential building in the back of the site, how we can provide screening from that residential building to the retail service areas at the back of Kings.

And so one of the things that you'll see is that we were looking at and working with the County on the access points to the property and one idea or the idea that we started to receive was creating a main street that went through the parking area.

So reconfiguring the parking area in front of Kings to provide a boulevard that ran in front of the retail, kind of like a main street where the street goes by the retail center and then leads to the back of the site and then into a courtyard area that would service the residential building.

And that -- and the idea would be that
we would use another structure to screen the back of the Kings service area, and I'll explain that a little bit more as I get to the next slide.

So the next image is a more developed, I'll call it an architectural site plan, and this shows the residential building that's being proposed at the back of the site, it shows the premium parking building that provides a separation or a buffer between the residential building and the service areas of the retail at the front of the site, and it shows that relocated driveway access into the shopping center that comes along the boulevard that runs back to the residential building.

So the next image is, again, an overall
view of the site looking back towards the racket club. You see the mountain range in the distance, you'll see the cell tower that's in question prominently located at what $I$ would call the center of the site behind the Kings shopping center building, and you can see the parking field that's contained by the two wings of the retail and the Kings center itself.

The next image is a conceptual
rendering of the proposed project, it shows very clearly the relocated entry point, the reconfigured
parking field in front of the Kings to now allow this what we're calling a new main street to run in front of the retail on the left-hand side of the image straight through to the back of the site.

And you can see there's a, we'll call it a portico share, but you'll see that there's a barn styled structure that's about a one-and-a-half-story structure that will contain the premium parking, the auto sales and service areas, the pool storage areas, and the residential storage areas within that building. And that building provides a distinctive feature that separates the residential building at the back and the retail service areas in the -- behind the Kings.

The residential building is a building that's located behind that, it has two lower wings and then the main portion of the building. The main portion of the building is actually parallel with Main Street, we did that very specifically so that the shorter sides of the projects were facing the neighbors and the broader expanse of the project faced Main Street.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. When you're mentioning places, could you point to them? I'm having a hard time picking out where the
buildings are.
THE WITNESS: So this is the Kings supermarket. These are the two retail wings that blanket. This is what $I$ was referring to as the parking field. This is the new entrance, reconfigured entrance and exit to the supermarket shopping center, as well as what we're discussing as the Main Street that leads back to the residential portion of the building.

These are the ancillary businesses that are happening in the back. This is the eastern driveway that $I$ showed you the first photograph, the Google Earth image of that we really saw as a service entrance to the residential -- I mean to the retail. So service trucks come along here and service the back of the Kings and service trucks come along here and service these businesses back here, as well as picking up refuse and deliveries for this retail strip along here.

So this was -- we thought this was a challenge access point to the site and that this would be a much nicer entryway to the residential portion at the back of the site.

One of the things that we're looking to do, and again, this is all in development, but we
were looking to build on the idea of the sort of agricultural style or that sort of equestrian horse farm style of the retail center. So we introduced the idea of the barn form to house the premium parking for the residents and then we used that barn form to inform the style at the architecture at the back of the site as well.

There is a portico share, so once the residence come through Main Street, they drive through a portico share and into a courtyard space at the back for the entrance into the residential building. And I'll show you some more things of that, images of that coming up.

The next plan that you see is actually of the residential portion of the site. So along the bottom of the page, horizontally along the bottom of the page is that premier parking building, that barn structure that we're using to buffer the retail and the residential.

This is the courtyard area that you would pull into. So a car would come in, pull in for drop-off or pull into the parking garage under the building. Access into the premium parking is from an entrance coming in at this edge of the site on the right-hand side of the page.

The premium parking is located in this location. The cell tower location is right in this location, so it's located in the parking spaces in the loading area of the Kings -- the back of the house for Kings.

There's bicycle storage in this building. There was discussion about pool storage. So one of the amenities for the residential building is a pool, an outdoor pool area that's located on the lower left-hand corner of the plan that you have in front of you. And associated with that are some restrooms and a pool storage area that can be used for the people, the residents at the pool area. The main lobby for the building is located on access with the new main street that we're proposing. And again, I'm not going to go into the very specifics of the project. This is really just to give you an overview of how the building is envisioned on the site.

The second floor plan, so again, you drove over the barn building in the front, the second -- the attic story or second floor of the barn is where the resident storage will be. So they'll be storage lockers, they'll be accessed from an elevator located adjacent to that portico share that we
showed.
You can see that the residential units form a $C$ shape on the lower floors of the building and as the building goes up, these floors drop off and then just the barn building continues. And you can see one of the things that we're really trying to do, realizing we have neighbors on either side of the property, is we put the shorter -- the smallest faces of the building facing those neighbors and the longest face of the building facing the shopping center and Main Street.

So the next image is again a conceptual rendered view. You can remember from the first aerial images that $I$ was showing you, you've got the mountains in the background, so that's in this view.

But you also see that now you're looking at the main entry, the main street that comes into the site. You can see that there's a planted median that separates ingress and egress. There's a paved median that implies a boulevard, you can still pull across it to park, but it just, it steps up the idea of main street.

The frontage of the retail along the left side of that main street really gets activated and becomes important. And then you can see as
you're looking down, a planted median picks back up when you get back to the residential portion of the building and the portico share, the drive through under the barn building, and then again, the residential building behind.

The next image that we have is really just a concept elevation, it basically begins to show concept materials that we're thinking about, some basic building dimensions on it.

And then the last two images, very quickly, again, these are rendered images. This is a rendered view from the main street. So I believe, and forgive me, $I$ don't know the name of it, but there's a Japanese/Chinese restaurant in the corner. There's currently a little trellis or arbor that sticks out into this area right here. One of the things that we're looking to do is remove that as part of this -- to provide a more open field to that main street and also provide some outdoor recreation areas in front of that shopping center. Again, you can see the portico share of the drive-through at the back here and then the new residential building behind that.

Another feature that we're trying to do as part of this is a little bit of dress up on the

Kings building. You can see on the side of the Kings building we're contemplating some form of mural or identifying feature that maybe can recall a little bit of the history of the town and then we use a green wall to screen the loading docks for Kings from the new main street.

And then the last image that $I$ have to share with you, again, this is a rendered image of the courtyard space. So this would be -- you can see a portion of the premium parking building on the left-hand side. You can see how we use these barn forms on the two Ls that come out from the main structure to create, again, a character and capture this courtyard space. And then in the background here, you can see the entrance to the pool area at the rear of the image.

So again, that's a brief overview, very conceptual. We'll have more detailed presentations of the site plan.

MR. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Stieve, I appreciate that presentation.

And that's all I had on direct for Mr. Stieve was just to provide some context of what it is that we're proposing and the location of the cell tower and the adjacent buildings here.

MR. GERMINARIO: Okay. So as far as questioning of this witness is concerned, this was largely just background information.

So I don't want to get into the questions of this development as he's described them other than the interaction between the location of the cell tower and the location of the residents.

So board members and members of the public are instructed to tailor your questions to that issue and that issue only. And if we go beyond it, I'll remind you.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Do you have any questions for Mr. Stieve, anyone on the board?

MS. CALDWELL: I have a question.
The fact that you have the opportunity to redesign the site, do you feel like the cell tower is where you would put it if you were designing this site? Is it in a good location?

THE WITNESS: I actually think that it's in a pretty good location. I don't think that it is intrusive into the design of the site. I do believe that by using this premium parking building, this barn structure to create a separation between the retail component and the residential component that, you know, that it provides screening to the
cell tower, and the cell tower I really don't think is any kind of a problem for the residential building.

MS. CALDWELL: What about from the other side now you're proposing a plaza area on the other side of the building, I guess adjacent to the cell tower location?

THE WITNESS: No, there's no sort of public interaction with that cell tower. That cell tower is actually on the Kings supermarket side of the site, it's not within the residential portion of the site. It's actually in the service area for the Kings where they do the deliveries for the Kings supermarket.

MS. CALDWELL: Were you showing us a plaza on the Kings side?

THE WITNESS: The plaza, the one rendered image -- I'll go to the second to the last image that -- so the Kings building is the building that is on the right side of the page and the Japanese restaurant is on the left side of the page. The plaza area is just in front of the Japanese restaurant. Right now there's a little trellis area, and I apologize, I'll go to the aerial view. It's this seventh sheet that 's the aerial view of the
site. I'll show you right here. That plaza space that I'm speaking of is right in here, the cell tower is back here.

MS. CALDWELL: And do you think there would be a better location on the site for the cell tower?

MR. ORTH: I mean, I just have to question the relevance of the question because we're not proposing to move the cell tower. We're not the cell tower applicant or the owner.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: The question is why not?

MR. ORTH: Because we don't own the cell tower.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: I know, so why not ask them to move it?

MR. ORTH: If they want to move it, they'll have to come before the board on that type of an application. We're not proposing a cell tower.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Did you inquire with Verizon, T-Mobile, and whoever else is on there to move the tower?

MR. ORTH: I have not.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: As you know, we did not want that location, we turned it down.

MR. ORTH: I surmised after the decade of litigation that was --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: It took two years to say no, and we did.

MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, let's not argue about this.

I think the question has at least a tangential relevance, so let's let the witness respond to it.

THE WITNESS: So the best thing that I can say is that what we've done is our focus has been primarily on this access through the site. We've done what we can to help mitigate all of the service and area along this property edge through the improvements of the Kings, the side wall of Kings, through the introduction of a green wall and through the introduction of the parking facility in the front.

MS. CALDWELL: Okay. So I mean, I guess just from my perspective and thinking of the reasoning behind the 250 -foot buffer and the D-3 variance is just thinking about the opportunity to look at the site as if that's the best location for the cell tower. So that was the reasoning behind my questioning.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, here, let me just, if you don't mind me asking the planner a question of my own?

