

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

----- X  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOBOKEN : Monday 6:35 p.m.  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION : June 4, 2018  
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

A P P E A R A N C E:

WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP  
520 Parsippany Road  
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054  
BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.  
Attorneys for the Board

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

## I N D E X

1		
2		
3		
4		PAGE
5		
6	Board Business	1 & 74 & 138
7	936 WASHINGTON STREET	9
8	70 HUDSON STREET	28
9	221 WASHINGTON STREET	54
10	Hoboken Post Office Redevelopment	82
11	Master Plan	138
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: The meeting is going  
2 to come to order. This is June 4th, 2018.

3                   This is an open public meeting of the  
4 Hoboken Historic Preservation Commission, and that  
5 adequate public notice has been provided by means of  
6 a notice posted outside the City Clerk's Office,  
7 along with advertisements in The Jersey Journal, The  
8 Star-Ledger, and the City of Hoboken's website.

9                   Everything is being recorded. If you  
10 have any phone conversations or personal  
11 conversations, please take them outside.

12                   Otherwise, we will begin the meeting  
13 with a roll call.

14                   MS. ANASTASIO: Steve Zane?

15                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

16                   MS. ANASTASIO: Ana Sanchez?

17                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: She will be late, but  
18 she will be here.

19                   MS. ANASTASIO: Seth?

20                   COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: Yes.

21                   MS. ANASTASIO: Marty Anderson?

22                   COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Here.

23                   MS. ANASTASIO: Dennis English?

24                   Jonathan Metsch?

25                   COMMISSIONER METSCH: Metsch. I am

1 here.

2 (Laughter)

3 MS. ANASTASIO: Jim Perry?

4 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Here.

5 MS. ANASTASIO: Sue Pregibon?

6 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Here.

7 MS. ANASTASIO: Ellen Stewart?

8 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

9 MS. ANASTASIO: Jon Vesey?

10 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Here.

11 MS. ANASTASIO: And Allen Kratz?

12 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Here.

13 MS. ANASTASIO: We have a quorum.

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. All right.

15 Did anybody not get a copy of the

16 updated minutes?

17 You did not?

18 There you go.

19 MS. ANASTASIO: And I put in your

20 corrections.

21 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay. Thank you.

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Mr. Chair, I read

24 the minutes that were circulated I think earlier

25 today. What were the changes, do you know?

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: I don't know. Ask  
2 Joan.

3                   MS. ANASTASIO: A few were I had like  
4 Marty was absent, and I had him present for the  
5 meeting.

6                   And what was the other one?

7                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: You had --  
8                   (Commissioner Pregibon and Ms.  
9 Anastasio confer)

10                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I'm sorry. I  
11 can't hear.

12                  MS. ANASTASIO: Okay.

13                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I'm sorry. What  
14 was said?

15                  MS. ANASTASIO: Hold on, Allen.

16                  I thought I printed it out.

17                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: There.

18                  MS. ANASTASIO: Let me see. Wasn't  
19 it --

20                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Just typos.

21                  MS. ANASTASIO: -- yeah, there were a  
22 few typos with the -- wasn't it -- 218 Washington  
23 Street, we had -- Jim wanted me to put in that we  
24 wanted the condo owner to kind of come and appear  
25 before the Commission to fix the building, the

1 facade of the whole building.

2 Right, Jim?

3 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yeah. Well, to  
4 address the concerns that the Board raised that  
5 night about the condition of the rest of the facade.

6 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Right, uh-huh.

7 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

8 Are we prepared to accept the minutes?

9 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I will make a  
10 motion to accept.

11 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Second?

12 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Second.

13 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Roll call.

14 MS. ANASTASIO: Steve?

15 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

16 MS. ANASTASIO: Marty?

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

18 MS. ANASTASIO: Jonathan?

19 COMMISSIONER METSCH: Yes.

20 MS. ANASTASIO: Jim?

21 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

22 MS. ANASTASIO: Sue?

23 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes.

24 MS. ANASTASIO: Ellen?

25 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

1 MS. ANASTASIO: Jon?

2 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes.

3 MS. ANASTASIO: Seth?

4 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: I wasn't there.

5 MS. ANASTASIO: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Did I hear my name  
7 called?

8 MS. ANASTASIO: Hum. Okay. Allen?

9 (Laughter)

10 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Well, you're an  
11 alternate tonight.

12 MS. ANASTASIO: But he is an alternate.

13 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yeah. We have a  
14 quorum.

15 MS. HOLTZMAN: Well, keep going. Go  
16 through the rest of your list. You stopped at Seth.

17 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yes.

18 MS. ANASTASIO: Well, Ana is not here,  
19 right?

20 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I think you --  
21 we --

22 MS. ANASTASIO: Steve said yes.  
23 Marty said yes.  
24 Ana isn't here.  
25 Jonathan, yes.

1 Jim said yes.

2 Sue said yes.

3 Ellen said yes.

4 Jon said yes, and Seth wasn't here, so  
5 he's tentative.

6 Okay. Allen?

7 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yes.

8 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you.

9 Next on the docket is the annual  
10 report, which I would like to move to the end of the  
11 meeting, if no one has any objections, because I  
12 would like to get through these three cases first.  
13 If there is any discussion, then we can truly have  
14 our discussion.

15 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Good idea.

16 (Continue on next page)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
APPLICATION No. H18-5-1

----- X  
RE: 936 WASHINGTON STREET : Monday 6:40 p.m.  
Block: 208, Lot 22 : June 4, 2018  
Zone R-1(H) :  
Applicant: Seven Valley's Restaurant :  
c/o MaryAnne Fike (tenant) :  
Certificate of Appropriateness for :  
Replacement of Storefront Window and :  
Door and Installation of a New Sign :  
----- x

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

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

1           A P P E A R A N C E:

2                   WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP  
3                   520 Parsippany Road  
4                   Parsippany, New Jersey 07054  
5                   BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.  
6                   Attorneys for the Board

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. So with that  
2 said, 936 Washington Street, please.

3                   THE REPORTER: May I have your name,  
4 please?

5                   MS. FIKE: Mary Anne Fike,  
6 M-a-r-y-A-n-n-e, F-i-k-e.

7                   THE REPORTER: Thank you.

8                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. And your  
9 project?

10                  MS. FIKE: Yes. Okay.

11                  I was here last month --

12                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

13                  MS. FIKE: -- and they requested a  
14 couple of things. One is that I take the awning  
15 down to view the building, what was left of the  
16 building -- did I send that to you, Joan? It was in  
17 the package.

18                  MS. ANASTASIO: I don't think you did.

19                  MS. FIKE: Here is a couple of photos  
20 with the awning down.

21                  And then the height of the window did  
22 not go down as far as we had to go to 18 inches  
23 above, but the architect re-did the drawings, and I  
24 think you have that and copies. But if you want, I  
25 have another one.

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: All right.

2                   MS. FIKE: If you want to circulate  
3 another one, a big one.

4                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Do you have one for  
5 that end of the table?

6                   COMMISSIONER VESEY: That is the same  
7 thing?

8                   MS. FIKE: Yes.

9                   And I didn't realize when I was here  
10 the first -- the last time, that the neighbor, Peper  
11 & Parlor, theirs actually starts at 16 inches high,  
12 and they're right next door, and their windows start  
13 16 inches, and I measured it with the tape measure,  
14 and I have that as a photo as well.

15                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Well, I just have to  
16 say that in all of these issues, past performance is  
17 no guarantee of future results.

18                   MS. FIKE: Okay. I understand. I just  
19 thought that they said that they wanted it to look  
20 like the other neighbors --

21                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

22                   MS. FIKE: -- and so that's why I did  
23 that.

24                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

25                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Mr. Chair, is the

1 new large drawing that is being circulated, is that  
2 the same that we received, A-1, in our packet?

3 MS. HOLTZMAN: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Okay. Thank you.  
5 Mr. Chair?

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: When we had our  
8 last meeting, one of the things that we requested of  
9 the applicant was that we have dimensions shown for  
10 the height of the -- or the eleva -- or the distance  
11 between the bottom of the window and the sidewalk,  
12 and maybe it is my eyes. I am not seeing it on A-1.

13 Does anyone --

14 MS. HOLTZMAN: It's three feet six  
15 inches.

16 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Are you looking at  
17 the big sheet?

18 You should look at the big sheet,  
19 because it's probably -- it is on the big sheet, but  
20 it probably got reduced so much, you didn't see it.

21 So it's 18 inches. The new window  
22 treatment is 18 inches, and then the old one was  
23 three foot six.

24 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So it's 18 inches  
25 from the sidewalk?

1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Correct.

2 MS. FIKE: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I blew this up. I  
4 really couldn't see it.

5 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I couldn't  
6 either.

7 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I don't --

8 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Well, it is there  
9 now.

10 Okay. So I suppose one question is  
11 since that was a request that the Commission made,  
12 are we happy with that dimension and that treatment?

13 Comments?

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I just have a  
15 question. It may be on the larger drawing, too.

16 Are the panes two feet by two feet?

17 Well, what size are the window panes?

18 MS. HOLTZMAN: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Why don't we pass  
20 this down.

21 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think that --  
22 I think they are not two feet high actually.

23 MS. FIKE: Not exactly.

24 COMMISSIONER STEWART: One foot ten I  
25 think high.

1 MR. MILLER: Here that marker --

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yeah, very -- it's  
4 almost --

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It's close to  
6 two feet, slightly shy of that.

7 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I thought there  
8 was some discussion about a 4-by-4. Four panes by  
9 four panes, but maybe I didn't hear that correctly  
10 the last time.

11 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No. I think --  
12 I think the discussion was about it was going to be  
13 an 8-by-8. Once we put in the 18-inch bulkhead, it  
14 would make it an 8-by-8 window --

15 MS. FIKE: Close to that.

16 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: -- and we would  
17 do according to that opening, that is what the  
18 window panes would be.

19 I don't think there was anything truly  
20 specific to the size of the panes, but the opening  
21 was going to be 18-by-18, once that 18-inch bulkhead  
22 was fitted in at the bottom.

23 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay. The opening  
24 8-by-8 is not shown here, though.

25 COMMISSIONER VESEY: No. It is

1 nine-four by eight.

2 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: It could be  
3 whatever it is as long as they put -- as long as  
4 they put that 18-inch bulkhead in at the bottom.

5 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay. Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Now, are you --  
7 excuse me -- are you putting in a lintel above the  
8 window? Is that --

9 MS. FIKE: No. The architect and the  
10 engineer said there is an existing one there.

11 COMMISSIONER VESEY: There's an  
12 existing one behind the brick?

13 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No. There has  
14 to be with that opening at the top. There's got to  
15 be a --

16 MS. FIKE: We are not going up any.

17 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER STEWART: The door is  
19 going to be the entire --

20 COMMISSIONER VESEY: But it looks like  
21 it is just brick there, and in the drawing it looks  
22 like you're putting what might be a bluestone lintel  
23 above, and that is why I am asking.

24 MS. FIKE: Are you talking about the  
25 door or the window?



1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Both.

2 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I'm talking about  
3 the window right now. But, yes, the window and door  
4 both have a dotted line detail that looks in --

5 MS. FIKE: Well, yeah --

6 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- the middle --  
7 the proposed drawing, it's not --

8 MS. FIKE: I think that is the  
9 existing. I think it's existing.

10 COMMISSIONER VESEY: No, it is not  
11 existing --

12 COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, it's brick,

13 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- in the existing  
14 photograph, it is brick right down to the door  
15 frame.

16 VICE CHAIR ZANE: But there has to be  
17 something there. This can't stay --

18 MS. FIKE: He said there was a lintel.  
19 I don't know.

20 (Board members confer)

21 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you, if you  
22 want that on the record.

23 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Okay. I mean, I  
24 am not seeing a traditional lintel here.

25 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: The drawing

1 looks like it has a lintel in it, so -- above the  
2 door and above the window, which is fine.

3 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Which I think  
4 would look nice --

5 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- if it was  
7 something like bluestone or slate or even --

8 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Limestone --

9 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- limestone or  
10 metal or something, but I am not --

11 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: -- well, that  
12 is what he has there, which is good.

13 And then the sign, it appears the sign  
14 is now sitting on top of that.

15 MS. FIKE: Right, directly above it,  
16 yes.

17 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I think it's just  
19 a metal --

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

21 In the left rendering, he identifies it  
22 as being existing steel.

23 MS. FIKE: Yes, right.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No changes.

25 MS. FIKE: That is not changing. The

1 steel lintel, no.

2 COMMISSIONER VESEY: So now that I am  
3 seeing this other photograph, what it looks to me is  
4 that there's a steel I-beam, and then filled in with  
5 brick, so visually -- visually you don't see a  
6 lintel over either one because it is, in fact,  
7 filled in with brick. Okay.

8 MS. FIKE: Right.

9 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Not to  
11 interpret the drawing, but I believe all he is  
12 saying, there is something structurally has to be  
13 here to do this trick. I don't think he is really  
14 identifying anything.

15 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yeah.

16 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I have a further  
18 question regarding the entrance.

19 At present, there is no step. There is  
20 a step up into the store itself, but you are showing  
21 two steps here. How does that work with this  
22 nine-foot door?

23 MS. FIKE: Well, we have to go through  
24 the Building Department for that because it is  
25 nonconforming in the fact that it is so high. So

1       what the neighbors have all done is put a smaller  
2       step, you know, because it is too big of a step up  
3       as it is.

4                   COMMISSIONER PERRY:  Not according to  
5       the photo I took of the store.

6                   MS. FIKE:  Well, it is a pretty tall  
7       step.

8                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  There is a step up  
9       to the residential entrance to the immediate north.

10                  COMMISSIONER PERRY:  Yes.  There is --  
11       yes, there's a step up for that.  But to your store,  
12       it goes right --

13                  MS. FIKE:  Right, correct.

14                  COMMISSIONER PERRY:  -- it looks like  
15       it is only about seven inches maybe, six or seven  
16       inches.

17                  MS. FIKE:  Hum, let me see.  It is  
18       pretty high I think.

19                  I mean, if they request it, we are  
20       going to have to put it in, you know, but I think  
21       they are going to request that we put a step in, a  
22       smaller step.

23                  That is something I will have to  
24       address with --

25                  MR. ANDERSON:  I think you can pretty

1 much bet on that.

2 MS. FIKE: -- yeah, I'll have to  
3 address that with the Building Department.

4 COMMISSIONER VESEY: And just to  
5 confirm, the curved lintel over the residential  
6 doorway is staying curved?

7 MS. FIKE: Yes, yes. We're not -- the  
8 sign doesn't go that far.

9 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Okay.

10 VICE CHAIR ZANE: My only other comment  
11 would be that I see the sign ends somewhat short of  
12 the store entrance's right side. If just -- if it  
13 would just be equal, like start at the window and  
14 end at the door --

15 MS. FIKE: I agree, yes.

16 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- okay, then that  
17 would be nice.

18 MS. FIKE: Yes, totally.

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

20 MS. FIKE: I have one of the letters,  
21 if you want to see the sample back lit.

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. I believe you.

23 Any other questions?

24 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I am sorry. I  
25 just wanted to clarify. It is not back lit. It is

1       halo, right?

2                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:   It's halo.

3                   MS. FIKE:   Halo, halo, yes.  I'm sorry.

4       Halo, like the cafe, it is like the same thing.

5       It's like a light that just shines in the back on

6       the walk around.

7                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:   So but your final  
8       treatment in the brick, it is going to be painted?

9                   MS. FIKE:   I think we are going to  
10      clean it to natural.

11                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   To natural?

12                  MS. FIKE:   To natural, yes.

13                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   So you're just  
14      cleaning it at the store level.  You're not going --  
15      you're not cleaning the whole building --

16                  MS. FIKE:   No.  I am asking the  
17      landlord, but I don't think he is going to do it.

18                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Well, that's going to  
19      be so odd.

20                  I mean, how are you going to work that  
21      over the residential door?  It's just there is  
22      nothing there.  There's nothing to sort of break --

23                  MS. FIKE:   Well, I see that line  
24      that -- what do you call that, a cornice or --

25                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Whatever that is,

1       yes.

2                   MS. FIKE:  -- yeah, I think it will be  
3       right up from there down, we will take care of.

4                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:  But, again, there's  
5       nothing delineating above -- above the residential  
6       door.

7                   MS. FIKE:  Right, right.

8                   I guess we will just carry that line  
9       right to the, you know, to the curve.

10                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  Well, given that  
11       comment, I think it would be nice to put something  
12       there, some sort of cornice.  You know, it could be  
13       something sort of lightly done, but something that  
14       separates the building from the store level from the  
15       commercial level.

16                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  You mean the  
17       residential area.

18                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  Well, the whole  
19       thing.  I mean, basically this, you know, from here  
20       down, if she is going to just clean the brick there  
21       and then, all of a sudden, it is just a line here,  
22       then the rest of the building is painted, that is  
23       sort of odd.

24                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  It is, but I  
25       really feel that is the responsibility of the owner

1 of the building.

2 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Well, that would be  
3 between the commercial tenant and the owner, so it  
4 is not our problem. There are -- as far as I'm  
5 concerned, our situation --

6 MS. HOLTZMAN: Ultimately they could  
7 match the paint.

8 MS. FIKE: Yeah. If you prefer that, I  
9 will match the paint.

10 VICE CHAIR ZANE: I think that would be  
11 the easiest thing.

12 MS. FIKE: All right. We will match  
13 the paint.

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

15 Comments?

16 A motion?

17 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I will make a  
18 motion.

19 I'll make a motion to accept as  
20 presented with the exception that the sign should go  
21 from the edge of the -- the far edge of the  
22 left-hand side of the window, cross and end at the  
23 far right-hand side of the doorway to the commercial  
24 space, and then the building should be painted,  
25 cleaned and then painted the same color as the color



1           that it is above at the residential level.

2                       COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I will second.

3                       VICE CHAIR ZANE: Roll call?

4                       MS. ANASTASIO: Marty?

5                       COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.

6                       MS. ANASTASIO: Seth?

7                       COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: Yes.

8                       MS. ANASTASIO: Jon?

9                       COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes.

10                      MS. ANASTASIO: Steve?

11                      VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

12                      MS. ANASTASIO: Sue?

13                      COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes.

14                      MS. ANASTASIO: Jim?

15                      COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.

16                      MS. ANASTASIO: Ellen?

17                      COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

18                      MS. ANASTASIO: Allen?

19                      COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yes.

20                      MS. ANASTASIO: Jonathan?

21                      COMMISSIONER METSCH: Yes.

22                      VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you very much.

23           Okay.

24                      COMMISSIONER PERRY: Catherine, do you  
25           need this drawing, Catherine?

(Board members confer)

- 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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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.  
This transcript was prepared in accordance with  
NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
APPLICATION No. H18-5-7

- - - - - X  
RE: 70 HUDSON STREET : Monday 7 p.m.  
Block: 210.01, Lot 24 : June 4, 2018  
Zone CBD(H) :  
Applicant: Green Rock c/o Michael :  
Gallucci (tenant) :  
Presenter: Jirka Kolar, Designer :  
Certificate of Appropriateness for :  
replacement of the wall sign above the:  
storefront, replacement of the awning :  
cover and color change. Installation :  
of decorative wire mesh in the lower :  
half of the storefront windows, and :  
installation of decorative tile on :  
fascia panels below the windows :  
- - - - - x

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

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

1           A P P E A R A N C E:

2                   WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP  
3                   520 Parsippany Road  
4                   Parsippany, New Jersey 07054  
5                   BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.  
6                   Attorneys for the Board

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Next up is 70 Hudson  
2 Street.

