# BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD <br> Regular Meeting <br> Monday, September 23, 2019 <br> -MINUTES- 

## 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson Casamento called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. in the Municipal Courtroom, 100 Commons Way, Bridgewater, New Jersey.

## 2. OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT ANNOUNCEMENT

Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act N.J.S.A. 10:4-6. On January 10, 2018 proper notice was sent to the Courier Newspaper and the Star-Ledger and filed with the Clerk at the Township of Bridgewater and posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building. Please be aware of the Planning Board policy for public hearings: no new applications will be heard after $10: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ and no new testimony will be taken after $10: 15 \mathrm{pm}$. Hearing Assistance is available upon request. Accommodation will be made for individuals with a disability, pursuant to the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), provided the individual with the disability provides 48 hours advance notice to the Planning Department Secretary before the public meeting." However, if the individual should require special equipment or services, such as a CART transcriber, seven days advance notice, excluding weekends and holidays, may be necessary.

## 3. SALUTE TO FLAG

There was salute to the flag.

## 4. ROLL CALL

Tricia Casamento - present
Evan Lerner - present
Mayor Dan Hayes - present
Councilman Howard Norgalis - present
Beth Powers - present
James V. Franco - present
Urvin Pandya, Alt. \#1 - present
Debra Albanese, Alt. \#2 - present
Stephen Rodzinak - present
Others present: Board Attorney Thomas Collins, Township Engineer David Battaglia, Board Planner Scarlett Doyle, Board Planning Consultant Christopher Melick, Board Traffic Consultant Jay Troutman, Connell Foley, LLP, Kevin Coakley, Esq and Nicole Dory, Esq, Attorneys for the Applicant.

## 5. APPROVAL OF BOARD MINUTES

February 12, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
April 9, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
June 24, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
July 9, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)

July 22, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
August 13, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
August 26, 2019 (pending)
6. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

There were no resolutions presented for Board approval.

## 7. LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

 CIP II/AR BRIDGEWATER HOLDINGSRoute 202/206
Block 483, Lots 17,18 \& 19
\#18-012-PB - Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan-Mixed use development including retail, office, restaurant, residential and office research

See attached Transcript dated September 23, 2019 prepared by Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CRR of Veritext Legal Solutions, 290 W Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Livingston, NJ 07039, which is available at the Planning office.

## 8. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

See attached Transcript dated September 23, 2019 prepared by Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CRR of Veritext Legal Solutions, 290 W Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Livingston, NJ 07039, which is available at the Planning office.

## 9. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at $10: 30 \mathrm{pm}$.
Respectfully submitted,
D'Andrea Aytes
Secretary to Municipal Services
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COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Here the only land development application on the agenda for this evening is CIP II/AR Bridgewater Holdings, LLC, Route 202/206, Block 483, Lots 17, 18, and 19. This is preliminary and final major site plan, mixed-use development, including retail, office, restaurant, residential, and office research.

Good evening.
MR. COAKLEY: Good evening, Madame Chairwoman. My name is Kevin Coakley. I'm here on behalf of the co-applicants on this application, which is AR Bridgewater and COE Bridgewater. In referencing them, I'm going to used the term Advance, in terms of AR Bridgewater, because AR Bridgewater is owned by the Advance Real Estate Investment Company, and I'm going use the term Thor when I talk about COE Bridgewater, which is owned by the Thor entity.

Thor is principally interested in the 47 acres in the ORD Zone, which is to the rear of the $R$-Seed development; whereas, Advance is primarily interested in the $R$-Seed redevelopment area, but somewhat also in the ORD Zone.

What we're here tonight for is to -is for preliminary and final approval as to the primarily commercial part of the development to the south of the boulevard, and we're here -although I say "primarily commercial," there is -- there are 26 residential units on that side of the boulevard. So that's preliminary and final approval.

We're also seeking preliminary approval for the residential part of the project, primarily residential, which is to the north of the boulevard, and there's 374 units in that area.

We're also seeking -- and this is where the Thor aspect comes into play -- we're also seeking a parking variance for the Thor operation in the ORD Zone.

So those are the three principal parts of the application.

Now, we were here in August, September, October, and November of last year; we had extensive hearings. Since last November, a number of things have happened; I'd like to just briefly hit on those things.

First, and most favorable, and a
significant thing that happened, was we were able to procure from the Department of Transportation a waiver for a traffic signal at Fourth Street, which was a matter of much discussion with the board -- particularly Councilman Norgalis, but other members of the board -- and that was -- it took about six months to get that. So the time we were away from the board was not lost. We had great assistance from Mr. Battaglia and other members of the department -- of the township's staff, but also from the commissioner of transportation. We twice reversed DOT staff to get that decision reversed, and ultimately get the -- a waiver from DOT, which is a binding right that we have regarding that traffic light. So that was a major development over the period of time.

The second thing that happened was that we -- if you remember, we were here back in November, and there was a gentleman from Avalon Bay who spent the evening asking questions. Well, that interest of Avalon Bay, who was suing the project at the time, that interest has been resolved. So Avalon Bay has no interest in the project going forward.

Thirdly, one of the things that happened is that Thor acquired the 47-acre property to the rear of the $R$-Seed development, and what they really acquired were two condominium units, Condominiums 2 and 3, and they acquired sometime over about the last 60 days.

Thor and Advance are here requesting a variance from the planning board for parking. Right now, there's about 1,190 spaces on the site, and after the R-Seed development goes forward, there will be changes in the entranceway, and there'll be about 1,168 spaces left. You'll hear testimony about that.

But the use of Thor of parking spaces in this ORD Zone is much less than that, it's probably less than half of that. So they would like -- the parties would like a parking variance to confirm that that level of parking, 1,168 spaces, is adequate for the site.

The ordinances that the township has adopted reflect the fact that the ORD Zone was to be enhanced by the $R$-Seed development, and that's in the ORD Zone, it's in the master plan. So these two properties, it was always intended by the ordinances that they would work together, and
this is part of working together. So even after, you know, the entranceway is changed, and the loop path is put through the ORD Zone, there will still be 1,168 spaces. There's no other changes being made to that property, and we're requesting that the -- that a variance be granted for that part of the property.

