

CITY OF HOBOKEN PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
CASE: HOP-16-11

- - - - - X
RE: 807-809 Castle Point Terrace :
Block: 236, Lots 3 and 4.02 : September 14, 2016
Zone: R-1(E) : 7:45 p.m.
APPLICANT: Trustees of Stevens :
Institute of Technology :
Preliminary & Final Site Plan and :
Variance Review :
(Continued from 6/28/16 & 8/2/16) :
- - - - - X

Held At: 94 Washington Street
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Chairman Gary Holtzman
- Vice Chair Frank Magaletta
- Commissioner Caleb D. Stratton
- Commissioner Brandy Forbes
- Commissioner Jim Doyle
- Commissioner Ann Graham
- Commissioner Ryan Peene
- Commissioner Rami Pinchevsky
- Commissioner Tom Jacobson
- Commissioner Kelly O'Connor

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

- David Glynn Roberts, AICP/PP, LLA, RLA
Board Planner
- Andrew R. Hipolit, PE, PP, CME
Board Engineer
- Patricia Carcone, Board Secretary

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

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

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

7 RUBIN & DOMBECK, LLC
8 141 Ayers Court (Suite 1B)
9 Teaneck, New Jersey 07666
10 (201) 618-8520
11 BY: JASON R. TUVEL, ESQUIRE
12 Attorneys for the Applicant.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

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

WITNESS

PAGE

Modeste A. Sobolta

31&53

Elizabeth Fassman-Beck

35&47

Andrew H. Missey

46

Keenan Hughes

55

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: All right. And who
2 is up to bat?

3 Mr. Tuvel, how are you tonight?

4 MR. TUVEL: Good evening, Mr.
5 Chairman --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Good evening.

7 MR. TUVEL: -- and members of the
8 Board.

9 Jason Tuvel, attorney for the
10 applicant, Stevens Institute of Technology.

11 We are back here on the North Building
12 application.

13 We had two meetings before the Board
14 previously. I thought our last meeting was very
15 productive, and we had a laundry list of items to
16 address after that meeting.

17 So just to summarize them very briefly,
18 our professionals, our traffic engineer and our
19 professional planner spoke with, I believe, Mr.
20 Roberts and Mr. Hipolit concerning parking issues to
21 work those out in connection with all of the numbers
22 that are going on on our campus, and I believe based
23 on the letters that we received, that was done
24 satisfactorily.

25 We also had a --

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Do you want to go
2 through it as a little introduction here, or do you
3 want to like knock these out one by one and have the
4 gentlemen comment on them?

5 MR. TUVEL: Either way. Either way is
6 fine.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's jump in here
8 real quick.

9 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's keep the foot
11 on the gas.

12 MR. TUVEL: That's fine.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: You received some
14 information on the traffic count, and what is the
15 recap there, Dave?

16 MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, before
17 actually the last hearing, which was not a
18 procedural hearing, it was more of an informational
19 hearing, there was a report filed by Stonefield
20 Traffic Consultants.

21 We had a question on it in our review
22 letter having to do with the parking in the city's
23 garage that was attributed to part of the Gateway
24 application, and that was the main issue that we
25 resolved.

1 That parking, which I believe was 60
2 spaces, was to compensate for the 39 spaces, I
3 believe it was, that was lost when Gateway was built
4 on the surface parking lot that is there.

5 It is temporary, and it would be
6 permanently replaced by the Babbio Garage.

7 So based on that, I can say that the
8 numbers that we are talking about from Babbio and
9 Gateway are accounted for in the Griffith or the
10 Babbio Garage.

11 For the surface lot or the Babbio
12 Garage Lot, our main point, which we continued to
13 make in the letter, is that the Griffith lot for the
14 purposes of the North Building be considered
15 temporary, and that as to permit parking for the
16 North Building also be taken care of when the Babbio
17 Garage is brought on line.

18 I think because it is closer, and it is
19 more convenient to the uses of the north garage, and
20 whoever was using the surface spaces currently on
21 the site when the North Building is built, and that
22 is basically the summary of it, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

24 MR. ROBERTS: That there's no -- that
25 the ordinance does not allow the same parking to be

1 counted twice, and that was the main thing we wanted
2 to make sure of, and I think we're comfortable with
3 that.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

5 Mr. Hipolit, do you concur?

6 MR. HIPOLIT: I agree.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

8 MR. TUVEL: We are good.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioners, any
10 additional questions or comments with regards to
11 this parking spot issue?

12 Great.

13 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

14 The next item was a meeting, and I
15 thank everybody -- I didn't attend that meeting, but
16 a lot of city officials attended. Mr. Hipolit
17 attended that meeting concerning the construction
18 logistics.

19 I know they went through in
20 excruciating details all of those items, and I
21 believe in reviewing Mr. Hipolit's letter, that it
22 was done to his satisfaction, and I believe to the
23 city officials' satisfaction, and there was also a
24 letter from the police department saying they were
25 satisfied with the routes that the trucks were going

1 to take, so I believe we have also accomplished that
2 goal.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Hipolit?

4 MR. HIPOLIT: So for the Board's
5 purpose, you asked me to attend the meeting with the
6 city officials on the delivery of the modular units
7 to the site more for the perspective of can it be
8 done -- more from the perspective of can it be done,
9 not from the details of how it would be done.

10 And what ended up happening was we met
11 with the city, the city's officials, the mayor's
12 office, council members, the police department, the
13 parking authority, myself, and representatives from
14 Stevens, and what was determined was that modular
15 units are delivered to the city on a number of
16 projects. It happens relatively routinely.

17 The police are very comfortable with
18 it. The city is very comfortable with it, and so is
19 the parking authority. They understand the staging,
20 changing of the road direction, the elimination of
21 parking for certain hours, and they understand there
22 will be a scheduling to be done with Stevens and the
23 police, but the one thing that came out of it is
24 that the police must escort the units into the city,
25 and that was it.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Was there also an
2 issue of some indemnification?

3 MR. HIPOLIT: I mean it is really an
4 issue between the applicant and the city, and
5 whether they need to post monies for any damage that
6 could happen. I mean, the police --

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That was discussed
8 at the meeting --

9 MR. HIPOLIT: It was.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- so we will let
11 them work that out.

12 MR. HIPOLIT: Those details we worked
13 out between the city now. It's not an issue.
14 There's nothing that needs to be done in that case
15 by this Board.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

17 MR. HIPOLIT: The only thing I'd say is
18 in your condition of approval, it requires a police
19 escort.

20 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Could you
21 describe what is going to happen? I'm just curious.

22 How many trips and what is the route,
23 do you know?

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Can you handle
25 that, Andy?

1 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I mean, just
2 briefly.

3 MR. HIPOLIT: I have notes. I'm not
4 sure it's necessary for me to cover it, but I can
5 tell you what we talked about.

6 MR. GALVIN: Well, the reason why we
7 are asking you to do this is because we don't want
8 to draw out the hearing tonight.

9 MR. HIPOLIT: No, I can do it.

10 So at the meeting, they are going to
11 have 42 modular units, an elevator unit, a crane.
12 It is going to take 11 days, basically four per day
13 for 11 days.

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: What time of day?

15 MR. HIPOLIT: It would be done during
16 the day.

17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Not during rush
18 hour, I assume?

19 MR. HIPOLIT: No --

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: The police are
21 going to --

22 MR. HIPOLIT: -- so to the police, this
23 seems very routine. They said units come to the
24 city all of the time, and nobody even knows about
25 it.

1 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: You know, this
3 happens to be four a day, but they didn't seem that
4 concerned. They are going to have an escort to get
5 it around the curves. It will go -- they said it
6 will go roughly quick.

7 The thing that does make this delivery
8 somewhat simpler is there's no trailer and a unit.
9 The wheels are attached right to the unit, so they
10 take it, drop it off, and the truck is just the
11 front of the truck, and they're good --

12 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Oh, okay.

13 MR. HIPOLIT: -- so it actually makes
14 it much simpler.

15 I can't stress enough that the police
16 were very comfortable with it. The numbers didn't
17 scare them. They understand there is going to be
18 staging off site, one brought in at a time.
19 They were comfortable with that.

20 And, again, the two police officers
21 that were there said this is something that is very
22 common.

23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So it goes
24 down -- up Washington --

25 MR. HIPOLIT: So it comes over I guess

1 either -- probably the Park Avenue Bridge, come up
2 14th, and down Washington, and up 8th.

3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

4 MR. GALVIN: Let me just say, too, this
5 is beyond what the Planning Board should get into.

6 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All right.

7 MR. GALVIN: However, in this
8 particular case when I heard this come up, I thought
9 we were right to question it because it went to the
10 issue of whether it was impossible to accomplish --

11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

12 MR. GALVIN: -- and I think on the
13 basis of impossible to accomplish, I think we had to
14 evaluate that.

15 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So now it
16 is possible?

17 MR. GALVIN: Now, it's possible.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, we got all of
19 the right people in the room, and they said that it
20 can be done.

21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All right.