3 Want to pass us some things?

4 Thank you.

5 THE REPORTER: Could I have your name,  
6 please?

7 MR. GALLUCCI: Michael Gallucci,  
8 G-a-l-l-u-c-c-i.

9 THE REPORTER: And what is your name?

10 MR. KOLAR: Jirka, J-i-r-k-a, last name  
11 Kolar, K-o-l-a-r.

12 MR. MILLER: Mr. Gallucci, you are the  
13 applicant?

14 MR. GALLUCCI: Yeah, I'm the owner of  
15 the restaurant.

16 MR. MILLER: And, Mr. Kolar, am I  
17 saying that correctly?

18 MR. KOLAR: It's Kolar.

19 MR. MILLER: Are you an architect, sir,  
20 or --

21 MR. KOLAR: No, designer.

22 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

23 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. Tell us a  
24 little bit about where your project is now.

25 MR. GALLUCCI: We are renovating the

1           inside right now, just cosmetic and, you know --

2                       VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.   So this  
3           represents what is there now?

4                       MR. GALLUCCI:   Yes.   That is the  
5           outside currently.

6                       VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Currently.

7                       And this is where we want to go?

8                       MR. GALLUCCI:   Yes.

9                       VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.   And so what's  
10          changed since last month?

11                      MR. GALLUCCI:   Well, when we came last  
12          month, we didn't have -- Jirka wasn't here last  
13          month.   It was his assistant, and we didn't have the  
14          right measurements.

15                      MR. KOLAR:   You didn't have the right  
16          measurements.

17                      VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.   I think there  
18          were some questions about the size of the type, and  
19          other than that -- well, I know there was a question  
20          about the tile.

21                      MR. KOLAR:   Yeah.   The tile will be  
22          handmade, I think -- in fact, I will show you a  
23          similar tile.

24                      I am showing a similar tile, which the  
25          design is printed on it, and in this case we are

1 going to use a 12-inch tile with that design, which  
2 you see on the picture.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

4 And so I think what we spoke about the  
5 tile was, it wasn't necessarily -- we didn't  
6 understand, or I didn't understand, I think it was  
7 my question, what it derives from in terms of was  
8 there any historic reference to this, anything  
9 else --

10 MR. KOLAR: Actually just from a design  
11 point of view, I liked the pattern because it was  
12 kind of unusual, and I thought that pattern would  
13 fit very well to that storefront. That was the idea  
14 behind it. There was no reference to anything.

15 I just was lucky I find that pattern on  
16 the internet. I mean I liked it.

17 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

18 And your intention also is to put up  
19 these screens?

20 MR. KOLAR: Yes. The screens are  
21 attached to the window frame from the outside, and  
22 they basically are mostly for decorative purpose  
23 because anybody who wants to break the window can  
24 break the window.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. I can't



1           imagine that happening.

2                           (Laughter)

3                           Okay. Any comments?

4                           COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I think we are  
5 still at square one with these tiles. You know, we  
6 needed -- being in a historic district, we needed  
7 some reference to why you were doing it. We  
8 understand that you may like it, but it doesn't  
9 really --

10                          MR. KOLAR: Basically this is a 19th  
11 Century motif, which means it would not be in  
12 contradiction with the storefront of the building.  
13 The actual storefront, as far as you could go, would  
14 be I would say 19th century, where you can get  
15 photographs of the building, how it looked at that  
16 time, and this motif, as a matter of fact, it is  
17 from that time period.

18                          COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Here in Hoboken  
19 or --

20                          MR. KOLAR: In -- it can be anywhere,  
21 because it is like in that period of time, 19th  
22 Century, basically Europeans were bringing motifs  
23 from all of Europe to America and used them for  
24 their places, for their restaurants, because this  
25 was a new world still at that time in around 1900.

1 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Could be.

2 (Laughter)

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. Well --

4 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I don't think  
5 they were in this particular building, but --

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- I am not buying  
7 it, but we're here.

8 Is the signage on the windows, does  
9 that count in the -- that counts in the overall  
10 signage. Are we in compliance with that?

11 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Are you putting  
12 the gold lettering that's on --

13 MR. GALLUCCI: It is same. It's the  
14 same as it is now, but it's just outlined.

15 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: It's the same  
16 as it is now.

17 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

18 MR. KOLAR: And it's painted. It's  
19 actually going to be painted on the glass.

20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yeah. Gold leaf.

21 MR. KOLAR: Yes.

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. Questions,  
23 comments?

24 COMMISSIONER VESEY: In the rendering,  
25 are these little benches? It looks like there is

1 a --

2 MR. KOLAR: No. They're just existing.  
3 They actually exist there right now, and we would  
4 not -- well, I don't know why they are not in that  
5 picture, because they are on my picture, which I  
6 took when I was doing the renderings, and they are  
7 there right now.

8 MR. GALLUCCI: Let me explain.

9 Yeah. Those were the benches that were  
10 there when we came to do it, so he just left the  
11 benches there. That is outdoor furniture. That's  
12 basically part of the outdoor cafe.

13 COMMISSIONER STUART: They're built in?

14 MR. GALLUCCI: That's not part of  
15 the --

16 MR. KOLAR: Actually I would say I  
17 would rather see that without the benches.

18 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Well, they are  
19 obviously not attached to the facade.

20 COMMISSIONER STUART: They're not  
21 attached.

22 MR. GALLUCCI: No. They have nothing  
23 to do with it.

24 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Okay. So --

25 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I have a

1 question for you.

2 In your application you indicated that,  
3 under Work Proposed, window repair and replacement.

4 MR. GALLUCCI: Oh, well, that one  
5 window is -- there is -- it's like dirt. You know,  
6 how dirt gets inside the window, we do have to  
7 replace the window because it needs to be replaced.  
8 That is part of one of the repairs, so --

9 COMMISSIONER STEWART: One of them, not  
10 both?

11 MR. GALLUCCI: Just one side, yeah, I  
12 think --

13 MR. KOLAR: I think if you --

14 MR. GALLUCCI: -- they are old windows.  
15 The window has been there for a long time, so --

16 MR. KOLAR: -- it is on the right-hand  
17 side, if you are facing the storefront.

18 MR. GALLUCCI: Yeah, yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I was --

20 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Well -- I'm sorry.  
21 Go ahead.

22 COMMISSIONER STUART: -- just going to  
23 say, there is an old image of the building, which it  
24 dates to 1915, and it is quite different than it is  
25 now. I don't know if you would like to see it.

1 MR. KOLAR: Thank you.

2 It looks like it was some kind of  
3 cabaret at that time based on the motif in front of  
4 the building.

5 MR. GALLUCCI: This, when I bought it,  
6 I bought it in 2001, this was the structure, you  
7 know --

8 COMMISSIONER STUART: Oh, yeah.

9 MR. GALLUCCI: -- and I was actually at  
10 a meeting like this, and I wanted to change it. I  
11 wanted to put the door on the side and then because  
12 of the front, because of the recessed doorway, this  
13 was like 16 years ago, and I just left everything  
14 the same, so the building is exactly how it was --

15 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Now, compared to  
16 then?

17 MR. GALLUCCI: When I bought the  
18 business, you know.

19 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, yeah,  
20 because I was going to say it is quite different in  
21 that image.

22 MR. GALLUCCI: But that I think --

23 COMMISSIONER STUART: It's gone.

24 MR. GALLUCCI: -- isn't it true that  
25 the wood along the bottom and that recessed doorway

1           isn't that sort of a historical front --

2                        COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Well, it is on  
3 a lot of other buildings, whether it was on this one  
4 or not.

5                        MR. GALLUCCI: Yeah. They wouldn't let  
6 me change it back then. That's what I mean.

7                        MR. KOLAR: This actually --

8                        COMMISSIONER STUART: Right, right.

9                        MR. KOLAR: -- there used to be almost  
10 like a vestibule, like you walk in, and the  
11 storefront actual door were reset completely.

12                       COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yeah, yeah. It  
13 is pretty beautiful.

14                       MR. KOLAR: Yeah, absolutely. Maybe  
15 even a theater kind of type of entrance.

16                       COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

17                       COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I have a question.

18                       VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes, sir.

19                       COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So, Mr. Kolar, you  
20 were referring to -- the reference, I think you said  
21 something like Germanic architecture, or did I  
22 misinterpret that?

23                       MR. KOLAR: Dramatic.

24                       COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I think you are  
25 going back to a historic reference. Could you say a

1 little bit more about the design motif and the  
2 period of significance of the storefront that you  
3 are referring to and attempting to replicate?

4 MR. KOLAR: I basically collect the  
5 books on area, and not just New York City where I  
6 am, but also Hoboken, Jersey City and the places  
7 around, and that is where I find inspiration for  
8 doing things which -- what I am doing.

9 And with respect for the past, because  
10 I think what we had before was the enormous  
11 heritage, and we all are kind of like you would say  
12 responsible for keeping as much as possible from  
13 that era because all of us were once there in our  
14 families, means I don't just put some designs  
15 together based on likeliness of it, but I think with  
16 the respect for the time period.

17 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So this is an  
18 attempt to replicate something that might look very  
19 German?

20 MR. KOLAR: No, actually not. I don't  
21 think it has nothing to do with Germany. It is just  
22 a -- it's a tile motif, where the triangle elements  
23 are, you know, placed together, and I think they  
24 were just quite unique.

25 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: To me it does say

1 something, and I say it positively, it looks  
2 somewhat Austrian, Viennese, Central European, which  
3 would be --

4 MR. KOLAR: In that case, I cannot say  
5 because when I find it, there was no description of  
6 any kind where it actually came from --

7 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Okay. Understood.

8 MR. KOLAR: -- I mean, I was unable to,  
9 you know, to figure it out where it came from, but I  
10 was just able to figure it out the time period.

11 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Okay.

12 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Just a couple -- oh,  
13 go ahead.

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I just had a  
15 question again about the signage on the glass.

16 Currently there is a sign that says  
17 "Open For Lunch" and there's business hours. Those  
18 would be obscured by this wire mesh that you are  
19 showing?

20 MR. GALLUCCI: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER PERRY: But are you going  
22 to put them back at some point or --

23 MR. GALLUCCI: No, I don't think --

24 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- so the only  
25 signage on the front glass would actually be the



1 Green Rock Tap & Grill?

2 MR. GALLUCCI: Right, right.

3 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay.

4 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So I have a question.

5 The main logo at the top, "Green Rock,"  
6 is that meant to be rustic or is this just the  
7 rendering?

8 MR. KOLAR: It's meant to be rustic and  
9 it will be painted. Basically it will be painted on  
10 that plywood board, which is there right now, but  
11 maybe it's rotten. Maybe it need to be replaced,  
12 but if it is replaced, it would be replaced by same  
13 board which was there.

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right.

15 So just in following your comments a  
16 minute ago, a storefront like this would have had a  
17 really finely painted sign. I mean --

18 MR. KOLAR: Correct, correct --

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- no one was doing  
20 rustic back then.

21 MR. KOLAR: -- correct. But through  
22 the years, if you want to see it like, okay, and if  
23 you want to say like this is like hundred years old  
24 storefront, then you make it look like this feeling  
25 of appearance of the time. It needs to look a

1 little bit rustic, otherwise if it is really new, it  
2 would not look -- it would look like it was painted  
3 today. And our intention is not to make it look  
4 like it was painted 2018, it's to make it look like  
5 we just polish it, and it was there.

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. So this is  
7 what I would suggest, because your other comments  
8 lead to a different direction, which I appreciate  
9 more, which is that I would do this in a finely  
10 drafted way and distress it.

11 MR. KOLAR: Well, no, no, no. We  
12 didn't understand -- we didn't understand each  
13 other.

14 That is how it is done. It is finely  
15 done and then distressed by the effect on the end.  
16 When you come to see it, it will be distressed  
17 effect. You would not know how I did it, because  
18 you would not be watching me in the process of doing  
19 it.

20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right. I am not  
21 questioning the technique. I am just saying that at  
22 the end of the day, the way this is drawn, and this  
23 is the way it is going to be, this is not the way a  
24 sign painter back then would do this.

25 MR. KOLAR: No. Sign painter would

1 paint it and wait 50 years for the time when the  
2 sign would actually look like that.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: But I guess it  
4 wouldn't --

5 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I think what  
6 Commissioner Zane is referring to, if I can, it has  
7 a freehand look to it, where it does not look like  
8 it is out of a font book where everything are right  
9 angles --

10 MR. KOLAR: No, no, no, again --

11 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- it has a very  
12 kind of freehand look.

13 Is it going to be done like a  
14 traditional --

15 MR. KOLAR: It's not going to look like  
16 it's looking on this drawing here. It's actually  
17 going to look like -- I am a personally assigned  
18 painter --

19 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right.

20 MR. KOLAR: -- I know how to make a  
21 straight line --

22 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Okay.

23 (Laughter)

24 MR. KOLAR: -- meaning it will be  
25 straight lines.

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.  I'm asking.

2                   MR. KOLAR:   It is not going to look  
3   like that, no.

4                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.

5                   MR. KOLAR:   It would be straight lines,  
6   and when the sign painter makes straight lines, they  
7   are actually straight, but you can tell they are not  
8   perfect like if you -- if they were made in  
9   machine --

10                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Right.

11                  MR. KOLAR:   -- which creates the  
12   feeling of handmade things, but they would not be  
13   crooked like this.  This is just a sketch, a  
14   drawing.

15                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.

16                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:   And will it --  
17   excuse me -- will it have some sort of -- it appears  
18   it has sort of a dropped shadow kind of look to it.

19                  MR. KOLAR:   Yes.  It will have one  
20   color inside the letters, and then it will have a  
21   clean outline and -- and shadow.

22                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:   And then  
23   distressed.

24                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.  We are going  
25   to hold you to that.

1 (Laughter)

2 Okay. So my only other comment is that  
3 vis-a-vis the tile on the bottom, the left side I  
4 think is interesting because it is somewhat  
5 symmetrical, I can't imagine a European tile center  
6 coming here --

7 MR. KOLAR: A very important thing --

8 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

9 MR. KOLAR: -- what you see on that  
10 right side, then it looks different than the left  
11 side, it is just because I place it in the drawing  
12 that way --

13 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. So --

14 MR. KOLAR: -- but that doesn't mean  
15 it's actually going to appear that way. It is  
16 almost like if I make a -- because I am an artist as  
17 well -- if I make a portrait, and you will not have  
18 symmetrical teeth, that doesn't mean if that photo  
19 is used for a dentist to do your implants --

20 (Laughter)

21 -- it is going to look like that on  
22 that portrait --

23 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

24 MR. KOLAR: -- in a relative, it will  
25 be symmetrical.

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. So understand,  
2                   though, that when people come before this Board, and  
3                   they present us with materials, we look at them  
4                   as --

5                   MR. KOLAR: As it is.

6                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- as it is --

7                   MR. KOLAR: I understand.

8                   COMMISSIONER STEWART: Literal.

9                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- so there should  
10                  have been a thing that said, it's not going to look  
11                  like this across the top.

12                  MR. KOLAR: Yes, yes. I understand.  
13                  I understand.

14                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: All right. So we are  
15                  going to have a symmetrical treatment and tiles on  
16                  the bottom.

17                  MR. KOLAR: Correct, correct.

18                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And straight line  
19                  letters at the top.

20                  MR. KOLAR: Yes.

21                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: And straight line  
22                  letters at the top.

23                  COMMISSIONER METSCH: If they said  
24                  that, we would have made them come back next month.

25                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: We could have saved

1 ten minutes.

2 Okay. Any other questions or comments?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would like to  
4 make a motion.

5 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I'd like to make  
6 one further comment, if I may.

7 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Me, too.

8 VICE CHAIR ZANE: One further comment.

9 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And I think Ellen  
10 does, too.

11 I am very impressed with this. Now, I  
12 am satisfied with the symmetrical nature of the  
13 tiles and the less distressed look of the letters,  
14 and I think that this very much, notwithstanding  
15 what Mr. Kolar said, this is very evocative of what  
16 a storefront would have looked like at the turn of  
17 the last century, 1900 in Hoboken, which is when  
18 this building -- the date of this building, so I  
19 think it is entirely appropriate. I think it really  
20 does evoke the majority or the very heavy German  
21 population we had in town, and I think this is a  
22 very nice change from the existing condition, and I  
23 hope that we approve it, and I am ready to vote in  
24 favor of it.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Any other comments?

1                   COMMISSIONER STEWART: I have an  
2                   awning -- a couple of awning questions.

3                   I think last time we wanted you to  
4                   explain to us how you are going to attach it.

5                   MR. KOLAR: Well, I brought you the --  
6                   basically there is a wooden frame, and the brackets,  
7                   which are holding the awning roller, will be  
8                   attached with screws to the wood, and I brought you  
9                   the actual screw to show you.

10                  Those are the screws, which are  
11                  generally used for attaching the awning that way,  
12                  and then there is a scissor arm, which is attached  
13                  with a similar, but a lot smaller screw, that is  
14                  same existing wooden frame.

15                  COMMISSIONER STEWART: Okay.

16                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: So this is a  
17                  retractable awning?

18                  MR. KOLAR: This is a retractable  
19                  awning.

20                  COMMISSIONER STEWART: And do you have  
21                  a sample of the fabric?

22                  MR. KOLAR: We have the -- we have the  
23                  sample here, and I also have the book from the  
24                  fabric maker.

25                  COMMISSIONER STEWART: Great.



1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: There you go.

2 MR. KOLAR: This is a sample of the  
3 fabric, and I will bring you the book.

4 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Is there a style  
5 number for that?

6 COMMISSIONER STEWART: It's two  
7 different colors.

8 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yeah. He's going  
9 to have to explain what that stripe is.

10 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I am having deja  
11 vu.

12 (Board members confer)

13 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: It is cited in the  
14 application.

15 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, is it?

16 MR. KOLAR: This is the company which  
17 makes it.

18 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh wow. Thank  
19 you. I'm sorry I missed that.

20 (Board members confer)

21 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I am reading in  
22 the correspondence we see. Sunbrella fabric 4666,  
23 logo red and Tuscan 4677, Tuscan.

24 Is that what we have in front of us?

25 MR. KOLAR: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Great.

2 Thank you.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So is the awning  
4 going to be solid, or is it going to be two tone?

5 MR. KOLAR: Only is two colors. The  
6 top is different than the flap.

7 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Because we are not  
8 seeing that obviously --

9 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: That's not how it  
10 reads here --

11 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Is it a flap or  
12 the piping?

13 COMMISSIONER STEWART: In the swatch  
14 there is --

15 (Commissioners speaking at the same  
16 time)

17 MR. KOLAR: That is a very bad copy  
18 there --

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So the top is the  
20 orange, and the front is the red?

21 MR. KOLAR: Yes, yes.

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: It is artistic  
24 license, Commissioners.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

1 MS. HOLTZMAN: Do you want a better  
2 one?

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yeah, okay. That's a  
4 better one.

5 All right. I don't know if you folks  
6 have seen this one.

7 MR. KOLAR: And here you can see this  
8 one, too.

9 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yeah, okay. All  
10 right. I am just clarifying.