So the specific provision, Jessica, the 250-foot setback, what do you construe the purpose of that to be?

MS. CALDWELL: Well, I think it said that it's A, not intrusive on residential properties and, you know, perhaps there's potential for RF issues. I'm not an expert on RF, so I think that's one of the things that we might want testimony on.

I think those are the types of things, whether it's visually intrusive, whether there's issues with conflicts with the way that the land is used around it, being outside, adjacent to it, all those types of things.

And I think potentially if you were redesigning the site, I would think you would put it in a different location and I thought that this opens up the opportunity to think about that potentially with this site.

I mean, you have multiple principal uses permitted, that doesn't mean that every use can be on the property all at once in any location. I think there's the opportunity to think about how the
uses work together.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: A couple of other things, 120 feet is what $I$ recall for the tower height.

MR. GERMINARIO: It's 130.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: A hundred and 30. So if it falls over, it's not going to kill anybody if it's 250 feet away.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, you know, these are issues that may come into play if the board decides that the $D-3$ variance is something that has to be in this application, but we don't need to get into those issues yet unless my learning counterpart believes that we do.

MR. ORTH: I concur with what you just said.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: So I was mentioning truck turning radiuses; is that something that $I$ can do?

MR. GERMINARIO: No, unless you can connect that for the need for a $D-3$ variance.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: No, I'm going to connect it to why not inquire at least about moving that tower.

MR. GERMINARIO: But that's an issue
that we don't need to get to. I mean, we're deciding tonight whether they need to apply for this variance. If they do need to apply for it, then you can question the very issues that the planner just went through in terms of okay, what was the intent of this 250-foot setback, is there a way of avoiding this variance by doing something like relocating the tower; those are all issues that you can get to, but we're not at that stage yet. We're just deciding whether they need this variance or not.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Well, in a way,
aren't we deciding that if it's moved, there might be a spot where they don't need the variance? We would ask that of anybody if they placed a generator in the side yard, could you put it in the rear yard, we would ask that question.

MR. GERMINARIO: That's part of the analysis of whether the variance is warranted or not. So if there's an easy way to avoid the variance, then that becomes a possible basis for denying the variance. So --

MR. SPRANDEL: What about the distance, the closest distance of the cell tower to approximately the closest resident?

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, you have to
remember that we went through that -- those conditional use criteria when this application was originally heard and it was determined that they met that criteria as the site existed at that time. The only thing that the board raised and denied initially, eventually it was overturned, but we initially denied on the basis of the fact that the cell tower was not located in a rear yard and that the -- ultimately the appellate court ruled that that variance should have been granted. So if that variance was, in fact, granted, the conditional use variance, that was a $D-3$ variance also.

But the criteria that we're talking
about tonight, as the site existed at the time of that application, it was conforming. It was not within 250 feet of the nearest residence, I believe it would be deemed --

MR. SPRANDEL: Right, but in this case it's going to be within 250?

MR. GERMINARIO: Right, it's sort of like the inverted picture of it. I mean, the mountain is coming to Mohammed rather than Mohammed going to the mountain, I guess you could put it that way.

The tower is where it is, but now
residences are being put in place and the question is, all right, they're not changing anything with the cell tower, you know, you'll hear their argument as they go through this case, but is it changing a condition of the conditional use approval and does that trigger a need to revisit that issue.

So there's the whole crux of the question. You'll hear their case and I'll chime in with my opinion when we get to the end.

Okay. So that being said, any more questions from the board?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anybody else?
MR. EGERTER: I've got a question. On the entranceway, it goes out to Route 24 , which is a county road. Does the County have any input on -and maybe I missed this, on the -- on what it's going to do to traffic?

MR. GERMINARIO: Could you hold that question until we get to site plan? Again, that's not relevant to what we're -- it's a good question, but it's not relevant to what we're doing tonight. CHAIRMAN RITGER: Any other questions from members of the board?

MR. GERMINARIO: Okay. So now public.
Again, remember what we're doing tonight. We're
talking about the relationship of the existing cell tower to the proposed new residential use and the proximity of that use to the existing cell tower. Everything else, although it was helpful background, everything else that Mr. Stieve went through is just context and we don't need a question that is not directly relevant to what we're doing tonight, so try and stay within those boundaries.

That being said, any member of the public who wants to come forward, please do so. CHAIRMAN RITGER: Come to the microphone and please identify yourself, unless of course you are covered by Daniel's Law, which would be moot.

MR. ORTMAN: My name is Frederick
Ortman, I've been a resident of the borough for about 19 years and a property owner, 3 Loryn Lane.

MS. SMITH: Can you please spell your
last name?
MR. ORTMAN: O-R-T-M-A-N.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Sorry, your time's up.

MR. ORTMAN: Okay. Yes, I know we are here to discuss the relationship of the cell tower to
the building and the need for a $D-3$ variance due to that.

However, the D-1 variance was weighed, the requirement was weighed with very little discussion and no comment from the public, so I'd like to address that.

MR. GERMINARIO: Go ahead.
MR. ORTMAN: My question is how are tenants defined as we interpret the application regarding the $D-1$ zoning variance requirement? To me that could mean anyone renting any space on the property, not necessarily residents of the proposed dwellings, and I think that wording is vague enough that a $D-1$ variance may indeed be required.

MR. GERMINARIO: How -- a tenant is defined as people who are not residents in the residential --

MR. ORTMAN: Everyone who rents space in Kings shopping center now is a tenant. For example, Kings is a tenant, Aoyama is tenant.

MR. GERMINARIO: No, their revised planning report indicates that the tenants -- that this parking is going to pertain to where the tenants of the residential buildings are.

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

MR. ORTMAN: The auto -- potential auto sales operation would also be a tenant.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, see, again, this use in terms of auto storage was what brought up the D-1, possible $D-1$ variance. They have to be either accessory to the residential, which would mean tenant's parking their cars in this building, or storing them, or an accessory to the auto sales and service.

The auto sales and service is a permitted use here on this property and the zone. So they can have the auto storage provided in connection with the cars that they're servicing and/or the cars that they're selling. That's a legitimate accessory use.

MR. ORTMAN: While you have described it in that way and defined tenants in that way, I did not hear the representatives of the developer define it that way, and I would suggest that it be very tightly defined if you're going to grant this exception from meeting the zoning variance based on the testimony that we've heard tonight.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: You're under oath, feel free to ask.

MR. ORTMAN: Can you define tenants in
this context, please?
MR. ORTH: Sure.
We stipulated this in writing in a
letter $I$ wrote to the board, I don't know, two weeks or so ago where we stipulated that the accessory parking would be for the tenants of the residential building, the 75-unit building, plus the automotive sales and service uses, so --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Just to clarify, there is a space on the second floor that's labeled "Tenant storage."

MR. ORTH: Sure.
One of the permitted accessory uses in this zone is also tenant storage. Tenant storage in that context refers to storage lockers for tenants of the 75-unit building.

MR. GERMINARIO: And also in response to your suggestion, if, in fact, the board does decide that the $D-1$ variance is not an issue as the planner and I have indicated that it's appropriate, our resolution will restate the conditions that Mr. Orth has just put on the record.

MR. ORTMAN: Thank you.
My additional question is regarding your comment about the Mountain moving to Mohammed.

And I guess I would suggest that if indeed there a residence built within the restricted area in terms of proximity to the cell tower, that would require the cell towers be removed, would it not.

THE WITNESS: No, it would not. We would have to then consider whether to grant that variance or not. I mean, there would be proofs put forward to say, all right, well, if it's within that 250 feet, the harm that the ordinance was meant to avoid is not -- would not take place.

For example, hypothetically we could have RF data showing that the signal very close to the tower is negligible, and people might have noticed this, if you go under that tower, you probably don't get cell service, it's just the nature of the way those towers operate.

Our planner brings up the question of, you know, of also the appearance or the, you know, having this tower very close to a residence, is that something that brings into play other planning consideration. So those proofs would have to be weighed and the board would have to decide to grant or not to grant that variances.

MR. ORTMAN: Thanks. Those are my questions.

MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Hi, Melissa Rawley-Payne, I live at 23 Drake Road in Mendham Borough .

MS. SMITH: Can you please spell your last name?

MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Yes. Sorry, it's long. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Y}$, hyphen, $\mathrm{P}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}$.

So my question was actually also related to the $D-1$ variance elimination, but you answered part of my question, which was how could -if they couldn't do third-party vehicle storage, how could they have vehicles stored for service? But you answered that it will be allowed.

But my question is actually is there designated parking for those service storage vehicles and if so, how much is dedicated to that?

MR. ORTH: So that's an issue we'll address at site plan application, but I can tell you we intend to have some sort of designation, some delineation between those parking spaces, but we'll address that more fully when we get to the site plan application.

MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anyone else?
MR. LUPO: Frank Lupo, 17 Dean Road.

THE COURT REPORTER: $L-U-P-O ?$
MR. LUPO: That's it.
I just want to understand if you were aware during the original cell tower meetings, a lot of discussion was coming from, $I$ don't know if it was the planner at that time, but we discussed the tower being in the rear of the developed lot because of falling ice and safety concerns during the winter when the ice built up in the tower.

The appeals court also in their brief or in their summary, highlighted that verbiage and stated that it's in the rear of the developed lot, therefore there was not going to be a lot of activity in the back, so it was okay and that's how it was kind of pushed through.

I just want to understand your thought on that.

MR. ORTH: To answer briefly, I was not aware of that testimony. That application goes back several years before my involvement in the property, but certainly if the board determines that a D-3 variance is necessary, that's, you know, I'm sure one of the things that will be under consideration.