22 MR. HIPOLIT: It is going to start
23 sometime after Christmas and be done within 11 days,
24 so, you know, it's due to weather dependent. If it
25 snows, they may or may not go. They follow the DOT

1 restrictions for snowfall, and the DOT is pretty
2 conservative, so there's a lot of eyes watching
3 here. I don't have any concern.

4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

6 MR. TUVEL: I just wanted to get into
7 a few of the other items.

8 Our professional planner will go into
9 this, but we consolidated the lots. That was
10 actually Mr. Roberts' recommendation at the last
11 meeting --

12 MR. GALVIN: It has been already done?

13 MR. TUVEL: Yes -- well, it's part of
14 the application. It's part of the resubmission, so
15 as a condition of approval, we would file a
16 consolidation deed with the Board. The Board could
17 see it would be filed, but that eliminates our side
18 yard setback variance, and we have eliminated the --
19 our lot coverage and open space and one of the
20 building separation variances, so we are actually
21 down to two very minimal building separation
22 variances. One of 1.3 feet, and one of 2.4 feet all
23 in relation to Stevens' buildings, so we are almost
24 a fully compliant site plan at this point.

25 We also submitted --

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Hang on one sec --

2 MR. TUVEL: -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- Mr. Roberts, do
4 you concur with all of that?

5 MR. ROBERTS: Just probably one slight
6 difference.

7 The variance that was eliminated
8 basically on this calculation was the coverage
9 variance --

10 MR. TUVEL: Right.

11 MR. ROBERTS: The open space is still
12 short by about two and a half percent, I believe --

13 MR. TUVEL: The only reason I said
14 that that wasn't a variance because by adding more
15 green space to the site plan, as we did, we took the
16 existing --

17 MR. ROBERTS: Oh, you are talking about
18 your revisions.

19 MR. TUVEL: Right.

20 So it is an existing nonconforming
21 condition today, and we are actually improving that
22 existing nonconformity. We are not exacerbating it
23 as we were previously, so now we are actually making
24 it better.

25 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Right.

1 But you still need relief. They still
2 need relief --

3 MR. TUVEL: I would actually say
4 that --

5 THE REPORTER: Mr. Roberts, what did
6 you say?

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: One at a time,
8 guys.

9 MR. ROBERTS: We still need relief.

10 MR. GALVIN: You're going too fast.

11 MR. ROBERTS: We have taken the
12 position that even though we agree that it has been
13 improved, but it's still basically --

14 MR. TUVEL: What I would say to that,
15 Mr. Chairman, just to be on the conservative side is
16 we will put on the proofs for it, but it is an
17 existing condition that we are making better.

18 MR. GALVIN: Right. And Dave is
19 correct, you still need a variance for that.
20 Although in the zoning world, it is a good thing
21 that you are improving the condition.

22 MR. TUVEL: So those are the variances.

23 And then with respect to Geotech, we
24 talked about that at the last meeting with respect
25 to Serpentine rock being in the area, so we

1 submitted the Geotechnical report that was prepared
2 in connection with this application.

3 Mr. Hipolit's office has reviewed it.
4 We received Mr. Hipolit's letter, and we are fine
5 with his recommendations.

6 We think that they are a good idea in
7 terms of prevention, so we will provide his office
8 with all of the plans that they require and also do
9 a sampling as the construction proceeds, as Mr.
10 Hipolit has requested.

11 MR. HIPOLIT: We are absolutely fine
12 with that. We would just say just take our letter
13 and just make it a condition. The report was very
14 comprehensive --

15 MR. GALVIN: What was the date of your
16 letter?

17 MR. HIPOLIT: September 9th.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Dennis, hold on.

20 MR. HIPOLIT: You want to follow the
21 September 9th letter.

22 MR. GALVIN: How about the prior
23 letter, was that different?

24 MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. You want to follow
25 the September 9th letter.

1 MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think on
2 one of the variances, we had initially said in our
3 earlier letters that we brought up the parking as a
4 potential variance, but I think based on the way
5 that the ordinance is constructed and the fact now
6 the parking is accounted for, they are allowed to
7 account for the parking off site, which they are
8 doing. And now that they have accounted for the 16
9 spaces that would be generated by the new building
10 and what we think is 19 or 20 spaces in the existing
11 surface lot, in either Griffith and/or Babbio, that
12 they don't need a parking variance because of that,
13 so I just wanted to make sure that was clear on the
14 record.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

16 MR. TUVEL: So, yes, we are fine with
17 Mr. Hipolit's condition that we comply with his
18 letter.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

20 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

21 So what I wanted to do this evening is
22 present three witnesses, very short.

23 The first would be to go over the
24 architecture. We reworked the architecture based on
25 the comments we received from the public and the

1 Board, and our architecture was very subjective, so
2 we tried to take everybody's comments into
3 consideration and do the best we can --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Just bring them up.

5 MR. TUVEL: -- so I am going to bring
6 Mr. Sobolta back up.

7 He was previously qualified and sworn,
8 so he's still under oath.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

10 MR. TUVEL: Modeste?

11 M O D E S T E A. S O B O L T A, AIA,
12 Elkin/Sobolta Associates, 36 Ames Avenue,
13 Rutherford, New Jersey, having been previously
14 sworn, testified further as follows:

15 THE WITNESS: Is this okay here?

16 MR. TUVEL: It is good.

17 Ready, Mr. Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

19 MR. TUVEL: Good.

20 Mr. Sobolta, why don't you just get
21 right into it and go through the revisions to the
22 plan that we made based on the comments we received
23 both from the Board and the public?

24 THE WITNESS: Well, we took the Board's
25 input and modified the building from some of the

1 previous, the initial application, the second
2 iteration to what we have arrived at now.

3 The strength of this scheme is it has
4 taken some of the best details from the others and
5 created a more appropriate academic administrative
6 building.

7 The other scheme tried to be a
8 dormitory, which it was not, and it just didn't
9 work.

10 The exterior design is based on the
11 vocabulary of the campus: Red brick, limestone
12 base, a white trim cornice around the windows, and
13 double hung windows.

14 The composition starts with the cement
15 base. It is a cement panel on the first floor. We
16 call it the limestone detailing that we have
17 throughout the campus.

18 The upper two floors are clad in brick,
19 the red brick that matches the Stevens' standard is
20 seen throughout the campus.

21 Both the cement panels and the red
22 brick are durable materials. Each has a 50-year
23 warranty, and it is intended for long life.

24 The window openings, we have added more
25 window openings and enlarged the window openings.

1 To articulate the facade better, the
2 proportions are much better with the larger windows,
3 and we are now bringing more daylight into the
4 perimeter of the three floors.

5 MR. TUVEL: And the floor plans have
6 not changed, correct?

7 THE WITNESS: The floor plans have not
8 changed.

9 MR. TUVEL: All right.
10 Why don't you describe the detail of
11 the roof?

12 THE WITNESS: The building is topped
13 with a continuous cornice creating a cap around the
14 perimeter of the building.

15 The cornice is articulated in a
16 contemporary style to create shadow lines and
17 details that simulate traditional building details,
18 while making the building appear more modern.

19 MR. TUVEL: All right.

20 And we added also -- we -- there is --
21 the building now is enclosed on the roof on all four
22 sides, correct?

23 THE WITNESS: We have enclosed the
24 building with a parapet around all sides, and that
25 is the same location as the cornice.

1 MR. TUVEL: And I know Dr. Elizabeth
2 Fasssman-Beck will get into this in more detail, but
3 the roof -- what was the extra roof in terms of the
4 green infrastructure?

5 THE WITNESS: We added -- to provide
6 for the research tables that would be required for
7 the study, and there are 30 of them, approximately
8 three feet by four feet wide, we created a wide
9 hatch with a ship's ladder that allows anybody who
10 is working in this area to comfortably walk up to
11 the roof. You don't have to climb a vertical
12 ladder.

13 MR. TUVEL: All right.

14 And, Modeste, even though you enclosed
15 the roof with a parapet on all four sides, the roof
16 will still drain to the bioretention planters
17 located in the rear, correct?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 There are five leaders -- four leaders
20 on the west side of the building, openings through
21 the parapet, crickets that direct the water from
22 each section to that leader, and that goes down to
23 the bioswale.

24 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

25 Dr. Fassman-Beck will get into that

1 detail --

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: One at a time.

3 MR. TUVEL: -- yeah. I won't have Mr.
4 Sobolta do that.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioners, are
6 there any questions or comments or questions with
7 regard to the architect's revised testimony as to
8 the revised building?

9 None at this time.

10 Are there any members of the public
11 that have any questions for the architect?

12 No.

13 Okay. Great.

14 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

15 So the next witness I would like to
16 call is Dr. Elizabeth Fassman-Beck.

17 We have to swear you in first and
18 qualify you.

19 She wasn't sworn at the last meeting.

20 MR. GALVIN: Here we go. Raise your
21 right hand.

22 Do you swear or affirm the testimony
23 you are about to give in this matter is the truth,
24 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

25 DR. FASSMAN-BECK: Yes.

1 E L I Z A B E T H F A S S M A N - B - E - C - K, having
2 been duly sworn, testified as follows:

3 MR. GALVIN: Please state your full
4 name for the record and spell your last name.

5 THE WITNESS: My name is Elizabeth
6 Fassman-Beck. That's F, as in Frank, a-s-s-m-a-n
7 dash Beck, B-e-c-k.

8 MR. GALVIN: Okay. Your witness.

9 MR. TUVEL: So, Dr. Fassman-Beck, would
10 you please go through your educational background
11 and your work experience?