The other thrust of the reason for the variance is that, you know, the 3.3-per-thousand ratio of parking spaces for office research properties is not appropriate for this property, given the way it's utilized and configured as a heavy equipment use of this property, and that's why we're seeking the variance.

Another development, and $I$ think an important one, is that Advance has now acquired the entirety of the ownership interest of the condominiums in the $R$-Seed development. So there was a partner from New England that was involved in the project; that interest has been changed to an ownership in Advance of those condominiums.

And I think that's a very positive development for this project, because, after all, this is a mixed-use project, and I think we've
all seen over the years that there's -- there can be problems when you have non-unified ownership at this stage of the project development, and we certainly had that with Avalon Bay -- and that's not to cast blame on anybody, but just to state a fact. So, anyhow, we have a single owner of those interests.

So the interest in the property, and the overall property, 110 acres of the Sanofi site, are Thor, which owns the 47 acres, and Advance, which owns the balance of the property.

A few housekeeping matters just to hit on:

One is, I don't think it's clear in the variance report, but over the time since the last hearing, we did make sure that we were able to expand the parking spaces in front of the proposed supermarket to 9 and a half by 18. So we have over 440 spaces there. That was not the case, perhaps, on some of the prior iterations of this plan.

Secondly, the question has come up from Scarlett repeatedly about what entity is going to manage the common areas and open space. And so there's an existing entity called the

Peters Brook Village Association, which is responsible for the maintenance of all common elements -- lawns, the loop path, landscaping, known as Powelson Farms -- but all that will be managed by an existing condominium association, Peters Brook Village Association.

Another housekeeping matter, we've had some requests over time for -- to show the actual materials that will be used on the commercial part of the project to -- so that the board members could match them up against what we presented in our presentations to the board. So they're here, and Mr. Diamond, the architect, will be here to testify briefly about which buildings and which materials fit together.

So those -- those are the principal things to talk about, in terms of housekeeping.

Van Cleef Engineering did a report last week, which we received, and we talked to Van Cleef, and we agree that all the Van Cleef report can be either a condition of the approval, or dealt with through compliance with the approval. So those, I think, are resolved in that way.

A couple of other things to resolve:

One is that, in Ms. Doyle's report, and her phasing plan, we talked -- she talked about having submissions of construction plans by June 30 and December 31st. Obviously, she was working with some of the older documents, and so, you know, we have proposed that the construction plans be submitted, and Mr. Norgalis wanted a direct date that he could just put his finger on, so within six months of the day of any resolution that you should pass, we will deliver construction plans for the entire frontage of the property, including the traffic light at Fourth Street. So all that would be covered in plans delivered to DOT within six months.

The rest of the construction plans, which involve submission of plans to the township and to the county, would be done six months thereafter. Those plans would be submitted to both -- to those agencies respectively within an additional six-month period. That's a very aggressive schedule, but one that the applicant is willing to live by.

One of the things in the phasing
schedule is the soil stockpile, and we would like that to be -- to move that soil stockpile in

Phases 1 and 2, not just Phase 1. It can be used to surcharge as the project is developed. That's a minor point that Ms. Doyle has -- I've talked to her about.

And we would like to have the right to move forward with three buildings in Phase 2. We've always talked about having the grocer, the wellness building, and we would like to also be able to go ahead with the residential building, as we install the traffic improvements, and that we would have all the traffic improvements installed before the third of those buildings. So that would be all the traffic improvements along the frontage and the light at Fourth Street. So all the major affecting-the-project traffic improvements.

So with that brief introduction, I'd like to call -- we'll call five witnesses. Most of them have been previously sworn. They're here primarily to discuss the Thor parking variance, because we essentially finished with our witnesses previously, except for Mr. Diamond. So we'd --

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO:
Mr. Coakley, can I ask you one question?

MR. COAKLEY: Sure.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: So when you were just discussing -- you said three buildings are going to be built in Phase 2. Is that what you said?

MR. COAKLEY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay. Do you know which buildings?

MR. COAKLEY: Yes. It would be the grocer, the wellness building, and the residential building, also known as Building 11. Right now, Ms. Doyle's phasing plan calls for two buildings, so we'd like to be able to have the opportunity to do a third building in that Phase 2 while we are doing the bulk of the traffic improvements.

MS. DOYLE: Madame Chairwoman, I'd like to make a slight --

MR. COAKLEY: Sure.
MS. DOYLE: -- clarification. When he said Ms. Doyle's chart for Phase 2, what that chart was is the chart that the applicant provided in the submission that was around end of January of this year. So I didn't create it myself.

MR. COAKLEY: Right. You edited it, that was my point.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MR. COAKLEY: But we accept your edits, except as I've noted.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay.
Thank you.
MR. COAKLEY: So with that
introduction, Mr. Collins, I have two witnesses who were not sworn of the five we intend to call.

MR. COLLINS: I'll swear them in.
MR. COAKLEY: Okay. Mr. Dan
Loughlin and Craig Hermann, please step up and be sworn.
(Whereupon, Dan Loughlin and Craig Herman are sworn in.)

MR. COLLINS: And please, starting on my left, your right, state your name and give us an address.

MR. HERMANN: Craig Hermann,
H-E-R-M-A-N-N. I work for PS\&S. The address is 67B Mountain Boulevard Extension, Warren, New Jersey.

MR. LOUGHLIN: Dan Loughlin, L-O-U-G-H-L-I-N. I work for JLL, and my office
is at 8 Campus Drive in Parsippany.
MR. COLLINS: Thank you, gentlemen.
MR. COAKLEY: All right. So I think
Mr. Hermann will be the first witness, and Ms. Dory will ask him questions.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: One more question, Mr. Coakley. You said there were five witnesses tonight. Correct.

MR. COAKLEY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Can you
just tell me the remaining three?
MR. COAKLEY: Yes, Mr. Gary Dean will testify regarding the parking variance, he did a report on parking on the site.

Mr. Phillips, Paul Phillips, is a planner, who will testify about the parking variance.

And Mr. Diamond will testify regarding the material boards.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MR. COAKLEY: Okay. Does anyone have any questions?