11 So any further questions, comments, a  
12 motion?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I will make a  
14 motion.

15 MR. MILLER: I think Marty had a motion  
16 just before the last two comments.

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Given the  
18 criteria presented and the rendering itself being  
19 more of an artist conception than a tight regimented  
20 measured drawing, shall we say, based on our  
21 conversation that the storefront itself would  
22 actually be more in the realm of straight lines than  
23 freehand, I would move to accept it as presented.

24 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Second.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Roll call.

1 MS. ANASTASIO: Steve?  
2 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.  
3 MS. ANASTASIO: Sue?  
4 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes.  
5 MS. ANASTASIO: Seth?  
6 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: Yes.  
7 MS. ANASTASIO: Ellen?  
8 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.  
9 MS. ANASTASIO: Jim?  
10 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.  
11 MS. ANASTASIO: Marty?  
12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.  
13 MS. ANASTASIO: Jonathan?  
14 COMMISSIONER METSCH: Yes.  
15 MS. ANASTASIO: Jon?  
16 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes.  
17 MS. ANASTASIO: Allen?  
18 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yes.  
19 MR. GALLUCCI: Thank you very much.  
20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you.  
21 (The matter concluded)

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.  
 This transcript was prepared in accordance with  
 NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
APPLICATION No. H18-6-1

RE: 221 WASHINGTON STREET : Monday 7:40 p.m.  
Block: 213, Lot 8 : June 4, 2018  
Zone CBD(H) :  
Applicant: Madd Hatter, Inc. :  
Presenter: Jeff Ross :  
Certificate of Appropriateness for :  
installation of a new sign :  
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Ana Sanchez, Chair
- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

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

1           A P P E A R A N C E:

2                   WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP  
3                   520 Parsippany Road  
4                   Parsippany, New Jersey 07054  
5                   BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.  
6                   Attorneys for the Board

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.   Next up is 221  
2   Washington Street.

3                   THE REPORTER:   Can I just have your  
4   name?

5                   MR. ROSS:   Jeff Ross.

6                   MR. MILLER:   Mr. Ross, we are just  
7   looking at the application.   You are the owner of  
8   the property?

9                   MR. ROSS:   I am owner of the business.

10                  MR. MILLER:   The owner of the business,  
11   okay.

12                  MR. ROSS:   Yes.

13                  MR. MILLER:   Okay.   Thank you.

14                  MR. ROSS:   Thank you.

15                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.   So this is  
16   strictly for a sign application?

17                  MR. ROSS:   Yes, sir.

18                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Okay.

19                  MR. ROSS:   And one other thing, the  
20   sign application, the awnings, they originally were  
21   red, but they were a little faded, so to match the  
22   sign, I just wondered if we could change the color  
23   to blue, if possible, or leave it the same.

24                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:   Blue?

25                  MR. ROSS:   Whatever you guys like.



1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: The back of the sign  
2 is going to be black?

3                   MR. ROSS: Yeah. It's black with the  
4 blue, with the white to match, just to give it a  
5 little change.

6                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. I didn't pay  
7 close attention.

8                   Does anybody have a picture of what is  
9 going on there now or when it was --

10                  MR. ROSS: I have one picture -- yes,  
11 thank you. That is it right there.

12                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Mr. Chairman, I  
13 think in the application, we have something that is  
14 an existing photo.

15                  MR. ROSS: Thank you.

16                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: I'll take a look.

17                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I know it is  
18 current, because it doesn't have the words when  
19 recovered.

20                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: That's what I wanted.  
21 I wanted to see what the sign was, because where you  
22 have it, it's sort of photo shop glued it.

23                  MR. ROSS: Yeah. That is the exact  
24 space that was at -- it is right in the middle.

25                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

1 MR. ROSS: Thank you.

2 MS. HOLTZMAN: As a matter of fact, the  
3 One Republic letters that were down and the bars  
4 that held the sign are still in place, that they are  
5 going to or looking to reuse.

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

7 So just to be clear, you are stating  
8 that you are going to change the awnings to blue,  
9 and the sign is going to be the same size and occupy  
10 the same space as the previous sign?

11 MR. ROSS: Yes, sir.

12 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Same letters, same  
13 font?

14 MR. ROSS: Yes, sir.

15 Actually they are existing letters.  
16 We're against -- it was against code. They were 15  
17 inch, and the code is 12, so I reduced it to code,  
18 so it is actually compliant.

19 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Mr. Chairman?

20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

21 Questions?

22 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Are the flags part  
23 of the application? I see two flags.

24 MR. ROSS: No. That was just from the  
25 photo shop picture. I'm sorry. There's no flags.

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  So why are they  
2           there?

3                   MR. ROSS:  That was just in the picture  
4           taken by a newspaper when One Republic had an event,  
5           and then we just --

6                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  Oh, and then you  
7           colored them blue?

8                   COMMISSIONER ABRAMS:  It was for an  
9           event that was going on there --

10                  MR. ROSS:  Yeah.  It was an event that  
11           they had --

12                  COMMISSIONER ABRAMS:  -- temporary.

13                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  Temporary.

14                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  The grand finale?

15                  (Laughter)

16                  MR. ROSS:  Exactly.

17                  (Chair Sanchez present)

18                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  I think,  
19           though, also there is some lighting up there that  
20           shines down on the awning that was actually put up  
21           illegally.  They had put red light bulbs into that.  
22           That is not going to happen here.

23                  What are you going to do with those  
24           lights?

25                  MR. ROSS:  Well, the boxes we took out.

1 You see the boxes next to the lights --

2 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yeah. There's  
3 boxes, yeah --

4 MR. ROSS: -- which were removed, and  
5 whatever you guys want me to do, I am easy. Whether  
6 you like red, blue, whatever you guys want, I'll do  
7 it.

8 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Is there a  
9 reason that you want to light that at all seeing  
10 that there's no signage there?

11 MR. ROSS: No. They are just existing,  
12 so we just left them. It is just the lenses that  
13 are red, so they're just --

14 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yeah. Can you  
15 remove those?

16 MR. ROSS: I could try, but I think due  
17 to the electrical, the way they drilled them out and  
18 stuff like that, it would take a lot of work. I  
19 mean, I could just leave them off, if you'd like,  
20 but --

21 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: How about you  
22 just leave them off then?

23 MR. ROSS: Yeah, that's fine. No  
24 problem.

25 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: The thing is

1           they are really up against where the residential  
2           part of the building is.

3                       MR. ROSS:  And we're actually facing  
4           this way, and I actually took them down, so they  
5           don't shine --

6                       COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  And they were  
7           red.

8                       MR. ROSS:  Yeah.  They are still red  
9           because that's the -- they have the illumination,  
10          but I hear you.  We can move those down.

11                      COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  Okay.  So we  
12          have that.

13                      The lettering with the white letters,  
14          can you explain that?

15                      MR. ROSS:  Yes.  That is 12 inches high  
16          by code, and basically it is just white outline --  
17          God bless you --

18                      COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Thank you.

19                      MR. ROSS:  -- it is a blue faced with  
20          the white background, like a 3d style like they had.

21                      COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  And they are  
22          not lit?

23                      MR. ROSS:  No, no.  They're not lit.

24                      Well, there is a -- there is a light  
25          panel that goes in front of it that was already

1 existing.

2 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: From below --

3 MR. ROSS: Yes, from below just to  
4 shine only on the letters, but that is it, but it is  
5 all existing.

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Questions?

7 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I just feel  
8 there is too much blue. We're going from a red  
9 thing to this blue thing. I just think I would like  
10 to see the lettering in a different color or  
11 something a little classier than a colored football  
12 game.

13 MR. ROSS: Sure. I understand. Just  
14 right now they are red with the white letters --

15 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes.

16 MR. ROSS: -- so we were just trying to  
17 be consistent with what you guys already approved,  
18 so what color would you like?

19 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: We may not have  
20 even approved that.

21 MR. ROSS: No problem.

22 What color would you like?

23 (Laughter)

24 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No. I am  
25 thinking something a little -- I don't know, with

1 the other Commissioners, something that is not quite  
2 as --

3 MR. ROSS: Yeah, any color.

4 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: -- to me it  
5 yells college football.

6 MR. ROSS: Okay. I agree.

7 COMMISSIONER STEWART: What about like  
8 a navy or something a little less sporty?

9 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Can you put a  
10 black background, do you want something to -- I see  
11 you have a little hat there --

12 MR. ROSS: You are talking about the  
13 cafe bar restaurant?

14 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No, no, no. I  
15 am talking about Madd Hatter.

16 MR. ROSS: Oh, okay. So if we made  
17 that all blue, you would be happier than the white  
18 you mean, or -- oh, you are saying there is too much  
19 blue there?

20 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No. I am just  
21 saying something that doesn't look so collegiate.

22 MR. ROSS: Got you.

23 MS. HOLTZMAN: Are you talking about  
24 the awning?

25 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: No. I'm

1 talking about the thing that says "Madd Hatter"  
2 that's on the fascia board below that cornice.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: The fascia board  
4 appears to be black.

5 MR. ROSS: It is black.

6 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: It is black, so  
7 you want something to stand out of the black.

8 MR. ROSS: That's why we put the white,  
9 because the red usually stands out, but I didn't  
10 want the One Republic look, which is pretty bright.

11 VICE CHAIR ZANE: I don't have a  
12 problem with it.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: But I think I know what  
14 you are talking about. You're talking about the  
15 white outline --

16 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes --

17 COMMISSIONER STEWART: That makes it  
18 very jarring --

19 MR. ROSS: Well, the white is just to  
20 bring out the lettering, because with the red it was  
21 brought out very heavy, but this is very bright, so  
22 I tried to dull that a little bit more.

23 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So possibly instead  
24 of white, to use a lighter blue.

25 MR. ROSS: Light blue?



1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Well, lighter.

2 Is that going in the direction you are  
3 looking for?

4 MR. ROSS: The outline we are talking  
5 about.

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So it's not  
7 white-white --

8 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yeah. I think  
9 it just looks like college colors, somebody's  
10 college colors, and they are like blaring in a  
11 historic district.

12 MS. HOLTZMAN: I think it is not the  
13 blue so much as the white outline --

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right.

15 MS. HOLTZMAN: -- so maybe when you get  
16 one of the letters made up, so we can see how much  
17 white it is, because maybe if it is less white --

18 MR. ROSS: Well, the letter is like a  
19 3D letter. It's like a tube, and then the back is  
20 white, and then the front fascia is blue, so you are  
21 only going to see it from the sides. This is  
22 just --

23 MS. HOLTZMAN: Oh, so it's the return,  
24 the return of the letter --

25 MR. ROSS: Yeah, it's just the

1 return --

2 (Commissioners speaking at once)

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Oh, oh, oh.

4 MR. ROSS: -- they are round letters.

5 They are rounded letters, so the white is just

6 straight on.

7 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: So it is not on

8 the inside --

9 MR. ROSS: No, no. It's just white --

10 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: -- so it's just

11 the return on the depth of the --

12 MR. ROSS: -- yes, yes, just the

13 return, correct.

14 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: -- maybe that

15 will not be that bad.

16 MR. ROSS: Yes, that is all.

17 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Okay.

18 CHAIR SANCHEZ: And was there a

19 discussion on the height of the letters?

20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: They're 12 inches.

21 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Twelve inches. We

22 could move -- I actually think the 12, again,

23 because this is such a walkable part of the street,

24 is a little high. We have allowed it in other

25 places, but I think as I walk by and look at it, and

1 I think that it just -- it blares.

2 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: The ones that are  
3 there now are 15.

4 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Because we did  
5 not approve those.

6 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: So --

7 MS. ANASTASIO: They were approved at  
8 12, and they put up 15.

9 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Well, I happen to think  
10 that 12 is sort of excessive for the street. We did  
11 it for Wok, which is only three letters, and it's  
12 just very bold --

13 MR. ROSS: I think Sauce just got  
14 approved, and I just measured their letters, and --

15 CHAIR SANCHEZ: But they only have the  
16 capital letter, and then they go with the smaller  
17 script --

18 MR. ROSS: Yeah.

19 CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- but you have all --  
20 all caps, because I think if the font was different,  
21 where you were only saying the "M" and the "H," then  
22 it would be a different issue.

23 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Isn't what he  
24 proposed still complying with the guidelines,  
25 though, the 12-inch?

1                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Yes, but we rarely  
2                   approve 12 unless it is sort of -- it is very large  
3                   for our urban context, where we are walking by.  
4                   We're not driving by usually at a fast speed.

5                   COMMISSIONER PERRY:  It is a large  
6                   storefront, though.  It is a pretty wide, wide area.

7                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  It is wide.

8                   (Commissioners speaking at the same  
9                   time)

10                  CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Yes, but there is --  
11                  from what I see in the photograph, there is  
12                  additional signage that says Cafe, Bar, Restaurant,  
13                  Brunch, so we are not limiting it to this sign.

14                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  I agree.  I think  
15                  the letters look very high and overwhelming and  
16                  unnecessarily so.

17                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  Maybe it's the  
18                  font.

19                  MR. ROSS:  It's the font, because I  
20                  wanted to show you guys the white.  You can't see it  
21                  like that, so it is just -- it's projected.  It is  
22                  actually smaller than that, the actual --

23                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  Is this -- is this --

24                  MR. ROSS:  -- that is the actual  
25                  12-inch diameter.  This is just imposed, so I could

1 give you guys a look. I sent it over to Joan, but  
2 there was a problem with the email, so I couldn't  
3 get it to you.

4 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- is this a chain,  
5 or this is just a restaurant?

6 MR. ROSS: No. It is just Mothers  
7 Against Drunk Driving. I am a former New York City  
8 cop, and I do donations for the charities, so I  
9 basically put the name, and that is what it is --

10 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Oh, okay.

11 COMMISSIONER PERRY: So it should be in  
12 12-inch letters. I agree, it should be 12-inch  
13 letters then.

14 MR. ROSS: That is for Mothers Against  
15 Drunk Drivers.

16 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So if there is no  
17 real design precedent or anything, maybe not a bold  
18 font, but like the regular, just to take this down a  
19 tick.

20 MR. ROSS: Sure.

21 So I don't know if -- these are like  
22 the letters, but they're just --

23 VICE CHAIR ZANE: I know what he had,  
24 right.

25 MR. ROSS: -- yeah. They're just

1 similar to that.

2 VICE CHAIR ZANE: What was is not  
3 necessarily what can be.

4 MR. ROSS: No, I understand.

5 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

6 So, yeah, I agree, this is less than  
7 this, but I will say that this is not like design  
8 forward. This is not -- one can do better and have  
9 a great sign that people see, so I am just asking  
10 could it be -- this would be considered a bold  
11 face --

12 MR. ROSS: Okay --

13 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- could it be --

14 MR. ROSS: -- whatever you like.

15 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay. So whatever  
16 font this is, it could be one of many, they're all  
17 similar, but if you look in the book, you will see  
18 they have bold, extra bold, regular.

19 MR. ROSS: So you want regular?

20 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: How about gold?  
21 Gold and blue is good.

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Regular.

23 COMMISSIONER STEWART: That's very  
24 collegiate.

25 MR. ROSS: Regular, okay. So the

1 regular font, no problem.

2 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So if you could send  
3 that to Joan, that would be contingent upon --

4 MR. ROSS: Yes, I will.

5 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Any other comments or  
6 questions?

7 MS. HOLTZMAN: And you are okay with us  
8 reviewing it in the office?

9 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes, that's what I'm  
10 saying to do.

11 MR. ROSS: Thank you.

12 VICE CHAIR ZANE: I guess no?

13 So my understanding is, just to recap  
14 vis-a-vis the sign, move it to the regular weight  
15 font, and that is it?

16 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: And it will be  
17 decided at the office. Otherwise it is fine.

18 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Any motions?

19 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I will make a  
20 motion to approve with the conditions that were just  
21 stated regarding the use of regular font for the  
22 "Madd Hatter" letters.

23 MR. ROSS: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I second it.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Roll call.

1 MS. ANASTASIO: Ana?  
2 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.  
3 MS. ANASTASIO: Steve?  
4 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.  
5 MS. ANASTASIO: Sue?  
6 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Yes.  
7 MS. ANASTASIO: Seth?  
8 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: Yes.  
9 MS. ANASTASIO: Ellen?  
10 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.  
11 MS. ANASTASIO: Jim?  
12 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yes.  
13 MS. ANASTASIO: Marty?  
14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.  
15 MS. ANASTASIO: Jonathan?  
16 COMMISSIONER METSCH: Yes.  
17 MS. ANASTASIO: And Jon?  
18 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes.  
19 MR. ROSS: Thank you very much.  
20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you.  
21 (The matter concluded)

22

23

24

25



C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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.  
This transcript was prepared in accordance with  
NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

----- X  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOBOKEN : Monday 8:10 p.m.  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION : June 4, 2018  
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Ana Sanchez, Chair
- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

A P P E A R A N C E:

- WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP
- 520 Parsippany Road
- Parsippany, New Jersey 07054
- BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.
- Attorneys for the Board

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

1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:  So Ana Sanchez has  
2                   returned.

3                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Are we ready for our  
4                   presentation?

5                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:  Yes, we are.

6                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Okay.

7                   MS. HOLTZMAN:  While they are setting  
8                   up, I have a quick question.

9                   John, there are two people that were  
10                  here at the last meeting that did not return with  
11                  anything.  Do we need to remove them?

12                  Can we leave them open ended for the  
13                  time being?

14                  MR. MILLER:  No.  I think we can leave  
15                  them open ended, and I think it is appropriate for  
16                  the Commission to carry those two applications.

17                  Excuse me.  The applications are -- the  
18                  first one is H18-4-2, 502 Washington Street.

19                  The other application is H18-5-6, 700  
20                  Washington Street, and it would be appropriate for  
21                  the Commission.  They were asked last meeting to  
22                  provide updated plans and an updated application.

23                  They are not here, but it is  
24                  appropriate to carry it to the next meeting.

25                  MS. HOLTZMAN:  For August?

1 MR. MILLER: Yes, that's fine.

2 COMMISSIONER VESEY: So that wouldn't  
3 be a de facto approval by not --

4 MR. MILLER: No, it would not, no.

5 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- because I know  
6 that the Xerox and Uno place has been operating and  
7 been in business and did their renovations, hung up  
8 their sign, and pretty much have done everything we  
9 told them not to do, and they are operating the  
10 business --

11 MR. MILLER: Uh-huh. Well, that's a --

12 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- my concern is  
13 that they are never going to come back.

14 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Madam Chair, I  
15 have the same concern that Commissioner Vesey has,  
16 and I noticed that we are not scheduled to meet  
17 until August.

18 Is there, inasmuch as we now have two  
19 things -- two items that are pending, does it make  
20 sense for us to meet in July to handle these, so  
21 that we are not holding up their business?

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ: We never meet in July  
23 unless there is a special need --

24 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Uh-huh --

25 CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- so I would --

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  -- well, I am not  
2                   raising it in that context --

3                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  -- so I would -- yes, I  
4                   would actually leave it open and see what happens in  
5                   the next couple of weeks in the office in terms of  
6                   workload that you receive in terms of --

7                   COMMISSIONER METSCH:  Why would we be  
8                   concerned about them?  They didn't show up.

9                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Well, because,  
10                  Jonathan, the two projects are kind of different.

11                  The Dunkin' Donuts project, no work has  
12                  been done.  They submitted plans that we wanted them  
13                  to amend, and they didn't file new plans and they  
14                  didn't come.