12 MR. GALVIN: And even you, keep your
13 voice up, because we have the high ceilings.

14 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

15 THE WITNESS: So my undergraduate
16 degree was in civil environmental engineering from
17 Duke University.

18 From there I went on to grad school at
19 the University of Virginia, where I received a
20 master's degree and a Ph.D. degree in civil and
21 environmental engineering, and that is where I began
22 to study stormwater management specifically.

23 From there, after I earned my Ph.D., I
24 went to work as a consultant for two years. I
25 worked in a small firm in Denver, Colorado, where

1 the firm specialized mostly in stormwater projects,
2 a small engineering firm, and then I realized
3 consulting was not for me, and research in academia
4 was where I belonged.

5 I took a position at the University of
6 Auckland in New Zealand where I was for almost ten
7 years, starting as an assistant professor -- well,
8 the equivalent of an assistant professor and moving
9 and being promoted to an associate professor with
10 tenure there over a nine and a half year period, and
11 I joined Stevens in January of 2014 in the civil
12 engineering department, and I am an associate
13 professor here at Stevens.

14 MR. TUVEL: All right.

15 So as it pertains specifically to this
16 project, can you just go through what your role at
17 Stevens is as far as green infrastructure and
18 stormwater management?

19 THE WITNESS: Sure.

20 Well, my research all centers around
21 understanding how the design of a green
22 infrastructure system or different green
23 infrastructure technologies make it work and make it
24 work to manage stormwater.

25 So green infrastructure is a name that

1 includes a whole lot of different technologies.
2 We've got green roofs, bioretention, and swales,
3 bioswales, and permeable pavements, and all of these
4 technologies are comprised of different engineering
5 components that come together for system
6 functioning.

7 So my research looks at how do we
8 design these systems and the different components
9 that go into the systems, so that we will have the
10 overall best stormwater management outcomes.

11 MR. GALVIN: So let's get on to what is
12 going on --

13 MR. TUVEL: I'm moving on, yes.

14 So with respect to the North Building
15 in this application, okay, we have three, I guess,
16 stormwater management features here.

17 Can you just walk the Board through
18 them and the benefits that you see from all three?

19 THE WITNESS: Sure. So -- oh, excuse
20 me --

21 MR. TUVEL: Go ahead.

22 THE WITNESS: -- so the first system is
23 a rain garden here.

24 When I first met with the project
25 manager, Ms. Steiner, it was back in November. They

1 wanted my opinion on the stormwater or think what we
2 could do for stormwater here.

3 What I noticed was that there is all of
4 this land area between Humphreys and Alexander House
5 that drains towards the building, so to me it just
6 was immediately obvious that we could put a rain
7 garden here that would treat off-site runoff, so it
8 is not part of the building, but it's not a part of
9 Stevens campus, and manages the runoff from this --
10 from that section.

11 And then the other thing that I really
12 wanted to do was when I looked at this building, I
13 thought it would just give us the perfect
14 opportunity to set up a research experiment on the
15 use of bioretention planters, and that is what we
16 have on this side of the building here that have
17 been described.

18 So these four bioretention planter are
19 designed to treat roof runoff, which I think is a
20 really critical component for the next step forward
21 in green infrastructure research.

22 So these bioretention planters, as you
23 just heard, each get an equal section of the roof,
24 and I have designed these planters so that we have
25 experimental depletability and a robust research

1 design, so that we can test the performance of these
2 systems.

3 And then the third stormwater
4 management system is an underground detention basin
5 or the subsurface detention systems, which are over
6 here that were designed by Lapatka Associates for
7 managing the higher flows that will come off the
8 building.

9 MR. TUVEL: And the most recent
10 provision of the plan is the experimental green
11 roof, and can you describe what that is?

12 THE WITNESS: Sure.

13 Well, on the roof I designed -- well, I
14 designed it for -- well, for the past year or so, I
15 have been brainstorming around in research
16 experiments and coming up with a research design
17 that I think is going to bring green roof research
18 or green roof technology to the next level.

19 I approached facilities management and
20 said I want to build this research experiment. Is
21 there a spot on the campus I can do that?

22 That is how we came to put it on the
23 roof of this building.

24 So we have 30 experimental systems that
25 are intended to be put on the roof here that we will

1 build and measure the runoff quantity and water
2 quality from.

3 MR. TUVEL: All right.

4 And so what is the purpose of the
5 research? Who is it going to benefit and why?

6 THE WITNESS: Well, how much time do I
7 have?

8 (Laughter)

9 MR. TUVEL: A very short version
10 before I get into trouble.

11 THE WITNESS: A very short version.
12 Okay.

13 So for the green roof experiments or
14 the planters?

15 MR. TUVEL: The green roof experiments.

16 THE WITNESS: The green roof
17 experiments, I have spent a lot of time on green
18 roof research and understanding how water flows
19 through green roof -- green roof systems.

20 In fact, you know, my research has won
21 an award from the American Society of Civil
22 Engineers for exactly that and for figuring out how
23 to get it to do what we wanted it to do in terms of
24 flows and controlling flows.

25 What we don't know a lot about yet is

1 the water quality system that goes with it. So the
2 idea behind these configurations and testing all of
3 these different sized systems side by side is to
4 compare and contrast the water quality aspects, and
5 we can't do that until we are testing multiple
6 systems side by side to see the effects in the
7 different combinations.

8 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

10 I think one of the questions, and the
11 research sounds very interesting, it is an
12 additional nice layer on top of it. I think if we
13 took a step back, one of the things that is
14 obviously most of concern to the Commissioners is
15 what our -- can you give us some insight into our
16 capture rate and things like that from these
17 multiple systems that are being built into this
18 project?

19 Because our main concern is that every
20 time we build something new in town, we want to make
21 sure that we are just not keeping it level, but we
22 are doing better, because the water at Stevens
23 doesn't flood Stevens, it runs downhill, right?

24 So give us some insight on that.

25 THE WITNESS: Sure.

1 Well, that is part of the intention of
2 the research is to really be able to feed that back
3 to Hoboken.

4 So the subsurface of a detention system
5 as my understanding is -- so, let's me back up for a
6 second -- this is a really redundant system.

7 So the subsurface of this detention
8 system is designed to capture all water, right?

9 So that is the last stage in what we
10 have as the treatment draining, and that is sized
11 and determined to manage all of the water.

12 Now, what we have on top of that are
13 the systems that are going to make the whole thing
14 work even better. Bioretention planters, their
15 whole purpose is to store and delay runoff.

16 You know, what someone walking by sees
17 as a planter, and what I see are engineered media
18 and baffled transpiration. You know, what I am
19 trying to do is figure out how to manipulate the
20 design to store the most water, to delay the most
21 water, and to make it an attractive feature.

22 In fact, the U.S. EPA has verbally
23 committed to \$15,000 for instrumentation for these
24 systems, so that we can help figure that out.

25 I think these are key systems for a

1 place like Hoboken. You know, our runoff issues in
2 Hoboken are -- it is all about impervious area,
3 right? We all know about --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you --

5 THE WITNESS: -- impervious areas --

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- okay --

7 runoff -- when you look at the area's roof --

8 THE WITNESS: Okay.

9 MR. TUVEL: So does that answer your
10 question?

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

12 Thank you very much.

13 THE WITNESS: Sorry. I am a professor,
14 and we talk at 50-minute increments.

15 (Laughter)

16 MR. TUVEL: I just wanted to make sure
17 we answered the questions.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I should have known
19 better, right?

20 (Laughter)

21 Yes.

22 Commissioners, any additional questions
23 for Dr. Fassman-Beck?

24 COMMISSIONER JACOBSON: Just as a point
25 of detail, and maybe it's not for you, but on the

1 engineering drawing, the same one that you have been
2 referring to, it shows a macadam walkway separating
3 the open space to the east of the project site and
4 the proposed building along with it some -- with the
5 rain garden that's there in front.

6 Is there any kind of like a curb or
7 anything that is an impervious barrier at grade that
8 is going to keep the runoff from actually reaching
9 the rain garden affair?

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is that an existing
11 sidewalk that is there, or is that something that is
12 one of the revised ones or new ones?

13 THE WITNESS: All right. You know
14 what, that is not for me to answer.

15 MR. TUVEL: I can have Mr. Missey
16 answer that.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, let's bring
18 Mr. Missey up.

19 MR. GALVIN: Come on up, Mr. Missey.

20 MR. TUVEL: Okay. And Andy has been
21 accepted as well and sworn.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: He's sworn out.