We'll proceed.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: No, I just want to remind people that there's another room
down here with extra seating and TVs available to see what's going on in here. So if you'd like a seat, you can go down there and get an available seat.

Thank you, Mr. Coakley.
Good evening.
MS. DORY: Good evening, Madame
Chair, members of the board, Nicole Dory, Connell Foley. It's nice to be before you all again on this application.

As Kevin mentioned, we have a few
witnesses for the ORD parking variance. So there'll be four witnesses for that.

I'll start with Craig Hermann and
Gary Dean. Craig will -- has been working on this, he's with PS\&S, and will give you an overview of the existing parking, and the buildings in the ORD Zone.

And Gary will testify as to his parking study.

So I'd like to present Craig Hermann
first. He has not been qualified yet, so I'll start with that.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that would be fine.

C R A I G H E R M A N N, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. DORY:
Q. Mr. Hermann, could you give the board the benefit of your educational background and experience?
A. Yes. I am a 1996 graduate from the Rutgers University College of Engineering, $B S$ in civil engineering, and $I$ have been a New Jersey professional engineer since 2004 .
Q. Okay. And have you testified before other boards before?
A. Yes, I have. I've been -- I've testified in front of many boards throughout the state: Montvale, Northvale, Emerson in Bergen County; Mt. Olive Township and Mine Hill Township in Morris County; and Belvedere and Hackettstown in Warren County, just to name a few. I've been accepted as an expert witness both as the engineer for the applicant and as a board engineer.

MR. COLLINS: The board will accept and recognize Craig Hermann's qualifications as a professional engineer.

MS. DORY: Thank you.
BY MS. DORY:
Q. Mr. Hermann, were you involved in preparing the engineering plans for this application?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. And can you please describe for the board the location of the buildings in the $O R D$ Zone and the existing parking, and how the parking will be modified as a result of the redevelopment?
A. Okay. So --

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Hermann, we don't mind if you stand on this side, so that when you point to things the public might be able to see it on some of them.

Also, if you want to go back a little bit further with the drawings, I think we can see it, and maybe more people will be able to see it.
A. So what we have in front of you right now is an aerial image of the existing property. This has already been provided as an exhibit in a past meeting.

> Right now, it is an existing
109.58-acre site, and we're focusing on the ORD Zone of the site, which is located in the northwest corner of the site, which is located about this area right here.

Just to orient you to the property, to the west is 287. To the east is 202/206. There is residential properties on the opposite side of 202/206, to the east. To the north, we have residential properties and the temple. To the south, we have additional residential properties.

MR. COLLINS: What was that exhibit number again, Mr. Hermann?

MR. HERMANN: I don't know what the exhibit number was.

MS. DORY: It was previously marked,
I can find out what it is.
MR. COLLINS: It might be on there somewhere, Mr. Hermann. Might be on the back there somewhere.

MR. HERMANN: Actually, I think I reprinted this.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. We'll receive it from Ms. Dory.
A. So what $I$ have in front of you now
is a colorized version of sheet C-03.01 of the PS\&S plan set. It's entitled ORD Zone Analysis Plan.

The ORD portion of the site is what's colored here. It is an R\&D facility, and it includes approximately 10 buildings, labeled JD, JR-2, JR-1, Building M, Building $N$, Building K, L, G, and HY. And there's also Building F, which is essentially a utility plant.

Mr. Coakley had referenced the condominium units owned by Thor, and those are Condominium Units 2 and 3, which Condominium Unit 2 is located to the east of the existing 13th Avenue, which will remain, and to the west is Condominium 3, which is basically the northwesterly corner of the property. The plan is to maintain this as it is now.

And as we reviewed the application since we were last here, we identified the parking variance requirement. Based on the 654,753 square feet of combination office and laboratory use, at a rate of one parking stall for every 300 square feet, which is the ordinance requirement, 2,183 parking spaces are required for this use, to support this use,
based on the ordinance requirements.
At the existing time, there is a total of 1,190 stalls, and they're spread out pretty reasonably with the site. There's a few larger parked areas to the north of the buildings, and there's a parking garage to the southwest of the buildings.

Now, as for the past few months, few years, that we've been developing this plan, with the help of the planning board, we have realigned the entranceway to the R\&D facility, for a few reasons:

Number one, what is now existing as Fourth Street will become Discovery Drive, and Discovery Drive has been extended to connect into the R\&D facility. That, and wanting to provide a connection to the proposed redevelopment, we needed to realign this entranceway into the R\&D facility or the ORD Zone.

With that, there was a parking area in the front of the cooling towers that we needed to reconstruct, and we lost 22 parking spaces when we did that. We were able to gain some back in this area, so we didn't lose the
whole parking lot, but at the end, we weren't able to provide the 22 parking spaces.

So with that being said, we need 2,183 parking spaces, based on the ordinance requirements. We're providing a total of 1,168 parking spaces, which includes 500 parking spaces in the major parking lots, which includes Parking Lot 8A, 8, 9, $K, 13$, and there's a few other small parking areas within the buildings themselves, and then a 668-parking-stall parking garage located to the southwest of the buildings. 668 in the parking garage and 500 surface parking stalls provides us with the 1,168 that we're proposing.

MS. DORY: Okay. I have no further questions for Mr. Hermann. Are there any questions from the board?

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: I have a question. And you may have said this, so I apologize. So you're providing -- you're going to provide 1,168. Correct?

MR. HERMANN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Right now, there's 1,190?

MR. HERMANN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: And why is it decreasing?

MR. HERMANN: There is a parking stall -- parking lot in front of the cooling towers, right where I'm pointing, right here, and because we needed to realign the driveway, adding the stormwater detention system, we weren't able to provide the total number in there. We have a few additional parking areas that we were able to provide between these buildings, but at the end of the day, the result is 22 less parking stalls.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: And do you know, on average, how many of those spaces are occupied a day, now?

MR. HERMANN: That will be provided through testimony from one of the other witnesses.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay. And are you -- is there -- if the opportunity -- if you need to in the future, is there an area where you can provide additional parking?

MR. HERMANN: There are some areas that we can provide additional parking, there's some open areas over here, around Parking Lot 9. There is also ability somewhere in the area just
to the back of the garage.
MS. DORY: And I just wanted to
clarify that the variance is based upon the 1,168 spaces.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay. COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: I have one question.

