## PLEASE TAKE NOTE:

ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2023, THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOROUGH OF MIDLAND PARK HELD A REGULAR MEETING IN THE MIDLAND PARK COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 280 GODWIN AVE., MIDLAND PARK, NJ. THE FORMAL MEETING BEGAN AT 7:30 P.M

## FORMAL MEETING

READING OF THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL:

| Mr. Les Andersen | present | Mr. Mark Divak | absent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mr. David Zuidema | present | Mr. William Placier | present |
| Mr. Richard Formicola | present | Mr. David Barlow | present |
| Mr. Nick Papapietro | present | Mr. Joseph Eliya, Alt \#1 | present |
|  |  | Mr. James Capalbo, Alt \#2 | present |

Attendance by Board Professionals: L. Herlihy, Esq., Attorney; R. Wostbrock, Engineer; D. Novak, Planner;
7:33:07 - 7:33:27 - recording was paused to adjust sound
Minutes of the 9/13/23 meeting - approved

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

Jag-Tech LLC dba Midland Park Food Mart - 184 Godwin Avenue - BL 17 LT 9.01 - Application has been withdrawn by the applicant on 10/11/23.

MHF Midland Park LLC/Taco Bell - 80 Godwin Avenue - BL 6 LT 17.02 - see attached transcript. Mr. Barlow has certified that he has read the transcripts and is eligible to vote. Motion to approve the use variance including the previously agreed to stipulations made by Mr. Formicola; seconded by Mr. Barlow. Mr. Formicola, Mr. Zuidema, Mr. Barlow, and Mr. Eliya voted yes. Mr. Papapietro, Mr. Placier, and Mr. Andersen voted no. Motion failed 4-3; application for use variance denied.

## RESOLUTIONS:

Baumann, Ryan \& Valerie - 217 Paterson Avenue - BL 26.01 LT 13 - Motion to approve the resolution made by Mr. Papapietro. Seconded by Mr. Formicola; all eligible members voted in favor.


LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MR. WHITAKER: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Before you do that,

```
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Here.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Here.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Here.
Public hearings, I'm advised Jag Tech
has been withdrawn. Okay.
So our only public hearing tonight is Taco Bell.
Mr. Whitaker, do you want to enter your appearance?
MR. WHITAKER: Certainly.
Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of
the Board, for the record, Bruce Whitaker from the
firm of McDonnell \& Whitaker representing the applicant, MHF Midland Park, LLC.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah, go ahead. Enter your appearance.
MS. RIZZUTO: Good evening, Anne Marie
Rizzuto from Weiner Law Group on behalf of the
objector, Burger Barn.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
I know you're here to give us your summation.
    MR. ELIYA: Here.
    So ouronly public hearing tonight is
        Taco Bell.
        Whitaker, do you want to enter your
        MR. WHITAKER: Certainly.
        Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of
            ve us your
```

        LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
            201-641-1812
    what need to consider.
So just to refresh everybody's memory
-- I'm sure you have not forgotten -- but this application is for use variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70D(1) for a principal use not permitted in the zoning district.

The application specifically is for a drive-through restaurant. So the use variance isn't for the drive-through and it isn't for the restaurant; it's for a combination thereof of a drive-through restaurant.

In order to grant a $\mathrm{D}(1)$ use variance, the board needs to consider both the positive and the negative criteria.

With the positive criteria, the
applicant needs to demonstrate that there are special reasons which exist for the granting of the variance, and that the granting of the variance will further the purposes of Municipal Land Use Law.

On the flip side of that with the negative criteria, the applicant needs to demonstrate there will be no substantial detriment to the public good and no substantial impairment to the intent of the zone plan.

Regardless of one's opinions on Taco
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Bell, I think we all agree this is not an inherently beneficial use, like a church, or a house of worship, or a hospital. Because it's not an inherently beneficial use, the applicant has an enhanced burden of proof where they need to demonstrate that the site is particularly suited for this use and that the use is not inconsistent with the intent of the Master Plan.

To back up from there, because oftentimes when we talk about the statutory criteria you hear a bunch of buzz words, special reasons, particular suitability. So let's delve into a little bit of what that means.

When we talk about special reasons, there's typically three types of categories for special reasons.

There's a reason where the proposed use is something that inherently serves the public good.
So, again, that would be more of an inherently beneficial use.

One special reason could be where the property owner would suffer undue hardship if it was compelled to use the property for whatever the use is. Or another special reason is where the use would serve the general welfare because the proposed site
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is particularly suitable for that proposed use. And that's what we're really looking at with this application, particular suitability.

And particular suitability you can think of as twofold. You can look at particular suitability as to why the location of the site within the borough is particularly suited to the use despite the underlying zoning. You can also look at what unique characteristics of the site make it particularly appropriate for that proposed use. And the site doesn't necessarily need to be uniquely suited for the use. That is to say, it does not need to be the only site available for that use. It needs to be particularly suited.

I want to take a step back even further a little bit to talk about planning and zoning in general.

Within the planning and zoning world, you typically have three bodies. You have the planning board; you have the zoning board; and you have the governing body.

The planning board, as its name implies, is responsible for establishing the planning vision through the development of a Master Plan, which is a comprehensive, long-term strategic
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development guide which is intended to guide the growth and development of the community. It's essentially a road map. It outlines where a municipality currently is and where it wishes to go in the future. And that Master Plan is supposed to develop the general parameters around what types of development are to occur and, basically, what types of development are to occur and where. That's the planning board.

The governing body, also known as the Mayor and Council, has a very important role to play in that as well. While the planning board prepares the Master Plan, the governing body is the sole entity responsible for adopting land use board regulations.

And then there's the zoning board, you guys. You have to deal with the work product of both the planning board and zoning board. You have the power to grant a $D(1)$ use variance from zoning regulations, which are dealt by the governing body in consideration of a planning board's Master Plan. So you are essentially a very powerful entity.

When we look at the aspects of the negative criteria, and specifically the intent of the zone plan, the courts have typically made it very
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clear that you should be making zoning decisions based on an ordinance rather than a variance.

So when you examine the negative criteria, you need to carefully consider the extent to which granting the variance would constitute what they call an arrogation of the governing body. That is, are you usurping the power of the governing body?

That brings us to the question which has been discussed at the beginning of this hearing process and was discussed by both planners, Order Number 19:21, which was adopted by the Council on October 28, 2021, which specifically prohibited drive-through restaurants.

There was a lot of discussion by the board and by the planners as to why that ordinance was developed.

To me, the intent of the ordinance is inherent in the way the ordinance was written. It was intended to prohibit drive-through restaurants in your B-3 District, as well as your B-1 District. B-1 District.

MS. RIZZUTO: B-1 and 3.
MR. NOVAK: B-1 and 3.
Thank you.
So there's been a lot of discussion
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about what the rationale or the justification for that was, what the thought process was of the Council. It could be many things. There could be concerns about the number of drive-through restaurants. There could be concerns about the safety of drive-throughs. The fact of the matter is essentially that's no longer in the hands of this board. You have to just look at the intent.

So when you grant the use variance and you look at the impact on the negative criteria, there's a number of aspects that you, as the board, can consider. One of the items would be involving your new land use.

So a common example of that, I believe, was even used in Medici are health clubs. There's a proliferation of health clubs. A lot of older zoning ordinances did not envision health clubs popping up as a permitted use.

As a more recent example, we see in downtowns paint-and-sip uses, new uses that may not be anticipated or envisioned by an older zoning ordinance.

You can also look at whether there's been surrounding changes to the surrounding development pattern or the surrounding character of
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sure Mr. Whitaker probably has that in his summation as well -- but I believe he brought up Purpose A, which is what you brought up, general welfare. There was also Purpose C, which is light, air and open space, as well as Purpose I, which is promoting a desirable visual element.

So there were other purposes of zoning that were bought up for the special reasons by the applicant's planner, not just the general welfare.

Your question as to how the approval of a drive-through restaurant with -- fast food drive-through restaurant essentially promotes the general welfare.

Typically when we look at what promotes the general welfare, one of the first things that I do is look at what does your Master Plan say, what does your re-examination report say.

The applicant's planner did discuss some of the goals of the Master Plan Re-examination Report. Goal 1 was to maintain the existing areas of visibility; Goal 2, which was environmental protection; and Goal 6, which was to reduce driveway movements onto Godwin Avenue.

So there was some discussion of our Master Plan and how the promotion of those Master
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MR. NOVAK: I think you can, yes, with something that was specifically called within a zoning ordinance as opposed to a use that was left out by neglect or something that was not necessarily envisioned at the time of the adoption of the ordinance.

So I believe you have to weigh that and you have to reconcile that with the intent of the zone plan.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. As far as the positive criteria, you were talking about specific --

MR. NOVAK: Special reasons.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. From
the testimony we've heard, I -- I have to hear from
other board members -- but for myself, I haven't
heard any particularly persuasive testimony from either of the planners as far as how this approval of this use will advance one of the purposes of zoning.

Have you thought about that at all, or is there anything in the testimony maybe that I've missed that you would see as a planner?

MR. NOVAK: The applicant's planner did bring up other purposes of zoning.

So in looking through my notes -- I'm
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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Plan -- really Re-examination Report goals are furthered by this proposed use.

So there was some discussion of that, but you have to weigh, as a board, whether or not you buy that a drive-through restaurant specifically promotes those goals.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: One last question, I don't know if you remember, but I became somewhat
frustrated with each of the planners while they were testifying over the fact that my understanding of the particular suitability that there's -- there's two aspects to that: One pertains to the negative criteria; and one pertains to the positive criteria.

And as far as the positive criteria is, my understanding always was that it has to be particularly suited, in that there's a reason why that particular location is suitable -- not suitable, not uniquely, but there's something about that site that makes it particularly suitable for this use.

So as an example I gave -- I'm not
going to do it again, but I gave the example of the grocery stores.

But again say there's a -- again, this is my understanding. There's a lot with severe steep slope problems or something. And a use comes before
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the board that's not permitted, but whatever it is, it -- the steep slope doesn't impact it, and it's more suitable for that site than a permitted use.

Am I completely out of -- out of touch, or is there any validity to that?

MR. NOVAK: I think we're saying the same thing, that there needs to be something about that site that is not necessarily solely unique.

It does not need to be solely unique.
That was something that was discussed in the Himeji case. Something about that site that lends itself to being suitable specifically for that type of use.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.
I know I said that was the last
question, but now I have another one.
MR. NOVAK: Okay.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Again, when the applicant's planner was testifying, I was trying to emphasis the fact that all of the testimony from the planner and the engineer as far as how this site can accommodate a drive-through, okay, was not to me particularly important because a drive-through is permitted. It's not the drive-through that's the problem. The problem is it's a restaurant drive-through that's not permitted. LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

And so it appears to me what we have to find is there's some special reason why a restaurant drive-through as opposed to any other kind of drive-through -- build a shoe repair or a Columbia Bank or whatever, they wouldn't even be here. They'd be at the planning board for a site plan, correct?

MR. NOVAK: Correct.
MS. HERLIHY: If I could?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You may.
MS. HERLIHY: Just to shed a little
light on that, I think -- and not put words -- he'll
stop me if I'm putting words into his mouth.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Oh, I'm sure he'll
stop you.
MS. HERLIHY: That the point -- so I
think they did do that, or they tried to do that.
In other words, they tried to point out
the difference or the distinction between a
drive-through associated with a restaurant and a drive-through associated with a bank.

For example, it is typical that you
would have a longer queue at a drive-through restaurant than you would at a drive-through bank. And because of that, they attempted -- whether they did or not, they attempted to show you that this
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here, why this site can accommodate those things
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site, not only could it accommodate the shorter drive-through bank queue or the shorter pharmacy bank queue, it could also accommodate the longer restaurant drive-through.

That's what I took away from that. CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I missed that.
MS. HERLIHY: That's how they tried to do that.