23 (Laughter)

24

25

1 A N D R E W H. M I S S E Y, Lapatka Associates,
2 Inc., 12 Route 17 North, Paramus, New Jersey, having
3 been previously sworn, testified as follows:

4 MR. TUVEL: Mr. Missey, you heard the
5 question?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

7 MR. TUVEL: Can you answer that just
8 very briefly?

9 THE WITNESS: Yes. I remain sworn.
10 Is that correct?

11 MR. GALVIN: Yes.

12 MR. TUVEL: Yes. We just said that.

13 THE WITNESS: This sidewalk at this
14 location from the southwest corner of the Alexander
15 lot parking area, all the way to the sidewalk that
16 goes to the Jonas Hall will be replaced as part of
17 this.

18 So any impediment to that flow to the
19 rain garden will be removed.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: That is the
21 sidewalk that is currently there, that is in poor
22 condition, that is going to be redone?

23 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

24 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Replaced with
25 what?

1 THE WITNESS: With a concrete walk at
2 grade.

3 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. So also
4 something impervious?

5 THE WITNESS: That will be
6 impervious --

7 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Impervious.

8 THE WITNESS: -- yes, it will.

9 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

10 THE WITNESS: That is taken into
11 account when the project --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Can we get that
13 pervious, impervious qualified there?

14 It is going to be impervious concrete,
15 correct?

16 THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes,
17 impervious concrete.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I think we should
19 get Dr. Fassman-Beck's opinion on that impervious
20 concrete, but I am not sure if we want to, so we
21 will leave it alone.

22 DR. FASSMAN-BECK: I can make it brief.

23 (Laughter)

24 E L I Z A B E T H F A S S M A N - B E C K, having
25 been previously sworn, testified as follows:

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, it seems
2 like -- it seems like, you know, if we had you on
3 the design team, that I am sure that you would at
4 least -- we would have pervious concrete perhaps or
5 maybe there is another option.

6 THE WITNESS: No, not in this case.
7 There are other investigations and modeling studies
8 where a sidewalk depending on the extent compared to
9 the rest of your area, a sidewalk may not have that
10 much of a measurable effect if you make it
11 pervious -- pervious --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And the other part
13 of this is we need the sidewalk to be usable for
14 handicapped access, so we need this to be nice and
15 level and pitched properly.

16 MR. HIPOLIT: You would get very little
17 benefit to make it impervious. It's just too small.

18 THE WITNESS: It's such a small area --

19 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: But the question
20 is -- I think the question is: Is it creating a
21 damming effect, so that it --

22 MR. HIPOLIT: No.

23 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: -- okay. That's
24 the question.

25 MR. TUVEL: Yeah. I think the curb --

1 they are getting rid of that, so it will be --

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So the answer is
4 no.

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It's not being
6 direct. It's going to go over it possibly --

7 MR. TUVEL: Right. It's going to sheet
8 flow into the rain garden.

9 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: All right.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Commissioners, any
12 additional questions for our professor?

13 COMMISSIONER PEENE: No.

14 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: I just hope
15 that you share your research with us because we see
16 a lot of green roofs. We'd like to know what's best
17 to recognize --

18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

19 THE WITNESS: I am trying as best I can
20 to share with the city. In fact, I met on Friday
21 with some of them, and I was looking at your
22 bumpouts across the street and how to maybe convert
23 them to rain gardens, so I've been from time to
24 time, I have been providing pro bono technical
25 advice and review on --

1 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Couldn't you have
2 been a member of the green team?

3 (Laughter)

4 THE WITNESS: -- and I thank you, Mr.
5 Doyle, for that. Yes.

6 At Stevens, we belong to the green
7 team, the Hoboken Green Team, so I serve to bring
8 what the city is doing and the green team is doing
9 to the Stevens -- to the Stevens' community and back
10 again.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. TUVEL: Thank you.

14 Do you want to open to the public real
15 quick?

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure.

17 Are there any members of the public
18 that have any questions for Professor Stormwater?

19 (Laughter)

20 Mr. Dan, sure. Come on up.

21 MR. TUMPSON: I just one question.

22 I notice --

23 MR. GALVIN: You have to state your
24 name for the record even though we know you.

25 MR. TUMPSON: Dan Tumpson,

1 T-u-m-p-s-o-n.

2 MR. GALVIN: Thank you.

3 MR. TUMPSON: I notice that there were
4 some trees that are to the north of this building
5 that are between that and the Pond House, and I
6 notice on the drawing, I guess it is that drawing,
7 with your Xs here.

8 Does that mean there's one to be cut
9 down?

10 THE REPORTER: Mr. Tumpson, I can't
11 hear you.

12 MR. TUMPSON: Are the trees going to be
13 cut down?

14 There are seven trees, and four of them
15 have Xs, and I am kind of making the assumption that
16 they are going to be cut down. I just wanted
17 confirmation on that.

18 THE WITNESS: That is not something I
19 could answer.

20 MR. TUMPSON: Because I was wondering
21 whether if they're being cut down had anything to do
22 your whole water retention.

23 THE WITNESS: No.

24 (Board members confer)

25 MR. TUVEL: What is that?

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Nothing.

2 MR. TUVEL: Dave, do you want to
3 answer the question on the trees?

4 MR. ROBERTS: Well, just that --

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Dave, can you turn
6 around?

7 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. ROBERTS: That was brought up at
10 the original --

11 MR. GALVIN: All the way around.

12 MR. ROBERTS: -- all the way around at
13 the --

14 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: That's the person
15 you want to face.

16 (Laughter)

17 MR. ROBERTS: It was brought up at the
18 first hearing and addressed by the applicant.

19 We did have a report back on the
20 condition of those trees, and they are -- they need
21 to come out, so --

22 MR. TUVEL: But they are being
23 replaced,

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

25 Any other members of the public,

1 questions for the professor?

2 Okay. Great.

3 MR. TUVEL: Mr. Chairman, my final
4 witnesses are --

5 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Before you do
6 that, can you bring Mr. Sobolta back, please?

7 MR. TUVEL: Sure.

8 MR. TUVEL: Modeste.

9 M O D E S T E A. S O B O L T A, having been
10 previously sworn, testified as follows:

11 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: This is just
12 related to that testimony.

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Mr. Sobolta,
15 based upon Professor Fassman-Beck's testimony of
16 doing these experiments and having facilities up on
17 the roof, was there any particular design difference
18 because of that, or was it designed with that in
19 mind, or was it just a regular roof design?

20 THE WITNESS: Well, no, there is going
21 to be an extra load of the cables, and they will
22 have to be fastened to the roof --

23 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS: -- but other than that,
25 there is nothing out of the ordinary.

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Okay. That is
2 all I wanted to know.

3 Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: May I ask, is the
5 roof flat?

6 THE WITNESS: The roof is pitched from
7 east to west a quarter inch --

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Because that's how
9 you achieve the drainage to the west.

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you,
13 Commissioner.

14 (Witness excused)

15 MR. TUVEL: The final witness is
16 Keenan Hughes, our professional planner, and he'll
17 address the variance criteria that we have here,
18 so if you could swear him in.

19 MR. GALVIN: Raise your right hand
20 Do you swear or affirm the testimony
21 you are about to give in this matter is the truth,
22 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

23 MR. HUGHES: Yes, I do.

24

25

1 K E E N A N H U G H E S, AICP, PP, LEED AP,
2 Phillips, Preiss, Grygiel, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street,
3 Hoboken, New Jersey, having been duly sworn,
4 testified as follows:

5 MR. GALVIN: Please state your full
6 name for the record and spell your last name.

7 THE WITNESS: Keenan Hughes,
8 H-u-g-h-e-s.

9 MR. GALVIN: And you are a professional
10 planner?

11 THE WITNESS: I am.

12 MR. GALVIN: Can you give us three
13 Boards you have appeared before in the not too
14 distant past?

15 THE WITNESS: I have, yes.

16 MR. GALVIN: No. Give us three.

17 THE WITNESS: Oh, Hoboken --

18 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Don't list Hoboken.
19 Give me three others.

20 THE WITNESS: Westfield, Cranford --
21 Westfield, New Brunswick and Asbury Park.

22 MR. GALVIN: All right.

23 Mr. Chairman, do we accept his
24 credentials?

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We do.

1 MR. GALVIN: You may proceed.

2 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

3 MR. TUVEL: All right.

4 Mr. Hughes, in connection with this
5 application, let's go through it real quick.

6 You have visited the site. You've been
7 to all of the hearings. You reviewed all of the
8 plans. You reviewed the city's master plan and
9 zoning ordinance.

10 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

11 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

12 Can you just walk the Board through the
13 variance criteria based on I guess there's two
14 variances that we have?

15 THE WITNESS: Right.

16 So I think everybody is familiar with
17 the site at this point. There are two very minimal
18 deviations which would be sought. The project
19 otherwise confirms to all of the regulations for the
20 R-1 zone --

21 MR. TUVEL: Okay. Just --

22 THE WITNESS: -- for lot coverage, et
23 cetera. So those minimum deviations are for open
24 space ratio, which we discussed earlier. It is
25 actually an improvement on existing conditions and

1 that increase of 182 square feet.

2 And then because the R-1(e) zone has a
3 requirement for building separation, which is a
4 minimum of 25 feet, plus one foot for each foot of
5 height, and the total will exceed 25 feet, we need
6 39.6 feet between the proposed North Building, 807
7 Castle Point and the Pond House, which is just to
8 the north from that building.