That's considered a secured area.
Right? The R\&D is fenced in, security?
MR. HERMANN: Yes.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: So the
requirement is that all the people who work in that area have to be able to park in that area. Right?

MR. HERMANN: Yes.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Now, the overflow you're seeking is outside the protected -- that you identify as potential, is outside the protected area. Isn't that true?

MR. HERMANN: No, it's located inside the protected area.

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Okay. So the commitment, then, is everybody who works there can park there, in the protected area?

MR. HERMANN: Yes.

MS. DORY: And you'll hear
additional testimony that the existing parking is more than sufficient for the use of the property.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the board with a question for this witness?

Seeing none, I'm going to open it up to the public. If any member of the public has a question for this witness regarding his testimony, please come forward, state your name and address for the record.

Thank you.
MR. MOENCH: Good evening, Matthew Moench, 1303 Roger Avenue.

Sir, could you explain to the public what the scope of your job is, with regards to testimony -- that these plans were? I mean, you provided testimony regarding the number of parking spaces, but did you provide any analysis with regard to the number of spaces? where the spaces should go? help design where they should go? I'm not sure what your role, as part of the team dealing with the traffic the parking is.

MR. HERMANN: As far as the ORD
Zone, my role was to look at the existing parking
stalls that are available, and compare that to the required parking calculation based on the ordinance requirements for the zone.

MR. MOENCH: Did you do any
independent analysis as to whether or not the number of stalls available is sufficient?

MR. HERMANN: That will be reviewed by another person that will come up after me.

MR. MOENCH: Did you do any analysis about where -- if the planning board came back and said they weren't going to give you a waiver, where, from an engineering standpoint, would you put the required parking, or what impact would it have on the application if you had to put in the additional parking stalls?

MR. HERMANN: We took a look at
that. We have some available areas, as I
indicated before, there's some open areas around this parking area and behind the parking garage that we could possibly put some additional parking stalls. There is a number of things we would need to deal with, layout, to see how many we could get; there's also some permitting that would be involved, because there are environmental constraints in these areas. So
there's a lot that we would need to do, but those are some open areas that could possibly be used for future parking.

MR. MOENCH: Have you done any analysis as to how many spots you could get, if you were to utilize some of those open areas?

MR. HERMANN: Not at this point, no.
MR. MOENCH: Do you have any
analysis as to what kind of permits would be needed, specifically, in order to accommodate those extra spots?

MR. HERMANN: Like I said, we would need to look at a few things. There are some environmental constraints that would involve DEP, and the town of course, with their permitting. So we could take a look at that.

MR. MOENCH: I don't have exact numbers, but it's about a thousand units that you're short, sir?

MR. HERMANN: About that, yes.
MR. MOENCH: And is it your
testimony before the board and the public today that, given the fact that you're a thousand units short, that you have not done any analysis as to how you can come closer to that number, or how
you would even meet that number, if you're denied the waiver?

MR. HERMANN: That will be addressed by the person that did that study.

MR. MOENCH: But I'm asking about it from an engineering standpoint. You just testified regarding where you would put spaces. I'm assuming a planner will come up and testify about how often spaces will be used, and traffic flow, and those matters, but from an engineering standpoint, if you're required to put in 2,000 units, is it your testimony that you don't have a plan to do that?

MS. DORY: Well, we have -- if I might interject, we have a traffic engineer that's going to be testifying next.

MR. MOENCH: I understand, but I'm asking an engineering question, which is from a planning/engineering standpoint: Where would you put the units, or what changes would you have to make to the plan to accommodate the waiver? Because a waiver is not automatic. This board could decide that it wants to uphold the ordinance that the township has in place, and require you to put in 2,000 , you know, and change
units.
So my question is: Does the
applicant have a plan to meet that 2,000 units, if the waiver is denied?

MR. HERMANN: We would need to look at exactly how we would lay out and how many parking stalls we can get in those possible areas that $I$ just identified.

MR. MOENCH: With the testimony that you gave, you talk about the existing number of parking spaces, and then noted that we lost a couple with regard to the water tower. Have you done any engineering work to come even close to or improve the number of parking spaces from what's already there, or are you simply saying we're going to rest on what's there, and we have no plan to add additional parking spaces at all?

MS. DORY: If I just might interject here, $I$ did clarify earlier that this variance request is based on the existing parking for 1,168 spaces. We have generally identified other areas that could accommodate stalls, if needed, but this variance request is based on 1,168 spaces being more than adequate for the existing use, and we will have a traffic engineer that
will provide that testimony.
Mr. Hermann has identified the existing parking and the ordinance requirements --

MS. DOYLE: Ma'am, there's a comment that I heard that they can't hear you. Perhaps either you get closer to the mic, or we have another -- maybe we should give her the second mic.

> MS. DORY: Can you hear me now? Okay. I just wanted to clarify that the parking variance request of the ORD Zone -(Technical issue.) MS. DORY: Okay. Third time is a charm.

Okay. So I just wanted to clarify that the parking variance request for the ORD Zone is based upon 1,168 spaces being more than adequate for the existing use.

The purpose of Mr. Hermann's testimony was to identify the existing parking in the ORD Zone, and the parking areas, and the possible locations, if parking was ever required in the future. But the present application for a variance is based upon existing conditions and
existing parking. There's no contemplated future addition of parking at this time.

MR. MOENCH: Thank you.
And I just want to make sure, I didn't actually get an answer to the last question, which was: Have you done -- you have not looked at any alternatives specifically that would provide additional parking, such that it would get you closer to the number required by the ordinance. Am I correct?

MR. HERMANN: I apologize, I thought
I answered that question before. So we
identified, as we've talked about, certain areas, but no, we have not done a layout to see how many parking stalls $I$ could get in those areas.

MR. MOENCH: Thank you. I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Please step forward with questions
for this witness regarding his testimony.
MR. FRESCO: Andy Fresco, 15 Glen
Eagles Drive, Bridgewater.
Just a quick question. Would curtailing or reducing any of the buildings help you meet the requirement without getting the
variance?
MR. HERMANN: From a calculations standpoint, if the square footage area goes down, the parking requirement.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Talk into the mic. MR. HERMANN: Is this better?