MR. LUPO: Right. At the same time,
why was the left side chosen on the cell tower verse
the right side of the cell tower, because the service lines that are critical service lines the power that cell tower and contain the fiber optics to that cell tower go through from the left side of that tower. Why not go to the right of the left side of the cell tower or move the cell tower?

MR. GERMINARIO: Frank, again, that is an issue that will come up if we decide that a variance is required and you'll have an opportunity to address those issues in terms of whether the variance should be granted or not, but I think, like the chairman, you want to get one step ahead and we're not at that point.

MR. LUPO: I always just make sure that we're just aware that the ice and the safety conditions --

MR. GERMINARIO: Right. Well, you know, I was involved with that and I argued that case before the law division and before the appellate division, and that was one of the arguments we had for denying the conditional use variance for not being in the -- for being in the front yard rather than the backyard.

And we have a different set of facts
here and $I$ don't know whether those facts in terms of
possible perils to the people at that time of the racket club, $I$ don't know that that relates really to what we're going to be talking about in terms of this particular variance.

And also I might add that the -ultimately the appellate division found that argument unconvincing.

MR. LUPO: Well, that's just the point, they said that there was no activity to back and that's why it could go there. That was the point.

MR. GERMINARIO: No, that's not true.
I mean, we -- again, I think we're getting off the track here quiet a bit. There was in the original application for the $T$-Mobile tower, it went through 28 board hearings and it was ultimately denied on the basis of the fact that they didn't meet one of the conditional use requirements which were it has to be in the rear yard and then it went up through the court and the courts --

MR. LUPO: I'm very aware of these --
MR. GERMINARIO: And one of the arguments that was presented was I think based in part on your testimony in the hearings was, okay, there are these risks involved, there may be ice falling, there may be a wind storm, one of the
antennas blows loose and it comes down and hits somebody on the head who's walking out of the racket club. The appellate panel found that reasoning to be too far fetched.

MR. LUPO: Absolutely, because at that time, there was less residents. What we're proposing here are 75 units plus an automobile service center plus parking. So we're increasing the use in this particular area, which only brings this conversation further up.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, but it's a different conditional use criteria we're addressing. They've already been granted that conditional use variance as a part of the resolution of that earlier application pursuant to the way the appellate court moved.

We're not talking about putting it in the front yard or the backyard, it already has the authorization to be in the front yard. What it doesn't have is -- well, we'll have to hear arguments both ways, but what it doesn't have is the authorization within 250 feet for residents.

And there are other considerations that may go into that, $I$ don't want to get into them tonight because it's not what we're here to do.

We're here to decide do they need the variance or not. If they need the variance, come back and -MR. LUPO: I think they need the variance.

Thank you.
MR. GERMINARIO: Okay.
MS. ORTMAN: Just a little lower.
We all know development is going to happen, but we want to make sure it's right for Mendham. And that's true, we want to make sure it's right and --

THE COURT REPORTER: Ma'am, before you continue, could you just state and spell your name, please?

MS. ORTMAN: Sure, it's Carol, last name is Ortman, $0-R-T-M-A-N, 3$ Loryn Lane.

So I'm sorry, I'm going to ask for forgiveness, but I had no idea that I was not allowed to say -- make any comments about the cell tower, so I just have a couple comments.

Any redevelopment, the master plan requires a traffic study; has that been done?

MR. ORTH: (No verbal response.)
MR. ORTMAN: Okay.
So I can't see that on the -- auto
sales, hydraulic lifts. Every space is going to have a hydraulic lift. You realize on the research for hydraulic lifts, the oil goes into the ground a lot of the time. So we have to be very careful of any oil going into the bottom, we already have problems with the area not being --

MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, so far you
haven't really touched on --
MS. ORTMAN: I know I haven't. I'm asking for forgiveness because $I$ didn't realize it was only going to be on the cell tower.

And the height limitation. Where can I find in the master plan where it says how high the structure can be? Because I think it says five or six stories.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: There's an overlay zone that dictates the height in the ordinance, the allowable height.

MS. ORTMAN: There's an overlay zone?
And where can I read more about that?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: eCode on the borough site, you can just search that.

MS. ORTMAN: Okay. I kind of was just going on the Dunkin' Donuts thinking that looks pretty high and, you know, I was thinking that looks
pretty high right there.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Off the top of my head, and you can correct me, it's either 60 or 65. MS. ORTMAN: Yeah, I thought they were going above that, though.

MR. ORTH: I believe it's 60, but -CHAIRMAN RITGER: Appurtenances can go higher than that, not the main level of building.

MR. GERMINARIO: In the ordinance that was Exhibit 2, A-2, it is specified as "Building height limit, four stories over parking."

MS. ORTMAN: Oh, four stories over parking?

MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, and ultimately 60 feet, $I$ guess it's whichever is greater.

MS. ORTMAN: Okay. So it's the parking and then four stores on top of that. Okay, great. But I think that's something to look into is the hydraulic lifts, that's a huge issue, you know, with the groundwater. Thank you.

MR. MARINO: Bob Marino, 27 Florie Farm
Road.
THE COURT REPORTER: How do I spell
your last name?
MR. MARINO: M-A-R-I-N-O.
Rizman Rappaport (973)992-7650
"When every word counts"

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank You.
MR. MARINO: I have a question regarding the $D-1$ variance and then the proposed $D-3$ variance.

Regarding the $D-1$ variance, the parking is going to be premium parking for residents. How do we distinguish from regular parking and premium parking, what's the qualifications that make it premium?

MR. ORTH: Sure.
Just briefly, and this is something we'll talk a little bit more at the site plan application, premium parking it's a word we came up with because it's climate controlled in that building. The regular parking for the other tenants is not going to be climate controlled.

Mr. MARINO: Thank you.
For Mr. Stieve, what is the distance from the cell tower to the borders of the property?

MR. ORTH: Mr. Stieve probably doesn't know the answer to that question, but we do have another witness who's our planner who is going to testify, so if he knows the answer to that, you can ask him that.

MR. MARINO: At that time?
Rizman Rappaport (973)992-7650
"When every word counts"

MR. ORTH: Yes, at that time.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: He'll be here tonight, correct?

MR. ORTH: Yes, the planner will be testifying tonight. And also when we get to the site plan application, we're going to present civil engineering testimony, which is, you know, can be a little bit dry, but it's going to include a lot of measurements, site constraints, et cetera, and that would be something that would be addressed.

MR. MARINO: Right, but that would seem to be relevant to the $D-3$ application because we're looking at a situation where there's going to be residential buildings within 250 feet of the cell tower.

My question would be is it possible to put forth a design that would be compliant with that's Borough Code 151, maybe, that 250-foot setback.

Second or thirdly, I guess, when did the applicant acquire the property?

MR. ORTH: I don't know the answer to that question.

MR. MARINO: Well, when did the
applicant put the cell tower on the property?

MR. ORTH: So to the extent it's relevant, the cell tower company was the applicant for the cell tower. The applicant just owns the underlying ground.

MR. MARINO: Okay. So it would be fair to say that it would be after V-Fee acquired the property that the cell tower went up?

MR. ORTH: No, I believe V-Fee owned the property before that.

MR. MARINO: Before the cell tower went up?

MR. ORTH: Yes, yes, I believe it.
MR. MARINO: So then would this -- and did V-Fee contract with Verizon or rent to Verizon to put the cellphone tower up?

MR. ORTH: I think we're getting a little far afield of the scope of the application tonight.

MR. MARINO: Well, respectfully, if you're going to ask for a D-3 variance --

MR. ORTH: We're not there yet. We're asking the board to determine whether or not a D-3 is applicable. If the board does determine that a D-3 is applicable, come back to the next hearing, we're gonna be -- we look forward to presenting this
application in public and we're going to have a lot more testimony on-site plan considerations.

MR. MARINO: Okay. So regarding a D-3 variance, I'm sure the board knows, but for the benefit of the audience, if you create a hardship, you can't then ask for relief from the hardship.

So to the extent V-Fee owned the property and facilitated putting up the cell tower, it would be inconsistent to come and say, well, now we've got this cell tower on our property, we need the borough to give us relief.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anyone else in the public?

MR. LUPO: I just had one follow-up question.

Just one quick question, what if -could you just not put the barn and this other car parking lot in there? Would you need the D-3 if you didn't have this premium parking? Why do you need this premium parking and this little car service thing?

MR. ORTH: That's part of the application that's presented before the board tonight and that's what's being presented.

MR. LUPO: Well, I guess my question is if you don't have those structures then do you need the $D-3 ?$ Just eliminate the car parking, premium parking. It's going to be -- I mean, isn't that the easiest thing to do?

MR. FERRIERO: If $I$ could just weigh in here, the $D-3$ is for the relationship of the tower to the residential building.

MR. LUPO: Oh, so the barn is okay then, the parking is okay?

MR. FERRIERO: Correct.
MR. LUPO: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anyone else?
Okay. We're done with this witness?
MR. ORTH: Yes.
Okay. Let me give Mr. Stieve just a minute to create some space, but my last witness will be Phil Abramson from Topology, he's our professional planner. I'm trying to help out my stenographer here.

MR. GERMINARIO: Do you swear that your testimony this evening will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. ABRAMSON: I do.

PHILIP ABRAMSON, PP, AICP,
60 Union Street, 1st Floor, Newark, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows: MR. GERMINARIO: Okay. Qualify him. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. ORTH:
Q. Okay. Mr. Abramson, why don't you just spell your last name for the record, please.
A. $\quad \mathbf{A}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$.
Q. Okay. And why don't you please provide the board with a brief overview of your professional qualifications, where you've been accepted as an expert in the field of professional planning, and just confirm that all your relevant professional licenses are in effect.
A. I'll start with the last one. All of my relevant professional licenses are in effect. Educationally, I'm a three-time graduate of Rutgers University.