15                  The other project had come for a sign  
16                  application, did construction without applying for a  
17                  certificate of appropriateness, came before the  
18                  Commission, and we told them that they needed to  
19                  come back with their applications in place.

20                  COMMISSIONER METSCH:  No.  I understand  
21                  that, but they didn't show up.  That is their  
22                  problem, not ours.

23                  CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Well, actually, before  
24                  we went off on that, I think what we should do is  
25                  maybe visit the site, and if it's something that

1       they finished all of the work and they haven't  
2       gotten the approvals, then it's time to issue a  
3       letter and a fine that they're not in compliance. I  
4       think that is the logical next step for the  
5       pizzeria,

6                   And in terms of a meeting, let's see  
7       what the next three weeks -- actually the next two  
8       weeks brings into the office. If at the end we are  
9       just looking at one application, then we could leave  
10      it as is.

11                   Last year we called a special meeting  
12      for mid July, so --

13                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: Just to be clear,  
14      what is 502 Washington not in compliance with?

15                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: I think they moved  
16      forward and completed all of the work without any  
17      approvals or certificates from this office.

18                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: The signs are in  
19      compliance, though, I believe.

20                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: They were never  
21      submitted.

22                   MS. ANASTASIO: They were supposed to  
23      come back. Do you remember, they were supposed to  
24      come back --

25                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: For a storefront

1 repair, which they painted over, but they did no  
2 repair. But as far as I can see, I am not sure what  
3 they are not in compliance with specifically.

4 COMMISSIONER VESEY: They didn't file  
5 the certificate of appropriateness. They came for  
6 the sign, so we deemed the application incomplete,  
7 and we didn't vote on it.

8 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I thought the  
9 history was we were not happy with the condition of  
10 the storefront, and when they came for the sign, we  
11 thought the storefront needed repair as well.

12 They had repainted it, and that is all  
13 they have done, but the signs are in compliance.

14 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I thought we asked  
15 them to come back twice.

16 Did we actually -- we never actually  
17 voted on the sign.

18 MS. ANASTASIO: No, we haven't voted on  
19 it.

20 COMMISSIONER PERRY: But the signs are  
21 not outside the regulations.

22 COMMISSIONER VESEY: No, but --

23 COMMISSIONER PERRY: But they do comply  
24 with our --

25 COMMISSIONER VESEY: -- they never went

1 through a review process.

2 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- they never got  
3 the formal approval.

4 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right.

5 CHAIR SANCHEZ: I actually think we  
6 should review our notes on that and then issue a  
7 letter.

8 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I just wanted to  
9 be clear what we are expecting them to come back  
10 for.

11 If they are not doing any work on the  
12 storefront, then there is no certificate of  
13 appropriateness any longer, is that correct?

14 MR. MILLER: No. They would still need  
15 a certificate of appropriateness because even though  
16 they complied, it hasn't been legitimized.

17 That work, even though it may comply,  
18 it still needs a certificate, so they would have to  
19 be -- it would be similar to a Zoning Board -- say a  
20 Zoning Board matter, if somebody built a fence in  
21 their backyard, and the fence didn't conform for  
22 whatever reason when they came in for a zoning  
23 permit for it, and said oh, I built a fence, but  
24 well, it doesn't comply with the ordinance, so you  
25 are going to have to go to the Zoning Board.



1                   That would be something similar here.

2       The work may comply, and we all may get the  
3       application and think that it does comply, but they  
4       have to come in for the certificate. It doesn't  
5       change their obligation, and we don't reprimand them  
6       for not having it, but they also have to meet the  
7       criteria for the certificate when they come in.

8                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay.

9                   (Continue on next page)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

----- X  
PRESENTATION BY KMS DEVELOPMENT : Monday 8:20 p.m.  
PARTNERS : June 4, 2018  
Re: Hoboken Post Office :  
Redevelopment Project Hotel :  
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

Ana Sanchez, Chair  
Steve Zane, Vice Chair  
Seth Abrams, Commissioner  
Martin Anderson, Commissioner  
Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner  
James Perry, Commissioner  
Susan Pregibon, Commissioner  
Ellen Stewart, Commissioner  
Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate  
Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer  
Joan Anastasio, Secretary

A P P E A R A N C E:

WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP  
520 Parsippany Road  
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054  
BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.  
Attorneys for the Board

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

1                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  So we are going to move  
2 forward to the presentation on the post office  
3 renovation and Riverfront Hotel.

4                   Can you please state your name and  
5 relationship to the project?

6                   Should they be sworn in?

7                   MR. MILLER:  I think so, yes.

8                   Gentlemen, if you could raise your  
9 right hand.

10                  Do you swear or affirm to tell the  
11 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth  
12 during this hearing?

13                  MR. REED:  Yes.

14                  MR. TEPERMAN:  Yes.

15                  MR. HARSHBARGER:  Yes.

16                  R O B    R E E D, PE, LEED AP, KMS Development  
17 Partners, LP, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.,  
18 having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

19

20                  Y O R Y    T E P E R M A N, AIA, Cooper Carry, 75  
21 Broad Street, New York, New York, having been duly  
22 sworn, testified as follows:

23

24                  P A T R I C K    H A R S H B A R G E R, Hunter  
25 Research, 120 West State Street, Trenton, New

1 Jersey, having been duly sworn, testified as  
2 follows:

3 MR. MILLER: Thank you very much.

4 I'll start from the left, sir.

5 MR. REED: I'm Rob Reed, and I'm the  
6 project executive.

7 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. How do you  
8 spell your name?

9 MR. REED: Rob Reed, R-e-e-d.

10 I am the project executive, KMS  
11 Development Partners. We are the developer.

12 MR. MILLER: Okay.

13 MR. TEPERMAN: I'm Yory Teperman, and  
14 I'm with Cooper Carry.

15 THE REPORTER: Could you spell that?

16 MR. TEPERMAN: Yes.

17 Y-o-r-y. Last name, T-e-p-e-r-m-a-n.

18 MR. MILLER: And, sir?

19 MR. HARSHBARGER: I am Patrick  
20 Harshbarger, H-a-r-s-h-b-a-r-g-e-r. And I am the  
21 principal architectural historian and vice president  
22 at Hunter Research in Trenton.

23 MR. REED: Well, thanks for the  
24 opportunity to talk about our project. We have been  
25 working on this project for a little bit of time

1 now, but we are finally moving along.

2 Is everybody familiar with the hotel  
3 project?

4 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Madam Chair, I'd  
5 find it helpful. We received just a notice that we  
6 would have a presentation tonight. Could you give  
7 us some procedural background what our role is and  
8 what is expected of us tonight?

9 Is this a certificate of  
10 appropriateness?

11 Is this a presentation?

12 I would just like the procedural  
13 background.

14 CHAIR SANCHEZ: It is my understanding  
15 that it is a presentation. It is not an application  
16 to the Board. So it is a presentation because the  
17 post office does have a potential to be a historic  
18 landmark and is listed as a building, but it is not  
19 an application, so it is for our questioning and  
20 really information.

21 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So we're  
22 looking --

23 MS. GIORGIANNI: I can go over the  
24 background.

25 KMS is the conditionally --

1 MR. MILLER: Wait a minute. Excuse me.

2 Who are you?

3 MS. GIORGIANNI: I'm sorry.

4 MR. MILLER: With all due respect, who  
5 are you?

6 (Laughter)

7 MS. GIORGIANNI: I'm sorry about that.

8 I'm Jessica Giorgianni, Principal  
9 Planner, City of Hoboken.

10 MS. HOLTZMAN: You're going to spell  
11 it.

12 MS. GIORGIANNI: You want me to spell  
13 it?

14 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

15 MS. GIORGIANNI: G-i-o-r-g-i-a-n-n-i.

16 MR. MILLER: And I will swear you in as  
17 well.

18 Do you swear or affirm to tell the  
19 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth  
20 during this hearing?

21 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes.

22 J E S S I C A G I O R G I A N N I, Principal  
23 Planner, City of Hoboken, having been duly sworn,  
24 testified as follows:

25 MR. MILLER: Thank you very much.

1 MS. GIORGIANNI: So KMS Development  
2 Partners has been conditionally designated as a  
3 developer for the post office site where the post  
4 office redevelopment plan is.

5 So that means we are in the process of  
6 negotiating a redevelopment agreement with the City  
7 of Hoboken with KMS, and Cooper Carry is their  
8 architect.

9 Because this site is located within a  
10 historic district, the post office as the owner is  
11 responsible for going through a Section 106 process  
12 through the State Historic Preservation Office,  
13 SHPO.

14 So what they are doing is following the  
15 rules and going through that Section 106 process in  
16 that apparently years ago, letters were sent not  
17 only to the Historic Preservation Commission, but  
18 also to the historic society or the historic museum  
19 and some other organizations in Hudson County.

20 It turns out that that communication  
21 never, you know, never went through or somehow the  
22 HPC didn't get it, so now we are having that  
23 conversation finally as part of the Section 106  
24 process.

25 Do you want to explain a little bit

1 more about the Section 106 project?

2 MR. REED: Yeah, yeah.

3 Any federal agency that is proposing  
4 work on a project, on a building that is eligible or  
5 could be eligible or is a contributing resource has  
6 to go through the Section 106 process, and that  
7 starts with a letter, a consultation letter to the  
8 SHPO laying out what the project is.

9 Then there is a determination in that  
10 respect, if the project has a material effect on the  
11 building, and then counsel in Washington is invited  
12 to participate.

13 We notify anybody who we think might be  
14 an interested party in essence via a certified  
15 letter. We didn't get any responses from anybody.  
16 This was three or four years ago, but nonetheless --  
17 and then there is also public notice.

18 And then we have to enter into a  
19 consultation process with SHPO, where we look at the  
20 project and come up with ideas and strategies to  
21 mitigate any impact on that project, on the building  
22 itself.

23 COMMISSIONER VESEY: So we have hard  
24 copies of the plans.

25 Electronically we got previously only



1 three pages, only 16, 18, 20.

2 MS. ANASTASIO: That was all that was  
3 sent to me.

4 COMMISSIONER VESEY: So we only got  
5 three of how many pages?

6 MR. REED: It wasn't from us. We  
7 didn't send anything directly to the HPC.

8 COMMISSIONER VESEY: So the electronic  
9 copy was only the three pages?

10 MS. GIORGIANNI: So I forwarded on  
11 essentially what we received from you all, which I  
12 believe were the copies of the certified letters,  
13 and then maybe some pages of the plan set.

14 MS. ANASTASIO: Right, right.

15 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yeah. We didn't  
16 get any letters. We only got three floor plans.

17 (Commissioners speaking at once)

18 MS. HOLTZMAN: They were sent to the  
19 various persons that were part of the Commission  
20 four years ago, three or four years ago, so --

21 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Well, it's just  
22 because Section 106 is a fairly big process, we've  
23 got this -- you know, this is the first time I think  
24 anybody has ever seen this on the HPC --

25 MR. REED: So what you're -- go ahead,

1 I'm sorry.

2 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I was just going  
3 to ask to go back to the Section 106 process, so  
4 then I guess the question is to Jessica.

5 What then is our role, or to you, Ana,  
6 what is our role then?

7 Do we just comment and then that is  
8 incorporated into the Section 106 process, and those  
9 are then sent on to Washington? Is that right?

10 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes.

11 I think that, you know, certainly, you  
12 know, minutes of this meeting, or perhaps, you know,  
13 a letter from the HPC at the end of this meeting,  
14 you know, weighing in on any comments or concerns  
15 that you have could be sent to SHPO.

16 MR. REED: SHPO is specifically looking  
17 for some feedback to see if the HPC has any  
18 comments.

19 MR. HARSHBARGER: I can say for  
20 somebody that's been handling the dialog with the  
21 SHPO, that we were very concerned that we weren't  
22 getting any feedback from you, and there were three  
23 certified letters sent. They were through voice  
24 communications, but not -- but never got directly to  
25 you. I don't know why, but that is just what

1       happened.

2                   MS. GIORGIANNI:   This is an  
3       administrative conversation for another time.  I  
4       don't want to waste time today talking about that.

5                   MR. HARSHBARGER:  Where things are to  
6       just sort of say is that with SHPO is that they have  
7       consulted with the US Postal Service and KMS, and  
8       have drafted a memorandum of agreement.  They agreed  
9       that this is going to be an adverse effect on the  
10      post office, and we are specifically here  
11      particularly to begin the conversation with you and  
12      have comments, and those comments are most  
13      appropriately directed to the postal service and  
14      SHPO.

15                  CHAIR SANCHEZ:  So I do think that it  
16      would be appropriate for us to submit sort of a  
17      written letter report of our observations and a copy  
18      of the transcript of the meeting.

19                  I would also request that the  
20      communication between SHPO and your organization  
21      that we be privy to that, so we understand what is  
22      happening and how the State Historic Preservation  
23      Office feels about the project.

24                  MR. HARSHBARGER:  Sure.

25                  COMMISSIONER PERRY:  Would it also --

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Just a question  
2 for clarification of Mr. Harshbarger.

3                   You said something about an adverse  
4 effect that SHPO did or did not --

5                   MR. HARSHBARGER: SHPO has already  
6 issued its letter finding, which is an adverse  
7 effect.

8                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And do we have a  
9 copy of that?

10                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: We don't. I just  
11 requested that it be sent --

12                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: That's what you  
13 just requested?

14                  MS. GIORGIANNI: The memorandum of  
15 agreement?

16                  MR. REED: That precedes the memorandum  
17 of agreement.

18                  MS. GIORGIANNI: Oh, okay. So I didn't  
19 receive that.

20                  MR. REED: So the letter -- the adverse  
21 effect is where SHPO says, okay, what you are doing  
22 is going to affect the fabric of the building, let's  
23 consult and come up with strategies to make it  
24 better. That resulted in a draft memorandum of  
25 agreement. So right now there is a draft agreement

1 between the Postal Service and the SHPO.

2 MS. GIORGIANNI: Which I can send  
3 around, if I haven't already, I will send the draft.

4 CHAIR SANCHEZ: We haven't seen it, so  
5 if we could see the draft memorandum of agreement,  
6 and if we could see the letter, both your  
7 communication to SHPO and their response --

8 MR. REED: Absolutely.

9 CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- where they say it is  
10 an adverse effect.

11 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Also in our  
12 statutory role, as education, do we also have a  
13 role, it sounds like other potential consulting  
14 parties have not received or heard anything. Is  
15 part of our action to also encourage the applicant  
16 or KMS or the city to reach out to these other  
17 potential consulting parties?

18 I think there is a list typically in a  
19 Section 106. There is a list I think, that the  
20 Quality of Life Coalition would be one, and the  
21 Hoboken Historical Museum --

22 MS. GIORGIANNI: Oh, yes. It was the  
23 Hoboken Historical Museum, the Hudson County  
24 Division of Cultural and Heritage Affairs, the  
25 Hudson County Genealogical and Historical Society,

1 the Erie Lackawanna Historical Society and obviously  
2 the HPC and the City of Hoboken.

3 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I think it is  
4 appropriate for us to encourage KMS to reach out  
5 again or for us in our role to encourage these  
6 groups to respond. It's a major property, and we  
7 have an educational role to play in that.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay. And I think we  
9 can sort of copy these organizations with our filing  
10 on this --

11 MS. GIORGIANNI: Exactly. Great idea.

12 MR. REED: That would be the best way  
13 to do it.

14 You will get a copy of the MOA. It has  
15 been drafted, and SHPO didn't want to sign that  
16 until they got some feedback from the Commissioners.

17 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, I'm  
18 grateful for that --

19 COMMISSIONER METSCH: And maybe -- can  
20 we move on to anything you know about the project,  
21 because we are not managing the project --

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ: No, but I --

23 COMMISSIONER METSCH: -- I know, but  
24 we've already spent 20 minutes talking about things  
25 that are hard to understand.

1                   We are here tonight to hear a briefing  
2                   on the project, not the management of the covenant  
3                   or the approval, and we should get those documents,  
4                   and if they are in our purview, look at them some  
5                   time, but I don't want to spend all evening arguing  
6                   about things that we really don't know the basis of.

7                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: Well, that is why we  
8                   are asking for the documents.

9                   COMMISSIONER METSCH: I know. But we  
10                  have been doing this, like we always do, for a  
11                  prolonged period of time, and rather than do it  
12                  dealing with the substance of why they are here. It  
13                  is a bad habit we are in.

14                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: Well, I don't  
15                  think we are arguing.

16                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.

17                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: I think we are  
18                  asking why.

19                  COMMISSIONER METSCH: We should ask for  
20                  a copy of the procedures that will be used --

21                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: That's what we're  
22                  doing. We're asking for the documents that were  
23                  apparently sent to us --

24                  COMMISSIONER METSCH: -- and how we're  
25                  incorporating that.

1                   We should do that at another meeting  
2 when we have it in front us, and we ought to move on  
3 to the presentation.

4                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I, too, am looking  
5 forward to the presentation, and I want to do that  
6 on the basis of knowing exactly what we are going to  
7 be doing at the end of it, and what action is  
8 requested, and that's why I asked about the Section  
9 106.

10                   I have one further question, and that  
11 is, I know that the city last year adopted a  
12 redevelopment plan, the Post Office Redevelopment  
13 Plan, which is on the city's website. Maybe the  
14 applicant will get to that in the presentation. I  
15 just wonder if what we've been handed tonight is a  
16 replica of that or if it's different, and I would  
17 like to hear that addressed when it comes to the --

18                   MS. GIORGIANNI: So that is the process  
19 that the administration is working through right now  
20 with the conditionally designated redevelopment,  
21 KMS, and so now we received the plans from the  
22 developer, and we are working through where there  
23 might need to be amendments to the redevelopment  
24 plan, where the project components will be  
25 consistent with the redevelopment plan, so that is



1 kind of the back and forth process that we are going  
2 through right now.

3 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And some of what  
4 we say tonight might feed into that process as well  
5 as the Section 106?

6 MS. GIORGIANNI: It could. I can't  
7 make any promises --

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.

9 MS. GIORGIANNI: -- because I don't  
10 know what we are going to talk about.

11 (Laughter)

12 COMMISSIONER METSCH: Neither do we.

13 MR. REED: 106 is a federal process  
14 that we are following --

15 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes.

16 MR. REED: -- so what you are looking  
17 at is the package we put together for the SHPO.

18 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you for that  
19 clarification.

20 MR. REED: At the same time, we are  
21 negotiating with the city towards a redevelopment  
22 agreement, and that redevelopment agreement will  
23 include the set of concept plans, so we're --

24 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes.

25 And the agreement, just so you know is

1 the process, the agreement is negotiated by the  
2 mayor, and so I am here acting on behalf of the  
3 Director Brandy who is acting on behalf of the  
4 mayor.

5 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.

6 MR. REED: So what we submitted, we are  
7 actually on the Concept Plan Number 38.

8 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes, Scheme 38.

9 MR. REED: Well, Scheme 38, which is  
10 being reviewed.

11 What you see was probably Scheme 25.

12 Once we settle with the city, hopefully  
13 in the next month or so, what is actually going to  
14 happen, this plan will be adjusted. But materially,  
15 this is where we are.

16 So what we wanted to do was just kind  
17 of walk through, not the architecture of the new  
18 building, but how the new building of this project  
19 affects the fabric of the post office itself.

20 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.