Sorry.
Can you ask that question again?
I'm sorry.
MR. FRESCO: Sure. So we're short parking spaces. If these folks don't grant you the variance, you'll need to figure out another way around it. To Matt's point, I'm asking: If you reduced the scope of this entire project, would you then be able to work with the parking spaces that meet the town's rules?

MR. HERMANN: I can't talk to any plan of any reduction in building, but from a mathematical standpoint, if you reduce the square foot, the parking requirement would go down. MR. FRESCO: Great. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Please step forward with questions for this witness regarding his testimony.

MS. GALLAGHER: Yeah, my name is Mary Gallagher. I live on Highland Avenue in Bridgewater. I just -- regarding all the parking, I'm wondering about truck delivery, you've got the grocery store, and boutiques and everything. We're talking about parking, but what about delivery or offsetting all of that? I just want to know if there's room.

MS. DORY: I just wanted to clarify that question, that this is -- this parking variance is only for the ORD Zone, which is currently a research and development campus.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Good evening.

MS. MINE: Good evening, Diane Mine, M-I-N-E, 743 Cedar Brook Road.

My question is, if you're not given approval, and you need to go to those areas that you designated as environmentally challenging, what are the environmental issues that you're thinking -- or you know are a concern?

MR. HERMANN: There are some
environmental constraints. The flood hazard area does extend into that area. And there are some wetlands --

COMMISSIONER RODZINAK: You need to hold it closer.

MR. HERMANN: There are some wetlands -- there are some wetlands located along the Peters Brook, so we would need to address all the requirements with the DEP before any construction that we do within those concerned areas.

MS. MINE: I live right across -diagonally behind it, and I'm very familiar with the wetland problems and the environmental concerns, that we don't have the turtles that we used to have. So are you claiming that you would disrupt an area that is already environmentally challenged, and put cars parked on that area? That would be your plan?

MS. DORY: If I might just
interject: The plan right now is not to add any additional parking. We're asking for an approval that the 1,168 spaces that exist are more than adequate. So we have testimony that will demonstrate that, and at this time, we're not proposing any additional parking.

MS. MINE: Okay. I'm just concerned that the additional parking you're requesting
doesn't seem feasible, and then, from that step, your next step would be more of a problem. But as for wetlands, that is not a good issue.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: I have one more question. I thought the issue was not that the 1,100 was sufficient, but if the 1,100 is not sufficient, you have the property available to then add the necessary parking spots.

MS. DORY: Yes, that's correct.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: And I think
the lady's question was, is there environmentally sensitive area that you're going to encroach upon if you attempt to get beyond the 1,100 ? And it sounded like we know there's 1,100, but you're not just asking for approval for 1,100 , you're asking for approval for the 1,100 and whatever else number you need up to 1,900, and then you'll find the space for it somehow.

MS. DORY: No. I'm sorry if it was confusing, but we're just asking for approval for the 1,168 spaces, and we will have witnesses to testify that that's more than adequate, and we're not planning on any existing impervious coverage
to provide additional parking.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Then I -- I'm sorry, I guess I don't understand. I thought my original thing was, you have 1,100, and you know they're there, but if you needed more, you could -- you could expand beyond the 1,100. But I think you're saying you never expect to expand beyond the 1,100.

MS. DORY: That's correct.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: So what you're
really saying is you want an exception to the ordinance that says 1,100 is okay.

MS. DORY: Well, the applicant understands, if there was any change in the use of the ORD Zone portion of the property, they would have to return to the board, but at this time, they're asking for a variance based on 1,168 spaces.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Good evening. How are you?

MR. KULAK: John Kulak, 13 Ramsey Street in Bridgewater.

Just a quick question. 1,168 spaces
is what you're asking for to be approved. What did the ordinance call for? What's the gross
number that the ordinance calls for?
MR. HERMANN: 2,183.
MR. KULAK: So you're approximately
1,000 short?
MR. HERMANN: 1,015 short.
MR. KULAK: 1,015. And your
analysis is that the existing use for the property will be more than adequately served. So are you suggesting that the ordinance is off by 50 percent?

MS. DORY: We will have an
additional -- we will have an additional witness to testify as to the particular use here, but what we're testifying -- or will testify to is that the ordinance requirement for general office use did not contemplate this type of use that's existing on the property, and so the parking is more than adequate.

MR. KULAK: So the use that will be -- that is -- right now, is being projected, based on the future use or the current use, will never change, is what you're suggesting.

MS. DORY: No, the existing parking that's there is on the existing use of the property.

MR. KULAK: So if employers change, if usage slightly -- we don't know what technology is going to be, so if there are more people coming into the same existing facility requiring more parking, there's no adequate plan for it, there's just a future, we'll come back to you and ask.

MS. DORY: The applicant understands that if there's a substantial change that affects parking, they will have to return to the board.

MR. KULAK: Okay. Thank you.
(Mr. Troutman arrived.)
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the public with questions of this witness regarding his testimony?

Good evening.
MS. WHALEN: Hi, I'm Laura Whalen, 1238 Mt. Vernon Road.

I have a question. Bridgewater is number 8 in the state in terms of redevelopment plans. Why should we want to give you a variance at all? People want to develop here. People want to own here. We're number 8 in the state out of 535 municipalities. What's for us?

MS. DORY: Madame Chair, I'm not
sure if the question relates to Mr. Hermann's expertise or testimony.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you have to ask questions related to what he talked about.

MS. WHALEN: So what's the -- so maybe it's a question for the planning board.

MR. COLLINS: You have to ask
questions of this witness.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Yeah, right
now, we're just asking questions of the witness regarding his testimony. There's going to be an opportunity later for additional comments.

MS. WHALEN: Okay. Great.
So how many -- what is the projected employment numbers? How many people will be employed in that zone?

MS. DORY: We will have another witness that will testify as to the use of the property and those types of questions.

MS. WHALEN: Could you tell me the number that was used in the calculations in order to calculate the parking spots?