MR. NOVAK: To add onto that too, there was also a lot of discussion, especially at the last meeting, regarding the menu board being a component of a drive-through restaurant as well, and the placement of that menu board, potential sites and sounds.

So that would be another unique aspect.
MS. HERLIHY: The ordinance doesn't say
drive-through restaurants are prohibited because we don't like longer queues, and menu boards, and speakers, and lights and noise.

But Mr. Whitaker is trying to tell you
that that's what comes along with a drive-through restaurant and that's what people find objectionable about a drive-through restaurant. He's trying to tell you why all of those things are not of concern

better than, perhaps, other sites. That was my take away. Maybe I missed it. I just caught up.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Before you, unless
-- I was going to have other board members ask
questions, but do you have something you want to ask first?

MR. WHITAKER: No.
I was being looked at.
But, no, I don't have anything to say. I'll get my turn.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
Anybody else have any questions for
Mr. Novak?
Go ahead, Rich.
MR. FORMICOLA: Are you done?
Are you all right?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah. I'm...
MR. FORMICOLA: For now?
Well, I'm going to ask him a question.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No.
He's going to ask one question.
MR. FORMICOLA: He's not done yet?
I'm sorry.
So the question I have is, with the --
with the Master Plan, okay, it's my interpretation --
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and you can tell me if this is wrong when you've met or when talked -- it's a general guideline, because if it was set in stone, am I correct -- and this is what they don't want, and really it should never be here because it's like a done deal. That's what they want.

Anything that we do, pretty much, this board, it's always an exception because they make a general assumption, we don't want something or we don't want a fence over 6 foot, 7 foot, but if you can show us a good reason, then you can that 10 . That's what we're here for.

MR. NOVAK: Yeah.
Two responses to that.
The first would be, you are correct.
While Master Plans can offer a lot of specificity --
and I've had to write some of those Master Plans with excruciating specificity -- they are supposed to serve as the basis for zoning. That means an ordinance is supposed to coincide with the vision of a Master Plan. And if it doesn't --

For example, say if a Master Plan makes a recommendation that we don't want gas stations in a residential zone, and the governing body decides we want to adopt and introduce an ordinance that says we
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backyard -- I'm sorry -- 6 feet in a backyard, but they could be 4 feet in a front yard.

But there may be some extenuating circumstances where a property is a corner lot or a property is right next to a commercial business where a 6 -foot fence in the front yard might help things.

So there may be unique aspects of a specific piece of property which would or could warrant the granting of a variance. And that's what this board hears all the time, whether it's a $\mathrm{D}(1)$ variance, or sometimes when it's something as simple as a bulk variance for a fence.

MR. FORMICOLA: Okay, thank you.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: A question
for you?
MR. NOVAK: We're going down the line, yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Going down the line, when this ordinance was passed back in 2021, was your firm involved in part of this particular ordinance?

MR. NOVAK: We were not, no.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: And the reason why I'm saying that, then, you talked about the Master Plan for the town. And the way this is
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worded, the objective of this ordinance is to eliminate drive-throughs for restaurants in general, not other businesses.

So it specifically indicates
restaurants for this particular prohibition. And I'm just curious if you guys were a part of that, but you weren't.

MR. NOVAK: We were not, no.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: So this is something that the governing body put into place and then was approved, and that's why we're here now.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anybody else?
MR. FORMICOLA: Just to -- because that -- I understand what you're saying about the governing body, but the problem I have with that is, when that went into play, we all know it's because of Starbucks when Starbucks went in.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: We don't know that for sure.

MR. FORMICOLA: You know, I'm just saying there was a lot of complaints back and forth. And they didn't have anything in the area.

But what I'm just saying is that they put a lot of things in play. That's why we're here because that doesn't necessarily mean all the time
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that, you know, okay, so there will never be any food drive-in food places in any of those districts ever again.

And, you know, it's not necessarily -you know what I mean.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Oh, yeah.
MR. FORMICOLA: I'm just -- I'm playing the devil's advocate on that.

So I'm just saying each case is
different. If there was going to be some wild case going in there, you know, crazy stuff, lights, disco, whatever it may be, you'd be like, you know.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: A disco, you're showing your age.

MR. FORMICOLA: You know, it would be
-- it would be crazy. You would say, well, it's
going to be a detriment to everybody for that. But on this something like, you know -- I'm not saying this particular, but in anything that -- whatever, there might be an exception to that. So I'm just -I'm just saying the Council put in a lot of things they voted, whether it be unanimously or not. That's another problem is that not everybody agrees with everything at the time.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I hear what LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

If this was part of multiple things
going through, this was a specific ordinance put in. Nothing else attaches. Just focus on this.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I'm not disagreeing
with you, Rich, but just as a note, whether it was
unanimous or not, whether it's reasonable or not,
that's beyond -- we have to assume the ordinance --
MR. FORMICOLA: Passed.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Not that it passed,
but that it's reasonable. And that's what we have.
We cannot decide, well, the Council voted $5 / 2$ so it really wasn't that...

As far as we're concerned, the
ordinance is what it is. That's not our -- if
somebody had a question about the validity of the
ordinance, they would have to start a prerogative
writ action and take it from there.
MR. FORMICOLA: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anyone else before
Mr. Whitaker?
(No Response.)
MR. WHITAKER: So I have questions of
Mr. Novak.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sure.
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MR. WHITAKER: One of the last
hypotheticals you used, you stated that the governing body could create an ordinance that's contrary to the Master Plan, and the planning board could tell them that.

And on the basis of that, you stated that the governing body could still pass it by a super majority, and they would have to put their reasons on the record, the purpose behind insisting on that ordinance.

So I'm going to emphasis the word
"purpose," P-U-R-P-O-S-E, okay?
In your analysis and review as a
planner -- and you are very cognizant and familiar with the Master Plan in Midland Park -- there is no provision in the Master Plan that says drive-through restaurants should not be encouraged or should not be allowed?

MR. NOVAK: I would agree with that statement.

MR. WHITAKER: In connection with -and we talked about this briefly in your last testimony, you've already confirmed that you were not involved as a planner in looking at this ordinance and maybe providing the purposes or reasons why for LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MR. NOVAK: That is correct.
MR. WHITAKER: You stated earlier there might, be is the word you used, reasons they gave, but you were hypothesizing; you don't know of any reasons for this ordinance.

MR. NOVAK: That is correct.
MR. WHITAKER: And you're also
familiar, in having created Master Plans and creating ordinances, that many times there's an introduction in an ordinance that says here's why we're doing this, in so words, here is the purpose?

MR. NOVAK: Absolutely.
I would include that in the whereas
classes.
MR. WHITAKER: Now, you are familiar as planner with the Medici case.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: And you've used the words already because you use them all the time, and rightfully so.

The Medici case and the cases after that, including the Himeji case, always goes back and reflects that an applicant has to demonstrate that the relief requested can be granted without
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substantial detriment to the intent and purpose of
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meets the requirements of the Master Plan?
MR. NOVAK: So that is based on the
transcript that had been forwarded over.
MR. WHITAKER: Right.
MR. NOVAK: I had not listened to a
recording of that meeting.
MR. WHITAKER: But the transcript, but
you rely on transcripts?
MR. NOVAK: Oh, yeah, absolutely, yes.
And the transcript was very short.
MR. WHITAKER: No reasons or purposes given there.

MR. NOVAK: I don't believe there was, no.

It was mostly discussion on the B-1 and
B-3 District. Some discussion about whether or not
the ordinance should be expanded to the industrial
district as well, but that was really the crux of that discussion.

MR. WHITAKER: No reason from the
Planning Board in preparing a resolution or a letter back to the Mayor and Council that says this meets the requirements or the terms of the Master Plan because, and recitation of some of the goals or the requirements in the Master Plan, correct?
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MR. NOVAK: Nothing that I saw in the transcripts.

I'm unaware if there was a letter that was later submitted, but nothing in the transcripts.

MR. WHITAKER: And let's go before the Planning Board is out.

You looked at the transcript regarding
the introduction of this ordinance -- again, not in
criticism of the Mayor and Council -- but that transcript and what went on.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: You saw some people that night didn't even have it yet; they had to run out and photocopy it, when you read that transcript.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: And you saw that when
they got it, they weren't quite sure what it was all about.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: And then you saw the minutes of the meeting in which that ordinance was then adopted?

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: The Mayor called the meeting to order for the adoption of the ordinance,
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asked for any comments from the public.
The minutes reflect there were none. But there was no comments at that point from any of the Council Members or Mayor saying we're passing this ordinance because.

MR. NOVAK: Correct.
MR. WHITAKER: The transcript of introduction, the transcript from the Planning Board, the minutes from the Mayor and Council, did you see in any of those documents the purpose behind passing this ordinance?

MR. NOVAK: I did not.
MS. HERLIHY: Mr. Whitaker, so you've
asked the question and he's answered. He's aware of the transcripts and these minutes but -- and I know you've provided copies to the board secretary.

MR. WHITAKER: To everyone.
And to my adversary.
MS. RIZZUTO: And I have an objection.
MS. HERLIHY: But in order for the
board to consider them as part of this application, they need to have been entered as part of your evidence.

If you're going to rely upon them, if you're going to now --
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MR. WHITAKER: I want to move them into evidence, yes.

MS. HERLIHY: Okay. So then you're going to then allow the objector's counsel --

MR. WHITAKER: Yeah, of course.
Absolutely. Yeah, we've opened it again. Okay.
MS. HERLIHY: Okay.
MR. WHITAKER: I want to just continue on this train of thought.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And I'll come back to it in just a minute.

MS. RIZZUTO: Just for the record, I
object to this questioning on the exhibits that have
not been discussed yet as to whether they can be
admitted at this time.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your objection is on the record.

MS. RIZZUTO: I was going to do it when he did his closing.

Obviously they're going to stand.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, they're going
to end up in the record.
MS. RIZZUTO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And he's seen them.
MS. RIZZUTO: Yes, I understand.
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MR. WHITAKER: The ZBA, a zoning board in any town has the ability in doing their analysis and deliberations to look back to try find out what the purpose was when they're trying to determine if a variance should be granted. Because in the Medici case in N.J.S.A. 40:55-70D, that word "purpose" constantly shows up, correct?

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: Now let's go look at the ordinance.

Now you're going to pull it up on your
screen.
MR. NOVAK: All right.
MR. WHITAKER: Okay. 19-21.
MR. NOVAK: I am getting there,
Mr. Whitaker.
MR. WHITAKER: Yeah. Take your time.
It's actually 34-9.1 has all the uses.
MR. NOVAK: And the -- oh, 34-9.1, yes, I have that open.

MR. WHITAKER: So Paragraph H, do you want to read that into the record.

MR. NOVAK: Paragraph H states:
"Restaurants: Provided, however, that drive-through restaurants, as defined in this
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MR. WHITAKER: But the planner is opened up tonight. And whether it's the planner or the engineer, they can always opine on do we meet the requirements of an ordinance. Okay?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We asked for his opinion.

MS. RIZZUTO: I understand.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
But your objection is on the record.
MS. RIZZUTO: He's rested. He's rested his case.

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Novak?
MR. NOVAK: Item A is that the drive-through be located a minimum of 75 feet from any residential zone.

MR. WHITAKER: The drive-through, itself.

MR. NOVAK: The drive-through, itself, is the lot -- I know it's immediately adjacent to a residential zone.

So I'm not familiar if that standard is typically measured from the lot or from the drive-through. It's a little ambiguous.

MR. WHITAKER: It's measured, from my
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experience, from a window, itself.
Let's move on. Hours of operation, we stipulated would be code compliant?

MR. NOVAK: And that is, hours of operation will be limited to 6 a.m. to 12 o'clock midnight.

And then Item 3 -- pardon me -- Item C:
"Any drive-through or drive-up window
shall have a minimum queueing length of 180 feet from the service area".