21 MR. REED: So we are actually not doing  
22 any restoration work to the public areas or the main  
23 facades. The bulk of this for our work is where the  
24 two buildings abut each other, and then there is  
25 some systems replacement and some back of house

1 work.

2 So the scope of work at the post office  
3 is we are going to install a new freight elevator,  
4 to get new loading docks off of First Street, new  
5 mechanical electrical systems, and then there is  
6 back of house work, locker rooms, some offices and  
7 bathrooms and what not.

8 So we are not touching the public  
9 lobby, the box lobby. We are not touching the  
10 Newark Street facade, nor the River Street facade,  
11 and most of the First Street facade.

12 So we just kind of wanted to walk  
13 through these plans, and this is identical to what  
14 you have in front of you. I don't know if everybody  
15 is familiar with the site.

16 So that the post office is L-shaped.  
17 The bank building that's in the corner, we are  
18 purchasing the back end of the post -- the loading  
19 dock off of Sinatra and the parking lot off First  
20 Street, so it is an L-shaped parcel.

21 Here are some shots of what is  
22 existing. So today, there is a mechanical building  
23 that is in the parking lot. I don't know if  
24 everybody is familiar with it.

25 So you have the loading dock that faces

1 the river and Sinatra Drive, and then you have on  
2 that same First Street side, there is a mechanical  
3 building. All right?

4 So what our subdivision is going to be  
5 from the face of the rear of the post office out and  
6 the side of the main building and out, so that the  
7 loading dock, the existing loading dock and that  
8 existing mechanical building would be in the  
9 footprint of the new hotel. So what you have in  
10 front of you is what the demolition is essentially.

11 New loading docks would be located off  
12 First Street, so that whole function that now faces  
13 Sinatra will be shifted over to First Street, and  
14 the new freight elevator will be installed.

15 All of the systems that are presently  
16 located in that mechanical building will be moved to  
17 the attic of the post office. There is probably a  
18 15-foot tall attic in the post office.

19 So it will be -- specifically the scope  
20 in the post office, we are going to create a well in  
21 the attic to locate the cooling towers. We don't  
22 believe they will extend above the roof line at all.  
23 If they do, it will only be a foot or so, and they  
24 will be set back. It has a Mansard roof and then  
25 new pumps and chillers and whatnot go inside the

1 attic, and then there is a new freight elevator that  
2 is moving the footprint for the new hotel.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: One second.

4 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.

5 The stenographer requested a break  
6 after two hours, and we are actually going on two  
7 and a half hours right now, so if we can just have a  
8 brief ten-minute break, and then we will begin again  
9 before you go too far on the presentation.

10 MR. REED: That's fine.

11 CHAIR SANCHEZ: And it will give us an  
12 opportunity to review the drawings.

13 MR. REED: Yeah. Past the first  
14 several sheets are the details, which tells you the  
15 focus. When we met with SHPO, the focus was on how  
16 the two buildings would physically connect, how to  
17 tie it in. That was their primary interest, and  
18 that is what that package is for.

19 CHAIR SANCHEZ: So if anyone needs  
20 to --

21 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Are we taking a  
22 break?

23 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Yes.

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: We are taking a  
25 ten-minute break.

1 (Recess taken)

2 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can I have your  
3 attention, please?

4 We can reconvene.

5 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Let's go.

6 MR. REED: All right.

7 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

8 MR. REED: All right. Just to recap,  
9 we actually don't have a whole bunch to show you.  
10 With the details, I mean, you can see it on your  
11 sheets.

12 So the rest of the sheets are details  
13 that were developed with the SHPO where the hotel  
14 building is going to interface with the existing  
15 building, so what I had colored here, like I said,  
16 this is a --

17 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Can you refer to a  
18 page number, please --

19 MR. REED: Yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- so we can  
21 follow?

22 MR. REED: Well, I am just pointing  
23 to -- I'll give you some elevations that the new --  
24 so I am looking at Sheet 6, on this one.

25 Just to, as we were saying that the --

1       this package was developed with the SHPO with the  
2       details. They were very interested in the effect of  
3       the existing building.

4               As we continue the negotiations with  
5       the city, and we are on Scheme 38 now, so right now  
6       the new hotel actually comes over further towards  
7       Newark Street and would cover these final two  
8       windows.

9               COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Mr. Reed, I am  
10       sorry. I am not finding the sheet numbers on the --

11              MR. REED: It is on your bottom left,  
12       very small.

13              COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Oh, I brought a  
14       magnifying glass.

15              (Laughter)

16              MR. REED: As we finalize the  
17       redevelopment agreement with the city and settle on  
18       the concept plan, this package will be updated with  
19       SHPO and resubmitted. The updated plans and an  
20       updated MOA would form the agreement with the SHPO.

21              So what we have now, and you will get a  
22       copy of it, with SHPO after consultation measures  
23       where photographic documentation of the whole  
24       building before we do any work, number one,  
25       archiving all of the existing drawings and plans and

1 photographs for the post office.

2 We would develop a display discussing  
3 the history and the significance of the post office,  
4 which would be displayed in the post office lobby.

5 We would also write a narrative about  
6 the history of the post office in the context of the  
7 district that it is in, and then also develop a  
8 walking tour program for people and visitors to  
9 follow and go around the district.

10 The SHPO also has -- when we further  
11 develop the plans, obviously because they are  
12 constantly -- further develop the plans and get to  
13 about 90 percent, we submit those to SHPO for review  
14 and then take their comments and then work through  
15 their comments, so there is a final check with the  
16 SHPO when we get to that point.

17 We can talk about the new project --

18 MS. GIORGIANNI: I was thinking maybe  
19 you want to talk about any of the feedback that you  
20 received from SHPO along the way that got you to  
21 this point.

22 MR. REED: Yeah. SHPO, it was  
23 interesting.

24 She wasn't very concerned about the new  
25 building, you know. We went in prepared to talk





1 corner, where that existing mechanical building is  
2 right there, and nothing on the inside on the public  
3 side either. It is all back of house.

4 So the post office is investing their  
5 money in the operation, one, with the new loading  
6 dock that will be on First Street and work room  
7 modifications inside and the freight elevator. It  
8 lets them use the attic now, so as their letter  
9 business drops off, their package business is going  
10 through the roof.

11 So one of the strategies of this plan  
12 for the Postal Service is to make this building more  
13 efficient and ready to continue their mission into  
14 the future.

15 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Allen?

16 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yeah.

17 Can you take us back to Sheet 6,  
18 because that shows the Sinatra Drive elevation  
19 demolition detail and also the River Street  
20 demolition detail.

21 Is this the sheet that basically shows  
22 how the new building is proposed to meet the  
23 existing building, is that the best sheet to  
24 illustrate that?

25 MR. REED: Yeah, yeah, in an elevation

1 view.

2 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Right.

3 So I am looking -- can you just  
4 explain, number one, which is -- this is looking at  
5 the existing building from Sinatra Drive --

6 MR. REED: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- and I see  
8 infill windows and that is -- what are we looking at  
9 here?

10 There will be some buildings on --  
11 excuse me -- there were what, five bays on the rear  
12 of the building, and two of them will be filled in,  
13 infill windows, is that -- am I reading that  
14 correctly?

15 MR. REED: Yes. That is what you are  
16 seeing there.

17 In reality, right now Scheme 38, the  
18 south edge of the building actually comes over  
19 further towards Newark Street, so those other two  
20 windows would be covered as well.

21 VICE CHAIR ZANE: And not visible to  
22 the public because the building will be there --

23 MR. REED: Because the hotel will be  
24 there.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right. Okay.

1                   MR. TEPERMAN: I mean, a whole bunch of  
2 them will be visible, because there is no --

3                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Space.

4                   MR. TEPERMAN: -- yeah. There's a  
5 corner turning, so that wall will be visible up to a  
6 point.

7                   MR. REED: Basially under this plan, we  
8 were further north, where this green wall is, the  
9 hotel would come out to there --

10                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right.

11                  MR. REED: -- so the corner, and it was  
12 important we wanted to keep -- maintain that corner  
13 to define the edge of the post office. That was  
14 important to the SHPO as well, and also respecting  
15 the cornice up there to our share lines up with the  
16 cornice --

17                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I'm sorry. I'm  
18 still trying --

19                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can we also -- well,  
20 after your question, I would like Mr. Harshbarger to  
21 speak a little bit about the historical significance  
22 and your role in the project.

23                  MR. REED: Sure.

24                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Allen, you have a  
25 question?

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yeah. I am having  
2 trouble understanding one over S-P -- over SHPO dot  
3 06. This looks -- this looks like it is from Newark  
4 Street, not Sinatra Drive. Am I -- I am not  
5 understanding this.

6                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: Number two is Sinatra  
7 Drive.

8                   MR. REED: That is correct.

9                   So you are standing in the parking lot  
10 of the post office --

11                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Well, I'm looking  
12 at the left-hand side of the page. I'm standing in  
13 a parking lot of the post office --

14                  MR. REED: Yeah. You're standing in a  
15 parking lot of the post office --

16                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- and I'm looking  
17 west --

18                  MR. REED: -- you are looking west.  
19 You are looking at the loading dock that gets  
20 demoed --

21                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Right.

22                  MR. REED: -- you're looking at windows  
23 which would be infilled, because they will be up  
24 against the new hotel --

25                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: The new hotel.

1                   MR. REED:  -- and you're looking at the  
2                   existing mechanical building on the right side,  
3                   which gets demoed.

4                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  And retained are  
5                   these two bays here --

6                   MR. REED:  Well, no.  I am saying that  
7                   in the current scheme that we are negotiating with  
8                   the city, the hotel extends further south, so bay  
9                   two would be covered.

10                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  90 percent of the  
11                  rear would be covered.

12                  COMMISSIONER STEWART:  The ones you  
13                  have in green, right.

14                  MR. REED:  Right.

15                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  Approximately 90  
16                  percent of the building would be covered.

17                  MR. REED:  Yes.  I think we are ten  
18                  feet --

19                  MR. TEPERMAN:  You can see with this --  
20                  this thing will not be covered --

21                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  The stair --

22                  (People speaking at once)

23                  MS. GIORGIANNI:  So essentially more of  
24                  the building here will be covered.

25                  MR. TEPERMAN:  Not that much.  We do it

1 maybe like another five or six feet out.

2 MS. GIORGIANNI: Okay. But we will  
3 still see kind of the cornice --

4 MR. TEPERMAN: Oh, yeah. You will see  
5 the cornice.

6 MR. REED: Yeah. This feature here  
7 with the relief there, yes, that is all still  
8 visible.

9 MS. HOLTZMAN: But then the upper  
10 floors are actually coming out actually further  
11 than --

12 MR. REED: Right.

13 MR. TEPERMAN: But the upper floors  
14 will not -- this is actually older drawings, it is  
15 going to be slightly back of this building --

16 MR. REED: Sure.

17 MR. TEPERMAN: -- so you're seeing --

18 (Mr. Teperman and Mr. Reed speaking at  
19 the same time)

20 THE REPORTER: Wait a second. Only one  
21 person can speak at a time.

22 (Laughter)

23 MR. TEPERMAN: This drawing, this  
24 drawing at the main entry, this southern facade is  
25 going to be about ten feet in, so it is actually not

1 this far out.

2 MS. GIORGIANNI: Are you sure --

3 MR. TEPERMAN: Yes, this is in --

4 MS. HOLTZMAN: I am looking where it is  
5 looking further up.

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So just to be clear,  
7 is all of this subject to change?

8 I mean, you are making sort of  
9 certifications, but in essence, what we are looking  
10 at is a concept that may or may not happen, but it  
11 won't be hopefully too far one way or another.

12 MR. TEPERMAN: It's just a conceptual  
13 design.

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Okay.

15 MS. GIORGIANNI: It is an evolving  
16 concept as negotiations continue.

17 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right. So we are not  
18 looking at ten things down in the --

19 MR. REED: Exactly. Yeah, we are not  
20 there yet. This is actually Scheme 38, which is --

21 MS. GIORGIANNI: The current concept --

22 MR. REED: -- the current concept, and  
23 this is where we are talking about, that  
24 southeastern corner.

25 CHAIR SANCHEZ: I was going to ask you



1 if you could refer to your Drawing 15, because I  
2 think that is where the line sort of moves  
3 completely or it becomes what you have just have  
4 showed us.

5 MR. TEPERMAN: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Oh, I see.

7 MR. REED: Correct.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: So you pick up an  
9 entire bay sort of to the left there.

10 MR. REED: Right, correct.

11 CHAIR SANCHEZ: So the overhang now  
12 instead of being, I don't know, 20 feet, is five?

13 MR. TEPERMAN: Yes, it probably is. I  
14 mean, this is what it is now.

15 So the building is actually further  
16 south from this one.

17 MR. REED: So two things that will be  
18 different on your Sheet 15, the edge of the  
19 extension, the overhang, will be pulled tight to the  
20 edge of the post office. It won't extend out past  
21 the post office, which nobody liked, and it is also  
22 a thinner plane that aligns with the cornice.

23 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So on the plan  
24 here then, 15, then the building, the new building  
25 itself will go further -- I'm using left-hand rather

1 than south, but it is the same thing, and you are  
2 saying the canopy that extends will align with the  
3 elevation, the facade of the --

4 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Left.

5 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- left --

6 MR. TEPERMAN: In accordance --

7 MR. REED: Yeah.

8 These are -- it is the result of  
9 negotiations with the city, what the city wanted  
10 ultimately was a lower building, which made it a bit  
11 wider building, and that is why we are with the  
12 administration.

13 I would think within the next month max  
14 that will be nailed down what the final concept  
15 would be, and then we can update the SHPO plans and  
16 redistribute them.

17 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I am looking at  
18 number 16, and you mentioned the cooling towers and  
19 saying that you were going to put those on the roof,  
20 and you hoped, I think that was your verb, that they  
21 would not extend above the roof line and ruin -- or  
22 be visible from the street.

23 Can you -- maybe you or Mr. Harshbarger  
24 can speak more about that --

25 MR. REED: Yes.

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  -- and the  
2                   historicity of the roof and its current kind of  
3                   defining aspect of the building --

4                   MR. HARSHBARGER:  Well, maybe I could  
5                   jump in about the significance of the post office --

6                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Yes.

7                   MR. HARSHBARGER:  -- and sort of answer  
8                   that question at the same time.

9                   We did cultural research surveys with  
10                  the Postal Service and its development partner,  
11                  which were both archeological and architectural.

12                  The current post office building was  
13                  actually authorized by Congress in 1926, but it  
14                  wasn't until about 1930 that the appropriations  
15                  actually came through.

16                  So although it is a new deal era post  
17                  office, it really wasn't built under a new deal  
18                  program.  It actually got in just under the line of  
19                  the construction that was really just starting  
20                  during the great depression.

21                  The drawings were -- the architect for  
22                  the post office were the architects of the U.S.  
23                  Treasury Department, so it can't really be  
24                  pinpointed to any individual architect.  It was an  
25                  architect's office down in Washington that designed

1       it. They were using a pretty typical pallet and  
2       style for the time, and you know, in terms of the  
3       architecture of the post office, the U.S. Postal  
4       Service has quite a large context for architectural  
5       design, and it is, you know, neo-classical designs  
6       that we're calling a pattern that was used pretty  
7       frequently from the 19-teens up until the 1930s  
8       primarily.

9               The decision of the SHPO was that the  
10       post office was eligible as a contributing resource  
11       in the Hoboken Historic District. At the time they  
12       made that determination, it was still the South  
13       Hoboken Historic District, and as you probably all  
14       know, they combined them all into one in the last  
15       couple of years.

16               In terms of -- you know, in terms of  
17       its significance in the district, not only is it  
18       representing an example of its style and its  
19       function, you know, it is about scale. It is about  
20       how it has very formal facades facing the main  
21       streets, but on the secondary streets or in the back  
22       of the lot it becomes much more functional with its  
23       loading bay and its mechanical room, which were  
24       original construction.

25               So in terms of the assessment of

1 effects, SHPO agreed that it was an adverse effect  
2 and because the original fabric is being removed,  
3 even if it is from what you can argue are the  
4 facades that were the more functional side of the  
5 building and not the ones meant to impress and  
6 interstate the function of a federal building.

7 One of the things that I found actually  
8 most interesting about the building and its history  
9 wasn't so much its architectural expression, but its  
10 sort of connection to the German-American community  
11 here, and it is a somewhat involved story, but the  
12 heart of it is that the post office is on a lot that  
13 was originally occupied by Hamburg American  
14 Steamship Company. This is where their offices  
15 were.

16 During World War I, the Federal  
17 Government seized that property from the steamship  
18 company, and it became the property of the Federal  
19 Shipping Board, and it wasn't until the postal  
20 master here, a man named Postmaster Graf, who was a  
21 German speaking postmaster, started making  
22 presentations to Washington that the little post  
23 office that he had, which had been built in the  
24 1890s, which was, of course, in the front of the  
25 lot, was overwhelmed and damp, and his clerks were

1 up in the attic of the old building suffering away  
2 from the heat, that it really began to move, and so  
3 there is kind of a sort of a -- and it was  
4 historically very important that the postal clerks  
5 and the postmaster of Hoboken spoke German, so that  
6 was an interesting part of the story.

7 Then I could say that archaeologically  
8 we looked at the lot. It -- actually, you know,  
9 until about the 1840s or 1850s, this was out in the  
10 river, so it is on made land.

11 And from about the 1840s, 1850s onward,  
12 the shoreline was moved progressively out by piers  
13 and wharfage, and so that is why you sort of have  
14 this along most of the harbor, a story of gradual  
15 expansion out into the river.

16 And so we also found out that in the  
17 parking lot area, where the hotel is going to be  
18 built, that there had been a significant amount of  
19 ground disturbance over the years. There was an oil  
20 tank buried out there. There were a lot of  
21 utilities and sewer crossings in the back of the  
22 lot, so you had to get down below about 10 to 15  
23 feet before you began to get into anything that  
24 hadn't been recently turned over, and so we  
25 monitored borings that were being done by the

1 engineers to see about the foundation to build of  
2 the new building.

3 And when they got down to -- it was all  
4 fill. It was just sort of like a mixture of sand  
5 and cinders and broken brick and things that were  
6 clearly of more recent origin from an archeological  
7 perspective.

8 Down at about 30 to 35 feet, we hit  
9 some wood, some fairly substantial pieces of wood,  
10 which because of the pattern, which we were hitting  
11 them, you would go like through 12 inches and a gap,  
12 and then through another 12 inches and a gap.  
13 They're grillage basically, the grillage upon which  
14 the old 19th Century wharf was built. So that is  
15 down 35 or 35 feet at this point, and then below  
16 that, you got into glacial till, so that is the  
17 archeological profile of that.

18 And it was the assessment of the SHPO's  
19 archeologists and ours as well, that there really  
20 wasn't anything expected of architectural -- of  
21 archeological significance. We were particularly  
22 concerned that there could be something funky like a  
23 boat, or, you know, you might go down into shell  
24 nims and things like that that were prehistoric on  
25 the shoreline, but they didn't. They didn't show up

1 in the borings, so we think that future -- the  
2 archeological site is pretty --

3 MR. REED: We had like when we did soil  
4 borings, and the archeologist observed it and didn't  
5 come up with anything.

6 Well, we will send -- Jessica, I can  
7 send you that report, if you want to distribute it.  
8 It is actually interesting reading.