MR. HERMANN: The number that was used to calculate -- the number that was used to calculate the required parking is based on the
ordinance requirement of one stall per every 300 square feet for office and laboratory use. For 654,738 square feet, that's equal to 2,183 parking stalls required for those two uses within the R\&D facility.

MS. WHALEN: So it's simply based on space and not the number of employees?

MR. HERMANN: Correct.
MS. WHALEN: Correct. So if there's 3 to 4,000 people expected to be employed in the entire complex, is there a portion -- what portion of that is covered by this zone and what portion is the other zones? And do those other zones have a similar witness or expert testimony?

MS. DORY: Well, just to take the first part of your question, the ordinance requirement is based upon square footage and not the number of employees. And we previously testified as to parking requirements for the R-Seed, which is the redevelopment portion --

MS. WHALEN: So there's no more questions on that?

MS. DORY: There's no more testimony presented for that today. This testimony is only for the parking variance for the ORD Zone.

MS. WHALEN: Okay. All right.
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Please come forward, state your name and address for the record.

MS. SELIKOFF: Patty Selikoff, 16 Gibson Terrace, Bridgewater, New Jersey.

So my question $I$ had, so you are pointing out that you have designated areas that you would put the additional, you know, parking, if you don't get the variance. What would you -let's say you can't touch the wetlands. Let's say DEP says, good luck, no. What would you -how -- I guess, to alleviate that -- or at least get to your number that you want, would you put a structure there? Like, would it be another parking garage, so that you could -- or is that completely out of your realm to accommodate those extra parking spaces?

MS. DORY: If we needed to provide additional spaces, we would return to the board. At this time, the parking variance is only for the existing stalls.

MS. SELIKOFF: But you guys haven't thought about whether or not it would need -- a
parking garage would be needed to put in there in those extra spaces that you're talking about.

MS. DORY: We would do that in the future, if we had to return to the board.

MS. SELIKOFF: And have you
considered -- like, have you guys considered the growth that this particular site might have over the next 10,15 years?

MS. DORY: There'll be an additional witness that will testify as to the current use of the property, and that it's likely to remain as it currently exists, because it would be not economically feasible to change it. So the current parking variance request is for the existing use, which is contemplated to remain.

MS. SELIKOFF: Okay. All right.
Thanks.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MR. HOPF: Bill Hopf, 770 Mountain
View Avenue, Bridgewater.
I'm just kind of getting hung up on the current usage, and $I$ keep on hearing you say that, based on the current usage, which to me sounds like number of employees. I heard you say that the 301 -square-foot spot in the current
ordinance doesn't necessarily apply to the way the space is currently being used.

Given that, could the current
employers just put in more of the same type of employees, using the space the same way they're using now? And if so, how many more could they put in there without going to the board for any sort of changes in approval or -- I'm sorry, I'm not sure $I$ 'm using the right words -- variances for zoning? I'm just trying to figure out whether or not you've taken into account any sort of increase in employees, current usage, versus the 1,168 spots.

MS. DORY: Madame Chair, if I may, we will have another witness that will be able to address these sorts of questions. This is not within Mr. Hermann's expertise or scope of his testimony.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Who's going to be able to answer those questions, Mr. Dean?

MS. DORY: Mr. Dean will provide some testimony as to that, and also there'll be a real estate broker, Mr. Loughlin.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay.
Thank you.

MR. HOPF: Thank you.
MR. PLACEK: Pawel Placek, 13 Claire Drive.

So my question is you're talking about car use. Right? And it's a little bit built up on the previous question. As you know, the companies are using the open space models right now, where they can fit three, four times as many people as they can in the fixed office model. What's the current use? Is it based on cubicles and offices? Is it open space? Can it skyrocket in the air, like, three, four times, or maybe five times?

MS. DORY: Again, Madame Chair, I think this question is more appropriate for the other two witnesses.

MR. PLACEK: Okay. But we're sitting in the room, and we're not getting the questions being answered. So we'll wait for the other witness.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Is there any other member of the public for questions of this witness regarding his testimony?

Seeing none -- oh, hang on. Hi, how
are you?
MR. OLENICK: Patrick Olenick, 458
Foothill Road, Bridgewater.
My question to you, sir, is, with work-from-home detail, do we have any assurances from the businesses that are currently there that people are going to actually come to work, and they're going to destroy this property. Has there any studies been done -- I mean, a lot of employers are cutting back in many ways, and there's no need to really be excessive with parking spaces. Has that been a consideration?

MS. DORY: I'm sorry, sir, but the ordinance requirement for parking is based on square footage, and at this time, we don't have any information about the future, you know, employees, or whether the employees are actually using the space. Is that your question?

MR. OLENICK: That is my question, yeah. I think it's important to decide who's actually going to be employed in the future.

MS. DORY: Madame Chair, I don't believe this question is within the scope of Mr. Hermann's testimony.

MR. COLLINS: You have to focus
questions about testimony that Mr. Hermann gave, and he didn't talk about that.

MR. OLENICK: Okay. That's okay.
No problem.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Any other member of the public with questions for this witness regarding his testimony, please come forward. Anyone?

Okay. Thank you.
MS. DORY: So if I may, if we could move on to Mr. Dean.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Yes, please.

G A R Y D E A N, having been previously sworn, remained under oath and testified as follows:

MR. DEAN: Good evening.
MR. COLLINS: Mr. Dean's
qualifications as a professional engineer and a traffic engineer and expert have previously been accepted and are still accepted.

And Mr. Dean, you understand that you are still under oath?

MR. DEAN: Yes, I do.
MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

MS. DORY: And Mr. Dean submitted a parking variance report dated August $29 t h$. It included a summary of a series of parking surveys that his firm completed, as well as the report, that demonstrates that the parking is more than adequate for this area of the property.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. DORY:
Q. So, Mr. Dean, could you please give the board an overview of your parking variance study for the ORD Zone?
A. I will. Good evening. And I do understand I'm still under oath.

I'm going to refer to an aerial exhibit. It's an image from Mr. Hermann's firm, PS\&S, that depicts the property in question. North is to the right-hand side of the exhibit -- I'll make it easier: North is now to the top, 287 is to the left, and Route 202/206 is to the right.