MR. WHITAKER: One-hundred-fifty.
MR. NOVAK: Which I believe was --
MR. WHITAKER: One-hundred-fifty.
MR. NOVAK: What did I say?
MR. WHITAKER: One-hundred-eighty.
MR. NOVAK: One-hundred-fifty.
I believe the applicant is proposing
180.

MR. WHITAKER: One-hundred-fifty-three.
MR. NOVAK: One-hundred-fifty-three.
My apologies.
MR. WHITAKER: And that says:
"150 feet from the center of the first
service area."
Do you know what they mean by "first
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service area"?
MR. NOVAK: My interpretation would be, essentially, where you're placing your order.

MR. WHITAKER: Or where the window is.
The service area is where the service is. That's the
way it's been interpreted for Dunkin' Donuts,
interpreted for Starbucks.
MR. NOVAK: I'll rely on that.
MS. RIZZUTO: Objection.
Unsupported in the record.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I'm sorry?
MS. RIZZUTO: Dunkin' Donuts and some other place that he just talked about, it's unsupported in the record.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. WHITAKER: With that said, can you think of a use that would have a service window, other than a -- would have multiple service windows other than a restaurant?

MR. NOVAK: Multiple service windows other than a restaurant?

MR. WHITAKER: All in a row. Because
you're measuring from the closest one.
MR. NOVAK: Other uses that would typically have service windows would be a bank.
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window.
A pharmacy, that would typically have one service window.

Without everybody laughing at me,
cannabis uses have been opening up with service windows.

MR. WHITAKER: In banks, actually.
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
And I surprisingly can attest that I'm not familiar with how that drive-through service works, but those would be the three big ones that I think you have now.

MR. WHITAKER: This ordinance is still on the books?

MR. NOVAK: That is correct.
MS. RIZZUTO: I'm sorry. What is "this ordinance"?

MR. WHITAKER: This ordinance,
34-13.13, the one he just read.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The drive-through ordinance.

MR. WHITAKER: Drive-through.
MS. HERLIHY: And it was -- it was
adopted 2021, prior to the adoption of the
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prohibition.
MR. WHITAKER: It wasn't modified when the prohibition came into play.

MS. HERLIHY: It also wouldn't be the
first time that a governing body missed something like that.

MR. WHITAKER: I don't know about that.
MS. HERLIHY: I'm just -- it wouldn't
be the first time that not everything in the ordinance that applies to one action doesn't get -you know, gets looked over, so to speak.

In other words, again, hypothecating, if the intent -- if the intent was outlaw or to prohibit all drive-up restaurants --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Drive-throughs are permitted.

MS. HERLIHY: Drive-through restaurants, I just said, they believed potentially that that's what they did by adopting that ordinance, that they did not then have to go through the remainder of the ordinance and say Section 34-13.13 does not apply to restaurants or somehow change that.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, why would they have to?

MS. HERLIHY: He's trying to say that
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one to the residential --
MR. WHITAKER: Not from the residential, 150 is the queueing.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah.
But it could be different, depending where the queue is.
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CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: This is for premises."

MR. WHITAKER: Okay.
So we touched base at the last meeting about this. And you agreed with me that if I pulled up a restaurant and the owner was kind enough to bring the food out to me and I drove off with it, that that's something that violates the prohibition on a drive-through?

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: You confirmed at the last meeting that a drive-through restaurant does not, in fact, need to be a window?

MR. NOVAK: Based on this definition, there is no reference of a window, yes.

MR. WHITAKER: Correct.
And based on the definition of
drive-through that you read before, it says
drive-through, drive-up windows; it also says outdoor ordering locations.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: So now just to go
through this definition so we understand, again, what's prohibited and what would be permitted.

If I have an establishment in which
food or drink is served to a customer and it's not
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within an automobile --
MR. NOVAK: As in a walk-up window?
MR. WHITAKER: Well, it's a person on a
motorcycle.
MR. NOVAK: There's no definition of automobile, from what I'm aware of, in the zoning ordinance.

I don't know what you would rely on then to define automobile or... A motorcycle would meet some sort of outside definition of automobile, but it certainly does say "automobiles" not vehicles.

MR. WHITAKER: It doesn't say trucks?
We might call a truck an automobile?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MR. WHITAKER: Let's move on.
Again, I'll read it to you:
"An establishment in which food or drink is served to customers within automobiles" -- my hypothetical was still an automobile -- "outside the confines of a building and where the consumption of such food or drink is intended to occur off the premises."

If I pull up to the window in my automobile, and I get that bag of food, and I drive
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out that lane and stay on the premises and eat it in the parking lot, I'm permitted to do that?

MR. NOVAK: Hm.
MS. HERLIHY: I would disagree.
MR. NOVAK: I think the intent -- the
language intended to occur off the premises separates
that possibility out from what's in -- from this scenario.

MR. WHITAKER: It's nebulous, is it not.

MR. NOVAK: Hm.
MR. WHITAKER: Nebulous? A little confusing.

MR. NOVAK: It's a little confusing.
But, typically --
MR. WHITAKER: What I'm showing you, basically, is that there's a question about the purpose. That's what I'm trying to show.

And I think you see that this is not an ordinance with clarity.

Wouldn't you agree?
MR. NOVAK: There are certain aspects
of this ordinance which could use clarification.
MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Just to make
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It's to prohibit drive-through
restaurants. And all the rest of it is not for us to determine what the Mayor and Council was thinking or whatever.

We may -- we may think it's a silly
ordinance or whatever, but we're -- I'm going to ask
Linda to confirm -- but we're obligated to accept to accept the ordinance the way it is.

MR. WHITAKER: I'd like to respond.
You're obligated to see as part of the Medici case as to whether what we are seeking here violates the purpose of the zoning ordinance. It presupposes something.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And the purpose is to prohibit drive-through restaurants. That's the purpose.

MR. WHITAKER: No.
The purpose from planning and zoning -Mr. Novak would agree with you because he said it already -- is to know what the purpose in passing the ordinance was in the first place.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, I disagree with you.

MR. WHITAKER: Because -- because when you don't know the purpose, you don't know how to
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1 a point you kind of the left open. The intent, the
way it was written, the interpretation is clear.
It's prohibited, drive-through restaurants.
MR. WHITAKER: Only if it's all -- all
these conditions have to be met in this ordinance.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I didn't want to interrupt you.

But along the same lines, we're all
agreed that the use that your applicant is proposing is a prohibited use.

MR. WHITAKER: I am. I'm just -- I'm going to purpose. Keep going.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And I understand
what you're saying is either intentionally or
inadvertently there may be other uses that are now no longer permitted.

But that doesn't change the fact that
the use you're proposing is strictly prohibited. And
I'm going to go back again to what I mentioned to Rich.

The fact that the ordinance may be, to use your term, lacks clarity or it's not clear why the reasons they voted for it or whatever, as Nick said, the purpose of the ordinance is clear on its face.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
grant or not grant a use variance, if you know that what my client is proposing to do violates the purpose of the ordinance, then I lose. But here you don't have a guideline to say here's why this should not be here, because the ordinance says it's prohibited, but why is it prohibited?

I'm saying my client's site is particularly suited for what we're doing. And I show all the reasons why it's particularly suited. And I can't say that it violates a purpose of the ordinance that we don't know about.

That's the picture I am painting. CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You can't show that you can solve the reasons or the conditions that the Mayor and Council was trying to -- was concerned with.

But that's not the purpose of the ordinance. The purpose of the ordinance is to prohibit drive-through restaurants.

I understand what you're saying is you're at a disadvantage because you have to show special reasons why this is particularly suitable, and without knowing what they were worried about, you can't show that you can solve those issues.

To me, that doesn't impact the fact
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that the -- and the Medici language to me says it doesn't violate the purpose of the ordinance. The

That's my argument.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Would you say that
argument is similar, if not identical, to the
argument in Saddle Brook Realty vs. The Saddle Brook
Zoning Board of Adjustment? And is there a distinction with this application and that.

MR. WHITAKER: Yes.
And I'll go through it when I get to the summation.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right.
MS. RIZZUTO: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I'm sorry.
MS. RIZZUTO: Is he done with his
questioning?
Because I would like to question this
witness as well.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
I'm not sure that he's done with the questions.

MS. RIZZUTO: Well, I think he said that he's done.

MR. WHITAKER: You asked a question?
MS. RIZZUTO: And then he went into his
summation early.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah, go ahead, ask
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some questions.
MS. RIZZUTO: Thank you.
Mr. Novak?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
Easy one to start off with.
MS. RIZZUTO: Have you seen other
zoning ordinances where they're nowhere as close?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Have you seen other zoning ordinances where the purpose is not specifically stated, either during the meeting or in the ordinance, itself?

Purpose not stated, have you seen that?
MR. NOVAK: Within the ordinance, I
have.
Typically in the -- within the meeting
as well, I don't recall one way or the other, quite frankly.

MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
So we established that you've looked at some of the things that Mr. Whitaker has not yet introduced into evidence.

Did you look at the transcript of
9/28/2021? That's the first one when it was introduced before the governing body.
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MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
Did you note that it is unsigned and
uncertified?
MR. NOVAK: I did not note that.
But I don't believe it was signed.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
And did you also note that Mr. Whitaker was present at the governing body meeting that day?

MR. WHITAKER: No.
That was Mr. Wostbrock. I haven't been to a governing body in Midland Park in at least ten years.

MS. RIZZUTO: It says "Bruce Whitaker, Esquire" on the first page. On the first -- on page number 2 of the transcript --

MR. WHITAKER: That's who ordered it.
MS. RIZZUTO: -- where it says
"Appearances," it says "Robert Reagan, Esq., Counsel
to the Midland Park Mayor and Council," and "Bruce Whitaker, Esquire."

MR. NOVAK: May I see it?
MS. RIZZUTO: Sure.
MR. WHITAKER: Evidently I wasn't there.
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It's evidently an error. I didn't even see that.

MS. RIZZUTO: I understand.
But it indicates that you're --
MR. WHITAKER: Okay, yeah.
MS. RIZZUTO: It's an uncertified
transcript, so maybe there's a mistake because it's a noncertified transcript.

MR. NOVAK: It does.
MS. RIZZUTO: But regardless of that, let's move on.

So besides the transcript of -- that we have here, there is also a set of minutes from the Mayor and Council meeting.

Did you look at those?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay. And were they different from this transcript? Because they're not -- they weren't provided by Mr. Whitaker. We don't have them in front of us.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, the minutes are from a different meeting.

MS. RIZZUTO: That's correct.
You chose what you wanted to give to
$\qquad$
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You did not give the minutes to the
September 28th meeting when the -- when the -- when the ordinance was -- was adopted.

So, sir, did you go look up those
minutes separately? Because Mr. Whitaker did not provide them.

MR. NOVAK: No. I looked at the October 20th.

MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
That's for the second meeting. Did you look at the minutes of the Planning Board when they determined and made a recommendation that the ordinance was consistent with the Master Plan? They made that clear finding, correct?

MR. NOVAK: I am not familiar with the minutes.

MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
But in the transcript that is
uncertified that Mr. Whitaker produced, they, in
fact, made that finding in that uncertified
transcript, correct?
They say they're going to direct the Planning Board attorney to write a letter.

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
I'm just looking for the exact text.
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Yes. That was made on page 10 of that transcript.
MR. WHITAKER: Why don't you read it into --

MS. RIZZUTO: That's the Panning Board transcript of October -- this is my turn right now, right -- October 18th, 2021, they made a determination -- they stated it on the record -- that it was consistent.

MR. NOVAK: The most -- yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Did the Planning Board -the Planning Board's main concern appeared to be that the governing body was prohibiting drive-through restaurants in $\mathrm{B}-1$ and $\mathrm{B}-2$, but --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Three.
MS. RIZZUTO: B-3.
But they felt it should also be
prohibited in I-2, which is an industrial zone; that was the main gist of the Planning Board's review, correct?

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay.
Are you familiar with the various
statutes that exist around the giving of a recommendation and what the governing body can do if they decide to go with the recommendations of changes
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by the planning board, or modify them, or reject them?