I have a bachelor's of science from
Rutgers Newark. I have an MCRP, master of city and regional planning degree from the Bloustein School in New Brunswick, and a juris doctorate degree from the Rutgers Law School in Newark where Derek and I were
classmates.
MR. ORTH: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I founded Topology, this planning firm ten years ago.

I currently serve as the CEO.
My professional license is in good standing. I'm nationally accredited under the American Institute of Certified Planners.

My municipal planning experience includes serving The Town of Morristown as the town planner and planning board planner, zoning board planner for about 13 years.

I've represented communities like Summit, Cranford, South Orange, Chatham, Boonton, Perth Amboy, several communities up and down this state.

My expert testimony before numerous land use boards and governing bodies throughout New Jersey including this board a few years ago for Jay Grant over on Main Street, the Town of Boonton -- oh, I'm sorry, no.

Mendham Borough, West Orange, Morris Township, Hoboken, Roselle, Burlington City, Fair Field.

And the last thing I'll say, which is a
qualification or not, I grew up in Mount Freedom, you know, like, 10 minutes from this site.

My first summer job was working produce when I was 15 years old in this Kings supermarket, and it's really, like, a pleasure and an honor to be back here as an adult now being about to impact the future of the communities I grew up in.

BY MR. ORTH:
Q. Thank you, Phil.

MR. ORTH: And with that, Mr. Chairman,
I proffer Mr. Abramson as an expert in the field of planning and request that he be considered as such by this board.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anybody have any questions or objections? No?

Seeing and hearing none, I vote we're willing to accept his credentials.

MR. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ORTH:
Q. Phil, why don't you take us through your presentation and let me know if you have any exhibits you'd like me to mark.
A. Okay. You let me know if I forget to say anything.
Q. Okay.
A. So I have the lovely job of having to come and disagree with your attorney on his findings and recommendations to you with regard to the D-3 variance.

So I'm going to state -- put a few things on the record with regard to the property and the zoning. The property is just over 13 acres, 13.27 acres in area. The current uses on the property is what the ordinance calls a planned commercial development and a wireless telecommunications facility and I guess you could say a fitness center, the shell of Mendham racquet club.

Am I doing that? Maybe I won't touch it. We'll give that a shot.

So the proposal that's been stated by Mr. Stieve, this application involves the construction of a new multifamily structure, as well as the now what was called the barn building, it does not involve any modification, intensification, enlargement of the existing mobile tower.

As has been discussed, I just again will put these things on the record. It was initially the wireless facility, the monopole was initially denied by this board July 7th, 2007, it was
permitted by order of the appellate division on February 16th, 2016, and then it was approved ultimately by the planning board in 2017, it was constructed some time thereafter, maybe 2018. And the purpose of what we're doing here tonight is under N.J.S.A 40:55D-70(b), which I'm going to quote directly from the Municipal Land Use Law, it enables the zoning board or in this case, a joint land use board sitting as a zoning board, to hear and decide requests for interpretation of the zoning map or ordinance or for decisions upon other special questions upon which such board is authorized to pass by any zoning or official map ordinance in accordance with this act.

Mr. Orth submitted the request for this interpretation on April 13th, 2023, and I took the liberty of forming a question. Like what are we really answering here? And it's under the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law and the Mendham Borough Zoning Ordinance whether $D-3$ variance relief is required to construct a multifamily residence within 250 feet of an existing wireless facility when doing so would violate a conditional use standard applicable to that wireless facility at its time of initial approval.

Are you okay, Mr. Germinario? Are you
good with that?
MR. GERMINARIO: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. So again going into some of the zoning of the property, and if you need to, you know, create a record and give us some background, so, like, $I$ wish you guys can fast forward me with stuff you already know, but --

So again, we're in the EB-AH zone, it begins at Ordinance Section 250-71. There's a broad set of uses permitted there, maybe the broadest in the borough. It includes multifamily housing, it includes a shopping center, it includes all the uses that we've talked about being proposed.

And we talk about conditional uses.
What are they? They're not really permitted, they're not really prohibited, they're somewhere in that Venn diagram, they're sometimes permitted uses.

So to use the definition contained in
state law, it's a use permitted in a particular zoning district only upon a showing that such use is in a specified location will comply with the conditions and standards for the location or operation of such use as contained in the zoning ordinance and upon the issuance of authorization therefore by the planning board.

So the conditional use are typically granted by the planning board unless there's a variance, and they always will be reviewed by at least one of the land use boards. So the conditional use ordinance that we're dealing with is Ordinance Section 215-12.6, it regulates wireless facilities in the borough.

So we talked about purpose a minute ago, like, why does this ordinance exist. We don't have to guess, there's a list, there's a list in the ordinance. I just pulled out one that $I$ thought was most relevant, because there's a lot of conditions in there, the 250-foot distance is one of them. I pulled out what I thought was the one closest to the basis for that separation.

Quote: "To preserve and protect the general visual, historic and natural environment within the Borough of Mendham and prevent adverse visual impacts from wireless communication towers, antennas and other facilities within areas zoned or used for residential purposes along public streets within historic sites and district within parks and along ridge lines, skylines, natural open spaces and other ecological and natural
features."
I will just -- I'll leave that. And then the conditions. I'm just going to read -- so my view -- I've sat for many hours today reading this ordinance. My view after all that is that this 250-foot separation appears in two different subsections, I think it was a cut-and-paste error, because it's in one section it doesn't belong in. We've cited both. I could read both if you'd like, but I'm going to read the one that I think actually we're dealing with here.

It says: "Setback facilities for wireless telecommunication facilities in any zone where conditionally permitted, wireless telecommunication facilities shall be located in compliance with the applicable minimum setback requirements, plus one foot of additional setback for each foot of tower height.
"In no event shall wireless telecommunication facilities be set back less than 150 feet from a street right of way and not less than 250 feet from any residential dwelling in any direction."

And the variance that you're seeking as
the zoning board, the one that allows you to grant a variance, N.J.S.A 40:55(d)3 -- or 40:55D-70 --40:55D-70(d) 3 is a deviation from a specification or standard pursuant to a reference pertaining solely to a conditional use, and I emphasize pertaining solely to a conditional use.

Last kind of tee up testimony here. So one of the things we're going to be doing tonight is trying to figure out what did the governing body mean, right? What did the governing body -- what does the ordinance mean, what did they intend when they adopted this ordinance?

So there's really four ways, and I've been in the position to advise boards like you sitting in Ms. Caldwell's seat a number of times. So I have four ways that come from case law and that come from the Bible of land use, we used to call it the Cox book, he's no longer alive.

So Number 1 is legislative intent.
"Priority should be given to the intent and purpose of an ordinance at the time of its drafting, the intent of which is supported by the ordinance itself, its subject, and in the context in which the ordinance was drafted."

So that's really the main one. That's
our job, to enforce the governing body's intent. And then moving beyond that specific verse general provisions, always go with the more specific provision as opposed to the more general provision.

Plain and literal meaning. Unless we're clearly using a different sense, words and phrases in the ordinance must be construed in the ordinary plain meaning of such words; however, where a literal reading of the ordinance would create a result contrary to the intent of the ordinance, including when applied in an unforeseen circumstances, the intent of the ordinance should govern.

And then prior rulings. I don't think that applies here. You would know better than me. I have not been able to find anything where you've had to deal with the situation that Mr. Germinario has pointed out with regard to cellphone tower distances and kind of reaching back to existing conditional uses. So if you don't have any prior rulings on that, we don't have to be consistent with any prior rulings on that. If you do, I'd love to hear about them.

Okay. So I respectfully disagree with
the findings or the recommendations of Mr . Germinario.

So point number one, to require $D-3$ variance relief under the circumstances is inconsistent with the mechanics of the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law and the language of the borough's ordinance.

So Mr. Germinario drafted a letter, I'm sure you all have it, and in that letter he cites one case from my hometown Randolph, New Jersey about the Macedonian church. And Mr. Germinario basically put forward the argument that, you know, this case, they had an approval, a conditional use approval, and then they came back and they needed a conditional use approval again. So therefore, with the cell tower, we're coming back again, we need conditional use approval again, not to oversimplify what you've said.

So let's -- I want to take a look at
the facts of that case. So this was, I don't know what street it was on in Randolph, but it was in Randolph, it was a church, and in 1978 they were initially approved and there was going to be, like, a community hall or an all-purpose room for, like, weddings and they don't do bar mitzvahs, but things like that, weddings and christenings, and they had a

5,000-foot recreation hall that required 50 parking spaces when they were building their church.

Then they didn't have enough money at the time, as the story goes, to build that all-purpose hall. So when they got enough money in 1991, they came back with a much bigger all purpose hall, 11,200 square feet, more than twice what the old one was, and it required 142 parking spaces, almost three times the amount of parking. And the church argued we already got our conditional use, we shouldn't have to modify, we shouldn't have to disrupt this conditional use, we already have it. We're conditionally permitted. And the Court said no, because the conditions were way more vague than they are here, like, you cannot impede the quality of life and the neighborhood and things like that, very difficult to measure.

But the Court disagreed with the
church, it agreed with the board and it found that it differed substantially from that approval in 1978, namely an increase in size. The conditional use increased in size.

Based on the changes in the proposal, the planning board acted within the bounds of its discretion in deciding to review the application anew
under the ordinance.
I would say of course this required conditional use approval, but this is not the situation we have here. We are not touching the conditional use in question. $D-3$ variances are only pertaining to a conditional use. A conditional use is not at application here, it's not at subject here, and that case was a lot about the First Amendment and religious freedom, but.

So again, looking at the ordinance, moving to the ordinance part, not just the Municipal Land Use Law, so what -- Ordinance Section 215-12.6B1A it says, quote, "Before proposing a site within the Borough of Mendham for wireless facilities," before, that's when this ordinance -- or this ordinance was drafted to regulate before a wireless telecommunication facility is constructed.