You've heard a description as to the number of parking spaces that are presently on the campus. When $I$ say "the campus," I'm referring to that section of the overall tract that essentially is the western side of the
overall property. That is a secured area that is gate and guard controlled. That is a research and development campus.

That particular portion of the site, lying in a different zone, as you've heard, requires roughly 2,200 parking spaces. The site doesn't have that today. The site is fully developed today. And the site, by and large, is fully occupied today.

The board is aware -- the public, perhaps, doesn't realize -- that an ordinance is a guiding planning tool, where we don't have specific information, where it's a guess, it's an estimate as to certain requirements. As a site is developed, and we see tenancy, we have the opportunity to go out and study, and see whether the ordinance, in fact, makes sense or not, given the particular land use.

My firm was retained about a year and a half ago to conduct that very study. And what we did, it was early to mid June of 2018, we actually surveyed, using a drone, the occupancy of every single parking space that's a surface space, and $I$ also had personnel go within -- and I'm pointing to the multi-story
parking garage.
And we looked at the parking demands of this campus during peak periods -and those periods are generally concentrated at 10 in the morning and around 2 o'clock in the afternoon -- and we studied exactly the parking demands and patterns for this site. We started on June 5th. We went to June 6th, 7th, 8th in the morning, Tuesday the 12 th, and Wednesday, June 13th. We've compiled all of that data, and it's summarized in our report addressed to the board, dated August 29, 2019.

Given that a certain amount of time had elapsed since this presentation, we also did a test this summer, to identify whether we were reasonably close, and the findings were virtually identical.

The single peak day of use was on June 12th, and we identified a maximum use -I'm sorry, July 9th of this year -- a maximum use of 529 parking spaces, that's it, out of an ordinance requirement of close to 2,200. The campus, at the time of that study, was 93 percent occupied, fully tenanted.

So we accounted for that 7 percent
vacancy to forecast what the site actually needs for parking -- not what the ordinance requires, but what it currently demands -- and that number is 569. It's less than half of the available parking that would be available in the future.

So in terms of the concerns of what if, maybe, employment trends change, we have 100 percent surplus capacity, in terms of those types of tenancy fluctuations.

As $I$ contrast that with the ordinance, your ordinance requires almost four times more parking than this site needs, and that is the basis for the variance request, that to provide additional parking to increase impervious coverage, to build blacktop that isn't needed, in my opinion, it's environmentally irresponsible, but more importantly, from a planning perspective, it's just wasted space, and there is little value in providing that.

And to me, it's clear that the ordinance hasn't kept pace with certain trends: the fact that there are buildings occupied with substantial laboratory space, equipment space, storage space, that just there's no people in
them, it's just it occupies that area. So your ordinance, I'll say, unfortunately, overstates the amount of parking that this particular site needs.

And now that we have multiple years of ownership by the applicant, and $I$ will say at least by studying the parking, I'm confident that sufficient justification exists to essentially grant the variance, which allows this use to continue as it has.

And that is the essence of this application, to appropriately size the parking for the uses of these buildings. And so I'm confident, and our report shows, that the relief can be granted with no detriment to the zone plan or zoning ordinance, in that we have twice as much parking as the site needs, even to accommodate future -- not increase in building area, but we'll say employment increases. So I feel confident, as does ownership, that this site has sufficient parking.

That's the essence of my testimony. MS. DORY: I have no further questions.

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: I have a
question.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Councilman?
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Mr. Dean, I
know you as a very accomplished traffic person, but I'm surprised that you would use a July 9 th date, a summer date adjacent to a July 4th holiday, as the traffic count for a building.

MR. DEAN: Of course, Mr. Norgalis.
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: That seems to defy all creativity, so to speak.

MR. DEAN: That is the reason we started doing our study in June of last year, which was not during a summertime, and the results are consistent.
(Audience interruption.)
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: So you're
saying --
MR. DEAN: I'm having a hard time hearing you.

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: -- it's so sufficient, that we should change the ordinance to go for one quarter of the number of spots as it relates to that facility?

MR. DEAN: We're not asking you to change the ordinance; we're asking you, given the
proofs of this particular case, and the fact that the use is here and the parking spaces are here, and it's twice as much parking as this site needs, $I$ think that's sufficient justification to grant the relief.

And our study was conducted in early June of '18, which was a non-summer count. The only reason we took the count in July of this year is anticipation of this very evening, and it was when we needed to file our documents. And the results were consistent, so I feel confident in the data.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Mr. Dean,
Ms. Dory, are you going to have someone testify as to the difference between laboratory use and office use, and the occupancy load of each type?

MS. DORY: We will have a witness that will testify as to the use of the property, and what portions are office; what portions are research and development.

COMMISSIONER FRANCO: But also the occupancy load?

MS. DORY: Right.
COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Because there's a requirement for each type of use.

MS. DORY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Mr. Dean, you said that, when you did the traffic study, 93 percent of the buildings were occupied. Correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: So if that 7 percent were to become occupied, and it was at full capacity, that 7 percent, is that similar space? And by that $I$ mean is that also laboratories, as opposed to cubicles that would fill it quicker?

MR. DEAN: Fair point. We assumed that, given that 93 percent of the site is occupied, that the remaining 7 percent would be so-similarly used. If it went 100 percent office, I suspect that that number would go up slightly.

The difference was -- I don't know what 7 percent of 654,000 is, but it is roughly 46,000 square feet. So if that went all office, at say four spaces per thousand, that's 90 spaces. We have nearly 600 empty. So even if it were to go to that extreme, there's still sufficient capacity in the parking lot.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. Any other member --

MR. COLLINS: I have a question.
Mr. Dean, was a variance previously granted for this parking arrangement?

MR. DEAN: I don't believe so, only because -- and I'll let Ms. Dory chime in -- that the zoning -- the split zone of the site was a relatively recent creation. So the creation of the Seed, or $S-E-E-D$ Zone, put the $O R-2$ Zone (sic) into a variance situation.

MS. DORY: If I might just add to that, Mr. Collins, there was, indeed, a parking variance that was granted in 2008 by the planning board -- and I probably should have mentioned that into my introduction to this parking variance request -- but that variance was for the entire New Jersey Center of Excellence campus, which is the ORD Zone, and now the R-Seed zone.