9 So obviously, all of the surrounding
10 buildings here are owned by Stevens.

11 The 807 Castle Point and the Pond
12 House, we are looking at the rears of those
13 buildings.

14 The distance to 807 Castle Point is
15 actually measured to this one-story window-less
16 entrance in the back, otherwise we would be
17 compliant.

18 So, again, very minimal deviations,
19 which I don't think any of us could actually
20 perceive in the field.

21 I think the deviations need to be
22 considered in terms of the overall benefits of this
23 project, and obviously you heard a lot about that
24 from Dr. Fassman-Beck.

25 The construction of a much needed swing

1 space for Stevens to accommodate its both short-term
2 needs and then longer term to facilitate other
3 renovations and new projects on campus, that is one
4 benefit. Increase in open space on the specific
5 site is another. The removal of an existing parking
6 lot and replacement with eventually an attractive
7 building in an appropriate location is another.
8 And, of course, again, the installation of this
9 cutting edge green infrastructure system,

10 So with those benefits in mind, the
11 proposed variance would further Purpose A in terms
12 of promoting the general welfare, of allowing
13 Stevens to construct this much needed swing space,
14 and accommodating the proposed green infrastructure
15 elements.

16 Purposes C and G in terms of
17 accommodating this building in an appropriate
18 location on a previously paved parking lot, which
19 again, from a planning standpoint makes a whole lot
20 of sense in terms of maximizing the land resources
21 that Stevens has on campus, and it's logically
22 placed here.

23 Again, its relationship to the rear of
24 those buildings, and it provides an adequate amount
25 of open space around the building to accommodate

1 circulation.

2 And then finally, I would reference
3 Purpose J just in terms of, again, redeveloping the
4 existing parking lot and then integrating these
5 green infrastructure components which certainly
6 promote environmental conservation and prevents the
7 degradation of the environment.

8 In terms of the negative criteria, I
9 would just point out the following mitigating
10 factors. We're well below the coverage requirement
11 for this site.

12 All four building facades are fully
13 designed. It is not like there's, you know, a
14 poorly designed rear end of this building abutting
15 on one of its neighbors. It is fully articulated on
16 all facades.

17 The entrances and activities of the
18 building are oriented away from 807 Castle Point and
19 the Pond House.

20 And then finally, I think the most
21 important point here is just that it is surrounded
22 by Stevens' own buildings, and this really does not
23 impact any adjacent privately owned properties.

24 MR. TUVEL: So with that, no
25 substantial detriment to the public good --

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

2 MR. TUVEL: -- to the surrounding
3 properties, so that's the first purpose -- first
4 element of the negative criteria.

5 And in terms of substantial impairment
6 to the zone plan or the zoning ordinance, what's
7 your opinion with respect to that?

8 THE WITNESS: Well, I think it is
9 noteworthy, the green infrastructure elements are
10 certainly consistent with a lot of the city's master
11 plan policies, its green infrastructure strategic
12 plan and other documents.

13 Insofar as the application actually
14 complies with the majority of the bulk requirements
15 for this site, which is really intended for the
16 campus as a whole, I think speaks to the fact that
17 it is not a substantial impairment of the zone plan.

18 MR. TUVEL: And with respect to the
19 distance between the two buildings, it's negativity
20 is minimum --

21 THE WITNESS: We are talking about 1.3
22 feet in one instance and 2.4 feet in another
23 instance, again, very minimal, negligible.

24 MR. TUVEL: And with respect to the
25 open space ratio, we are improving the conditions?

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

2 MR. TUVEL: So you don't see any
3 negative impact?

4 THE WITNESS: No. It is very clear
5 that the benefits here outweigh the detriments, so
6 it is a strong justification of the C-2 standard.

7 MR. TUVEL: Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Mr.
9 Hughes.

10 Mr. Roberts, anything to add?

11 MR. ROBERTS: Just one follow-up --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I'm going to have
13 to ask you to turn around again.

14 MR. ROBERTS: -- on the --

15 MR. GALVIN: Mr. Roberts, this way.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Roberts, we
17 need you to turn around again.

18 MR. GALVIN: Mr. Roberts, this way and
19 raise your voice.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

21 MR. GALVIN: Phyllis thanks you.

22 MR. ROBERTS: I am going to look and
23 talk to Phyllis, but the question is for you.

24 (Laughter)

25 It's obvious the coverage or I should

1 say the open space variance is a reduction, so I
2 don't think there is an issue there.

3 I think the only question I would have
4 is the deviations on the building separation are so
5 slight, that I was wondering if you could indicate
6 whether you see a practical difficulty or an
7 unnecessary hardship in trying to comply.

8 We know that these are modular boxes
9 that are being built and in fact being delivered to
10 the site, and we know that the deviation is a slight
11 deviation, but that raises the question as to why
12 not make it comply, if it's that close, and I am
13 wondering if you could speak to that.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

15 So I think there is a C-1 aspect here.
16 There are practical difficulties, because believe it
17 or not, the program of building as designed, every
18 square foot of it is necessary to accommodate the
19 immediate needs in terms of relocating folks, so
20 there is really not a whole lot of wiggle room in
21 that regard.

22 But, furthermore, my understanding from
23 the engineer is that part of the site design is
24 really trying to focus on the existing parking lot,
25 so as to eliminate, you know, additional

1 disturbances, and given the fact that the deviations
2 are so minimal, I think there is a stronger case to
3 be made under the C-2 justification.

4 MR. ROBERTS: That was my only
5 question.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Dave.
7 Commissioners, any questions for the
8 planner?

9 COMMISSIONER JACOBSON: I didn't take
10 the time to ask this question when the issue of
11 combining the lots came up in a previous review, and
12 I understand the justification and logic for doing
13 it relative to the proposed building and the
14 existing structure at 807 Castle Point Terrace.

15 My question is: What are the future
16 implications for that?

17 Where now there are two Stevens' owned
18 buildings on a single lot, which happens to abut
19 Castle Point Terrace, if they decided to tear down
20 both of those two buildings in the future, what
21 could be built on that now single combined lot that
22 fronts Castle Point Terrace?

23 I would like to understand what the
24 implications of this are for the future, not
25 immediately.

1 MR. GALVIN: Unless you guys have a
2 good -- I would say no matter what they want to do,
3 they will come back to the Board.

4 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER JACOBSON: Well, I
7 understand that, but Stevens is having now one
8 larger lot. What are the implications to that in
9 terms of --

10 MR. GALVIN: I mean, I think an
11 argument could be made here, this is an entire
12 campus --

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Speak up.

14 MR. GALVIN: -- it's an entire campus.
15 It could be one. I don't know what Montclair is,
16 but I assume it is one block and lot. I don't know
17 if it's multiple blocks and lots, you know --

18 MR. TUVEL: I don't know if Mr.
19 Hughes --

20 MR. GALVIN: -- I understand the
21 complication of --

22 MR. TUVEL: -- I don't think Mr.
23 Hughes or Mr. Roberts could answer that. I think it
24 is more of a plan development type of scenario and a
25 lot-by-lot basis, even though we do look at it lot

1 by lot.

2 MR. ROBERTS: And the only thing I
3 would only add is that now anything new that could
4 be built there would be based on back lot
5 configuration in terms of coverage, setbacks,
6 whatever.

7 If they decided to consolidate more
8 lots, as Dennis was figuring, then we would take the
9 larger lot and take the coverage and the setbacks
10 and the separation.

11 So effectively, whether they took down
12 those two buildings and built one larger building,
13 they would still have to meet all of the
14 requirements for relief, so it's just now that the
15 three larger lots that are being split up into two
16 smaller lots, and by consolidating the two lots,
17 because one of the lot lines effectively was going
18 to run through the building, they eliminated the
19 side yard setback variance.

20 MR. GALVIN: There is always a crazy
21 alternative, too, when they sell the property to a
22 new entity, it's not the college, and they want to
23 do something, and in that case they would have to
24 come back and subdivide, if they wanted to put
25 something smaller on a smaller lot. It gives us a

1 matter of control.

2 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Is it not correct,
3 that we requested that they consolidate, and it
4 solves easements and things like that --

5 MR. GALVIN: Yeah.

6 MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, it makes it easier.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. GALVIN: It is a better planning
9 alternative as the saying is --

10 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Well, I may be
11 wrong about this, but did you say earlier that the
12 surrounding properties are all owned by Stevens?

13 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: But isn't
15 there -- aren't there fraternities right below? Do
16 you own those fraternity houses?

17 That is why I may be wrong.

18 THE WITNESS: I guess my understanding
19 is 807 is owned by Stevens, and Pond House is as
20 well. Jonas, Humphreys, these are all Stevens'
21 owned properties.

22 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So you own all of
23 them --

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Tuvell, can we
25 confirm that 807 is owned by Stevens?

1 MR. TUVEL: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I just wanted to
3 hear it on the record.

4 MR. TUVEL: Yes. 807 is owned by
5 Stevens, that's correct.

6 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: But there are two
7 buildings, right?

8 MR. TUVEL: Right. But maybe it
9 wasn't clear. The variances that we are seeking for
10 those buildings, those are Stevens' owned buildings.