It doesn't say anything about existing
facilities, like as Mr. Germinario said, like, the mountain came to them or something like that, it doesn't address that situation, right, that's why we're here. If it did, we wouldn't be here.

And in my view, it does not prohibit subsequent dwellings from coming to an existing facility before proposing -- yeah, I read that. I
read that.
So and I guess I'll also just say that the east business affordable -- this is a new zoning district, this is an affordable overlay, it dealt with neighborhood impacts in its own way. It did not speak to this issue.

This cell tower was there when the ordinance was adopted, it was there when the settlement was being negotiated, it's in the concept plan, and the ordinance was adopted on the basis of that settlement agreement.

The east business overlay imposed its own buffering requirements to protect adjacent residential districts. It demonstrates the same intent as the wireless ordinance to protect existing residents from the impacts of new development, not to protect new residents from existing structures. And that is the requirements of Section 215-27, impact on adjoining residents shall apply.

A 30-foot buffer is required where the east business affordable housing zone abuts any overlay residential district, but existing improvements, roadways, or structure shall be exempt from this requirement.

Bottom line, there's no clear legal --
there's no clear legal mechanism. You are not obligated. You would not be flaunting the law or ignoring part of your code to decide that this is an as-of-right use. I think, quite frankly, it's the opposite here.

Point number two, in 2017 the approval of the wireless facility did not impose any ongoing conditions of approval to be associated with the variance relief. So if we have no clear statutory or ordinance provision requiring this, then the next place I would look, as I guess an attorney and also a planner --

BY MR. ORTH:
Q. As a planner tonight.
A. As a planner.
Q. I'll be the lawyer. Okay?
A. He'll be the lawyer.

But as a planner with a legal eye, I guess you could say, I'd be looking at the conditions of approval, right? That's the thing that lives on, that's the resolution, that's where we all go to look about what happened and what did we agree to as part of this approval collectively? Nothing in there about this.

Does it mention the ordinance at all?

Actually yes, but just not this section. It references Section 215-12.6L regarding the removal of the telecommunication facility. That one they knew. That one the planning board knew that they needed to keep enforcement of well after this ordinance either comes or goes or whatever happens that you knew that you wanted that to be durable.

Why mention the condition if it was presumed as an automatic operation of law that conditional use standards are imposed upon a use for its lifetime. Why do that?

There's nothing prohibiting housing or requiring ongoing enforcement of conditional use standards in the resolution itself. So these are going to go faster, I promise.

Point number three, to require a D-3 variance under the circumstances would be inconsistent with the intent of the governing body. So again, we talked about legislative intent being really the most important thing, the governing body's intent, what did they intend -- and not when they adopted that cellphone or the mobile tower ordinance, what did they intend when they entered into a settlement agreement? What did they intend when they adopted the zoning allowing
multifamily to happen here? Did they intend for us to turn around three years later and say actually, Governing Body, you were wrong. You cannot build the housing here that you already permitted. They decide. They make those decisions. The governing body makes those decisions.

And so we have in the settlement agreement, Mr. Orth, and I think the relevant points in that settlement agreement, not to quote -- I'm not quoting tonight, that it permits the housing as of right and it permits the existing uses to remain as of right.

That is not the -- that is not what -deciding anything else, deciding that a $D-3$ variance would be required here would presume that you could deny that $D-3$ variance, which makes it not as of right. It was supposed to be an as-of-right thing, that was the bargain of the governing body.

So I have a map, an exhibit, and I think somebody asked this question, it's not the best map, it's not as pretty as Bruce's pictures. BY MR. ORTH:
Q. Before you hand that out, Phil, why don't we just identify what the map is, provide a date of it, and tell the board what it is you're
going hand to them.
A. Okay. It's A something.

MS. SMITH: Five.
BY MR. ORTH:
Q. We're up to A-5.
A. A-5. So this is an aerial photograph, it is not, you know, done to precise engineering standards, but I'm comfortable as a licensed professional testifying to this.

What I did was I tried to look at some of the different setbacks that are required under the ordinance because that affordable housing ordinance pushes the housing to the way back, right, and then the cell tower ordinance puts that little ring, that 250-foot ring around it. So what's left?

You know, we've heard some talk about relocation. Is there a place to relocate it where we're not going to trigger new $D-3$ variances? And then you really do need a new D-3 variance because then you're relocating or disrupting the actual conditional use or the conditional structure, however you want to say that. Anyway --
Q. Which again is not what we're proposing, right?
A. Which is not what we're proposing.

So that's what this is, it's an aerial photograph with some annotations that my list has created on there. May I approach?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yeah, go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I'm going keep one for myself and then I will give some more, or should I pass these out?

MR. ORTH: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to mark Mr. Abramson's copy as A-5, if I may.

MR. GERMINARIO: Hold on. Let me just take a look at this thing.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: If you have any extras, send them back.

MR. GERMINARIO: So Mr. Abramson, You have on this marked out the 250 -foot radius --

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. GERMINARIO: -- from the cell tower within which there would be an issue with the proximity to residential uses, right?

THE WITNESS: Correct, so yes and I'll just --

MR. GERMINARIO: And before you go on, so what is this red line 700 foot setback line, what is that?

THE WITNESS: Thanks for asking. So
that is the closest a multifamily residence can be to the street. The affordable housing ordinance requires a 700-foot setback. So that housing is pushed within 250 feet of that tower, that was the intent of that ordinance.

So if this, in fact, requires $D-3$
relief under some mechanism that $I$ have not been able to locate after weeks of research, then the governing body -- it was on oversight of the governing body to do that because they pushed that. And there's nowhere within that front yard set back that you can put that tower and it would be not within 250 feet on this property.
(Whereupon, Aerial Photograph is marked as Exhibit A-5 for identification.) MR. GERMINARIO: So you've just made a -- this can go in, but you've just made a very good argument for the variance relief.

MS. BUSHMAN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: I made the argument as to why the legislative intent couldn't be to --

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, that's --
MS. BUSHMAN: Who are you to determine what the legislative intent is of our city council? You are talking about intent, intent, intent, but you
have not -- I mean that's hearsay when you're talking this intent and they made a mistake.

We passed -- what was passed was passed. This is an issue for the court because obviously you have a very different opinion of what our council did and I'm not going to sit here and guess what city council did 10, 15, 20 years ago or what those good people's legislative intent was. They passed ordinances, they have it in the code. So you can debate all you want, but I am very offended.

THE WITNESS: Can I explain?
MS. BUSHMAN: On behalf of city council and of the very good volunteers on this committee. And I am one to say very few words. And for your gratification, I've been an AIC certified planner since 1986, so I have earned my stripes.

And I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but that's about the first time I've ever been very disturbed. CHAIRMAN RITGER: I applaud your enthusiasm on this --

MS. BUSHMAN: And to dictate to this board that your intent, this is your intent and to say that we made a mistake and that you can interpret the code freely because you accused counsel of making
a mistake based on your interpretation, it sounds to me like this has to be decided in a court.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, no, no. The -MS. BUSHMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but I'm just very offended. I apologize.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, your comments are well taken, but this isn't the venue for deciding it. What we decided -- the applicant -- it's the applicant's move about whether they want to challenge it in court or not, but the question is before us.

And I think Mr. Abramson is trying to make a circumstantial case to infer based on this logic that he's presented in this exhibit to infer what the intent might be.

Can he tell was what the actual intent was without reading your mind, Joyce, no.

MS. BUSHMAN: Well, that's my point.
MR. GERMINARIO: And I think you're right to point that out, but it is in the law when you're looking for legislative intent, you can use inferential arguments. And so what he's trying to do, it may not absolutely prove what the intent is, but it's presenting some evidence and that's allowable.

So did I explain your case well enough
or do you want to add something to that?
MS. BUSHMAN: I understand the points, Tom, but to infer that this was a mistake by council and therefore, the intent is this; it's one thing to discuss the intent, it's another thing to say there was mistakes and say, so we'll interpret it this way.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, yeah, but you know, that cuts both ways. If was a mistake and it wasn't their intent, the mistake means okay, they didn't realize it, there's a conflict and Mr. Abramson is trying to make his case for it existed when they put the combination of 70-foot setback and 200-foot radius, maybe they didn't, that just didn't pop up on their radar that's conceivable too but --

THE WITNESS: That's what I meant.
MR. GERMINARIO: So go ahead with your testimony, you know.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So the last point I have, point number five, is talking about logic, right.

We talked -- Mr. Germinario's letter talked a lot about logic. And it -- I'd like to discuss why I think it was more logical to interpret that a $D-3$ variance is not required here.

We take this D-3 to its inevitable conclusion. The D-3 proofs would not really make sense here when we have -- when the use is existing. It would require me to put proofs on basically that the site remains appropriate for a conditional use despite the failure to conform to all the ordinance's conditions, which is Coventry Square, the permitted case on conditional uses.

We would do that by looking at purposes and conditions. What is this ordinance trying to accomplish? What is that conditional use ordinance trying to accomplish?

The only stated intent in this case are visual and aesthetic in nature. And to cite the United States Telecommunication Act, 40 U.S.C.(a) 332 quote:

> "No state or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of environmental effects of radiofrequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the commission's regulation concerning such emissions," which was cited by New Jersey Supreme Court in

Smart SMR verse Borough of Fair Lawn in 1998. So what are the other conditional uses? What are the things that we're trying to avoid, that people in this new apartment building are going to have to look at the cellphone tower here verse to the right verse somewhere else?

How -- for how -- as the next point, these conditions associated with conditional uses in the ordinance, how long -- how long do they persist, a hundred years? Fifty years? Eight years? Is it forever?

There's been -- there's no law on this. There's no case law on this point. So now we're going to determine that there's an indefinite expert, you know, or what -- yeah, I said that -- or that they're going to stay on for that long.