Are you familiar with all of the
statutes that govern that decision process?
MR. NOVAK: Yeah, I'm typically
familiar.
MS. RIZZUTO: Yeah.
You stated earlier, they should be --
if they are going to disagree with the Planning Board recommendation, they should put their reasons on the record, correct?

MR. NOVAK: If the --
MS. RIZZUTO: If the governing --
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
If the Planning Board finds that a provision of the ordinance is --

MS. RIZZUTO: Inconsistent.
MR. NOVAK: -- inconsistent with the
Master Plan -- and the Municipal Land Use Law is very specific. It says inconsistent.

MS. RIZZUTO: Right.
MR. NOVAK: Then the governing body
needs to put the rationale for the adoption of that ordinance on the record.

MS. RIZZUTO: Right.
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But here that didn't exist. It doesn't exist in any of these uncertified transcripts or minutes. They found it to be consistent.

So the governing body then acted at the second adoption meeting. We don't have a transcript, but we do have the October 28 governing body minutes. Can you take a look at that, page 4 ?

Page 4 is on the top.
MS. HERLIHY: I'm sorry.
We don't have a transcript of what did you say.

MS. RIZZUTO: We don't -- we don't have a transcript of the second reading and adoption.

No, we don't.
MR. WHITAKER: We couldn't get the transcript.

MS. HERLIHY: The planning board and the transcript.

Just so I can clarify. The transcript of the September meeting, that was a transcript that you had done of a recording.

MR. WHITAKER: I had any stenographer
get a transcript of the recording of that for the Planning Board.

But my stenographer was unable to get LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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But my stenographer was unable to get
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the one for the 28 th, or whatever, the minutes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Just so you know, that
would be not be acceptable in a superior court
appeal. It has to be done by the municipal shorthand reporter, not the applicant.

MS. HERLIHY: Was the recording not
available?
Why was --
MR. WHITAKER: I don't know. I don't
know. I'd have to check.
MS. RIZZUTO: So can I just direct your
attention to page 4 where the actual ordinance is repeated, and I'm going to presume word-for-word.

Can you look at Section 5 of the ordinance where it says:
"Inconsistent ordinances repealed. All
ordinances or parts of ordinances which are
inconsistent with the provisions of this
ordinance are hereby repealed, only to the
extent of such inconsistency."
Do you recognize that language having
seen it in other ordinances?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: It's typically found in
other ordinances.
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It's called severability. No, not a
severability. It's called an inconsistency repealed?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: And that goes to what the
board attorney was saying earlier, that sometimes the ordinances don't get directly repealed, but this
provision does in fact repeal inconsistent ordinances, does it not?

MR. NOVAK: It would repeal a very direct inconsistent ordinance.

So if there's something else in the regulations that was discussing how drive-through restaurants were a permitted use in the B-3, this would in effect repeal that section.

MS. RIZZUTO: Right.
And judges struggle to figure out
what's inconsistent or not. But this board is not the appellate board, right.

So, in addition, the applicant made you read through the definition of restaurant drive-through. You see that that's in Section 1.

Section 2, let's read Section 2, and tell me if that has enough clarity. It says:
"Restaurants: Provided, however, that drive-through restaurants as defined in this
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chapter are deemed to be prohibited."
So Section 1 needs to be read with
Section 2.
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Would you agree to that?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay. Let me just -- I
think that was pretty much all I had.
Is the purpose of this ordinance to prohibit restaurants with drive-through lanes?

MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Thank you.
Nothing else.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Can I ask a
question?
Can you, for the benefit of the board, the section you were going through with the minutes, Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3, can you just read it out loud.

MS. RIZZUTO: Sure.
Of the ordinance?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: The
ordinance on final. Then the Section 1, 2, 3 and 4, everything that ties into that particular ordinance as part of these minutes.
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MS. RIZZUTO: Okay. So it's on page 4.
Section 1 is a --
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Actually,
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automobiles outside of the confines of the building and where the consumption of such food or drink is intended to occur off the premises."

Not that it's required to be off the premises. It's intended to give it to a window, that they're going to drive off with it.

Okay. Then you want me to keep reading?

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. RIZZUTO: Number 2, Section 2, this is an amendment of Section 47-71, Use Regulations. Paragraph --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thirty-four.
MS. RIZZUTO: Thirty-four -- sorry,
-7.1, Use Regulation, Paragraph A-7, Restaurants.
So they're amending a section of the ordinance, and they're saying restaurants is hereby amended to read as follows:
"Restaurants: Provided, however, that drive-through restaurants as defined in this chapter are deemed to be prohibited."

Section 3 -- that was for the B-1 Zone.
Section 3 is for the $B-3$ Zone. And it is amending 34-9.1.
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And they use the word "amended."
Permitted Uses, Paragraph H, Restaurant, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Restaurants" -permitted.
"Restaurants: Provided, however, that drive-through restaurants as defined in this chapter are deemed to be prohibited."

So they were clear, they allowed restaurants in the B-1 and in the B-3 but not if they have drive-throughs.

Severability is a standard clause that writers of ordinances like myself include all the time.

And it basically says if this goes to a court, and if a court finds that Section $Z$ is improper or unconstitutional, that doesn't affect Section A, B and C.

That's an example. That's what severability means. Cut out the bad part. Leave all of the rest of the law in place. That's what severability is.

Inconsistent ordinances repealed. I
already went over that. That's a standard clause that people who write ordinances, like borough attorneys and planning board attorneys, keep into
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their ordinances.
And then of course Section 6 is the
effective date. And I'll note for the record that
the governing body determined that it should take effect immediately. They didn't say six months from now, a year from now, whatever.

They said October 28th.
Now, are you familiar, Mr. Novak, with
the -- with the time period required for filing a prerogative writ to oppose an ordinance; do you know the time period?

MR. WHITAKER: That would be a legal question.

MS. RIZZUTO: You asked him to do a lot of legal stuff.

Is that objectionable?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: First of all, are you qualified --

MS. RIZZUTO: Do you know?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: -- to answer that?
MR. NOVAK: Can you repeat the
question?
MS. RIZZUTO: Do you know what the time
frame to appeal an adoption of an ordinance is?
After -- after the Council adopts it,
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what's the timeframe to appeal.
MR. NOVAK: Is it 20 days or 45 days?
MS. HERLIHY: It's really irrelevant to
this board and what's before this board.
MS. RIZZUTO: Right.
But I'll note for the record that there
was no appeal of this ordinance because we wouldn't be here if there was.

We would have a decision from a judge, and maybe they would have overturned it, or maybe they wouldn't have.

But it was never challenged.
And 45 days from any municipal action is the appellate requirement. It's code of superior court.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But we know that.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay, I understand.
I'm making a record.
That's all I'm doing.
MR. WHITAKER: Just so the record is
clear, I haven't used the word "inconsistent" per se with your ordinance. I just said that the ordinance lacks clarity.

And Mr. Novak agreed with me.
MS. RIZZUTO: Yes, I understand.
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## But you've also picked and

cherry-picked sections of Chapter 34 and said, this
applies and this doesn't, and this applies and this
doesn't. That's not for this board. This board has
an ordinance that prohibits -- very recently from the
Mayor and Council prohibits this use.
MR. WHITAKER: We all know that.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Are you finished with your questions for Mr. Novak?

MS. RIZZUTO: I am, for Mr. Novak.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Do you have anything?

MS. HERLIHY: No.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Jim?
MR. CAPALBO: Question.
If we understand your questioning, then, if nobody appealed any ordinance that was adopted, nobody would be allowed to come for a variance; is that what you're saying?

MS. RIZZUTO: No.
MR. CAPALBO: Well, that's the why I understood it.

MS. RIZZUTO: No.
That's not what I'm saying.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: She's saying --
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MR. CAPALBO: I don't know why she said nobody appealed it. They shouldn't be here because nobody appealed it.

MS. RIZZUTO: No. That's not what I'm saying.

MR. CAPALBO: That's what you meant.
MR. WHITAKER: My client is not the property owner.

My client wasn't aware of the ordinance.

MS. RIZZUTO: According to this, Mr. Whitaker was there.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Do you recall whether you were there?

MR. WHITAKER: I do not believe I was
there. I did not have this at the time the ordinance got passed.

MS. RIZZUTO: You didn't have Taco Bell as the client.

MR. WHITAKER: I came in in January, as
I recall.
MS. HERLIHY: I understand what probably happened. The transcript was done from a recording.

There wasn't somebody actually there at
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the meeting.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right, okay.
Anything else for Mr. Novak? I guess
since he testified, we have to open it to the public
for him to ask questions of him.
Right.
So if nobody else has any questions
from the board, can we have a motion?
MR. CAPALBO: So moved.
MR. PLACIER: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Barlow?
MR. BARLOW: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
Does anybody in the public have any
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

70 motion.

MR. PLACIER: So moved.
MR. CAPALBO: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Barlow?
MR. BARLOW: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I have a
question for our esteemed attorney.
For the minutes that were just read on Ordinance 19-21, and the way it's worded on here, and saying an ordinance to amend or replace in its
questions for Mr. Novak?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Seeing none,

Chapter 34 of the Code of the Borough of Midland Park entitled -- okay. This particular Ordinance 19-21 just amends that ordinance.

I don't have in front of me
Ordinance 08-21 to make a comparison.
But this particular ordinance -- as I'm reading this, this particular Ordinance 19-21 is not an ordinance to amend and replace.

MR. WHITAKER: Ordinance 08-21 -- I have it -- lists all the permitted uses.

And this amends the permitted uses.
And I've never said that these ordinances are inconsistent. I was just showing that there's a lack of clarity in looking at this as to what they attempted to do, and that there's ordinances here that don't really get to the finish line.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anybody else?
Have we already done your summation?
MR. WHITAKER: I didn't even start.
Sorry, I'm going to hold you up, but a couple things.
I'd like to move all the exhibits, including those transcripts. I will give you one, if they're not certified by the stenographer. They are a matter of
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record. They came from the Mayor and Council. And I've given them to the board and for everybody for the purposes of edification. We're here to try to determine what the purpose of an ordinance is. I honestly did some research that anybody on the board could also have asked for and have done. I would like to do that.

There was an -- as exhibits. That would be, I think, A-15 of my exhibits, if my list is correct, collectively.

I was asked to provide an outline. And I did that and sent it over. I'd like to make that A-16.

One of the other things that was asked when I went through all the transcripts of all the meetings -- they go back to March of this year -- is that a couple of times I saw in the transcripts there was questions of me, can you provide us with stipulations that we put on the record.

So I have gone through -- I had my
list. I went through and verified it with the transcripts. And so I have provided a list called "Stipulations." I've given that to opposing counsel. I'd like to mark that A-17. It consists from stipulations from $A$ to $L$.
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CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Ms. Rizzuto, do you
have any objection to these exhibits going into evidence?

MS. RIZZUTO: Yes.
Yes, I do. I'd just like to make a record.

The objection is that these are not properly transcribed materials because they are not signed and certified.

And they are not done by the designated required Certified Court Reporter that's required under statute when we go on appeal to the Superior Court.

For purposes of this board, this board
could take judicial notice of properly presented documents. These are not properly presented because they are not certified. They are, in fact, uncertified.

In addition, the October 28 -- I've
done this many times. This is minutes. It looks
like minutes. It reads like minutes.
But the truth is, he could have had
these certified by the borough clerk that they are
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official minutes. However -- so that's my objection.
I also think that, for the record,
because there may be an appeal from this case, I
think that the minutes -- the transcript of
September 23, 2021 should be its own exhibit.
The transcript of the Planning Board of 10-18-2021 should be its own exhibit.

And the minutes of the governing body from October 28, 2021 should be its own exhibit. The applicant asked for that to be all marked together. I'm sorry, I don't know what the number was.

MR. WHITAKER: So for the first time in my life, I'm not going to disagree.