9 As we said, one of the covenants with  
10 SHPO is to write a narrative about the history of  
11 the post office property, so that will go way back,  
12 and that will be part of the interpretive display.

13 You were asking --

14 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I was asking about  
15 the roof, and picking up on what Mr. Harshbarger  
16 said, you talked about the vocabulary and the  
17 template that the post office had at this time, and  
18 I found a photo of the North Bergen Post Office,  
19 which was constructed just about the same time. It  
20 has a similar type of roof, a low roof that comes up  
21 on four sides, and I think it's a very defining  
22 character, defining aspect of the building.

23 So when you mentioned, Mr. Reed, that  
24 you hoped the mechanicals would not impact that, I  
25 was starting --



1                   MR. HARSHBARGER: I think, you know, we  
2                   are still looking to get through the details of  
3                   this, but my impression given the description of it  
4                   and what I've seen so far is that it will not be  
5                   visible from the street.

6                   MR. REED: Towards the center of the  
7                   roof --

8                   MR. HARSHBARGER: It's towards the  
9                   center of the roof --

10                  MR. REED: -- we will be carving out an  
11                  opening and creating an outdoor space for the  
12                  cooling towers, so it would be set back in the  
13                  center of the roof, and the building looks identical  
14                  to a building that we worked on in Waco, Texas, a  
15                  post office there, a model that they used all over  
16                  the place.

17                  But fortunately, I think attic space is  
18                  very generous, so that is a place we can put all of  
19                  the mechanicals and make everything work.

20                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Comments or questions,  
21                  Commissioners?

22                  COMMISSIONER PERRY: Chairman, I have a  
23                  question or a comment.

24                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay.

25                  COMMISSIONER PERRY: And I guess I

1 direct this to Mr. Harshbarger and probably the city  
2 representative, Ms. Giorgianni.

3 I see on Page 2, there is a series of  
4 photographs, and photograph number four, the second  
5 line down in the middle.

6 Yes, right there.

7 There is a monument that you are  
8 looking at. It is a historical monument. It goes  
9 back -- the original origins go back to 1899, and I  
10 think there was a rededication in 1908.

11 It is looking directly at your new  
12 project, and your residents or your guests in that  
13 project are going to be looking directly at it. It  
14 is in a state of disrepair --

15 MR. REED: It sure is.

16 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- it has been  
17 neglected, and I think that it would be a good  
18 gesture, perhaps on behalf of the city, SHPO and  
19 KMS, to maybe include a cleaning and restoration of  
20 that as part of your project.

21 It is only a hundred feet outside of  
22 your property line. I don't know who owns the  
23 historic monument, but it is certainly not something  
24 that I am sure you want your guests looking at, and  
25 I think something could be done in cooperation or

1 with the support of the State Historic Preservation  
2 Office and the city to clean and restore that  
3 historic monument as part of this redevelopment.

4 MR. REED: We didn't really talk about  
5 the street scape.

6 Newark Street will be reconfigured.  
7 There will be a sidewalk added on the post office  
8 side. There is none today. That diagonal parking  
9 will become parallel. There will be a new sidewalk  
10 on the south side, street scape lighting. That is  
11 all still part of the negotiations with the city.  
12 The city is trying to create a gateway up Newark  
13 Street, so --

14 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Well, your gateway  
15 goes right past this monument --

16 MR. REED: Oh, I know. It looks  
17 horrible. There's weeds sprouting out of it. It's  
18 all cracked --

19 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- so I ask that  
20 you keep it in mind --

21 MR. REED: Sure.

22 COMMISSIONER PERRY: -- and see what  
23 you can do to clean that up, and it has been  
24 neglected.

25 MR. REED: Yeah.

1                   And then one of the things in  
2 negotiations with the city is, you know,  
3 contribution type things, so we have actually  
4 thought about that.

5                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: Good.

6                   Thank you.

7                   MS. GIORGIANNI: Thank you.

8                   I have noted it, and I will bring it to  
9 the attention of my Director and the Mayor.

10                  COMMISSIONER PERRY: Do you know who  
11 owns it?

12                  MS. GIORGIANNI: Probably the city, but  
13 is it in the right-of-way --

14                  COMMISSIONER PERRY: I think it's in a  
15 public plaza. It's just east of the Hoboken Land &  
16 Improvement building, but I think it's probably city  
17 property.

18                  COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is that the Sam  
19 something --

20                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: It's the Sam  
21 Sloan --

22                  COMMISSIONER PERRY: It's the Sam Sloan  
23 historical monument. The plaque is barely readable,  
24 but at one point he was important enough to get a  
25 statute commissioned for him --

1                   MR. REED: Was it a fountain at one  
2 point, do you know?

3                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: He was the  
4 president of the Delaware Lackawana Railroad.

5                   MR. REED: Yeah, no. I saw that. But  
6 was there a fountain around it?

7                   COMMISSIONER PERRY: I don't know.

8                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: There was -- that  
9 statute of Sam Sloan was moved from the Ferry Plaza  
10 at some point, and I think it was in the 1980s when  
11 the City of Hoboken received a Green Acres grant to  
12 redo what is now called Warrington Plaza.

13                   That is the genesis of those. I don't  
14 know what the right adjective is, brutalist type of  
15 furniture out there, and the fountains that don't  
16 work, the skateboard magnets and all, but that was  
17 part of Green Acres funding.

18                   I am speaking from having worked for  
19 New Jersey Transit and researched it at that point,  
20 and at some point to facilitate that project, Sam  
21 Sloan was moved northeast or northwest, so that is  
22 not the original location, and I don't know who  
23 owned the statute at that point, but I guess the  
24 city could research that and find that out.

25                   MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes. I mean, you

1 know --

2 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So in line with  
4 Commissioner Perry's comments, I would extend that  
5 to the post office building as a whole.

6 I know you said you weren't going to  
7 touch the outside, but I believe that we would like  
8 you to touch the outside.

9 MR. REED: It is entirely up to the  
10 Postal Service.

11 VICE CHAIR ZANE: And we will come up  
12 with a list.

13 MR. REED: That is fine. It could be  
14 in your comments.

15 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right.

16 MR. REED: As far as the scope of what  
17 happens inside and outside of the building is  
18 postal.

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Right. But this  
20 building is essentially in many ways a facade, sort  
21 of an auxiliary facade to your building, so people  
22 coming into your place, down Newark Street, et  
23 cetera, it would do everyone, you know, well to make  
24 that look as nice as it could.

25 MS. HOLTZMAN: I have two questions, if

1       you are all right.

2                    Along the north side of the building,  
3       there is a ramp structure.  Is that handicapped  
4       egress for --

5                    MR. REED:  In the alleyway between --

6                    MS. HOLTZMAN:  Yes.

7                    MR. REED:  -- that's -- yeah.  That is  
8       a ramp for the postal carriers to come out.

9                    MS. HOLTZMAN:  Okay.

10                   And that is marked as a driveway?

11                   MR. REED:  That -- yeah, on our site  
12       plan application, that was a driveway with the --  
13       with the -- there was a driveway entrance there from  
14       River Street, and that is still in our plan, but it  
15       is probably not going to happen.

16                   MS. HOLTZMAN:  Okay.

17                   So will that still be a pedestrian gate  
18       or a loading/unloading type of like hand truck type  
19       of entrance for that?

20                   MR. REED:  Yeah.  Oh, yeah.  It is for  
21       walk out, yeah.

22                   MS. HOLTZMAN:  Because right now it is  
23       a solid curb --

24                   MR. REED:  Correct.

25                   MS. HOLTZMAN:  -- with the tree and





1 Version 38, where you are extending the ground floor  
2 several feet towards Newark Street, and my question  
3 is: What are the additional uses in that ground  
4 floor area that you are adding.

5 MR. REED: The uses -- it is the same,  
6 that is the entrance.

7 Yeah. This is an older site plan, so  
8 that is purely entrance.

9 MS. HOLTZMAN: Okay. It's just a  
10 larger lobby?

11 MR. REED: Yes.

12 MS. HOLTZMAN: Okay.

13 MR. REED: And there is an escalator  
14 that takes you up to --it's basically a jump  
15 lobby --

16 MR. TEPERMAN: This will --

17 (Mr. Reed and Mr. Teperman speaking at  
18 the same time)

19 MR. REED: As you know --

20 MR. TEPERMAN: -- made to work, you  
21 know.

22 MR. REED: -- we are up at about  
23 elevation 19 --

24 MS. HOLTZMAN: I'm just asking --

25 MR. REED: -- so this is all entrance,

1 lobby. You could take the escalator up to the  
2 lobby, and there is also an elevator for handicapped  
3 that goes to the lobby and then stairs and any key  
4 functions that are up out of the flood plain.

5 What this space is -- this also helped  
6 us create a retail opportunity on Sinatra, which  
7 would be wet flood proofed and then loading docks in  
8 the back house space.

9 Basically the building -- as we pushed  
10 the building down, we picked up basically one bay,  
11 and that made us -- allowed us to cut 40 feet off  
12 the height of the building.

13 So, you know, the envelope in the  
14 redevelopment plan is what is part of our current  
15 negotiations.

16 CHAIR SANCHEZ: I think I would like to  
17 echo Commissioner Zane's comments, that although  
18 this building might have been a cookie cutter post  
19 office by the Federal Government, I think to Hoboken  
20 and to this particular street, it's one of the few  
21 buildings that is older than 50 years. It's  
22 probably rounding a hundred or close to a hundred,  
23 so I think it does matter to us, and it will be --  
24 the front of your building, and I think Hoboken very  
25 successfully created a waterfront that did not give

1       this back to Hoboken, so your building will be seen  
2       from the promenade, but also as you approach it from  
3       our city. So I think the post office becomes a  
4       linchpin and should be worthy of whatever you do  
5       behind it.

6                       What I would like to do, if there are  
7       no other comments, I would like to form -- I will  
8       get to you, Allen -- I would like to form a  
9       committee for the next month. I would like to  
10      gather the documents that we do not have in order to  
11      review, and then along with our transcript provide  
12      you with a written report of what we feel we would  
13      like to contribute or see that --

14                      MR. REED: Great.

15                      CHAIR SANCHEZ: Allen?

16                      COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I think that is an  
17      excellent suggestion.

18                      I was just simply going to add that  
19      this is a very important building, and as you said,  
20      Mr. Harshbarger, this was conceived of in the  
21      twenties. Neo-classical certainly was an important  
22      style of the centennial of our nation's birth.  
23      People were thinking in that pattern, but this  
24      building -- and this building also has some  
25      wonderful traces of art deco because at the time the

1 building came into being, there's more deco details  
2 particularly inside, so --

3 MR. HARSHBARGER: Inside.

4 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- it is a really  
5 nice transition that we have here of these two  
6 architectural styles.

7 And I think, notwithstanding the fact  
8 that it was a cookie cutter style, it was a style  
9 that was chosen, and it plays very nicely with the  
10 Hoboken Land & Improvement Company building, which  
11 is right across Newark Street, the same type of  
12 brick, the same sort of roof line, so it plays very  
13 well in the neighborhood, and I think it is in that  
14 spirit that we are looking forward to this project  
15 being a similar happy marriage of various  
16 architectural styles that creates a lively, well  
17 programmed street scape in Hoboken.

18 MR. HARSHBARGER: If I may, excuse me.  
19 I didn't want to leave the impression with you that  
20 I was sort of downplaying the architectural  
21 significance of the building and its context to the  
22 city, because it is a very important component in  
23 the historic district, and I would add, I totally  
24 agree with what you had to say, so I didn't want to  
25 maybe make it --

1                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I didn't take it  
2                   that way, and in fact, you know, I am impressed with  
3                   the research that you have done, and this is also  
4                   important because in the depression very few -- very  
5                   little money was being spent on construction, so  
6                   this played an important role, as you probably found  
7                   it in your research, the construction of this was --  
8                   and it was fraught with labor strife. There were  
9                   criticisms that not enough local labors were being  
10                  used, and ultimately the contractor went out of  
11                  business and had to -- because of labor strife and  
12                  financial problems, so it was very much part of the  
13                  economic flux and dynamics of Hoboken at that  
14                  period, so it is important in so many different  
15                  ways.

16                 To that point, with all of the research  
17                 that you have done, is this something that you can  
18                 convert into a National Register nomination, and the  
19                 reason I mention that --

20                 MR. HARSHBARGER: As an individual  
21                 nomination for the post office?

22                 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I'm sorry?

23                 MR., HARSHBARGER: As an individual  
24                 nomination for the post office?

25                 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yeah.

1                   The reason I mention that is that, of  
2                   course, there are advantages in terms of funding and  
3                   rehabilitation and funding, knowing, you know, the  
4                   Hoboken Public Library qualified for \$442,000 for  
5                   flood mitigation post Sandy money.

6                   So having a building on the Register  
7                   really definitely has advantages, and it would be a  
8                   shame to see the research -- it would be very  
9                   advantageous to see the research that you have done  
10                  take the next step and go into a nomination, whether  
11                  it's a nomination for an individual property or  
12                  whether it's a theme nomination for post offices of  
13                  this sort. I think there is a lot of grist here for  
14                  the mill.

15                  MR. HARSHBARGER: Yeah. I think it  
16                  would be possible to offer that up in your comments  
17                  to the SHPO as a possible mitigation item. The way  
18                  SHPO has directed this so far has been more towards  
19                  a past certain American building survey type  
20                  documentation, which would also include a very  
21                  significant piece of research in an historic area,  
22                  which with the place of input costs would be the  
23                  jumping off point for doing a nomination pretty  
24                  quickly actually, so I think, you know, that is sort  
25                  of something we can pass along to them and get their

1 take, their National Register's coordinator's take  
2 on it.

3 I will say that when they wrote their  
4 opinion, and you'll see this in the one we sent  
5 over, their opinion was it was a contributing  
6 resource in the district. They did not opine that  
7 it was an individual resource --

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I see.

9 MR. HARSHBARGER: -- so I think, you  
10 know, we might -- they might want to reflect on your  
11 opinion that it could be individually eligible and  
12 see if they want to think about that.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can I have volunteers  
14 for the committee?

15 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I am happy to  
16 volunteer.

17 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Me, too. I  
18 volunteer.

19 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I'm in.

20 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So who do you have  
21 on the committee?

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes. I have Allen, Jon  
23 and Steve.

24 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Did you get Marty?  
25 Did you have your hand up?

1 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Did you have --

2 (Laughter)

3 THE REPORTER: Did you say yes or no?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Oh, I didn't  
5 speak.

6 (Laughter)

7 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Oh, usually we just  
8 have groups of three, so I could sit in on it, so,  
9 you know, we can discuss it further.

10 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: We can have four  
11 without violating any public meeting act.

12 CHAIR SANCHEZ: I would be five. So,  
13 okay. Thank you. We will, like I said, gather the  
14 information and --

15 MR. REED: Jessica, you shoot me an  
16 email with your list.

17 MS. GIORGIANNI: Yes. Basically what  
18 we discussed tonight and the items reflected in  
19 the -- with respect to the MOA, and on the study and  
20 the narrative and --

21 MR. REED: Yeah, and the consultation  
22 letter, too. Thanks.

23 MS. GIORGIANNI: Thank you.

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.



C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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.  
This transcript was prepared in accordance with  
NJAC 13:43-5.9.

CITY OF HOBOKEN  
HOBOKEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

----- X  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE HOBOKEN : Monday 9 p.m.  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION : June 4, 2018  
----- X

Held At: 94 Washington Street  
Hoboken, New Jersey

B E F O R E:

- Ana Sanchez, Chair
- Steve Zane, Vice Chair
- Seth Abrams, Commissioner
- Martin Anderson, Commissioner
- Jonathan Metsch, Commissioner
- James Perry, Commissioner
- Susan Pregibon, Commissioner
- Ellen Stewart, Commissioner
- Jon Vesey, 1st Alternate
- Allen Kratz, 2nd Alternate

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

- Ann Holtzman, Zoning Officer
- Joan Anastasio, Secretary

A P P E A R A N C E:

- WEINER LAW GROUP, LLP
- 520 Parsippany Road
- Parsippany, New Jersey 07054
- BY: JOHN P. MILLER, ESQ.
- Attorneys for the Board

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



1 to get moving on is getting plaques on a few of the  
2 buildings, not all of them at one time, but just  
3 beginning the process, and the ones that either are  
4 owned by the city or the ones we can put plaques on  
5 without having to do extensive negotiations with  
6 owners, but I want to give you some recommendations  
7 as far as design content of plaques, how much it is  
8 going to cost.

9 I don't want to initiate any  
10 conversation with a vendor without getting  
11 authorization from either you or Ana about who to  
12 talk with.

13 So if there is somebody you would like  
14 me to speak with, I am happy to begin the  
15 conversation, but I am not going to go and pick a  
16 vendor.

17 MS. HOLTZMAN: Yes. If you want to  
18 just stop by at some point when you are in the  
19 neighborhood, let's just talk through, you know, the  
20 parameters and in terms of, you know, size, copy,  
21 those kinds of things, so that we have an idea of  
22 what you have in mind, and then I don't think that  
23 there would be any reason for you not to be able to  
24 speak to somebody. I mean, obviously you are not  
25 authorizing the purchase order, but we certainly can

1 get some feedback in terms of cost and of those  
2 kinds of things from various people.

3 CHAIR SANCHEZ: The city doesn't have  
4 any particular vendors that it would prefer using,  
5 so if we got three different quotes for bronze  
6 plaques to put --

7 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yeah. Well, I'm  
8 not going to get three different quotes. I just  
9 want to start a dialogue and see what -- I have no  
10 idea what these cost.

11 You mentioned in one of your email  
12 responses that you would like to get more content  
13 than what I had originally proposed, so I mean,  
14 these are all things that add to the cost.

15 I am just trying to get a parameter,  
16 which I will stop and find out what the parameters  
17 are, see how much content you want.

18 It will help at least establish some  
19 idea of what these would cost to get property  
20 specific plaques. I had something more generic in  
21 mind that could be applied without identifying the  
22 property, just say it was listed on the State and  
23 National Registers, but --

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: What I saw, and  
25 actually I saw this yesterday, were two plaques.

1 One was sort of a round medallion that designated it  
2 as a national monument recognized by the Landmark  
3 Commission, and then adjacent to that was a larger  
4 plaque that actually told a little bit about the  
5 building and its significance, so it might very well  
6 be twofold. One that goes around the larger one  
7 that we could add.

8 COMMISSIONER PERRY: All right.

9 Well, something like that might not  
10 work for a firemen's monument in Church Wood Park  
11 because the base is rather small, so you would need  
12 something perhaps specific to that kind of statute.  
13 But let me drop by. If there is a vendor the city  
14 uses, I am happy to start conversations with them.

15 MS. ANASTASIO: Jim, Ray Guzman is  
16 doing one for Sybil's Cave.

17 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Does he do bronze,  
18 too?

19 MS. ANASTASIO: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Oh, he does.  
21 Okay.

22 MS. ANASTASIO: So I mean, we could  
23 contact him. I don't know what pricing, but we  
24 could contact him perhaps.

25 COMMISSIONER PERRY: I think the

1 pricing is contingent on our content. You know, I  
2 thought initially it would be incorporating the seal  
3 of the City of Hoboken on it, but that gets into a  
4 lot more detail at this point, but I am happy to  
5 speak to Ray after I talk to Ann and just get an  
6 idea.