And I'll conclude it's my opinion it is within the zoning board's jurisdiction and discretion to determine that conditional use standards for an existing wireless facility should retroactively apply to the proposed inclusionary developments for the reasons I've stated.

The intent of the zoning ordinance was to restrict wireless facilities within 200 feet from existing residences. To find otherwise under the
circumstances would be inconsistent with the intent of the governing body's execution of the settlement agreement under the EB-AH Ordinance.

MR. ORTH: I have nothing further on direct for Mr. Abramson and I tender him over to the board and your professionals.

MR. GERMINARIO: Okay. Could I go
first?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes, Tom.
MR. GERMINARIO: So Mr. Abramson, what was the status of this tower prior to the settlement agreement?

THE WITNESS: It was there, as far as I know.

MR. GERMINARIO: It was what kind of a use at that point in time?

THE WITNESS: An existing use?
MR. GERMINARIO: Well, in terms of we talked about permitted uses and conditionally permit uses.

THE WITNESS: I really think that
applies to things that are --
MS. SMITH: Mr. Abramson, can you
please speak up a little?
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
Rizman Rappaport (973)992-7650
"When every word counts"

So it wasn't the subject of any active application. So was the use considered conditional, yes.

MR. GERMINARIO: It was a conditional use.

So did the settlement agreement change that, did it change it from a conditional use to a categorically permitted use, did that happen? Is that what the settlement agreement did?

THE WITNESS: The settlement agreement had no effect on the use.

MR. GERMINARIO: So it remained a permitted use -- I'm sorry -- a conditionally permitted use.

So the argument that I've heard both from counsel and yourself was that somehow when this settlement agreement referred to the fact that existing uses would -- permitted existing uses would remain as permitted uses, then it didn't change the status of the tower, the tower remained as a conditional use permitted as a condition use, correct?

MR. ORTH: Objection.
I'm going to -- if I may,
Mr. Germinario, I have a very brief closing argument
whenever Mr. Abramson is done and I'm going to address that briefly.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, I'd like him to answer the question. He testified to it, so I'd like him to answer the question.

MR. ORTH: You can answer the question.
THE WITNESS: So under the zoning ordinance is a conditional use, it was not subject to any preceding or active application at the time.

MR. GERMINARIO: Okay. So there was no operation either through the settlement agreement or through the ordinance that was passed pursuant to the settlement agreement that wiped out the conditions subject to which that power existed as a permitted use?

THE WITNESS: No, but the tower exists as a permitted use.

MR. GERMINARIO: Granted.
So now we come to a point where one of the conditions that made it a permitted use, one of the compliance conditions that made it a permitted use was the fact that it was more than 250 feet from residences.

And now, as happened in the Macedonian church, the site development is changing so that now
what was -- so that condition that was originally approved is no longer complied with, now we have residences within 250 feet.

So why -- under the Macedonian case, I see the clear parallel. Why are we, in our discretion -- I mean, they talk about board discretion and the board is entitled to exercise that discretion in a reasonable way to say okay, let's look at this now, let's look at what has happened and how it's changed in the conditions pursuant to which this was originally approved.

I'm not saying that this triggers something where we say, okay, we have the right to tell you to pull up the tower and move it to the other side of the lot or anything like that, but the fact that we have at least an obligation as a planning group to look at the planning consequences of the change, you're saying we don't have that discretion?

THE WITNESS: I don't think you do.
MR. GERMINARIO: Why?
THE WITNESS: Because I think that it's an existing use and we do not have a conditional use variance in front of us. The Macedonian church case specifically involved the modification and
intensification of a conditional use, this case does not.

MR. GERMINARIO: It becomes intensified -- well, $I$ won't use the word intensified.

The planning aspects of it change when you put housing right next to it; don't you agree with that? There are planning --

THE WITNESS: Housing is a permitted use here.

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, yeah, but as a planner you want to put on blinders and say okay, I don't want to see what happens when I put housing next to this tower, I'm just going to say it's an existing thing, so we can just wipe this slate clean.

Let's say hypothetically, and I'm not saying this is true, but hypothetically let's say that in the interim, the $T$-Mobile people have put a 5G antenna that's pointed straight down, why would they do that in the real world, of course it would be ridiculous, but let's say they did and it was pointing straight down with an intense RF signal right at where you -- the bedrooms of the residential building that you want to put there, we would -- we should say, okay, we want to put our head in the sand and we don't want to look at that because it's
existing; is that what you're arguing?
THE WITNESS: I think under federal law and under the Fair Lawn case, you're prohibited from looking at radiofrequency and the environmental effects of radiofrequency.

MR. GERMINARIO: We -- well, I don't agree with that. I mean, we -- we went through many hearings on the original site of this in which we heard RF testimony and RF testimony showing that they meet federal standards, and I think the telecommunications act says that, it says okay, if they're meeting federal standards, you don't develop your own standards or say that's not good enough?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. GERMINARIO: So there's a difference there, though. The question is, okay, are they meeting -- do they continue to meet federal standards with this housing right underneath the tower?

I think there's a very clear answer to that. We got many volumes of testimony on what the -- where the RF signal was -- where it was and what they -- the magnitude of that radiation was and at the foot of the tower was not a place where it was.

So, you know, these things are things that we have to look at, not to say, okay, well, okay, now you're putting this close, so you can't do it. We're just saying as planners and as regulators we can exercise our discretion, let's take a look at it.

You've already made a number of arguments that would actually be very convincing in the context of is it proper to grant this variance. THE WITNESS: I'm glad you think so. MR. GERMINARIO: But what I'm suggesting, though, is that those arguments would apply, but they don't foreclose us nor should they foreclose us from reviewing and making sure. I mean, we're dealing with questions that may be of significance to public health and safety, of, you know, obtrusive appearances and so on and so forth. I've heard all that you've said and when you come back, if the board decides that way, those arguments are going to be good arguments, persuasive arguments in terms of what the need for variance relief or the justification for variance relief could be, but I'll leave it at that.

Your opinion is the board is without power to exercise its discretion to take another look
at this to make sure it's still okay.
THE WITNESS: So the board has the -this is the zoning board essentially. MR. GERMINARIO: Correct. THE WITNESS: You have the right to interpret your ordinance.

MR. GERMINARIO: All right. Okay. MS. BUSHMAN: Thank you. MR. GERMINARIO: All right. Paul, would you like to --

MR. FERRIERO: I did have one question because I wrote some notes here and I'm coming at this as the engineer trying to think logically. I am a planner, I'm going to let Jessica do that and I'll let you do that, but I'm trying to understand what you said.

It almost sounds like you said once you get a conditional use approved then those conditions disappear and they don't apply here anymore.

THE WITNESS: So what 1 will -- what my testimony is is that $I$ have spent weeks researching case law on this matter, and I'm sure Mr. Germinario has too and, there's nothing -- this is not addressed by the courts.

MR. FERRIERO: I'm not asking you that
question.
THE WITNESS: Well, that's where I would get my guidance from.

MR. FERRIERO: Okay. But is it -- how long does a site plan approval last?

THE WITNESS: It lasts, what is it, two or three years until -- unless it's vested and they pull building permits and there's two extensions that can happen under the statute to your --

MR. FERRIERO: I'm going to have to disagree with you on that. It's my opinion that a site plan approval lasts indefinitely. The protections of the ordinance may expire, as you said, but the site plan lasts indefinitely.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. FERRIERO: How long does a variance
last?
THE WITNESS: It runs with the land.
MR. FERRIERO: Okay. So why wouldn't the conditions of a conditional use run with the land like a site plan runs with the land and just go on indefinitely? I can't understand -- I'm trying to wrap my head around that logic that all of a sudden this one thing just goes away and --

THE WITNESS: I understand, but we're,
you know, we're bodies of law and there is no law on that point.

MR. FERRIERO: No, but there is logic.
THE WITNESS: In your opinion.
MR. FERRIERO: In my opinion.
MR. ORTH: Paul, can you -- were you talking about the conditions of approval attached to the approval, or just the conditional use?

MR. FERRIERO: No. What Phil said was that the conditions of a conditional use go away once it's approved.

MR. ORTH: Any further questions from the board?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anybody?
MR. SMITH: Well, yeah, I have just a response. I mean, you're proposing this residential unit, which is four stories above the parking garage which elevates potential living spaces and it could potentially put them in line with RF frequencies because when this tower was put up, all the buildings in the surrounding area in there were only one story and they had lined all the antennas -- I was at every meeting, you know, right from Day 1 with this cell tower proposal and, you know, so everything was in line.

I would at least like the opportunity to have an RF expert justify your point or our point and make it clear to everybody that there's no health or safety issues that could potentially happen to residents of those units.

MS. SMITH: Rich, can you speak up a little more into the microphone?

MR. SMITH: I would just appreciate an RF expert in investigating this, because the elevation of these apartments brings it in line with the height of the tower to a certain point and it could potentially, you know, have RF radiation or frequency entering into living areas of these apartments and, you know, from a health and safety aspect, I'd like that investigated. So I would tend to want to have, you know, that investigated and checked out.

MR. ORTH: So thank you, Mr. Smith, your concern is noted and, you know, public health and safety is always a part of any land use application, whether it's a D-3 or an as-of-right application.

So that's not a concern that necessarily goes away even if the board determines that there is no $D-3$ variance associated with this
application, which is what we're requesting that you interpret.

MR. SMITH: Well, there was a D-3
interpret -- you know, we did require a $D-3$, then we can request that and hold you to it; whereas, you know, if we just say oh, no, you don't need a variance, you know, it could be status quo, the towers could stay the same, the frequencies could stay the same, and there could be no investigation of potential harm.