A-15 will be the first one.
A-16 will be the second.
A-17 will be the third.
The outline will be A-18.
Just moving up the numbers.
And the stipulations will be A-19.
(Whereupon, Transcript Dated
September 23, 2021 is marked as Exhibit A-15, for identification.)
(Whereupon, Transcript Dated October 18, 2021 is marked as Exhibit A-16 for identification.)
(Whereupon, Minutes of Mayor and Council Dated October 28, 2021 are marked as Exhibit A-17 for identification.)
(Whereupon, Outline is marked as Exhibit A-18 for identification.)
(Whereupon, Stipulations are marked as Exhibit A-19 for identification.)

MS. RIZZUTO: Okay. And there is also
correspondence from Mr. Whitaker sending these things to the board dated October 3, 2023.

I'm just making that part of the record.

Now, just briefly, Your Honor.
MR. WHITAKER: Your Honor?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your Honor?
Thank you.
MS. RIZZUTO: Oh, sorry.
MS. HERLIHY: Mr. Whitaker, any
objection to -- should the board vote in favor of the application, should the board approve this
application tonight, or at some other point in time,
but should there be an approval, that it be
conditioned upon you providing properly certified transcripts of both of these meetings as well as certified minutes so that the certified transcripts
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and minutes could be compared to what was submitted as exhibits?

MR. WHITAKER: No objection.
MS. HERLIHY: As long as they are the same.

MS. RIZZUTO: While I appreciate the assistance suggested by the board attorney, what you have before you is what I stated.

And I believe that you can give it what -- excuse me -- whatever weight you want to give it, uncertified, uncertified by the -- by the reporter and uncertified by the clerk.

And, yes, you can ask for something later. But if there's an appeal, you're just messing up the record at this point by asking for something after a decision is made. I understand.

I just do not think that that is the proper procedure for what should be a final vote that should be published in the newspaper within ten days, et cetera.

Also, you're not giving me an
opportunity to state any objection I might have to what he does.

So at this point --
MS. HERLIHY: I'm not sure what you
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mean by not giving you the opportunity -- hold on --
to state an objection.
And I did not make that request of
Mr. Whitaker for your benefit or for your client's
benefit. It was done for the benefit of the board.
The board, I believe, may want to take
notice of what he submitted, what's in those
transcripts, and vote accordingly.
And if they rely upon that, then I'm just going to assure that are relying upon something that's --

MS. RIZZUTO: But you can't.
MS. HERLIHY: I can. I can do that. I
just did.
MS. RIZZUTO: No, no, no.
But you can't change tonight what is before the board that they can rely upon.

But listen, I only --
MS. HERLIHY: It's a condition of approval.

MS. RIZZUTO: I'm only stating for the record. And I don't need to belabor the point.

MR. WHITAKER: The Rules of Evidence, we all recognize, are somewhat relaxed under the Municipal Land Use Law.
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MS. RIZZUTO: Right, of course.
And so I just want to move on to the other two things.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But before you do that, I just want to make sure you didn't miss something.

When Ms. Herlihy made that condition, she specifically said that when they come back certified or whatever, they are the same as what was presented tonight.

MS. RIZZUTO: But they can't be the same if they're certified, right.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Why can't they?
MR. WHITAKER: They just have to be signed at the bottom.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Why can't they?
MS. RIZZUTO: It's okay. I don't need to belabor the point, really. Your Honor. Your Honor. I'm really sorry.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All rise.
I'm usually on the other side when I do boards and down here when I do court, so anyway.

Mr. Whitaker rested his case -- I don't
know -- several meetings ago. Not even last meeting
but the meeting before he rested. He's now
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presenting new things, which is beyond what is normally done.

And he is presenting an outline for the zoning application.

Now, I read the transcript of the last
meeting. I wasn't here. And someone requested --
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I did.
MS. RIZZUTO: Yeah.
What is the list of -- you asked what is the list of variances we're voting on. And we got this. We got this.

And I object that it's expanding a record on a case that he rested on the meeting before. That's all I have to say about that.

And I don't know if it's accurate either because I haven't looked. I got it tonight.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, we asked him for that. He got that for us as a favor for us.

MR. WHITAKER: I sent that to the counsel that was here last time. I did not realize that he didn't share it with her.

So I object to the concept that I
didn't give it to her until tonight.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I
specifically asked for that because this meeting has
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gone on for a long time.

I wanted to make sure everything is documented.

MR. WHITAKER: And the word you used was "outline."
presenting new things.
And the board has to look at the record in its entirety, not just what the applicant decides to give you.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Absolutely.
MS. RIZZUTO: Anyway, and with respect to the last exhibit, I think, which is stipulations, Mr. Whitaker and I talked about this beforehand, he indicated that he went through the transcripts and gathered these from the transcripts.

He did not put the references for the transcripts, like what page and what date they were made. Neither here nor there.

My objection is, I caution that it be accurate and that something isn't missing from what the board might want to impose as a condition should you approve.
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But she said he introduced new
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first witness was Evers Santana, who testified that he worked in the restaurant industry for over 30 years and with the applicant's restaurant group, and is responsible for real estate development and construction.

If you recall, he testified that he is involved with the QSRs specifically for over 25 years.

If you recall, he actually worked for
Friendly's in Midland Park many years ago and actually trained at Roy Rogers before it and became a manager.

Now, he's done everything from
development through construction and operations. And he's operated multiple locations for many years. Why is that important?

Because he basically is an expert in
the field of QSR operations, because he was able to explain all of the aspects of a QSR, specifically a Taco Bell operation.

He testified that the site will accommodate Taco Bell's needs. He testified that the demographics in Midland Park with the surrounding area show that a Taco Bell would be a successful franchise at this location. He testified that they

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
information. That was all based on testimony of the planner. He didn't introduce it. He questioned the planner.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We know. MR. CAPALBO: We should be aware of that.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
Anything else?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No?
Okay, Mr. Whitaker?
MR. WHITAKER: Thank you for your time.
And I would ask that you indulge me, because we've been working on this since March, and there's a lot of information that's been provided to you. If you don't mind, I'm going to sit as I give the summation and not walk around the room.

But there's a lot that we have to review. And this is the type of case, and important enough, and the considerations and the decisions you have to make are that important that I am going to walk you through what we presented, and then I want to explain to you our position from a planning perspective and from a legal perspective.

When we go back, you'll know that our
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would operate seven days a week, 8 a.m. to midnight.
And he testified that there are three shifts that overlap, that they have a maximum of eight employees, but they're not all there at the same time, they don't come all at the same time, they don't leave all at the same time.

He testified, and we stipulated, that there are two deliveries per week, and the timing of them are controlled by the owner. And he stipulated that the distributor would be coming to this location between $5 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and $7 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. He testified, if you recall, and it's important to know, that there's a lock box there. They have a key. They enter the facility. They drop off the merchandise. And the driver does it all. There's no employee there at that time. And that a typical delivery lasts about 45 minutes to an hour.

Remember, there's nothing in the ordinance that regards the prohibition as to when deliveries can be made; however, the applicant provided a stipulation to allay the concerns that were raised by board members during the course of the hearing.

Mr. Santana testified to something that was very important, something that was not news to us
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but something that was very important in understanding the drive-through QSR concept. And that he said for a freestanding QSR, a franchise only approves of it if it has a drive-through. You heard that testimony a number of times. You heard it also from Mr. Dean. Why? Because, as he testified, 70 to 75 percent of the business post-pandemic, where people don't want to come face-to-face with a crew member, where people have gotten used to not having to get out of their car to get food, customers' habits have changed. So that 75 percent business aspect is for a drive-through.

So effectively when you have an ordinance that says no drive-through, and recognizing that the QSR basically requires a drive-through to have these type of franchises in a community, that ordinance effectively says that the QSR doesn't exist in this town. And that's an important aspect for you to think about, because I think we all expect or have an expectation in today's world that a business like that belongs in a community.

In addition, he talked about the walk-in traffic. He talked about how they accommodate DoorDash and the GrubHub operations in specific areas for pickup. He established through

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
all of that testimony that the drive-through is essential for the viability of a QSR.

He testified about the logistics of this. He testified, and it was confirmed later by Mr. Dean, and even you own traffic consultant, that perhaps as many of 7 to 8 would be the maximum that would ever be queued in this 153-foot queuing lane that we have that will accommodate 11 cars.

He testified that Taco Bell is very different from other franchises in how the product is served because it's not cooked per se. It's already prepared. It's warmed. And then in a typical, if you recall, transaction, it can run between a minute to 2.5 minutes, and you're in and out.

He talked about the uniqueness of this franchise. And he talked in terms of the ordinance that you have will more than accommodate this site. Remember, this is a site that has a drive-through. It's not something that's new to this site. There was a drive-through there first before this applicant knocked on your door.

Yes, it was a franchise -- a
drive-through for a bank. And we acknowledged, and we had the testimony provided to you, acknowledging that the drive-through restaurant use will be

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
different than a drive-through bank. But at the same time, we acknowledged and showed you that this particular site -- and you'll hear this word -- I'm sorry -- a few times -- is particularly suited for the use.

He testified that there's sufficient parking for the customers that actually come into the facility. He stipulated, because this is what they do, employees would park farther away and would not be right next to the site, like any type of business, so that the customers are there to be accommodated first.

He had uncontroverted testimony that 11-car stacking is more -- this is his words -- more than ample for his business at this location.

And at this point, you also may recall
-- it was a long time ago -- he testified that they had two other locations, buildings similar to this, and they have looked at those facilities, and it's never queued up to be 11 . It was typically at 8 .

What's important for you to understand is that this person, knowing the operational aspects, is a designer, not on his own, but did the design with the engineer. And that was testified to. So there was an operational experience when this plan
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was put together.
From there, you heard the testimony of Andrew Missey. You know Mr. Missey. He's a very well experienced civil engineer. He's been doing this in Bergen County for over 35 years. He does a lot of planning and development work and many projects in this municipality and others with Lapatka \& Associates.

What did he testify to? That the current Columbia Bank, which is nonconforming, would be removed. It would be eliminating some of those nonconformities. That the site has a unique feature, and that its driveways exit on Erie and Rea and return you to Godwin.

So there's no driving through
residential areas by this proposed tenant as well as the other tenants in this commercial area.

And he said that they were going to be increasing the greenery over what's there now by some 1,500 square feet.

He testified as to the design of the drive-through, would be from an engineering aspect adequate.

And said -- and uncontroverted -- it meets all the requirements of your ordinance. Even
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civil engineer, but his expertise is traffic consultant and traffic engineering.

He testified that this is basically the replacement of one drive-through use with a different drive-through use. He acknowledged that QSRs will generate more traffic, but he testified that it will not have a traffic impact on the roadways themselves.

He recognized that a restaurant use is a permitted use in the zone. So a restaurant use being permitted there -- we don't know what the purpose of the prohibition on a drive-through was, but we certainly never heard or saw anything from the Mayor and Council that said we want to eliminate the drive-through use to eliminate traffic on the roadways.

He provided a report that provides industry standard trip generation rates, how much this use would generate. And he stated that basically this use will have a de minimis effect on the overall traffic in the area. It was his opinion that the impact would be small. And he used the words "fairly innocuous."

And the roadway system, therefore, is not being affected by the drive-through use.

He confirmed that the standards for a
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Parking requirements, we're proposing 170 spaces for the whole center, and only 167 are needed.

The electric is going to now be put underground, so you will not have the ugly telephone poles and lines servicing this building.

The landscaping will be developed by increasing the screening of the drive-through with the yew hedge. The screening on the northeast corner will have arborvitae. You're going to have holly junipers.

And he also testified that he would be putting in that fence to eliminate the concern that your engineer had about what -- he used the word "blinding" of headlights coming around on the -- on the drive-through.

The parking setbacks are going to be improved. And there will be plantings at the height that will eliminate lights from the headlights. And we have a stipulation for that that it would be subject to the borough engineer's approval.