11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. I didn't
12 realize that Stevens owned fraternity houses.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: They do.

14 THE WITNESS: They own some and not
15 others.

16 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, when you
19 look at this document, it says that the project is
20 17,400 square feet, but also when you look at the
21 calculations for lot coverage and open space, it
22 talks about 19,000.

23 So my question is: The project area,
24 as you defined it here, is less than the full lot,
25 which extends over to Castle Point, which is where

1 the fraternity is --

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 Just to be clear, Commissioner Doyle, I
4 think you may have been looking at a revised plan
5 under lot consolidation as the full lot area of
6 19,700 square feet, so that was the basis for all of
7 the calculations for the bulk requirements.

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: So this project
9 area is just for our ease and understanding what
10 will be impacting by the project, not the --

11 THE WITNESS: I believe so. That is
12 the site engineer's drawing, but --

13 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Good.

15 Thank you.

16 Are there any members of the public
17 that have questions for the planner, Mr. Hughes?

18 Okay.

19 MR. TUVEL: Great.

20 So I guess I will let you open it up to
21 the public and then I'll come back.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure.

23 Any other closing remarks or anything
24 at this time, Mr. Tuvel, or you're going to wait?

25 MR. GALVIN: Well, I would recommend

1 that the --

2 MR. TUVEL: I'll wait.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No. We are good.

4 Thank you.

5 Members of the public, if you have any
6 opinions or any additional questions, we will take
7 those now.

8 Mr. Tumpson?

9 MR. GALVIN: Now, I got to put you
10 under oath, Dan,

11 Raise your right hand.

12 Do you swear or affirm the testimony
13 you are about to give in this matter is the truth,
14 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

15 MR. TUMPSON: Yes.

16 MR. GALVIN: Again, state your full
17 name for the record and then you may proceed.

18 MR. TUMPSON: Daniel Tumpson.

19 MR. GALVIN: Thank you.

20 MR. TUMPSON: I don't -- I'm still
21 trying to clarify the situation here.

22 There are some trees here, and I am
23 just wondering whether it's really necessary --
24 first of all, are they being cut down, and second,
25 will all of this be necessary for it to be cut down?

1 I know these three here are actually
2 even dead or very near dead, but this one here is
3 completely alive.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Dan, let's try to
5 get you an answer on that.

6 Mr. Hipolit, you had some information
7 on that?

8 MR. HIPOLIT: I do.

9 In one of the first hearings there were
10 questions on this, so I visited the site.

11 The trees that are marked that need to
12 come down are dead.

13 The tree closest to the building, in my
14 opinion, the construction of the building will
15 destroy that tree anyway. It does -- or it can be
16 compromised, so I would recommend that they come
17 down.

18 MR. TUMPSON: Okay. So it has to do
19 with the fact --

20 MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.

21 MR. TUMPSON: -- that it is too close
22 to the building, and that is why it has to come
23 down?

24 MR. HIPOLIT: Correct, yes.

25 MR. TUVEL: I would just add to

1 that -- I'm sorry -- I would just add to that that
2 we had an ARC after the first meeting, when Mr.
3 Roberts brought up the issue, and we had an arborist
4 look at them, and he confirmed what Mr. Hipolit is
5 saying, and that whatever we are eliminating, we
6 will place elsewhere on the campus the exact number.

7 MR. TUMPSON: Well, I mean, this has
8 been -- now I am making a comment.

9 I'll just say this: One of the great
10 things about Stevens and one of the things I
11 appreciate about when they do these changes, these
12 new buildings and so forth, that they do it in a way
13 that allows the main campus to remain open and
14 green, and very old trees, some of them are 200
15 years old and so forth, and they -- most of them
16 continue to exist, and that is very good.

17 So I was just curious about that, and
18 you indicated, and it is clear that this site here
19 isn't a site where there is not a lot of
20 interference with the older trees and the green
21 space.

22 So I am very glad that whatever changes
23 they are making, I'm sure they're necessary changes
24 that they are making sure that they minimize the
25 impact on the green campus that, you know, people

1 from Hoboken and the Stevens' community can all
2 enjoy.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. GALVIN: Raise your right hand.

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

8 MS. ONDREJKA: I do.

9 MR. GALVIN: Thank you.

10 MS. ONDREJKA: Mary, last name
11 O-n-d-r-e-j-k-a. 159 9th Street.

12 Can you answer this question?

13 I always thought this, that all of the
14 property on Castle Point Terrace from 9th to 8th on
15 the east and west side is owned by Stevens.

16 I go up there a lot, and all of them
17 are frat houses, and I wondered -- and I want to
18 know, aren't they all completely owned by Stevens?

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Jason, could you
20 come up?

21 MR. TUVEL: Yeah, sure.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So I want to get
23 her an answer, but I think we need to maybe be
24 specific, because I could see him cringing as soon
25 as you said "all," because then he is freaking out,

1 going like, how big is the "all."

2 MS. ONDREJKA: No. I said between 9th
3 and 8th.

4 MR. TUVEL: Yeah. I would have to
5 pull out the tax maps.

6 MS. ONDREJKA: No. All of those frat
7 houses --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Do we have somebody
9 here that could -- how about -- let's --

10 MR. TUVEL: I can pull it out.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: One at a time,
12 guys.

13 So let's deal with the properties that
14 abut the new building.

15 MS. ONDREJKA: Yes, all of those.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Can we start with
17 that?

18 MS. ONDREJKA: Sure.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Let's start with
20 that.

21 MR. HIPOLIT: Jasaan has the 200 foot
22 list of the property owners on it to give her --

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Jason has the list
24 of the 200 foot property owners, which will tell us
25 the answer to this.

1 MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Does somebody know
3 that the buildings that are to the top of this plan
4 to the west of this new building, are those
5 buildings all Stevens' buildings?

6 Mr. Maffia, do you know this off the
7 top of your head?

8 MR. MAFFIA: I can tell you that we own
9 some frats, and we don't own some frats.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Then don't answer,
11 if you don't know.

12 MR. MAFFIA: I can't tell you for sure
13 whether we own those -- but 807 we own.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: 807, which is the
15 one that's directly to the north?

16 MR. MAFFIA: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Point it out.

18 MR. MAFFIA: It's right here.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

20 MS. ONDREJKA: Now, I know you do
21 because I see them all of the time --

22 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

23 MR. MAFFIA: I just don't know if the
24 frats on either side are the ones owned by us or the
25 ones owned by the fraternity because there is a

1 mixture.

2 MS. ONDREJKA: What do mean by
3 fraternity --

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So, Jason, give us
5 an answer here.

6 What do you got?

7 MR. TUVEL: So I can give you the
8 numbers. So we own 803, 805, 807, 809, all of the
9 800 block is owned by Stevens.

10 MS. ONDREJKA: That's what I thought.
11 That is exactly what I thought.

12 MR. TUVEL: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: She was saying
14 both sides.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Was there anything
16 else --

17 MS. ONDREJKA: Well --

18 MR. TUVEL: No. I'm talking about --

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Hang on, guys.
20 Slow down.

21 MR. TUVEL: Give me one second.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Jason?

23 MR. TUVEL: So then 810, 806, 802, 800
24 are all owned by Stevens.

25 804 is actually owned by a fraternity

1 based on the tax records --

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

3 MR. TUVEL: -- but then all of the rest
4 of them are owned by Stevens.

5 MS. ONDREJKA: Okay. And that is on
6 the other side of the street?

7 MR. TUVEL: See, I wasn't going to
8 bring this, and now I'm glad I did.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

11 MS. ONDREJKA: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

13 Any other members of the public that
14 have any opinions or --

15 COMMISSIONER PEENE: The gentleman in
16 the back.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Sure. Come on up.

18 MR. GALVIN: Raise your right hand.

19 Do you swear or affirm the testimony
20 you are about to give in this matter is the truth,
21 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

22 MR. NAUMANN: I do.

23 MR. GALVIN: State your full name for
24 the record and spell your last name.

25 MR. NAUMANN: Dave Naumann,

1 N-a-u-m-a-n-n.

2 MR. GALVIN: And your street address?

3 MR. NAUMANN: 532 Hudson Street.

4 I would urge you to approve this. I
5 work in the Lieb Building. I am looking forward to
6 working in the Gateway Building, and in the meantime
7 I am looking forward to being in the swing space for
8 us as we see it.

9 As best I can tell, they have done a
10 great job of designing and improving the runoff
11 situation by taking a parking lot and turning it
12 into the place that collects all of the runoffs and
13 gets them straight. Lots of cool stuff as it turned
14 out.

15 I wanted to address -- I think what I
16 can do is address one question, which is: I also
17 had this question, gee, if it is only two feet, too
18 big for some formula, sure, it is already 30 feet
19 away from our building, so it's cool, but can't you
20 just shrink it a wee bit more, and just not even
21 need a variance.

22 But I am here to tell you, we are
23 bursting at the seams in computer science with
24 faculty, with students, and we really need all of
25 that space.

1 So as a faculty member of the computer
2 science department, I have been involved in the
3 discussions about what is this going to look like,
4 how is it going to look, and I will tell you, my
5 office is going to be way smaller, but at least --
6 so what they are scaling this for is to deal with
7 current needs for our programs. So it would be
8 great if it could be done just the way it's
9 designed.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great. Thank you.