MR. ORTH: Understood.
I just wanted to make that clear that that type of request can be made even if you determine that there is no D-3.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: I had previously -Tom, don't hit me -- previously I asked about the location of the tower, but did you do due diligence and ask the owners of the tower, Verizon, T-Mobile and the like if they could, in fact, replace the tower with DAS units?

MR. ORTH: I have not, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Why not? You wouldn't need a variance if you did.

MR. ORTH: I'm not sure what a DAS unit is, to be honest, at this moment.

MR. GERMINARIO: Mr. Chairman, you're getting ahead of us. Those are questions that would come into play if the board decides --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: It would obviate the need for a variance, that would be one of the things I would think of.

THE WITNESS: What is a DAS unit?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: A distributed antenna system.

MR. GERMINARIO: We're not deciding tonight whether they can avoid the variance, we are deciding tonight whether the variance exists.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: All right. Let me ask a totally different question.

In your opinion, Mr. Abramson, could you build the entire residence around that tower, surround it immediately so the tower is right in the middle of it?

THE WITNESS: There are wireless antennas on top of residential buildings, you know, regularly in this country in New Jersey. So yeah, I don't think --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Would you do it?
THE WITNESS: Would I?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yeah.

MR. ORTH: Phil, frankly, we have an application pending before the board.

The application is what it is and we're not changing it tonight, Mr . Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Well, all right. Let me go a different route.

Obviously you've dealt with
transformers and transformer locations?
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: So what is the requirement for a transformer and its proximity to a building?

THE WITNESS: 8-by-8 it has to be --
CHAIRMAN RITGER: No, it's 10-by-10, but go on.

THE WITNESS: 10-by-10, but it's an 8-by-8 transformer.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: And how much clearance do you need around that transformer?

THE WITNESS: I think it's 3 feet for a

CHAIRMAN RITGER: No, it's 10 to a combustible service.

Now, in this scenario if you had a transformer that exists, you're suggesting you could
build a building, a new building closer than 10 feet whereas -- yeah, that's what you're saying, we're going to build a -- we're going to take down the old building and build a new one real close to that transformer pad, you're asking us to say that's okay. THE WITNESS: So --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: We have a cell tower that requires 250 foot of clearance, you're saying, no, we could build right around it. And we think we should look at that.

THE WITNESS: I understand. I don't -think that this is different than the transformer phase. I understand your point. And our point is that zoning was adopted after that 250-foot of clearance to say this is a place where you should put housing. And there's no place that could be done in accordance with that ordinance that wouldn't be --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes, there is, but you didn't even go there. You could tear down all the rest of the buildings on the site and build your residential 250 feet away. It would fit. It would work.

THE WITNESS: I know, but that's also -- there's legal issues there, but I understand your point, Mr. Chairman.
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MR. ORTH: Is there a question?
MR. LUPO: I'm just wondering why you missed that paragraph, that's the question.

THE WITNESS: I'll use this one.
So, Mr. Lupo, is it?
MR. LUPO: Yes.
THE WITNESS: So I pulled out the ones that I thought demonstrated intent and purpose. What we will demonstrate, and maybe to Mr. Germinario's point, these are the types of things that would go into a variance proof.

But as I was in the back listening to your questioning earlier, my thought was that this location is more cordoned off from public access than the location that -- that's there today.

Right now a member of the public could walk right up to that fence, that will not be as easy the case under the proposed condition, but I guess maybe I'm getting ahead of myself because that is a --

MR. LUPO: I just want to make sure you read the whole --

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
MR. LUPO: -- purpose of the ordinance,
because I know that you may have offended somebody on
the board.
THE WITNESS: Clearly.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anyone else from the public?

MR. MARINO: So I think Mr. Ritger -THE COURT REPORTER: Just remind me what your name is, sir.

MR. MARINO: Marino, M-A-R-I-N-O, Robert 27 Florie Farm.

I think Mr. Ritger asked this question, but I just want clarification. Is it possible -- how far is the cell phone tower located from the borders of the building, the property? That would be question one.

And then two, is it possible to construct the residences in a way that's in -compliant with the borough's ordinance?

THE WITNESS: I'll answer the second one first.

I have not been able -- I have not seen a way where you can -- where all the ordinances harmonize with each other.

MR. MARINO: That's not really the question. The question was is it possible to build residences in a way that it would be compliant to
build residences on the subject property in a way that they would meet the 250 -foot setback, minimum setback requirement?

THE WITNESS: So as part of the hypothetical, do we assume that the cell tower remains on the site?

MR. MARINO: In its current location. THE WITNESS: Not one -- yes, it's possible, but you would require different variances, it would trigger different -- new variances.

MR. MARINO: Okay.
So it is possible then to build without asking the borough to turn away from this statute, it would require other variances, but it is possible, so that this isn't the only solution to the problem? THE WITNESS: It would -- it would be dramatic.

MR. MARINO: All right. And then do you know the distance to the property line?

THE WITNESS: I can -- do we have that map? I kind of estimated it for you. I don't have it.

Can I borrow that?
MR. GERMINARIO: I think your circle
sort of just goes outs to that --
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THE WITNESS: Yeah, it doesn't go -- I mean, I'm going to let you see this, that might help you. So I'm looking at A-5 and pointing to Mr. Marino, this orange circle is 250 feet, so you kind of --

MR. MARINO: 250 from the tower?
THE WITNESS: Correct, and that red line is the front yard setback.

MR. MARINO: So 250 feet from the tower extends to this building --

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. MARINO: -- which appears to be Mendham Hardware?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
MR. MARINO: All right.
Thank you.
So again, it is possible, it's just not what the applicant is offering today?

MR. ORTH: It's not what we're proposing today and it would create additional variance conditions and also totally disrupt the concept plan to the site.

MR. MARINO: So it would require more work for the applicant to be compliant.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Anyone else?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN RITGER: No, not hearing anyone else in the public.

So Tom.
MR. ORTH: Mr. Chairman?
MR. GERMINARIO: He's got to give a summation.

MR. ORTH: Literally two minutes,
Mr. Chairman, if I may?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Go for it.
MR. ORTH: So first of all, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board, Members of the Public, Board Professionals, we really appreciate your time this evening and your consideration of our proposal.

To briefly summarize, we respectfully submit that there's no doubt that the settlement agreement expressly states the governing body's intention to rezone the subject property and accomplish two relevant items.

First, that the 75-unit inclusionary project be permitted as an as-of-right use and second, that all existing uses on-site be treated as permitted uses.

The settlement agreement is a critical document because it provided for the rezoning of the subject property and was also the principal document, which allowed Mendham to satisfy its affordable housing obligation by meeting nearly the entirety of its obligation on one site.

We respectfully submit that this
intention was carried over into the ordinance which expressly references the settlement agreement and states that it is designed to implement the objectives of the settlement agreement, which as noted, provided that all existing uses are to be treated as permitted uses.

Since the cell tower existed prior to the execution of the settlement agreement, it is an existing use, which we respectfully must be considered as a permitted use and not a conditionally permitted use.

That said, even if the board finds that
a portion of Ordinance 09-2020 conflicts with the code provision concerning cell towers, the ordinance provides a way to resolve this inconsistency, that conflict resolution paragraph is set forth in Section 5 of Ordinance 09-2020 which states that:
"All ordinances of the Borough of

Mendham that are inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency." So Ordinance 09-2020 contemplated that there might be some inconsistencies and addressed them by resolving them in favor of the ordinance. By the ordinance, I'm referring to Ordinance 09-2020. Third, it is also clear that Mendham's cell tower ordinance, which is found at Section 215-12.6 of the code is only applicable when an application for a cell tower is filed with the board. We are not proposing a cell tower, we are proposing a residential development in furtherance of Mendham's Mount Laurel obligation.

So for all these reasons and for the reasons testified by our experts, we respectfully request that the board interpret Ordinance 09-2020 so as to not require a D-3 conditional use variance in connection with the residential development of this site. Thank you.

MR. GERMINARIO: So let me just state a little legal guidance of my own in this response to some of the issues that they have raised.

When we look at the settlement agreement, it does not say that it's going to convert
any conditionally permitted use to a categorically permitted use; it doesn't say that. It says that there will be an ordinance passed and it refers to that ordinance and it says that existing uses, the actual words "permit the existing uses on the property to remain as a permitted use."

So the permitted -- conditionally permitted uses would remain as conditionally permitted uses; that's -- that fits perfectly within the actual wording of the settlement agreement.

And when you look at the ordinance itself, it does not refer to the telecommunications tower as uses permitted under Section 215-73, it doesn't specifically refer to it, but it does refer to any use permitted in the historic business zone. So this cell tower would fall under that category as a use permitted, but a use permitted conditionally. And I think the terminology is broad enough to take that in. So there isn't -- I don't see any inference here that somehow through the back door, this ordinance intended to repeal the conditional use conditions and the telecommunications tower ordinance.

I mean, that's such an extreme step to go ahead and say, okay, this ordinance is -- now you
can put up cell towers with any conditions whatsoever, we can just throw this ordinance out. I would expect that to be emphatically stated, not just through some verbiage, that standard verbiage at the end of every ordinance that the township -- I mean the borough passes.

So I don't find that argument
convincing. I think that, as I said to Mr. Abramson, the board has issues that are raised by the fact that this will no longer comply with the conditions under which the tower was approved and the board has the discretion to take a look at that and see and satisfy itself that we're not creating conditions that are either incompatible with the character of the area or incompatible with the health and safety of the people who are going to be residing in this proposed housing.

So my legal position remains as stated in my letter of May 2nd, it's up to the board to make the final decision.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: All right.
MS. BUSHMAN: Are you asking for a
motion too?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Well, we've got to formulate that motion. So to get to that, I would
think the motion is simply to state that a variance would be required, therefore -- well --

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, let me try and state it.