Then the next witness, who was here
twice, Gary Dean, a very well-recognized
transportation engineer. He's been doing this work, as he testified, since 1988. And he is not only a
fast food restaurant, a minimum of eight stacking in a queue; we have 11 , perhaps 12 . He testified that based upon the ITE standards, he found that the Mexican-themed QSRs need less stacking because the menu is limited.

If you remember he testified, as well as the operational gentleman, that cooking per se is not involved, and it's only warming of precooked foods.

So service is quicker than the other types of facilities that you might used to and seen in cooking the hamburger or the chicken.

He distinguished the applicant's use from Wendy's because of that, where at that point, they would need more queueing because there's more time to get from a reader board to the window.

He testified that the most significant enhancement in terms of the overall safety eliminating the curb cut on Godwin Avenue. I've said it before. I have to say it again. Your engineer concurred and suggested that we do that. And we did. That, from a planning aspect, is a positive element. He submitted a report that substantiated his testimony.

Then you heard from your own traffic
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expert. I've been doing this for a number of years. And many times I've listened to two traffic experts. And the one thing that they can agree on is that they disagree. That didn't happen here.

Your traffic expert stated that he can't imagine anything that would be generated that would make an accident history here. He checked the accident history. He did more than we did. We didn't check that. He said there's no accident history here. He agreed with Mr. Dean that the elimination of the drive-through on Godwin Avenue is "a positive aspect" because it reduces the number of conflict points.

He thinks, and he said, "I certainly think that the application should be supported from a traffic standpoint."

He concurred with Mr. Dean pertaining
to the pass-by traffic. And, in addition, he went beyond what Mr. Dean did. He looked at the ITE Manual. He looked at the NJ DOT numbers. And then he also found, because he did a lot of research -- he also found a periodical on a QSR report that confirmed that a Mexican-style restaurant needs a queuing of approximately seven.

And I don't have to read it into the
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record, but you have it.
Both his report and Mr. Dean's report comes to the same conclusion. And that is that this drive-through has no potential negative impact on Godwin Avenue or the adjacent properties, and that the site can accommodate the use. It's in his report of June the 9th. It's in Mr. Dean's of June the 1st. They both agree.

We had some brief testimony from the architect, Mr. Liepins. He is an architect that is familiar and does the Taco Bell facilities. He prepared the plans for the location and he described them to you. I don't need to go into any detail.

This is not a new aspect. This is a prototype. This building works well for the use that is intended.

He testified that all the signage is compliant -- and we had an agreement with your professionals that it is -- except for one.

And that the sign that faces the drive-through. And that's because it's not on a -facing a municipal parking lot, a public parking lot or a roadway.

But he testified that the applicant thought it was good for traffic and motorists from a
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safety aspect to be able to see a sign as they come down the road.

But I will tell you that if you
disagree because we need a variance for that, that at the end of the day, that would not be a reason to deny the application. If you I believe that that sign is not warranted or necessary, then the sign goes away.

The lighting, he testified to, as well as Mr. Missey, will be code compliant.

So then we got to the crux of matter from a planning standpoint when we talk about the ordinance, we talk about this particular property, and we talk about the planning aspects. Matthew Seckler, our planner. Been practicing for over 15 years. Been before more than 70 board. Serves as a municipal planner as well as a planner for applicants.

And he testified and confirmed that the site 3.55 acres. It is 15 times more than a tract of land is necessary for in $B-3$. And here's the important part if you look at A-14 in your exhibits. This property is the third largest out of 109.

He testified and confirmed that restaurants are a permitted use, and QSRs are a
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permitted use. It's solely the drive-through aspect that requires the $D$ variance. And we know that.

And then he walked you through the Medici standards. And I'm not going to belabor the Medici standards right now tonight because you've heard about it, we've talked about it, and we've talked about the particularly suited aspect under Medici.

With that, he took you through that colored zoning map. He took you through all of the planning aspects that he testified to. And then he did a comparison. Because if you have in your mind that the town wanted to eliminate drive-throughs because of a traffic concern, because of stacking of cars on roadways or whatever, both Mr. Missey, both Mr. Seckler and Mr. Dean, as well as your engineer for traffic consultant here showed and confirmed that we don't have that problem here because additional traffic beyond what we think would ever be in the queue is internal. And what do I mean by that? It stays on the property.

And he opined at this point that perhaps the town had a concern about a drive-through on one of the 109 lots in the B-1 and B-3 Zones that is small enough that it would be overburdened.
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But maybe what the Mayor and Council could have done -- and I'm not criticizing -- is maybe they could have distinguished and said, well, if it's a piece of property over 2-and-a-half acres, then it would be permitted if it meets all the other requirements for queuing and ingress and egress, et cetera. If they had done something like that, there's probably three properties in the 109 where it would work. And it would be able to provide a QSR with a drive-through. Because otherwise there's no QSRs in Midland Park because the drive-through is an integral part of being a QSR.

He testified -- and Mr. Novak went
through these already. He testified that it does meet certain requirements under the municipal -under your Master Plan. So let's walk back.

He showed you the first positive criteria in showing -- and he confirmed what we've already gone through ad nauseam, all of the reasons why this property is particularly suited for the use. And he then went and he testified to a number of the goals in the Master Plan that are being enhanced or being met, recognizing the Master Plan never said you can't have drive-throughs in Midland Park. No, there's not even anything in that Master Plan that
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comes close to that.
And he was able to pick out goals in your Master Plan, including revitalization of a building that's vacant, a bank building. And we know they're tearing them down or leaving them vacant because they are anachronistic at this point. And he showed that it was viable for the business corridor on Godwin.

And I submit to you that in everything that we've done here, we haven't seen or heard the negatives from the Master Plan. We can't pick anything out of the Master Plan that says, oh, the Master Plan says this shouldn't happen because. Because, ladies and gentlemen, it's not there. It truly is not there.

So he testified that the goals are being complied with, but they are also being enhanced. So he testified and was able to prove the positive criteria. He proved the negative criteria.

He then opined also about the signage.
And he talked and said that he thought from a planning perspective the one sign that we need to seek a variance for, not because of size but because of location, was appropriate and met the C(1) -excuse me -- the $C(2)$ criteria. It was a substantial
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safety benefit and would outweigh any detriment.
But, again, if you didn't agree with
that, that request for variance relief would be withdrawn.

I'll very briefly go over the testimony that was provided to you from the objector's planner, the person that didn't come to all the meetings and wasn't quite sure what meetings she came to, who started out by talking about the sign on the side of the building over the drive-through. That was the first thing that was objectionable.

As I just stated, if the board agrees with her, so be it, it's gone.

But in connection with her testimony pertaining to the use variance itself, with all due respect, I believe it was at best weak. I think one of the best examples of how unsubstantiated her testimony was, that at the beginning of the evening she believed the testimony that Taco Bell made was that they would be open 24 hours, seven days a week. I objected to that and said that's not the case. The Chairman said the same thing. Then I asked the next question: Were you even here? She wasn't sure and then she said no.

She had the chance to go back and look
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at transcripts. She had the chance to get a recording of this and listen to it. She didn't do her homework.

On the basis of that, I think it was very evident why she was here. Because I also asked her if she ever talked -- because the objector is another property owner in Midland Park. So did you talk to that objector and understand what your client's concerns were in connection with this application? And the answer was no. She only talked to the law firm.

And I think we can all see through the objections that were made there, that they were really not planning objections. They were the objections pertaining to trying to get this denied because of competition. That's that sum and substance of what we have from that planner. And I think without going -- belaboring it and going through all the various things that she couldn't say or do, I think we all recognized I asked a series of questions that she basically refused to answer because she didn't have the right answer for it.

She was basically given a job to come out and throw what she could from a planning perspective against the wall and see what would
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stick. I would say none of it really stuck.
I think from the standpoint from
Mr. Seckler, who gave much more extensive testimony about the positive and negative criteria, that at the end of the day, his planning testimony supports the applicant's request.

So now, with that as a synapsis of the overview of this application that started in March, I want to walk you through what you're here to make a determination on. I maybe gave some of it away already when we had this further back-and-forth with Mr. Novak earlier.

But what I've stated is that we have stipulated to certain conditions. We have all the engineers basically agreeing that this site can work. We've had planners give you sufficient reasons to support the positive and negative criteria of the application. And beyond that, we've had even your own professionals concur. We said we can meet all the conditions your borough engineer provided.

We haven't heard -- not that it's his place -- any objections from your planner saying this violates this, this and this in the Master Plan, because it doesn't. And of course your traffic engineer went beyond what our traffic engineer said
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in supporting this application.
I know that as board members you have a very hard task in being able to look at all this testimony, evaluate the testimony, the exhibits, and then at that point take that litmus test that's in Section D of the Municipal Land Use Law, in N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70, and you have to look at that and you have to look at whether this site is particularly suited. I've given you all the reasons why, and so did our professional.

And to look at the negative criteria at
the same time and see that we've met our burden of proof.

And I'm going to go back just to dwell for a moment again. When you do that analysis from a planning perspective, you have to put into your head, why do I -- what is it in this ordinance of prohibiting it, what is it that I'm going to latch on to a deny for to say, oh, we can't do this because? It is contrary to the purpose of the ordinance.

And I'm going to take you past the purpose of the ordinance being, thou shall not have a drive-through restaurant in Midland Park. I think what you have to look at -- and I know what you have to look at -- is when you don't have a purpose in the

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
ordinance, you've got to look and say, okay, it's prohibited. But did they ever take into contemplation a piece of property that's 3-and-a-half acres, that's six times the size of Wendy's, six times the size of Dunkin' Donuts, six times the size of Starbucks?

Was that ever thought of when they went to introduce an ordinance, when they sent it to the planning board, who had the right to say to their planner, hey, take a look at this; do you think we should just make it a carte blanche, or should we just say one line, prohibited, and maybe get a report back from the planner that says hey, you can tweak this and do that? It didn't happen. And I'm not criticizing anybody. It didn't happen. But I think that has to go into your thought decision-making process deliberation, if you will, in looking at this and saying, we've got a site that's particularly suited for it.

I think when you look and go through all of the aspects of what we were able to show you here, that we meet our burden of proof. This doesn't open the door for every other property owner in the B-1 and the B-3 to say, oh, my turn. I know that was a concern that was raised here. But we all know that
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piece of property is judged on its own merit And you're looking here at maybe three pieces of property that would be large enough to accommodate a drive-through. I don't know because you haven't seen it. But that's not how you look at it either. You look at this site. And if you say to yourself, you know, the Mayor and Council really thought this was going to be something that has to be prohibited everywhere because they didn't want to fill up the street with cars out of a queue, well, if that's what you think is going on here, it's not happening here. You've heard all the testimony.

Any additional traffic beyond the queuing where we have 11 cars we can queue, we need it only for 7. Let's just say it happens. It's a special day for Mexican food. Those cars are internal on this site. Why? Because it's 3-and-a-half acres. It's not a half-acre. It's not out in one of your streets.

You heard some borough residents that that came in here. And I think it was nice they came. It was encouraging to hear them say, hey, why can't we have this in the town. I know they didn't meet the standards of the Municipal Land Use Law.

But I think they paint a picture of
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saying, why is it that an objector can tell us what we can and not have in the town?

Again, I think what they came and looked at and saw is that from a practical standpoint, this application as proposed works.

The planner testified that it's unique.
The planner testified it's viable. The traffic engineer testified it's viable. Our engineer testified it's viable.

And on the basis of that, you've heard all the goals of the Master Plan that are being met. There's nothing here that said there's goals that have not been met. And that's what we really had to look at for the negative criteria.

I think I've given you many reasons why. You only need one to approve an application like this. Each case is decided on its own merits. And I believe in this instance we've been able to provide you with all of the foundation basis requirements for the positive criteria and the negative criteria. And on the basis of that, I would respectfully request that you approve this application.

And I thank you most sincerely for all the time you spent on it, including putting up with
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me tonight.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Ms. Rizzuto, did you have any final comments?