11 MR. NAUMANN: I personally will be
12 looking forward to walking around the campus looking
13 at something that really fits. It's really nice.

14 Thanks.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

16 Any other members of the public?

17 Sure. Come on up.

18 MR. GALVIN: Raise your right-hand.

19 Do you swear or affirm the testimony
20 you are about to give in this matter is the truth,
21 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

22 MS. PRUSSACK: I do.

23 MR. GALVIN: State your full name for
24 the record and spell your last name.

25 MS. PRUSSACK: Kathleen Prussack,

1 P-r-u-s-s-a-c-k.

2 815 Hudson Street, Hoboken, New Jersey.

3 MR. GALVIN: Thank you.

4 MS. PRUSSACK: I'm here to urge you to
5 support the project. I am a neighbor. I would be
6 objective if there's any in terms of parking and in
7 terms of the traffic, and in terms of getting the
8 modulars up, and I think that there really is not a
9 problem.

10 I think that they have taken care of
11 the parking issue with the different lots, with
12 Babbio and with one on the waterfront.

13 And in terms of the getting the modules
14 up, you know, during the day I work at home, so I
15 know what the traffic and parking is like during the
16 day, and during the day it is not so bad to have
17 people not park in order to move the modules up, so
18 I think it is really going to be fine.

19 It's in the campus. I think the
20 redesigned building is really attractive and fits in
21 with the rest of the campus, and it's a good use of
22 the technology to be able to study the rainwater and
23 the runoff, so I urge you to vote for it.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. GALVIN: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

2 Any other members of the public?

3 MS. ANDREJKA: Is this still for
4 questions?

5 MR. GALVIN: No. These are comments,
6 and then we are going to close up, and then we're
7 going --

8 MS. ANDREJKA: But this is not
9 comments --

10 MR. GALVIN: -- and then we're going to
11 vote.

12 MS. ANDREJKA: Okay. Well, I have
13 comments --

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Come on back up.

15 MS. ANDREJKA: Well, I typed it up.

16 (Laughter)

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Gosh, no, we
18 wouldn't want to shut you down, so --

19 MS. ANDREJKA: No, I know that, but it
20 moved quickly on me here.

21 MR. GALVIN: Well --

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Take your time.
23 The floor is yours.

24 MS. ANDREJKA: I know.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: She's still sworn

1 in.

2 MR. GALVIN: Yes.

3 Ask questions instead of giving extra
4 comments.

5 Go ahead.

6 (Laughter)

7 MS. ANDREJKA: I'm sworn in.

8 Okay. Here is my two cents worth:

9 I have been present at the multiple
10 Zoning and Planning Board meetings that have been
11 held to hear the various projects that Stevens
12 Institute of Technology has presented to the Boards
13 for approval these past two years.

14 I heard very concise testimony by the
15 architects, planners, traffic experts, and various
16 Stevens' professionals that are directly involved in
17 the future construction projects that will affect
18 the future of Stevens.

19 The reasons that I have virtually
20 followed whatever this private institution has
21 wanted to do within their grounds on their campus is
22 because, one: I never wanted to see the campus
23 destroyed through poor planning and design.

24 And two: I never wanted to see Stevens
25 unjustly limited in the scope of their educational

1 growth and future campus improvements by the City of
2 Hoboken due to possible prejudice for the past
3 because of others who might have sabotaged their
4 workable, friendly atmosphere between the two
5 parties.

6 I have lived in Hoboken 29 years this
7 past June 6th, and I witnessed the comings and
8 goings of what Stevens has attempted to do with
9 their property through all of those years.

10 I did not agree with most of the past
11 projects under the past president, but I never
12 allowed that prejudice to -- I've never allowed that
13 to prejudice me going forward with an open mind to
14 see what the new president and staff would do to
15 accomplish at Stevens when he came on board.

16 Watching the countless Zoning Board
17 proceedings that involved Stevens, I have heard how
18 accommodating Stevens has allowed itself to be, and
19 I would say that Stevens truly bends itself over
20 backwards to assure that no one is affected in any
21 adverse way with any project they are trying to get
22 established for a better school with future
23 students, so that they may reap the benefits from
24 the improvements.

25 This North Building structure

1 sandwiched between the fraternity houses and
2 Humphreys Hall will not be seen by anyone unless you
3 are on the ground of Stevens, and walking between
4 these buildings because the North Building is three
5 stories high, as most of the structures that will
6 surround it.

7 The time spent in getting the building
8 constructed together by means of a modular design
9 will only be a temporary situation, and once all of
10 the 42 units are all delivered upon the campus,
11 Hoboken streets will no longer be affected by any
12 inconvenience.

13 Hoboken streets have plenty of other
14 things that will continue to inconvenience the car
15 drivers on a regular basis that have nothing to do
16 with Stevens.

17 I am proud that Stevens exists and
18 exists within the confines of Hoboken because it is
19 a privilege to be near incredible halls of learning
20 that offer the best it can to its students and gives
21 me the privilege of walking upon their beautiful
22 campus any time I want to experience the beauty of
23 nature.

24 There is such an incredible dynamic
25 going on within the historic buildings which blend

1 peacefully within the newer structures on the
2 campus, and there is a peacefulness amongst the
3 nature where an education is allowed to flourish
4 with students and faculty who can work and study
5 together because they can take advantage of the
6 opportunities which will continue to be allowed
7 because of projects such as this North Building.

8 One last note.

9 The City of Hoboken is continuing to do
10 its best to eliminate as many parking spaces as
11 possible in town, and it has eliminated more than 60
12 parking spaces due to various ill-conceived projects
13 these past few months, and we will continue to lose
14 more spaces in the future due to future projects.

15 Stevens has gone in the opposite
16 direction. It has done everything possible to
17 provide more than enough parking spaces within the
18 Babbio Garage and Griffith parking lot.

19 And just today, in "The Wall Street
20 Journal," there's an article entitled: "More
21 Builders Say No To Parking Lots," which reports that
22 developers in more U.S. cities are reducing the
23 amount of parking spaces that are included in the
24 new projects to discourage the use of automobiles,
25 encourage mass transit, and just plain free up the

1 space for other uses.

2 Well, Stevens is bringing up a small 19
3 car parking lot for their future educational
4 opportunities, and there is nothing wrong with that.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

7 Any other comments?

8 Mr. Somerville?

9 MR. GALVIN: Raise your right hand.

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

13 MR. SOMERVILLE: I do.

14 MR. GALVIN: State your full name for
15 the record and spell your last name.

16 MR. SOMERVILLE: Paul Somerville,
17 S-o-m-e-r-v-i-l-l-e.

18 Thank you.

19 I am grateful for the comprehensive
20 presentation. I know you probably got a great many
21 documents in your package for this meeting.

22 Was one of them a study from the
23 arborist who decided that the trees must come down?

24 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Roberts?

25 MR. ROBERTS: We actually don't have a

1 report from the arborist. We just got the
2 information from the applicant's engineer for the
3 arborist.

4 MR. SOMERVILLE: It might be worth
5 obtaining that from Stevens. It sounds like if you
6 take them at face value --

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Mr. Tuvel, you are
8 nodding at that?

9 MR. TUVEL: Yes. I am happy to submit
10 that to the Board as a condition. It is no problem.

11 MR. SOMERVILLE: It is a sequa into two
12 things really.

13 My great uncles were gardeners back in
14 the day, so when I look at those 200 or 300-year-old
15 trees, I think of them. It sounds like a couple of
16 them must come down, but it sounds like a third is
17 questionable.

18 And the trees itself are part of the
19 historic nature of the setting. We often think of
20 Historic Preservation as only the built environment,
21 but, in fact, it's things like the very old trees,
22 view corridors, and at Stevens, you have
23 repositories of native American sights as well.

24 One of the things that was a condition
25 of the approval for the demolition of the Lieb

1 Memorial Building was that Stevens would work with
2 the Preservation Commission to get the Stevens'
3 historic district underway as recommended in the
4 city's master plan.

5 It doesn't sound to me like in these
6 meetings, and I've now attended two or three of
7 them, that that has ever come up except for someone
8 like me standing at this rail railing at you guys.

9 It has to be baked into the cake. If
10 their long-range plan is to go forward, this cannot
11 be an afterthought. Once those things are gone,
12 they're gone.

13 That is all I have to say.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Mr.
15 Somerville.

16 Any other members of the public,
17 opinions, anything else to offer?

18 Commissioners?

19 Mr. Tuvel?

20 MR. TUVEL: I will be really quick.

21 I just wanted to say this project has
22 come I think a real long way since we first started,
23 so I want to thank the Board for working with us in
24 connection with that.

25 Let me just cite some of the changes.

1 We added more stormwater infrastructure to the
2 project. We corrected the ADA issue. I think the
3 architecture has significantly improved from when we
4 were initially here.

5 We have eliminated several variances,
6 to where we are down to really almost a fully
7 conforming application, and we also eliminated a lot
8 of unnecessary pavement that currently exists on the
9 site that doesn't need to be there in the future, so
10 that adds to the stormwater management.