So on the question of the $D-1$ variance as it pertains to the issue of potential services that would store vehicles for third parties that would not be an accessory to this -- either the car dealership or the residential dwelling, that we find that based on the representations made and the document, the revised planning report, that that variance is not required, that would be point number one.

Point number two, that the board has heard the arguments of the applicant, but the board reaffirms the position of its planner and its attorney that a D-3 variance is required with respect to the setback of the tower from the residences that are proposed.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: So to boil that down to two different questions, we would need a motion to state that a $D-1$ variance is not required and then a separate motion stating that a $D-3$ variance is required. So if there's an agreement on that, we can start with the first.

MR. GERMINARIO: Yes, you can do it that way.

MS. BUSHMAN: So you're stating the first motion in the negative so --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes.
MS. BUSHMAN: Say that again.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes, it will state that the $D-1$ variance is not required and if you agree, you're stating that it is not required.

MS. BUSHMAN: So that would be a yes. And then the other one you're stating in the affirmative --

MS. SMITH: Tom, Mr. Lupo pointed out that you didn't open the public comment at the end of the testimony.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: It wasn't a new -- we open testimony when there's a new person that is providing testimony.

MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, but -- no, that is a valid point. Under the procedure if they have their -- as opposed to questions, if they have factual testimony that they want to give that would be relevant to this, we should reopen and allow that.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: So be it.
MS. SMITH: They have to be sworn in,
correct?
MR. GERMINARIO: They have to be sworn in, yeah.

Mr. Lupo, is it?
MR. LUPO: Yes.
MR. GERMINARIO: Frank Lupo. Frank Lupo, do you swear your testimony will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. LUPO: I do.
FRANKIUPO,
17 Dean Road, Mendham, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. GERMINARIO: Go ahead.
MS. SMITH: Frank, can you use that microphone, that one?

MR. ORTH: Testing. It's out.
MS. SMITH: Here.
MR. LUPO: Thank you.
I just wanted to make a comment.
I appreciate all your input and
interaction and understanding that the -- these ordinances are there for a purpose and there is a conditional use and we did go through 22 meetings, at least $I$ went through 22 meetings, and there's purposes for those 22 meetings.

And technology changed, things have changed, not only do you want to expand the uses on that property, but as the Chair said, there's other technology. So that tower does not have to remain. That tower could go away. That tower could be transformed. I think there's other opportunities here as opposed to just saying we're going to put this up here and just look the other way.

So I do believe a D-3 variance is
something, a process that we need to go through. And I do believe those directional antennas compounded by multiple towers and the 5G are going to present some sort of RF frequencies or dangers to the tenants that are to be facing those towers or facing that -facing that tower and those antennas.

That's all I want to say and I just want to thank you for your efforts and your passion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Public comment is open if anyone else would like to come forward.

MR. GERMINARIO: And again, this is -we're saying comment, but we want to hear factual testimony.

Do you swear -- repeat your name again.
MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Melissa

Rawley-Payne.
MR. GERMINARIO: Do you swear your testimony is going to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Yes, I do.

23 Drake Road, Mendham, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. GERMINARIO: Okay.
MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: So there was a
statement by the V-Fee attorney, and apologies, I forgot to write your name down, so --

MR. ORTH: Derek.
MS. RAWLEY-PAYNE: Derek, yes, that this will meet almost all of our affordable housing requirement, but there is a document on the website, third affordable housing presentation that says we have 152 units that we have to meet.

So I just wanted to make that clarification to the public because I didn't want anyone walking away thinking this was it, because we still have quite a number of affordable housing units ahead of us. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Very good job. I was going to point that out myself.

All right. We do have a bit of a time constraint, but nonetheless, any other comments from the public or testimony, I should say?

All right. And let's see if we can get ourselves to a motion for the first item, which was the $\mathrm{D}-1$ variance.

So again, I'll state it this way: A D-1 variance is not required and if you want to make a motion, that's the statement.

MR. PACE: I guess that's with the stipulation that was made that the parking would be different?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: That parking would be for tenants only.

MR. PACE: I'll make that clear.
MR. SMITH: I'll make a motion.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Do I have a second?
MR. EGERTER: I'll second.
MS. SMITH: Who was the second?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Mr. Egerter.
MS. SMITH: Okay.
Ms. Bushman.
MS. BUSHMAN: Could you please repeat
the motion?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: That a $\mathrm{D}-1$ variance
is not required.
MS. SMITH: Do you agree?
MS. BUSHMAN: I'm going to vote no, I don't agree.

MS. SMITH: You think a $D$ variance is required, a D-1?

MS. BUSHMAN: Yeah.
MS. SMITH: Okay.
Mr. Ritger?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Smith?
MR. SMITH: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Sprandel?
MR. SPRANDEL: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. D'Urso?
(No response.)
MS. SMITH: Oh, sorry, he isn't --
Mr. Egerter?
MR. EGERTER: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Ms. Garbacz?
MS. GARBACZ: Yes.
MS. SMITH: And, Mr. Molnar?
MR. MOLNAR: No.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: All right.
Next up for the D-3 variance the
statement will be this: The $D-3$ variance is required, and this is regarding the setback for the cell tower.

Anyone like to make a motion stating that the $D-3$ variance is required?

MR. KAY: I'll make a motion that the D-3 variance is required.

MS. SMITH: Mr. Kay, you can't. I'm sorry.

There's not enough board members missing.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: I see. MR. EGERTER: I'd like to make a motion.

MS. SMITH: Mr. Egerter.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Do we have a second?
MR. SMITH: I'll second it.
MS. SMITH: Ms. Bushman. A D-3 is required.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Is required.
MS. BUSHMAN: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Ritger?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Smith?
MR. SMITH: Yes.
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MS. SMITH: Mr. Sprandel?
MR. SPRANDEL: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Mr. Egerter?
MR. EGERTER: Yes.
MS. SMITH: Ms. Garbacz?
MS. GARBACZ: Yes.
MS. SMITH: And, Mr. Molnar?
MR. MOLNAR: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Okay. Well, this concludes the interpretation segment.

Thank you.
MR. ORTH: Mr. Chairman, may I briefly discuss scheduling and next steps for the site plan application?

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yes, I think Lisa, you're going to know more than I regarding who we have in June, so --

MS. SMITH: I haven't had any
communication with Accordia, so --
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Okay. Do we have
Kuchinski then as a hearing?
MS. SMITH: Yes, it will be Kuchinski and then if they wanted to come on for --

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Okay. So we have an application that will precede you for an addition of
lot coverage on a house on Franklin, but that will be for June.

So we would expect, if you would like, to see you in June.

MR. ORTH: Yes, that would be great, Mr. Chairman, and the board has determined that a D-3 variance is required.

I believe there's an application fee associated with that which we will submit to Ms. Smith and we'd like to be scheduled for the June meeting.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Very good.
MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, so that will be initially completeness based on your submission that would require fees and documentation in connection with the $D-3$ variance, and then we will go right from the completeness into the hearing on the merits.

MS. SMITH: And then just note that the next meeting is at the high school, West Morris High School.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Mendham High School.
MR. ORTH: We're going to the high
school?
CHAIRMAN RITGER: Yeah.
MR. ORTH: Okay. I'll just get the
address for that and I will notice for the June meeting on the assumption it will be -- the application will be deemed complete.

CHAIRMAN RITGER: Okay.
MS. SMITH: Now, will you need all new applications to the board, all new plans and -- just so he knows what he needs.

MR. GERMINARIO: No, I think, though, that the board already has copies of the planner's revised planning report, they'll need that.

MR. FERRIERO: They may want to amend that to include the $\mathrm{D}-3$ arguments.

MR. GERMINARIO: The what?
MR. FERRIERO: A D-3 variance. Aren't they going to put that in their planner's report, that they need a $D-3$ variance?

MR. GERMINARIO: Well, you know,
that -- the D-3 variances, they're going to have to address that in the planner's report as far as the basis for the relief, it's up to the applicant.

If the applicant can do that, they can revise the planner's report so that some of Mr. Abramson's issues that he made that really would pertain to the merits of that variance, you could do that. That's your option.

I don't think we have to compel you, because you can do that through testimony as well. I'm sure that Mr. Abrams is going to be back and testifying on the merits of that, granting that variance.

MR. ORTH: Right. Thank you.
And I wouldn't bring Phil back as the initial witness on the site plan application, you know, we'll probably start with the engineer, just so everyone knows.

MR. ABRAMSON: Give me a breather.
MR. GERMINARIO: But I think just a word to the wise, Mr . Orth, you might want to get an RF expert. I think that he would have all the data he needs if we could pull out some of the records of that original application as we went through that whole thing in terms of RF.

Matter of fact, I seem to recall there was an exhibit in that case that went from zero distance out to the property line and said here are the RF numbers. And, you know, again, you don't have to prove to the satisfaction of this board that it's quote, unquote safe, you have to prove that it is in compliance with federal standards of safety, as you referred to The Telecommunications Act and you
witnessed it too.
So we're not here as experts, but we need an expert of some form to tell us yeah, this is with the housing where it's proposed, no problem, federal standards are going to be complied with.

MR. SMITH: And that report also was
that ground up, Tom, we're talking four or five stories high, so you'll have the different elevations.

MR. GERMINARIO: Yeah, yeah, you're right. So the expert, you know, these things it's a matter of mathematics, the radiation is so much here, so all equations that they can come up with and extrapolate from the existing data, but, you know, so let's have that and perhaps your other witness talking about the sort of use of the buildings to mask or block the site of the tower in terms of the other part of this ordinance talking about the sort of aesthetic context of the 250-foot boundary.

MR. ORTH: Okay. Thank you, everyone, for your time and we'll look forward to seeing everyone again in June.

Thank you.
(Whereupon, this meeting in concluded.
Time noted: 10:00 p.m.)
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