MS. RIZZUTO: Just a few -- just
briefly, Members of the board and Mr. Chair, thank you for having the objector -- allowing the objector to be present and to state our positions on the record, et cetera. We appreciate the opportunity to have worked with the board.

I just would like to remind the board that with respect to the particular suitability, this site is not particularly suited to a drive-through for a QSR, merely because it has a singular drive-through lane. The site is overcrowded. There is no parking on that site. The people -- the parking for people who want to go inside is across a double lane main aisle in the back of the whole mall site. There is no parking around the restaurant itself. So people have to cross that main aisle. The one handicap space is crowded into an area that is also dangerous. These were all raised during the course of the hearing, so I won't belabor them.

But there is -- there is something to be said for there is only one lane. You can't -- you
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can't even get out of the lane because they don't provide the second bypass lane, which almost every QSR that I've ever seen has that second bypass lane. This was a bank site, a totally different use than what the QSR that is provided with Taco Bell is proposed for.

The applicant's counsel raised Mr. Dean and indicated how several of the other witnesses complemented his testimony. I'll just ask you to take judicial notice of an Appellate Division decision A1563-20, Raritan Partners, LLC vs. Raritan Township Zoning Board in which Mr. Dean's testimony was found to be incredible by the board and backed up by an Appellate Division decision that supported the board in rejecting his testimony because it was not supported by evidence.

So he's got a tarnished reputation that maybe this board isn't aware of.

MR. WHITAKER: I'm going to object to
that. One decision in the many that he's been involved with over the last 15 years --

MS. RIZZUTO: I understand.
MR. WHITAKER: -- doesn't mean that he has a tarnished reputation.

That's insulting.
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is only two years old. And you have to take -- you
have to take into consideration and give weight to the governing body knows what sites it has. The
sites within, but this site existed exactly as it was. If they wanted to exempt this site, they could have. If they wanted a drive-through, they could have, there. They didn't. They wanted no drive-throughs in B-1 and B-3. And that's what this property is. It's one of those zones. I apologize.

In any event, so I urge you to stick with the ordinance. Your planner told you, you should be paying attention to your code and your Master Plan over the granting of a variance if in fact this is a prohibited use and they have not made their proofs as to particular suitability or any of the other elements.

I think that you have plenty to show you that the $\mathrm{D}(1)$ variance, the hardest variance that you can get under the Municipal Land Use Law, is even harder because of the youthfulness of this ordinance. It just happened. By the time they came here, it was only six months old. It's approximately two -- two years old now, or whatever it is. And they didn't -they haven't gone and repealed it. And they haven't LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
transcripts.
MR. WHITAKER: We all agreed that the ordinance does not require a bypass lane.

We all recognized that the bank didn't
have a bypass lane. It was passed by the Planning
Board when that was built for Atlantic Stewardship -or Columbia, I believe, some time ago.

In connection with my approach as to
purpose, I stand by that. I believe that it's necessary that you understand in any ordinance what's the reason for it.

But putting aside for a moment and disagree with me on that and look at the same application and say, okay, it's prohibited, that doesn't mean we can't grant a variance. That's been said and agreed.

So let's just look at all the reasons why this site works. And let's forget for the moment, if you will -- I'm not putting aside my argument, but just as an alternative, let's look and say this site works. There's no prohibition to it in the Master Plan. It's particularly suited. And make that finding without alluding to the purpose. That's your alternative here. I think either way the concept is that this is a site that can accommodate
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done anything to change it. And I think they think that there's plenty of QSRs already in town along Godwin Road. And I don't foresee them changing this anytime in the future.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, I think that's
truly speculative. Let the record reflect that.
MS. RIZZUTO: Okay, that's speculative.
But the point is, they just did it.
There's no reason for them to make any changes. And there's no appeal of their -- it's too late for them to appeal.

And for the applicant to say that you can just grant this variance because there's no purpose stated, it's a trick. That's a trick. There doesn't -- there isn't a requirement for a purpose.
And I think you, Mr. Chair, said it -- said it
perfectly. The purpose is to prohibit drive-throughs with a restaurant use in B-1 and B-3. That's what the purpose is.

Thank you.
MR. WHITAKER: So just rebuttal very quickly.

I know my adversary wasn't at all the meetings.

MS. RIZZUTO: But I read the
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what the applicant is proposing.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Before we discuss
this, since you have two different voting
requirements, I assume we would vote first on the use and then --

MR. WHITAKER: It's a D variance.
First -- then you would go to the C variance
certainly. Bifurcated first, yes, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Just so everyone
understands what we're going to do is, because we need five affirmative votes on the use variance, first we'll consider the use variance. If the use variance is approved, then we will vote again on the $C$ variances, the front yard and the buffering and whatever.

If the $D$ variance is not approved, then we don't have to go to the $C$ variance, right?

MS. HERLIHY: Correct.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
Is there anything before we discuss
this that we need to know to not get in trouble?
I'm assuming there's a good chance that we decide this may end up on appeal in court, but I want to make sure we...
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MS. HERLIHY: The only thing I want to add --

MR. CAPALBO: Open to public at all, or no.

MS. HERLIHY: No. MR. CAPALBO: We're done.
MS. HERLIHY: I'm not going to
reiterate this requirements, or the proofs, or the statutes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you. MS. HERLIHY: Because I think it's been covered in great detail and very well this evening by everyone.

The only thing I wanted to add for the
board -- the board to think about is that they are asking for a use variance tonight.

So you are well within your power to impose reasonable conditions. I did not sit through all of the meetings.

I did read all of the transcripts probably one-and-a-half times. And I know -- saw all the questions and the concerns of the board during the course of the hearings. And I know that on a number of occasions Mr. Whitaker, you know, stipulated that his client would comply with the
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ordinance or comply with the prior CVS approval. And that's great because they have to do that. They have to comply with ordinance and they have to comply with the prior CVS approval.

But if you are -- if you're considering the application and you are considering approving the application and you're concerned about some of the things that were discussed, you can, like I said, impose reasonable -- we have to be reasonable -reasonable conditions to address a concern that you might have that might be swaying you one way or the other.

So I didn't see that discussed before. I didn't see that raised or mentioned. And I just want everyone to know that if it does make a difference to you and -- you know, an example -- I'm not saying this is what came up -- but hours of operation.

If the ordinance says that for a
drive-through it can be until midnight, and the applicant has stipulated they'll comply with the ordinance -- they have to comply with the ordinance -- if you saw to condition an approval on closing at 11 o'clock, you could do that. I'm not saying you should. I just wanted you to know that again, if you
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have something that's of concern to you, you may be able to rectify or get over or get past it or satisfy yourself by some sort of a reasonable condition.

I just want you to keep that in mind as you're talking about and thinking about it.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, I've had a lot to say so I'd like to hear from other -- other people.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I just have a question, though, of Mr. Whitaker.

In your summation, I believe you indicated the bank did not have a bypass lane. I believe there was two lanes in that bank.

MR. WHITAKER: No.
You could go out onto Godwin.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I believe there was two lanes. They also had the existing structure.

MR. WHITAKER: Perhaps I misspoke. But your ordinance does not require it. You've got -you've got an ordinance that tells you what has to be.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I just
wanted to -- for the record.
MR. WHITAKER: Understood.
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MS. HERLIHY: Was one a bypass lane, or were they both --

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Well, no. There's two lanes at the bank.

MS. HERLIHY: Right.
And you could get service -- maybe one was like one of the tubes or something.

MR. WHITAKER: Yeah.
But if one is in front of both of them, you couldn't get bypass.

MS. HERLIHY: Right.
I was going to say, a bypass lane is a dedicated lane that you do not have service.

But if you're -- if you're on line, at any given point while you're on line, you can change your mind, you could decide you have an emergency, and you could get out of the lane, as opposed to just a two-lane drive-through. You could still be stuck behind someone and not have to the ability to stay.

MR. WHITAKER: And the law is clear that if you don't have a standard that requires a bypass, you would have a problem saying, well, you don't have a bypass and constitute a denial.

MR. NOVAK: And the outside lane was a pneumatic tube.
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MR. WHITAKER: Yeah. MS. HERLIHY: Was it?
MR. NOVAK: Yes.
MS. HERLIHY: That might be accurate.
I just qualify that by saying when you're requesting a use variance --

MR. WHITAKER: Understood.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I just
wanted to make a point there was two lanes.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So do you want to
go around, or does somebody want to volunteer
thoughts or opinions? Somebody other than me
hopefully.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: I have a lot of thoughts and opinions. You heard some of them during this thing. Mr. Whitaker did an excellent job with his testimony and representing his client with this application.

And while the site may be well-suited for this, and given the testimony, I'm still going by that the Mayor and Council specifically passed an ordinance to prohibit this type of business. And it
was only two years ago. I can see if it was
something that's been in the books for years or decades. Times have changed and there's also
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that decision based on facts and information. Look, it works. Sometimes it doesn't work.

You know, I think it would work in this particular form. That's just my opinion. I think it would work. I've been there. I live right down the block from there. I've seen the size. I know I see the traffic at Wendy's. This is going to be much better than Wendy's. It goes into the street.

So, I mean, that's just me. That's just how I feel about it.

## CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anybody else?

MR. CAPALBO: I agree with Rich. And I think Starbucks was the rush to judgment for making this ordinance.

That's my personal opinion. I don't have anything factual. But I think the conditions that prevailed because of the approval of Starbucks, which really didn't have to come to the Zoning Board, correct? So I think that was a rush to judgment, and let's stop drive-ins because of the condition of Starbucks.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, actually, it was after Starbucks was Dunkin' Donuts came here. And then we decided -- they came here for a use variance because the zoning ordinance -- because the
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zoning officer, and I assume the Mayor and Council thought the same thing, that you needed a use variance to do a drive-in.

So we decided no, you don't. The ordinance is clear, you don't need a use variance. It went to the Planning Board, which of course has the Mayor and a councilman on it. And almost immediately after that, after it went to the Planning Board, there is a new ordinance that --

MR. CAPALBO: My first -- my biggest concern was the queueing. And I think Mr. Whitaker and his people have addressed that. I think with 11 or 12 cars, I think it's doable.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: For myself, I mean, I really have no problem with a Taco Bell there.

I agree, I think it would work fine. But it may even be a better location than some of the others. But like Nick said, I just -- I can't get past the fact that the Mayor and Council specifically prohibited this two years ago. And the fact that the site works for it, to me it doesn't -- it just doesn't come up to the level of that necessary for special reasons.

And also, it's a case where it's specifically prohibited. As when I was talking to
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David, it's not that it's an use that they didn't anticipate. And as Rich was saying, or one of them, that times change and there's a new type of use that the ordinance didn't -- didn't anticipate. They certainly anticipated it. It was in direct response to Dunkin' Donuts. We're not going to have any more -- and, I mean, I'm not saying it's a good thing, or that I agree with the ordinance or whatever. But from my point of view, that's not for me to decide as a member of this board.

As a resident of Midland Park, I don't see any problem with a Taco Bell there. I mean, I don't see a problem. But as a member of this board, I just can't get past the fact that the Mayor and Council has specifically prohibited it.

So anyone else for or against? Go
ahead.
Well, Dave or David?
MR. BARLOW: David.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No. I thought -I'm just --

MR. BARLOW: He's Dave.
I'm David.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I know that. Which one of you is going to talk? LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MR. BARLOW: Should I defer to my eldest?

MS. HERLIHY: Who decided that they should sit next to each other?

That's the problem.
MR. BARLOW: This is what I would say,
all right, both attorneys did very well. All right.
But Mr. Whitaker's point of view, all
right, as far as the positive criteria, all right --
all right, the world has changed right now. All right. He to me has proven his point. We have a lot of kids in Midland Park. Everyone likes Taco Bell. It's not like we're having a Chick-Fil-A here. All right. Because you can get chicken at Wendy's. You can also get chicken at Burger King. All right.