7 MS. HOLTZMAN: Just so you know, I will  
8 just give you a couple of examples.

9 I know that he did the one that is on  
10 the World War II memorial down by the waterfront.

11 There is a freestanding one that has  
12 the tablet type of sign.

13 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Okay.

14 MS. HOLTZMAN: There is a similar one  
15 like that on the Garden Street Mews, so obviously  
16 these are freestanding ones. That is not what we  
17 are looking at, but he did that work, that cast  
18 work, so --

19 COMMISSIONER PERRY: That is good to  
20 know. I didn't know he did casts. I thought he  
21 just did --

22 MS. HOLTZMAN: But it's certainly --

23 (Commissioners speaking at the same  
24 time)

25 MS. HOLTZMAN: -- you know, of course,

1 and I am sure we can find a couple of others, too,  
2 and I will just verify, too, exactly whether or not  
3 any of this falls into any kind of bidding scenario  
4 or anything like that. I don't think it is probably  
5 at that threshold, but we will make sure.

6 COMMISSIONER PERRY: And I was  
7 suggesting starting off very limited, you know,  
8 maybe six properties total, maybe even three that  
9 are specifically city owned that we won't run into  
10 any issues with ownership, but at least set a  
11 prototype and see what we can do to expand the  
12 historic recognition for these buildings around  
13 town.

14 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Allen, you have a  
15 question?

16 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: No.

17 CHAIR SANCHEZ: No.

18 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Jim, grave markers,  
19 that is who makes them. It is a grave marker.

20 COMMISSIONER PERRY: Yeah. Does he  
21 make them, Ray?

22 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Any place that does  
23 cemetery work will do it. They are used to one  
24 offs.

25 (Laughter)



1 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So a production day.

2 (Laughter)

3 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay. So the annual  
4 report, so that was emailed --

5 COMMISSIONER VESEY: It was emailed.  
6 We had another round of notes. I think the thing  
7 that John Miller had the objection to, we actually  
8 removed, which was the requiring demos to come to  
9 the HPC. It was the rewording that Ann had done  
10 that said continue and encourage planning to request  
11 reports, and we added the design guidelines. We  
12 added the -- we changed the -- 709 Washington got  
13 changed because it is actually not new construction.  
14 So unless there are other comments, we are ready to  
15 vote on it.

16 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay.

17 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Ann.

18 CHAIR SANCHEZ: No. Do you have a  
19 comment?

20 MR. MILLER: I have two comments on the  
21 revised report. Starting on Page 14 under the  
22 Building Demolition section, I had an issue with the  
23 last sentence of that section in the Building  
24 Demolition section on Page 14.

25 This is the sentence that states:

1 Since many demolitions are proposed as part of an  
2 expanded use subject to Planning Board or Zoning  
3 Board of Adjustment approval, many applicants are  
4 avoiding review by the Historic Preservation  
5 Commission.

6 I am not sure that is accurate, number  
7 one.

8 And number two: I just don't think it  
9 is accurate. I don't think it is accurate, and I  
10 think it is sending a message that I don't think the  
11 Commission wants to send, because we are stating  
12 there that many applicants are avoiding review.

13 I really question that. I am not sure  
14 any applicants are avoiding review by the Historic  
15 Preservation Commission when they come into a  
16 Planning Board or a Zoning Board.

17 I mean, they may request as part of the  
18 application that they are looking for a demolition  
19 to be done, but I don't think they are coming to go  
20 to those Boards to specifically subvert or do an end  
21 run around the Historic Preservation Commission, and  
22 that is what is being implicated in that section,  
23 and I just -- I don't think it is accurate and --

24 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Well, I believe we  
25 already changed this once before to take out that

1       they were intentionally doing it. I mean, if the  
2       issue is with the word "avoiding," we can look for  
3       another adjective.

4                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can we leave it, and  
5       could we say applicants "may avoid" since it's a  
6       possibility?

7                   MR. MILLER: I don't think they are  
8       avoiding anything. I really don't.

9                   I think that the ordinance, the way it  
10      is set up is that it states that if they go before  
11      the Planning Board or the Zoning Board, the  
12      ordinance first of all says, and whether this is  
13      being done, I mean, this is something for the  
14      Commission to consider, it is 42-11F, where it says:  
15      An application is made directly to the Board  
16      involving historic site or property in the historic  
17      district. The Board shall refer a copy of the  
18      application to the Historic Preservation Commission.

19                  Now, whether that is being done, I  
20      can't say one way or the other, but that is  
21      certainly a requirement that if the Commission  
22      wishes to highlight or make a reminder in its  
23      report, and I think it does maybe somewhere else  
24      just in the report, I think that is fine.

25                  I think this is a leap that I wouldn't

1 even change the wording. I think the entire  
2 sentence is incorrect and should be deleted. I  
3 just -- if you're saying -- if what you are saying  
4 is that many applicants are intentionally and  
5 purposely avoiding review by the Historic  
6 Preservation Commission, I doubt that the Commission  
7 has the authority and the backup for that. I mean,  
8 I think it is a -- I think it's a very accusatory  
9 statement, and I don't know --

10 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can we add it in --

11 MR. MILLER: -- and I just don't agree  
12 with it --

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- can we simply say  
14 that we believe the Historic Commission should  
15 review it?

16 Delete the sentence and basically just  
17 state: It is our opinion that the Historic  
18 Preservation Commission review should be added,  
19 required, or it provides a benefit.

20 MR. MILLER: I think if you want to  
21 state that, that the Historic Preservation  
22 Commission should review the applications or have  
23 the chance for the application, then that portion of  
24 the ordinance that I just stated, I think that is  
25 what should be essentially restated there.

1                   COMMISSIONER ABRAMS:  Doesn't the  
2                   ordinance specifically speak to who gets the  
3                   demolition ordinance in some circumstances --

4                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Yes.  That is the  
5                   point of this, however it is worded.  Whether or not  
6                   somebody is doing it intentionally, we can't make  
7                   that conjecture, but the way it works --

8                   MR. MILLER:  But you are stating that.

9                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  -- well, we are  
10                  not --

11                  MR. MILLER:  You are.  You're saying  
12                  many applicants are avoiding review.  You're  
13                  saying --

14                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Well, that is what  
15                  I said.  If you change the word "avoiding," they are  
16                  not coming before the HPC.  We can agree upon that,  
17                  so the issue --

18                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  I don't know if  
19                  I agree with that --

20                  COMMISSIONER PERRY:  I'm not sure about  
21                  that.

22                  VICE CHAIR ZANE:  It's not even many.  
23                  It hasn't been long enough for it to be many.

24                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:  If they have  
25                  variances, then they don't come to us.

1                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Well, if they  
2                   have a variance, that is just the ordinance. That  
3                   is the way it is, and it's not our ordinance. It's  
4                   the Zoning Board's ordinance. It is the ordinance  
5                   of the city.

6                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: That is where they  
7                   have to go for a variance.

8                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: We have nothing  
9                   to say about that.

10                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So let me ask --

11                  MS. HOLTZMAN: Excuse me one second.

12                  You've got -- these are -- the section  
13                  that we're talking about here on Page 14 is  
14                  observations.

15                  If you go over to Page 20, which is  
16                  where your recommendations are, I think you've  
17                  covered the fact that the HPC would like to take a  
18                  crack at it, if they have an opportunity, if they're  
19                  given an opportunity to by the Board, so I think you  
20                  are addressing the callout as a positive  
21                  recommendation as opposed to addressing, potentially  
22                  addressing it here as an observation.

23                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So building on  
24                  that point then, so the reverse engineering from  
25                  Page 20, which is a recommendation back to an

1 observation on 14, perhaps the observation is that  
2 the Commission is concerned that this ordinance that  
3 John just cited to us is not being followed.

4 MR. MILLER: I don't think you even  
5 want to say that --

6 VICE CHAIR ZANE: It is being followed.

7 MR. MILLER: -- I don't -- I think -- I  
8 think it is -- I think to a large extent, it is  
9 being followed because I think an applicant before  
10 the Planning Board or the Zoning Board, all they  
11 really care about is getting their application  
12 approved, and they read the ordinance, and they see  
13 which avenue, which way they got to go, so they make  
14 a decision.

15 I simply -- I just simply think it is  
16 untrue when they say: Applicants are avoiding  
17 Historic Preservation review. I just -- I don't --  
18 I don't see it.

19 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Can I just make a  
20 suggestion?

21 Can we strike: "Many applicants are  
22 avoiding review by the Historic Preservation  
23 Commission?"

24 Take that out of the sentence and have  
25 it read: Since many demolitions are proposed as

1 part of an expanded use subject to Planning Board or  
2 Zoning Board of Adjustment approval, all projects do  
3 not benefit from the Historical Preservation  
4 Commission, and then go on to say, but we do.

5 Would that be adequate?

6 Since what we are saying is that we  
7 provide a service benefit, a certain expertise that  
8 the other Boards do not share.

9 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: That was where I  
10 was attempting to go, really calling out the  
11 requirement in the ordinance, and, you know, I think  
12 you are on the right track --

13 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Ana, do you want  
14 read that back to me so I can --

15 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- it's not  
16 accusatory --

17 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Here.

18 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Thank you.

19 So "Many applicants" --

20 Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: What is it again?

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ: We add: "All projects  
23 do not benefit from" in lieu of "Many applicants are  
24 avoiding review."

25 COMMISSIONER VESEY: And then it goes



1 on to list from the ordinance the qualifications of  
2 the --

3 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Just  
4 grammatically, I would say "Not all applications"  
5 instead of "All applications do not."

6 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes. We should polish  
7 the grammar.

8 (Laughter)

9 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: It's slightly  
10 different.

11 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I'm sorry.

12 "Not all projects benefit from," and  
13 then how do you link it?

14 CHAIR SANCHEZ: From the Historic --

15 COMMISSIONER STEWART: From the  
16 Historic -- the benefit from appearing before?

17 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Benefit of review?

18 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Review by.

20 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Uh-huh.

21 MR. MILLER: But what is the goal of  
22 that statement then?

23 CHAIR SANCHEZ: The goal of that  
24 statement is to say that this is a service that this  
25 Commission provides to the community --

1 MR. MILLER: Right.

2 CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- and it's sort of the  
3 skill set that is really not represented as clearly  
4 in the other two Commissions.

5 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And then that  
6 becomes a predicate for the recommendation on Page  
7 20.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Any other -- as we --  
9 so it's --

10 VICE CHAIR ZANE: I believe we only got  
11 \$40,000 from the city --

12 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Yeah, that has  
13 been changed.

14 MS. HOLTZMAN: I might be working off  
15 an old one, too.

16 MR. MILLER: I guess that language is  
17 fine. I would prefer a more statutory or ordinance  
18 based, just as more of a -- more of a statement in  
19 line to support the idea that when an application  
20 does come before the Zoning Board or the Planning  
21 Board, that the Historic -- when it's in a historic  
22 district, then the Historic Preservation Commission  
23 gets a copy. I am not sure whether that is  
24 happening. Maybe I'm incorrect about that, but --

25 CHAIR SANCHEZ: My concern is that I

1 would like to take a vote on this and sort of move  
2 forward since we are halfway through the year, and  
3 we'll be looking at 2018 shortly.

4 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So picking up on  
5 counsel's comment, could we say it is not clear  
6 that -- it's not clear that all applicants receive  
7 the benefit?

8 Does that square the circle?

9 VICE CHAIR ZANE: It is in the eyes of  
10 the beholder.

11 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Stating it that  
12 way --

13 MR. MILLER: And is it? I mean, is  
14 this -- not to beat this up, but is it really that  
15 statement of the ordinance that exempts applicants  
16 who seek relief from the Planning Board from  
17 appearing?

18 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yeah. I mean --

19 MR. MILLER: See, I don't think it  
20 does. I don't think it exempts them from appearing  
21 because -- well, that is in regard to a demolition  
22 or a partial demolition.

23 I don't think it exempts them at all  
24 because if they submit an application, a demolition  
25 application to the Planning Board or the Zoning

1 Board, or that is part of their plan, then under  
2 this ordinance, they still have to send a copy of  
3 their application to us, so I just don't see where  
4 it is an exemption. It is an option under the  
5 ordinance.

6 We may not be happy with the option,  
7 but it's an option under the ordinance, but I don't  
8 think the wording is correct. I don't think it  
9 exempts applicants. It gives them another avenue,  
10 and, you know, whether we agree with that avenue or  
11 not, we could argue about that for a long time. But  
12 I don't think it exempts it because of the statement  
13 in the ordinance at 42-11F, because whether they  
14 come in for demolition or not, and it is in the  
15 historic district, and it's Planning or Zoning  
16 Board, they have to send an application to us. They  
17 have to send it under the ordinance, so I don't  
18 think the statement is correct. I don't think it is  
19 accurate.

20 COMMISSIONER STEWART: Does the report  
21 constitute a review?

22 I guess it does. Is it a -- the report  
23 that is sent -- no, it's sent to the HPC -- I am so  
24 confused. Wait a minute.

25 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Nobody is exempt

1 within the rules. I mean, if you are not in a  
2 historic zone, then you are going to either one of  
3 these Boards, except by recommendation of either one  
4 of those Boards to come to us, as we saw with 217  
5 Willow.

6 MR. MILLER: Right. But I don't think  
7 it necessarily exempts applicants who seek relief,  
8 because they still have to provide an application to  
9 the Board, and you tell me if I am wrong, but upon  
10 receipt of that application, I mean, the Historic  
11 Preservation Commission can make comment on it, if  
12 they wish, demolition or not.

13 VICE CHAIR ZANE: If invited.

14 MS. HOLTZMAN: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes, if invited,  
16 they can --

17 MR. MILLER: Yeah. I just think -- I  
18 don't see "exempts" in there. I just think  
19 "Exempts" isn't the right --

20 VICE CHAIR ZANE: It doesn't exempt  
21 them because they are not obligated to come before  
22 us --

23 MR. MILLER: True, they're not.

24 VICE CHAIR ZANE: -- right, so there is  
25 no exemption necessary, so this whole paragraph is

1 unnecessary.

2 MS. HOLTZMAN: They are obligated to  
3 appear before one Board or the other.

4 If they are going already to the Zoning  
5 Board or the Planning Board for some other variance  
6 or a site plan, then that reviewing Board would hear  
7 the demolition portion of the application.

8 MR. MILLER: I guess it comes back to I  
9 am trying to figure out what we are trying to say,  
10 what's the goal of that section, and as I read the  
11 two sections together, I mean, I am starting to  
12 agree with Steve. I don't know why it is in there.  
13 I don't know what the purpose is.

14 CHAIR SANCHEZ: The purpose is that  
15 many of the demolitions happen in areas that we  
16 might deem to be historic districts, but are not  
17 historic districts because our districts are limited  
18 to Washington Street, Hudson, Castle Point.

19 So in areas like -- so that's why that  
20 statement is there because our districts should be  
21 larger, but they are not, and the demolition  
22 ordinance was made as a protection for that historic  
23 fabric, but it has loopholes, so we are trying to --  
24 we're asking them to take a look at that loophole  
25 and is that really what we want to happen.

1                   MR. MILLER: So then we are asking --  
2                   so then we're asking the Commission to review  
3                   demolitions --

4                   COMMISSIONER VESEY: Well, we  
5                   originally asked them to close the loophole, and  
6                   then we changed that because you thought maybe that  
7                   that was not -- or two issues. There's the issue of  
8                   the City Council did it, and this is a  
9                   recommendation, and we are recommending they change  
10                  it, which some members may feel we should ask them  
11                  to change it, and some members may feel we shouldn't  
12                  ask them to change it.

13                  VICE CHAIR ZANE: But that is really  
14                  what's necessary. It is not that anyone is doing  
15                  anything wrong. I said the law from our position  
16                  seems to be deficient, and we would like them to  
17                  change it.

18                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right, and the  
19                  other issue was that you said at the last meeting  
20                  that you thought maybe that was a violation of the  
21                  MLUL, but I am pretty sure Jersey City and other  
22                  municipalities have demo ordinances where they  
23                  absolutely go through HPC, so I don't know that it's  
24                  illegal, but we did take out the requirement, that  
25                  we were asking for the requirement. We were

1 basically just -- we were trying to find a way of  
2 saying -- stating the fact that because of this  
3 loophole that is in the demo ordinance, even though  
4 the demo ordinance starts out by saying it should,  
5 you know, things that are recommended should go to  
6 the HPC, if they're variances, they don't.

7 So although the Planning Board and the  
8 Zoning Board are very qualified Boards to determine  
9 it, they don't necessarily do the same historical  
10 architectural review that we do. They would be --  
11 it appears that they do more of an engineering and a  
12 planning review than a historical review.

13 MS. HOLTZMAN: I think that you are  
14 projecting the fact that you believe this to be a  
15 loophole that was unintentional, when, in fact, it  
16 actually was very, very specifically written that  
17 way, so that we were not burdening applicants with  
18 duplicity of applications.

19 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right. But we  
20 have other situations where people have to go to  
21 multiple Boards, so I mean it's not -- and I think  
22 the thought of the committee was that in the case of  
23 a demo of a building that has been there a hundred  
24 or more years, that that is probably the situation  
25 where someone should have to go to two Boards.



1                   VICE CHAIR ZANE:  If they are in the  
2 historic district, they have to go to two Boards.  
3 They have come to us first, and then wherever they  
4 are going to go --

5                   COMMISSIONER PERRY:  Right.

6                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  I mean, a lot of  
7 this circles back around to the fact that even  
8 though the master plan and the master plan reexam  
9 and the SHPO and everybody else has said that they  
10 are eligible and should be expanded.  We haven't  
11 been able to expand the districts, and so the  
12 building -- the demo ordinance basically said, yeah,  
13 we haven't gotten around to doing all this, so we  
14 are going to send everything to the HPC first.

15                   But the reality is, that the way they  
16 wrote the demo ordinance now, a majority of people  
17 are looking to build bigger properties, so a lot of  
18 things outside of the historic district don't come  
19 to the HPC, and it seemed like something to be put  
20 in the annual report.  It's not binding, but it is  
21 an opinion and it is what does happen, so we are  
22 trying to find a way to memorialize that in --

23                   MR. MILLER:  But I think saying that  
24 the ordinance exempts applicants for one step --

25                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Well, I think we

1       took out --

2                   MR. MILLER:  -- and that many  
3       applicants are avoiding review, I don't think that  
4       gets you there.  I don't think that --

5                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  We do.  We took  
6       out the word "exempts," didn't we?

7                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  No, it's still here.

8                   MR. MILLER:  I don't think that  
9       sentence should be in, the one "exempt applicants,"  
10      I just don't see a need for it.

11                  CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Well, why don't we say  
12      does not require applicants -- because it really  
13      doesn't require that they go to two Boards.

14                  MR. MILLER:  Well, see, again, that  
15      goes -- okay.  You want them to go to two Boards,  
16      but I think you have to be a little more clear about  
17      what the Commission wants.

18                  Does the Commission want their  
19      jurisdiction to expand to outside the Historic  
20      Preservation -- the historic districts for  
21      demolitions?  Is that what the Commission wants?

22                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Yes.

23                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  Yes.

24                  CHAIR SANCHEZ:  No.  The Commission  
25      wants the historic districts to expand in Hoboken --

1                   MR. MILLER: And that's actually one  
2 question that comes up, because that is the heart of  
3 the matter, is that you -- and we are -- in this  
4 section, we are dancing around it a little bit.