11 So I would ask the Board to approve the
12 application as presented now, and I want to thank
13 everybody for working with us during this process.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

15 Mr. Galvin, you have a couple of
16 conditions here?

17 MR. GALVIN: I do.

18 One: The applicant must arrange for a
19 police escort for the delivery of all modular units.

20 Two: The applicant must file a deed of
21 consolidation.

22 Three: The applicant agreed to comply
23 with Mr. Hipolit's letter of September 9th, 2016,
24 regarding Serpentine rock.

25 Four: The applicant will comply with

1 the Board's planner and engineering letters.

2 Five: The sidewalk along blank will be
3 replaced.

4 What street was that?

5 MR. TUVEL: Oh.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: How do we describe
7 that?

8 MR. TUVEL: I guess between Humphreys
9 and -- I don't remember --

10 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: It was on that
11 side.

12 MR. TUVEL: Right here.

13 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

14 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It's the eastern
15 side of the property.

16 (Board members confer)

17 MR. TUVEL: Between Humphreys and the
18 proposed North Building.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Between
20 Humphreys --

21 MR. TUVEL: Hall --

22 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- Hall --

23 MR. TUVEL: -- and the proposed North
24 Building.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- and the proposed

1 North Building.

2 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: On the eastern
3 side, if that helps.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I'm sorry, Mr.
5 Magaletta, what?

6 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: It is on the
7 eastern side, if that helps.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: On the eastern side
9 of the North Building.

10 Is that correct?

11 MR. TUVEL: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Between
13 Humphreys Hall and the proposed site.

14 MR. GALVIN: I have this sentence
15 different, but --

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: We'll figure it
17 out.

18 MR. GALVIN: Okay.

19 Six: All trees removed will be
20 replaced with new trees one for one.

21 MR. TUVEL: That's fine.

22 MR. GALVIN: Okay. We didn't set a
23 caliper, but I think we are okay on this project.

24 Seven: The applicant is to supply the
25 arborist's report regarding the removal of trees to

1 the Board's Engineer and Planner.

2 MR. TUVEL: That's fine.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Great.

4 Commissioners, any additional --

5 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: How do we
6 incorporate what Mr. Somerville is referring to
7 about the old trees?

8 I mean --

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, we are going
10 to get the arborist's report --

11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: -- that is going to
13 get on the record, so we will be able to see what
14 the stat -- you know, what the --

15 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. While
16 they're for looking at that, once they -- okay.

17 MR. TUVEL: Just to add, my
18 understanding is that none of them are the older
19 trees that were mentioned, that these are kind of
20 newer trees. They're not some of the significant
21 ones that Mr. Somerville and Mr. Tumpson were
22 referencing.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: And I hope, Mr.
24 Tuvel, that you will take back to your client Mr.
25 Somerville's comments as well, because I know they

1 are starting a master plan. Hopefully that's
2 underway as well. I think his comments are well
3 taken and advised with regards to the trees being
4 historic as well.

5 MR. TUVEL: Absolutely.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: For sure.

7 Mr. Kratz, you had something?

8 MR. KRATZ: Yes.

9 Allen Kratz, K-r-a-t-z.

10 1245 Bloomfield Street.

11 MR. GALVIN: Are you asking a question
12 or are you going to comment?

13 MR. KRATZ: Comment.

14 MR. GALVIN: Comments are closed.

15 MR. KRATZ: I didn't hear the vote --

16 MR. GALVIN: We don't have to -- we
17 really don't have to take that.

18 MR. KRATZ: -- I have a question to
19 follow up on the conditions. It was something
20 that --

21 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Please, go ahead,
22 Mr. Kratz.

23 MR. KRATZ: -- that the Chairman just
24 raised.

25 And it's that Mr. Somerville made a

1 comment about the condition of the Lieb Memorial
2 demolition being that Stevens would work with the
3 Historic Preservation Commission to create that
4 historic district and to protect the buildings.

5 I am turning that into a question:
6 What will be done to make that in fact a reality?

7 MR. TUVEL: Well, I mean, I am not
8 saying that his question is irrelevant completely,
9 but it is irrelevant as to the North Building
10 application, and I would say, too, in connection
11 with Historic Preservation's recommendation on the
12 Gateway Building, it wasn't that a district would be
13 created, but that we would work in the future, and
14 it will be done as part of the master plan process
15 when we engage in that.

16 But in terms of what historic
17 preservation is appropriate for the campus, and
18 whether that's a district or that it's certain
19 buildings, that is yet to be seen. I just wanted
20 that to be clear.

21 So as to the North Building, I don't
22 think historic preservation is an issue.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: I would agree with
24 regard to this application, that that specific --

25 MR. KRATZ: So that could not be made a

1 condition?

2 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: No.

4 MR. KRATZ: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

6 So there are seven conditions as read
7 by Mr. Galvin.

8 Are there any additional questions,
9 comments or conditions that the Commissioners wish
10 to offer?

11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I would just like
12 to say also thank you for the process, and I think
13 that you have got a better building because of the
14 cooperation, and I'm sure it's been painful at
15 times, and I appreciate everybody trying to work
16 together.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you for
18 saying that, Ann. It's very nice.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If I may, I
20 wasn't here for the testimony, but I have reviewed
21 all of the transcripts, and it is great to see the
22 handicapped accessibility being addressed in a more
23 direct way, as well as the incorporation of the
24 green roof into the building and really looking at
25 those sustainability efforts. They are important

1 concepts for the city.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you,
3 Director.

4 MR. GALVIN: For the record, just one
5 second.

6 I have verified that Ms. Forbes did
7 sign the certification stating that she reviewed the
8 transcript, and she is eligible to vote.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

10 Mr. Pinchevsky?

11 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: Thank you.

12 I echo my fellow Commissioner's
13 comments about working with the Board on this
14 application.

15 I do have one follow-up question,
16 though, on the historic application that was
17 mentioned by the two previous members of the public.

18 I guess it was mentioned that on a
19 separate application, Stevens made a promise to move
20 forward with designating areas -- can I get some
21 clarification as to what they are referring to and
22 why it doesn't apply?

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Well, it was at a
24 Zoning Board meeting, and there is from the language
25 I heard from the applicant's attorney and from

1 members of the public, there is definitely at least
2 two minds and two opinions as to exactly what was
3 said and what will happen going forward. It has
4 nothing do with regards to this application.

5 It is a good question. This Board is
6 undergoing and is starting its process for a master
7 plan reexamination.

8 The Stevens' folks in the last couple
9 of months have come to this Board and made sort of a
10 preliminary master plan preview meeting, and they
11 have hired professionals to create a master plan for
12 their campus and their university.

13 So in addition to that, the
14 administration, I am sure, is working with this
15 large property owner in our town.

16 I don't think it is a matter for us to
17 deal with right here and right now. It certainly
18 will be in the future.

19 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: Just my own
20 understanding of it, not saying that Stevens or the
21 applicant did.

22 But if Stevens did make a promise for
23 another application, that is irrelevant for us at
24 this application, is that correct?

25 MR. GALVIN: I don't know that I agree

1 with that completely, but I don't think that's
2 relative to what you're talking about --

3 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: Okay.

4 MR. GALVIN: -- because I was at the
5 Zoning Board, but I was not at the Historic
6 Commission, and I don't know what was said between
7 the Historic Commission. I'd have to go back and --

8 MR. TUVEL: We are going to have to do
9 that as part of the master plan process to make sure
10 that we get it right. There's no question about
11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: I just think
13 it's a pretty serious topic, but it seems that
14 everyone is on board with that, that it is
15 irrelevant for this application.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Okay.

17 So any other -- thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: You're
19 welcome.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: So any other
21 additional questions or comments, Commissioners?

22 If not, there's seven conditions as
23 read by Mr. Galvin.

24 Is there a motion?

25 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: I move to accept

1 the application with those conditions.

2 COMMISSIONER PEENE: I second.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Second.

4 Pat, please call the vote.

5 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Magaletta?

6 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Yes.

7 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Stratton?

8 COMMISSIONER STRATTON: Yes.

9 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Forbes?

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

11 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Doyle?

12 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Yes.

13 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Graham?

14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

15 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Peene?

16 COMMISSIONER PEENE: Yes.

17 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Pinchevsky?

18 COMMISSIONER PINCHEVSKY: Yes.

19 MS. CARCONE: Commissioner Jacobson?

20 COMMISSIONER JACOBSON: Yes.

21 MS. CARCONE: And Commissioner

22 Holtzman?

23 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. TUVEL: Thank you very much.

1 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Congratulations.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Is there any
3 additional business for the Board?

4 If there is none, is there a motion to
5 close our meeting?

6 VICE CHAIR MAGALETTA: Motion.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Second?

8 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Yes.

10 All in favor?

11 (All Board members answered in the
12 affirmative.)

13 CHAIRMAN HOLTZMAN: Aye.

14 Thank you.

15 (The meeting concluded at 9 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

 PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300
 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
 My commission expires 11/5/2020.
 Dated: 9/16/16
 This transcript was prepared in accordance with
 NJAC 13:43-5.9.