So I think it's a good idea. And I
think with the stipulations, they have met
everything. And especially with the construction materials, it has been removed, been completed.

So, you know, for me, I'm just looking
here. It says has been completed.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Let me ask Dave
because he's our monitor.
MR. BARLOW: Well, he could be. He's in the construction business. All right. So that's
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just my opinion.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Go ahead, Dave.
MR. ZUIDEMA: Well, I just wanted to
address the board attorney, is that it keeps being referred to as 3 -and-a-half acres. And obviously this is one corner of it.

But they always go back to 3-and-a-half acres, 3-and-a-half acres.

MS. HERLIHY: I think that the site is 3-and-a-half acres.

MR. ZUIDEMA: I get it.
So my question is that, I would -- my
vote would be predicated a bit that we have a
building on those 3-and-a-half acres that has a
plastic sheet in front of it for the last three years unfinished on the 3-and-a-half acres.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: He's talking about

MS. HERLIHY: Yeah, no, understood.
MR. ZUIDEMA: There's rodents in there.
And there's construction vehicles there. There's
construction materials in the back.
My vote would be -- could go either
way. But I don't think I would vote for this because of the disrepair of the -- of the site. Because
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we're -- Mr. Whitaker, and rightfully so, we're going to 3-and-a-half acres. I think it could accommodate it because they're including all of, you know, right over to Erie Ave.

But I don't think going Ridgewood Heights or Midland Park Heights, how many more years do we go by this? We have Dunkin' Donuts empty. We have the dry cleaners that are empty. We have potentially another store that's empty there. And there hasn't -- nothing has been done.

So if somebody were to say to me -now, I don't know -- that's why I have to ask you. If somebody were to say to me --

MS. HERLIHY: Yeah, I know where you're going.

MR. ZUIDEMA: -- yes, this will be -- I don't think we can. So my vote would probably go not bigger.

MS. HERLIHY: So to the extent that anything that's happening on the site is a violation or is contrary to a prior approval, you can condition any further -- so it's one site. So this approval affects it. You can condition this approval on this property on any open or outstanding violations or issues being taken care of.
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## that.
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So, again, I don't know if -- I hear
what -- listen, I live here too so I know what you're saying. I don't know if they are again in violation of a permit or if they're just failing to do -- I don't know what the issues are.

But you can condition an approval on the property owner correcting any outstanding -- any outstanding issues or violations.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Whitaker has already agreed that they're going to stipulate that they're not going to --

MS. HERLIHY: Right.
And cleaning up -- again, cleaning up the property.

Anything that they're required to do
that they're not in compliance with, you can
condition that on that. You can condition a CO. You can condition a building permit. You can say that you will not -- that the town will not sign a site plan, enter into a developer's agreement and allow them to get started with construction, let alone get to construction and not get a CO. They can't put a shovel in the ground until this is taken care of.

MR. WHITAKER: I have no trouble with

MS. HERLIHY: Yeah.
With respect, you know, stores being
empty --
MR. ZUIDEMA: No, I get it.
MS. HERLIHY: Yeah. If anything, you
know, having this -- having Taco Bell there
generating traffic and people onsite may make it more
attractive for leases for other people to want to be
in that -- you know, in that area.
MR. ZUIDEMA: I get it.
And the building -- see, I would be --
if I'm understanding you correctly, I would be favorable then.

But having to put a timeline on that building there that's been sitting vacant and half-built basically, we've got to put a time on that that that has to be finished. Okay?

Tell me legally, what do we do about that? Because I would vote then no, because that building will remain that way for another three years.

MS. HERLIHY: I'm not familiar enough with our building code as to whether or not there's a particular period of time that they -- they get a building permit. They have to -- they may come up
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MR. CAPALBO: Does the same person own all of that.

MS. HERLIHY: Yes.
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yeah.
That man owns it.
MR. CAPALBO: That entities owns all, the whole --

MS. HERLIHY: The whole shopping
center, yes. They would be using a portion of the shopping center.

MR. ZUIDEMA: They keep telling us it's
3-and-a-half acres.
MR. CAPALBO: Who is actually the applicant, the property owner.

MS. HERLIHY: The applicant is the Taco
Bell entity. And the owner -- in order to come
before the board, the owner has to consent to the application.

So the owner -- the potential landlord knows that the applicant is here and is doing this.

MR. WOSTBROCK: Linda.
MS. HERLIHY: Yes.
MR. FORMICOLA: I'm sorry. You go ahead, sir.
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MR. WOSTBROCK: Could the condition be
that the site is completed, the site work is
completed and the building is shelled in?
Certainly if they don't have a tenant
there, the interior tenant fit-out isn't going to be completed.

But the exterior wholeness of the building, you know, the windows are in, the roof is on, the tarps are off, whatever the conditions are. You know, how granular could that condition be, condition of approval.

MS. HERLIHY: Yeah.
It has to finish the building. I mean, I know that they have building permits. I think their building permits were...

MR. FORMICOLA: They've been pulled.
MS. HERLIHY: They've been pulled.
MR. WHITAKER: I'm told there is a
reapplication for the permits now. Then when permits are issued, it will be taken care of in six months.
I'm also told that they have a prospective tenant for the building. I got that just now from the owner.

MS. HERLIHY: So would you agree --
MR. WHITAKER: Six-month timeframe from when the permits are issued?
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|  | 129 |  | 131 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. HERLIHY: Six months from when the | 1 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: He doesn't get a |
| 2 | permits are issued to complete. | 2 | building -- Taco Bell doesn't get a building permit |
| 3 | MR. WHITAKER: To complete, that's | 3 | -- |
| 4 | right. | 4 | MR. WHITAKER: Until the other building |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: When can they | 5 | is done. |
| 6 | begin? | 6 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But what do you |
| 7 | MS. HERLIHY: When? | 7 | mean by "done". |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Taco Bell. He's | 8 | MS. HERLIHY: It has a CO. |
| 9 | just saying that's when -- | 9 | MR. WHITAKER: A CO. |
| 10 | MR. WHITAKER: We could begin, but we | 10 | MR. FORMICOLA: Fixed. |
| 11 | don't get a CO until that time. | 11 | Everything is ready to go. |
| 12 | MS. HERLIHY: I'm just taking a note | 12 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. That |
| 13 | here. | 13 | should -- |
| 14 | MR. CAPALBO: You would agree to that | 14 | MR. ZUIDEMA: I wanted to hear his |
| 15 | stipulation. | 15 | question. |
| 16 | MR. WHITAKER: Yes. | 16 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Oh, yeah, yeah. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Dave? Dave, what's | 17 | MR. ELIYA: So if that was an |
| 18 | your -- you're the one with the main concern. | 18 | agreed-upon stipulation, would that then be a |
| 19 | MR. CAPALBO: They have to abide by it. | 19 | positive criteria that you can take into |
| 20 | MR. PLACIER: You would think | 20 | consideration for the use variance? |
| 21 | somebody's in the old Dunkin' Donuts. | 21 | MR. FORMICOLA: It's up to the |
| 22 | MR. WHITAKER: They have a Wonder | 22 | individual how you interpret it. |
| 23 | tenant I'm told. I don't represent the tenant, but I | 23 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's correct. I |
| 24 | was told that. | 24 | don't know. |
| 25 | VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: With the | 25 | MR. ELIYA: I would see it, but I don't |
|  | 201-641-1812 |  | 201-641-1812 |
|  | 130 |  | 132 |
| 1 | other building that's been under construction for | 1 | know if it's technical. |
| 2 | three years, if you get new permits and you start | 2 | MS. HERLIHY: It's something that they |
| 3 | again, based upon the history, who's to say the same | 3 | have to do anyway. We're just giving them a hook. |
| 4 | thing won't happen again? | 4 | In other words, we're making it -- |
| 5 | In the meantime, you'll have a Taco | 5 | giving them an incentive, but if, you know, if... |
| 6 | Bell under construction again. | 6 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Does it justify -- |
| 7 | MR. WHITAKER: Wait one second. | 7 | MS. HERLIHY: You know, promote a |
| 8 | MS. HERLIHY: Well, it might be under | 8 | purpose of zoning? |
| 9 | construction, but they certainly -- they wouldn't get | 9 | Again, that's a -- |
| 10 | a Certificate of Occupancy. So they would be -- they | 10 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's why you get |
| 11 | would have a Taco Bell potentially complete and | 11 | the medium bucks. |
| 12 | closed. | 12 | MS. HERLIHY: Well, listen, it's not my |
| 13 | MR. ZUIDEMA: Let the landlord go | 13 | place to say what someone thinks is going to promote |
| 14 | against our applicant then instead we wouldn't be the | 14 | a purpose of zoning or not. |
| 15 | guy calling the shot on that. | 15 | You could find potentially that it |
| 16 | MS. HERLIHY: So it would be no CO | 16 | promotes the purpose of zoning. I'm trying to think |
| 17 | until it's finished. | 17 | which purpose of zoning. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It sounds like | 18 | MR. NOVAK: I mean that -- |
| 19 | something's brewing. Let's wait a minute. | 19 | MS. HERLIHY: Promotion of the general |
| 20 | MR. ELIYA: Would we be able to take | 20 | welfare, health, safety. I mean, it's an unsafe |
| 21 | that push of construction, would that be a positive | 21 | condition. |
| 22 | criteria that you could take into consideration? | 22 | MR. NOVAK: Potentially yes. |
| 23 | MR. WHITAKER: I have it solved. He | 23 | I would slightly disagree, though. I |
| 24 | doesn't start and get a permit until the other | 24 | mean, there's the Burbridge case which is about an |
| 25 | building is done. | 25 | extension of a nonconforming use. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  | 201-641-1812 |  | 201-641-1812 | beautification of the site.
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element, then potentially it's something you can consider a little bit more.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Does anybody else

This is not quite the same because it's not the redevelopment of the whole site. So if
they're catching up to the site to where it needs to
be -- again, I know this is technical for us to give
testimony. I don't know if I would necessarily
consider that part of the special reasons myself

MR. ELIYA: It's not development of the

But they continually use the whole site as, you know, a basis that it is particularly suited

So if they're going to take everything in its entirety, then I would presume that you should probably take the entire site in its entirety.

MS. HERLIHY: Yes, that is correct.
The point here is that whether the Taco Bell application is approved or not, ultimately they're required to do certain things onsite. That would be

MR. NOVAK: If they were tearing the
whole thing and it was a Taco Bell with a new shopping center, removing blight, promoting a visual

The board and court tied that to the

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Ms. Herlihy can figure it out.

MS. HERLIHY: I got it.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Is there a second?
MR. BARLOW: Second. I second it.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: David. He said he

MR. BARLOW: Yeah, I second.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No.
But you have listened to all the tapes?
MR. BARLOW: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MR. CAPALBO: Excuse me a minute.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Discussion on the
motion?
MR. CAPALBO: Pardon?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Discussion on the motion, yeah.

MR. CAPALBO: Am I allowed to vote?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No. Wait.
Do we have -- one, two, three, four,
five, six, seven. No. Sorry.
MR. CAPALBO: I was just wondering about that.
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Everybody has caught up on all the meetings and everything.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. CAPALBO: Okay. You know, I didn't
want to -- I didn't want to screw anything up by voting.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, she wasn't going to call your name.

MR. CAPALBO: Oh, good.
The other question, did we ever approve
the minutes from the last meeting?
MS. HERLIHY: Not yet.
MR. CAPALBO: Okay. So I'll be quiet.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Should I have done
that in the beginning? I missed it.
MS. HERLIHY: It's all right.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. We'll
do it with the resolution. You can do the roll call now.

MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: No.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: No.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Barlow?
MR. BARLOW: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No. Four/three,
right?
So we don't have to go to the Cs. All right, it's four/three against.
The application is denied.
MR. WHITAKER: Thank you for your time. (Whereupon, this matter is concluded.
Time noted: 9:52 p.m.)
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