5                   If the Commission wants to expand its  
6 jurisdiction, or as Ana just said, if the Commission  
7 wishes to have historic districts expanded or  
8 additional districts enacted, then say it.

9                   COMMISSIONER VESEY: Right. I think  
10 it's a difference --

11                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: It is our job  
12 to expand the districts. So for the past 20 years,  
13 why haven't we been expanding districts?

14                   MR. MILLER: Yes. I don't know the  
15 answer to that question.

16                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: It is this  
17 Commission's job to expand districts, so -- and  
18 designate buildings, so why hasn't that been in the  
19 last 20 years?

20                   MR. MILLER: Yes. I don't --

21                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: So you can't --  
22 so you can't be saying: You guys didn't expand the  
23 district.

24                   Who are you guys?

25                   You guys are the new guys, you know

1       what I mean?

2                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  But, Sue, we are  
3       not saying that.  I think we are getting off the  
4       topic.

5                   What we are saying is the City Council  
6       wrote the demo ordinance, and the demo ordinance --

7                   COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  Well, it was  
8       like pushed through in like two meetings --

9                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Right.

10                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  -- it was  
11       rammed through --

12                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Right, right.  And  
13       it said -- and it said --

14                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  -- without  
15       really thinking about it.

16                  COMMISSIONER VESEY:  -- and it said  
17       that basically everything would go to HPC.  That's  
18       the big headline of the demo ordinance is everything  
19       would go by the HPC first.

20                  But then it goes on to say:  Unless  
21       you're applying for variance and relief --

22                  COMMISSIONER PREGIBON:  Right.

23                  COMMISSIONER MILLER:  Well, where does  
24       it say that everything goes to HPC?

25                  COMMISSIONER ABRAMS:  It says it in C

1 and then F in the body.

2 Otherwise there's an appeal from us one  
3 way or the other, so --

4 MR. MILLER: To the Zoning Board, yes.

5 MS. ANASTASIO: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: I am not sure  
7 why we can't get just together with somebody else  
8 and talk about this and forget about this annual  
9 report thing.

10 If you want to change something, why  
11 don't you just sit down with the mayor or the  
12 Planning Board together with the Council people and  
13 say this is how we're going to do it?

14 Writing this down in this annual report  
15 is not going to go anywhere.

16 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Actually the  
17 annual report gets sent to the Planning Board, the  
18 Zoning Board, the City Council and the Mayor --

19 VICE CHAIR ZANE: And it's a  
20 requirement --

21 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- and it is the  
22 vehicle for socializing that discussion further, and  
23 that's why we're wrestling with the language.

24 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: Well, the  
25 annual report goes to every year, and nothing -- and

1 we have been talking about getting together with  
2 them, and nothing ever happens, so I just really  
3 can't take any more. I got to go. This is just  
4 beyond, beyond.

5 MS. ANASTASIO: Nobody ever sent us an  
6 annual report.

7 COMMISSIONER PREGIBON: We have never  
8 gotten an annual report from --

9 (Commissioners speaking at the same  
10 time)

11 (Commissioner Pregibon leaves the  
12 meeting)

13 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Zoning does an  
14 annual report and it is on the Hoboken website, and  
15 we formed a committee to do the annual report.

16 Now, it's part of our ordinance, and we  
17 are required to do it, so we did it, you know, and I  
18 know that Joan has worked hard doing it in the past,  
19 but as the description of the annual report, it did  
20 not really address these issues the way the annual  
21 report was put together this year.

22 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: A lot of work  
23 went into it obviously, so --

24 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Obviously.

25 MR. MILLER: I think it needs to be

1 working especially since as Allen just mentioned,  
2 that it does go to the Planning Board and the Zoning  
3 Board, which he is correct.

4 If I'm on the Planning Board and the  
5 Zoning Board, I take a look at this and say, What  
6 are you talking about?

7 What do you mean that many applicants  
8 are avoiding review?

9 What do you mean that the ordinance  
10 exempts applicants?

11 I just don't think it is correct. I  
12 don't, and I just don't think it is correct, and  
13 legally, legally it is not correct. It's just  
14 not --

15 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: The ordinance  
16 speaks for itself, right?

17 MR. MILLER: I agree. I agree, and I  
18 think we are opining on the ordinance.

19 Is that really the job of the annual  
20 report?

21 The ordinance is the ordinance. You  
22 may not like it.

23 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: I mean, I think  
24 we have discussed it before that we have  
25 recommendations about altering the ordinance on the

1       latter half of the report, you know, but --

2                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  This is not  
3       legislation.  This is the Commission's impressions  
4       of --

5                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  You know, it said  
6       we're to advise the Planning Board and Zoning  
7       Board --

8                   MR. MILLER:  But it is not correct.  It  
9       doesn't exempt applicants, number one there, and it  
10      says, "Many applicants are avoiding review."  It is  
11      just not correct.

12                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  We were going to delete  
13      that, and we're going to delete the other item.  I  
14      just -- we have had this in front of us now for two  
15      months --

16                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  For three months.

17                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  -- since the final  
18      draft of Freddy, so --

19                   COMMISSIONER VESEY:  Joan, you did tell  
20      me you were going to send me a rewrite, but I didn't  
21      get one.

22                   CHAIR SANCHEZ:  Allen?

23                   COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  Yeah.

24                   I am retrieving language here that the  
25      Administrator Holtzman provided that I thought was



1       pretty good. The city adopted a building demolition  
2       ordinance in 2016 -- I'm sorry, Phyllis, I'm reading  
3       too quickly -- to create an additional step prior to  
4       the issuance of a demo permit and to establish a  
5       public process.

6                   I think I would add to that, that is to  
7       subject demo applications to the public review  
8       process inherent in the roles the Commission, the  
9       Planning Board, and the Zoning Board of Adjustment.  
10      Various citizens have expressed to the Historic  
11      Preservation Commission their concerns that the  
12      demolition ordinance has not helped prevent the loss  
13      of historic assets.

14                   I mean, that I think is a fact. People  
15      have expressed that to us.

16                   I think what Administrator Holtzman  
17      stated is that there was this additional step prior  
18      to the issuance of the demolition permit, which was  
19      to establish a process, to establish, you know, to  
20      subject these to -- the inherent roles of the  
21      Commission, the Planning Board and the Zoning Board  
22      of Adjustment.

23                   Notwithstanding that, we have heard  
24      from citizens, and I think whether they are accurate  
25      or not, we can take note of the fact that many

1 citizens have said to us: All of these good  
2 intentions, well intentioned ordinances have not  
3 prevented the loss of the historic fabric in the  
4 city.

5 That then sets the predicate for Page  
6 20, which is let's get more regulation, let's expand  
7 the historic district, whatever you want to do. But  
8 as an observation, I think, Colleagues, that is an  
9 accurate statement.

10 MR. MILLER: And legally, I don't have  
11 a problem with that statement, and I think it  
12 achieves the same goals that you are looking for,  
13 that it needs improvement. I think you are stating  
14 flat out that the ordinance needs improvement, and  
15 legally, I am okay with that.

16 COMMISSIONER VESEY: I am okay with  
17 that.

18 MR. MILLER: So we strike the paragraph  
19 that is on the bottom of 14, is that where it is?

20 MS. HOLTZMAN: Yes, and the top of 15  
21 it continues --

22 MR. MILLER: Yes. The comment that I  
23 would have for the beginning of paragraph 15 up  
24 until maintenance and repair of historic sites is  
25 that I think under -- I think under -- I just don't

1 think there is a conflict there.

2 I think we keep talking about conflict,  
3 and we talk about exemptions. I think we have to  
4 get away from that, and I think we have to get back  
5 to the language that Allen read, and it's a more --  
6 it's accurate and it's more positive, rather than  
7 conflict and avoiding review.

8 I don't see the -- I don't see the  
9 purpose of that. I think if we go over the language  
10 that Allen just read, I think we can take out the  
11 rest of that on the top of Page 15 down to the  
12 maintenance and repair of historic sites section.

13 Because the language that Allen stated  
14 states that, yes, the ordinance needs work, so I  
15 don't think we need to keep mentioning that in that  
16 page --

17 MS. HOLTZMAN: Not to open a whole  
18 other can of worms, but similarly in the flood  
19 prevention section, there are statements--

20 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Which page are you  
21 on?

22 MS. HOLTZMAN: 13.

23 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: 13.

24 MS. HOLTZMAN: There are statements in  
25 the second and third paragraphs that parts of those

1 paragraphs are perfectly fine and factual  
2 statements. There's other parts of those paragraphs  
3 that become emotional commentary that are not fact  
4 based statements, so I think we just have to look at  
5 these things and make a decision that is this  
6 conveying something relevant or not.

7 I think we also have to --

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Ann --

9 MS. HOLTZMAN: -- we don't have a  
10 resolution prepared for this because we weren't sure  
11 if this was ready to vote on. So I think if we can  
12 make whatever changes we need to make between now  
13 and the next couple of weeks, we can get the  
14 resolution -- well, unfortunately, we're out until  
15 August, but --

16 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Then I think we need to  
17 call a meeting in July, because --

18 MS. HOLTZMAN: You know what, though?

19 I have to tell you. You don't need a  
20 special meeting to vote on this --

21 CHAIR SANCHEZ: No --

22 MS. HOLTZMAN: -- the last time now the  
23 Zoning Board happened to have gotten their annual  
24 report done, this is the first time that they have  
25 had theirs done in a timely manner -- on an even

1       closely timely way. The last time they did them,  
2       they did three years at a time.

3                       So the fact that we are late on this,  
4       when you are putting this much more work into it, I  
5       don't think it's that much of a problem.

6                       COMMISSIONER VESEY: Okay. So moving  
7       forward, what would the process be?

8                       We will have to figure out a time to  
9       come by your office. I think we really do need to  
10      get like a final. If John wants to do another pass  
11      on these things, we do need to get some consensus  
12      and get it in. But then how would we actually draft  
13      a resolution?

14                      MS. HOLTZMAN: It's a very standard,  
15      you know, one-page resolution that just says that  
16      the Board has adopted it and the resolution conveys  
17      it to the other Boards.

18                      COMMISSIONER VESEY: Then we would wait  
19      until August to do that?

20                      CHAIR SANCHEZ: Well, I think before  
21      that, we need a red line comment from you, so we  
22      know your issues before we sit at the table and  
23      begin to hash it out.

24                      COMMISSIONER KRATZ: I would suggest --

25                      MR. MILLER: There was one other new

1 issue that came up that was new in this version,  
2 that I wanted to address as well as part of that, so  
3 I don't know whether we do that tonight or whether  
4 we --

5 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Why don't you  
6 elaborate what --

7 MS. HOLTZMAN: Give it to us in your  
8 notes, please.

9 MR. MILLER: Okay.

10 MS. HOLTZMAN: And if you would also  
11 after the title page, insert a page that talks to --  
12 acknowledges who worked on it, who were the authors  
13 of the -- I mean, I know that there were three or  
14 four of you that worked on it directly. I think  
15 that needs to be conveyed in there.

16 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: To the point that  
17 John -- that counsel -- as you're preparing  
18 language, I mean, I would refer you to what we, the  
19 Committee, received from Administrator Holtzman on  
20 May 22nd, 2:44 p.m.

21 I quoted two sentences from three  
22 paragraphs that I personally thought were very good,  
23 and that may be a spring board for you --

24 MR. MILLER: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: -- as you wish.

1 MR. MILLER: No, that is fine.

2 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: It is hard to  
3 create these things de novo, but there's some work  
4 here, so --

5 MS. HOLTZMAN: Thank you for the date.  
6 I will reforward it --

7 (Laughter)

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And the time, 2:44  
9 p.m.

10 MS. HOLTZMAN: -- tomorrow, if I find  
11 it.

12 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: And, you know, I  
13 certainly understand the need for getting this out  
14 because it does, like the work that we put into it,  
15 I think is very good, and we intend for it to  
16 make -- to be a call to action in certain other  
17 parts of the city, so I'm a little glad we are  
18 working on this.

19 I am a little disappointed to think  
20 that it won't come out until the third quarter of  
21 the year. I understand that other Commissions and  
22 other Boards have been slow, but I am thinking that  
23 a July meeting for this and for any other  
24 applications that may come in, and for further  
25 comments on the post office site, I mean, I think

1           that would be time well spent for us to have a  
2           meeting in the middle of the July.

3                         CHAIR SANCHEZ:  I think it would be  
4           wise of us to turn around the post office in a  
5           month, just to put it in part of their negotiations,  
6           because, as you said, something should be done to  
7           the building.  You know, the building is all but  
8           ignored, and it is the gateway to the city, so --

9                         COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  So the first  
10          Monday in July I think is the 1st, and the second  
11          Monday, which is the 4th of July weekend, so a lot  
12          of people may be away.

13                        Do we want to vote now to meet subject  
14          to our availability on the -- what is it -- the 7th  
15          of July?

16                        MS. HOLTZMAN:  We are going to have to  
17          look at how other meetings are going to conflict,  
18          so --

19                        COMMISSIONER KRATZ:  Okay.  But we  
20          typically, don't we reserve the first Monday, but  
21          you are saying if we go to the second Monday, that  
22          becomes a problem.

23                        Are we all available on the first  
24          Monday?

25                        COMMISSIONER PERRY:  I am not.



1 COMMISSIONER STEWART: I'm not.

2 COMMISSIONER ABRAMS: No.

3 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So the second --

4 CHAIR SANCHEZ: The second Monday is  
5 the 7th?

6 COMMISSIONER PERRY: The first Monday  
7 is the 2nd.

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So the second  
9 Monday is the 9th, right, Jim?

10 COMMISSIONER PERRY: The second Monday  
11 is the 9th.

12 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: The post office  
13 matter, you know, it certainly sounds like the city  
14 is making some decisions and as it's negotiating,  
15 and I think the sooner we get our comments in, the  
16 better off we are.

17 COMMISSIONER VESEY: Since the annual  
18 report looks like we still have more work to do, and  
19 although it was a committee, I tend to be now the  
20 secretary, kind of redid the typing and collecting  
21 everybody's notes.

22 Marty, you said maybe you wanted to be  
23 on the post office committee?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I did indicate  
25 that, yes.

1                   COMMISSIONER VESEY: So I am going to  
2                   remove myself from that committee because it seems  
3                   like I'm still going to be tied up with the annual  
4                   report for a while. I would love to be on there,  
5                   but --

6                   (Laughter)

7                   VICE CHAIR ZANE: I thought the annual  
8                   report was last year --

9                   (Commissioners speaking at once)

10                  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I have  
11                  one suggestion to make, not to further, whatever,  
12                  the impertinent, but in my own experience, I think  
13                  this report needs a drop dead date. It will never  
14                  be perfect. I think maybe you should get it through  
15                  legal review, and then as of such date at midnight,  
16                  that is what we are sending to the printer. You  
17                  can't tweak it forever, and I think timely  
18                  submission is important.

19                  I mean, getting three years of reports  
20                  at one time, are they ever read?

21                  Do they matter at that point?

22                  Anyway, that's my big mouth going off.

23                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: The road to hell  
24                  is paved in good intentions, as they say. We meant  
25                  to get this and collect a lot of communal thoughts

1       that have come up at the meetings, and I think we  
2       will still do that, but it's --

3                   COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, there is  
4       a management concept that all tasks take as long as  
5       the amount of time allotted to them. I mean, it  
6       sounds flip, but it is true.

7                   COMMISSIONER VESEY: Yes, it's true.

8                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: So, John, are your  
9       comments ready to come back to us?

10                  MR. MILLER: Yes. I could put them in,  
11       and as Allen had mentioned, Ann will forward the  
12       emails as far as other changes or other comments,  
13       and, yes, I will put them together within -- I can  
14       get that out by Friday of this week.

15                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: By Friday --

16                  MR. MILLER: Of this week.

17                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: -- which is the 8th?

18                  MR. MILLER: Friday is, yes, the 8th.

19                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Because then you will  
20       compile everything again, and it will be  
21       recirculated.

22                  COMMISSIONER VESEY: As soon as I get  
23       notes -- as soon as I get -- I think what I will do,  
24       John, and, Ann, is I think at this point the most  
25       expedient thing to do is to send you a Word version,

1 and you can either track changes or do a red line.

2 MR. MILLER: Yes, I will do that. Yes,  
3 that is fine.

4 MS. HOLTZMAN: And then, John, you and  
5 I can maybe compare notes between now and Friday, so  
6 that we can give them one version that has  
7 everything in it?

8 MR. MILLER: Absolutely. That would be  
9 the goal to have it all in one document by Friday.

10 MS. HOLTZMAN: I'll try to make it as  
11 easy as possible.

12 MR. MILLER: Right. That's fine.

13 MS. HOLTZMAN: So if you want to look  
14 at the 9th, kind of hold the date for the moment,  
15 let me see what conflicts and stuff, and we will  
16 check tomorrow what the schedule is and what  
17 conflicts we have.

18 The other part of that is that we need  
19 to get the notes and things together for the post  
20 office and everything from everybody and formulate  
21 it into something by that date, and there is a lot  
22 of stuff that's going on between now and then, so  
23 we have to make sure that we're going to be able to  
24 hit that date, if we are going to make a special  
25 meeting just for that.

1                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: Well, we should be able  
2 to gather the information we don't have, like the  
3 memorandum of agreement and the --

4                   MS. HOLTZMAN: Well, it depends on how  
5 quickly they get all of that stuff to us, too, so --

6                   CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay.

7                   MR. MILLER: Can I make one change as  
8 far as the deadline?

9                   Can I go to Monday, because most of the  
10 day I'm going to be in court on Friday.

11                  MS. HOLTZMAN: Is that okay with  
12 everybody?

13                  COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Sure.

14                  (Laughter)

15                  MR. MILLER: I wish I wasn't, but I am  
16 afraid I am going to be in court on Friday.

17                  MS. HOLTZMAN: How about the 11th?

18                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Okay. And we are  
19 tentatively looking at the 9th?

20                  MS. HOLTZMAN: 7/9.

21                  CHAIR SANCHEZ: Should we have an  
22 option for the following Monday, if the 9th is not  
23 available?

24                  MS. ANASTASIO: The Shade Tree is the  
25 9th.

1 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Shade Tree is the 9th,  
2 okay.

3 VICE CHAIR ZANE: It must be a great  
4 meeting.

5 CHAIR SANCHEZ: We will consider the  
6 9th and the 16th.

7 Do I have a motion to adjourn?

8 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: So move.

9 VICE CHAIR ZANE: So move.

10 CHAIR SANCHEZ: All in favor?

11 (All Board members answered in the  
12 affirmative)

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIR ZANE: Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER KRATZ: Thank you.

16 (The meeting concluded at 9:30 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1

2

3 I, PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, a Certified Court

4 Reporter, Certified Realtime Court Reporter, and

5 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby

6 certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate

7 transcript of the proceedings as taken

8 stenographically by and before me at the time, place

9 and date hereinbefore set forth.

10

11 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither

12 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel to

13 any of the parties to this action, and that I am

14 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or

15 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in

16 the action.

17

18 s/Phyllis T. Lewis, CCR, CRCR

19 - - - - -

20 PHYLLIS T. LEWIS, C.C.R. XI01333 C.R.C.R. 30XR15300

21 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey

22 My commission expires 11/5/2020.

23 This transcript was prepared in accordance with

24 NJAC 13:43-5.9.

25