And that, at that time, the board granted a variance for -- I believe it was about a little over 2,000 spaces was adequate for the entire 109-acre campus, based on the research -similar research and development type of use by Sanofi Aventis.

So if you contrast that to the
current parking variance request for 1,168 spaces for the approximately 47 acres in the ORD Zone, it's pretty much comparable, if not more.

MR. COLLINS: And so is another witness going to talk about that variance, and the similarity of this?

MS. DORY: Yes.
MR. COLLINS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other member of the planning board with a question for this witness?

MAYOR HAYES: I just have --
Ms. Dory, so you're saying that, when it was all used as the back is used now, there was a significant reduction in parking need from our ordinance; hence, the board, then, had given a similar -- similar, $I$ don't know about the numbers -- relief. Is that what you're saying?

MS. DORY: Yes, and a copy of that 2008 -- the resolution for that 2008 approval was included in the submission that we made on August 30 th.

Thank you.

Is there any member --
MR. COLLINS: I guess I do have some more questions for Mr. Dean, then.

So, Mr. Dean, you know, hearing what Ms. Dory said, and then translating that to the property, are the spaces that are associated with these buildings generally proximate to these buildings, so that it's an easy walk for the occupants of the buildings to use these parking lots?

MR. DEAN: Correct. As I indicated, when we did our study for the parking, we basically used the internal roadway that essentially bisects the campus -- that bisects the campus -- the answer is yes, Mr. Collins.

> MR. COLLINS: Why don't you sit by the table. I don't think I'll make you use the map. But $I$ do just want to try to get a sense of where these thousand or 1,100-plus spaces, relative to the buildings in the zone that will remain, and where were the other thousand that will no longer be needed, because some buildings are no longer using them? So it's just basically geography of the spaces.

MR. DEAN: I'm now referring to the
prior exhibit that Mr. Hermann used. It's a sheet labeled C-03.01.

The line that we used, the parking areas that we considered are identified on the plan as being Foundry Lane, which is to the right-hand side of the exhibit, and it basically -- the parking areas we studied are all of those in the colored area of this map.

So, yes, they are proximate to the building. They include the parking structure and the four or so larger paved parking areas that you'll see are distributed around the campus and the buildings.

MR. COLLINS: And so will the other buildings that are existing buildings that will be demolished as part of the overall development and redevelopment of the entire tract. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: That is correct, and a security fence will be accordingly adjusted to segregate the $O R D$ portion of the site from the R-Seed portion of the site.

MR. COLLINS: And so, actually, some of the existing parking lots that are servicing the existing buildings that are being demolished,
they will be rebuilt or maybe removed and new parking lots will be built in the other redevelopment portion of the total tract. Is that your understanding?

MR. DEAN: That is correct.
MR. COLLINS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other questions from the board?

Seeing none, I'll open it up to the public at this time. Any member of the public with a question for this witness regarding his testimony, please come forward.

State your name and address for the record.

MR. MOENCH: Good evening, Matthew Moench, 1303 Roger Avenue.

Sir, if you wouldn't mind, can you
just provide for me how you define occupancy?
You've mentioned that a few times in your testimony.

MR. DEAN: Sure. Whether we observed a car parked in the space or not. It's either occupied or vacant.

MR. MOENCH: Sure. I should have clarified. You talked about occupancy of the
buildings. You talked about 93 percent, 7 percent. So what do you mean when you say "occupied"?

MR. DEAN: That the space was leased and tenanted.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. Did you do any -- did you gather any information to understand whether or not those particular spaces, while leased, are being used at their maximum capacity? In other words, a company could own 40,000 square feet of site, but still be in the process of moving employees in, or otherwise building up that space.

MR. DEAN: And that's one of the reasons that we did the snapshot, if you will, of parking, both in 2018 and 2019, to eliminate the potential for that, say, marginal fluctuation.

MR. MOENCH: So is that a no, that you didn't get any data specifically from the companies regarding their individual usage of the space?

MR. DEAN: I did not poll the individual tenants, no.

MR. MOENCH: So do you have any knowledge about the tenants with regard to any
plans that they may have with regard to expanding their usage within the footprint of the building that they currently have now?

MR. DEAN: I did not, no.
MR. MOENCH: Do you have any
knowledge regarding the leases for those tenants, to understand how long each tenant may or may not be planning on residing in the current space?

MR. DEAN: No.

MR. MOENCH: When you --
Mr. Norgalis already commented on the timing of the study. Did you have any data from the companies, at the time that you took the study, with regard to their particular employees, and vacation time, or data with regard to employees working or not working at the times that you took the data?

MR. DEAN: No.
MR. MOENCH: Mr. Collins, there was some commentary by counsel with regard to this -I guess some kind of variance that was previously issued. I didn't hear whether or not there's going to be a witness to testify to that, or whether counsel is a witness with regard to the facts of that --

MR. COLLINS: That's more of a question for Ms. Dory.

MS. DORY: We'll have another witness to testify to that.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. Sir, have you done any analysis with regard to the condition or usage of the site as it existed at the time that that particular variance was granted by the planning board, compared to how it is now?

MR. DEAN: No.
MR. MOENCH: Could you clarify for me, within the site -- portion of the site that we're talking about here, what buildings are going up or coming down? Or are there no changes with regard to the buildings?

MR. DEAN: I can't speak to that definitively. I mean, the campus is comprised of numerous buildings, so $I$ don't have an answer for that. I know that the total ORD Zone area is 654 and change square feet.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. I heard
testimony, $I$ think it was from you, sir, but it may have been from the prior witness, with regard to two condominium buildings, I think, that were a part of this area.

MR. DEAN: That was a different witness.

MR. MOENCH: Am I correct, though, that those buildings are in this area?

MR. DEAN: I don't know.
MR. MOENCH: So you, in providing your parking study, don't know what buildings may or may not change within the site?

MR. DEAN: I looked at the area that would remain and the parking as it's being used today.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. But you don't know what areas are -- if you don't know what buildings are coming up or coming down, how do you know what areas are going to remain to calculate the parking?

MR. DEAN: That's why Mr. Hermann and $I$ consulted, and that's why, in our report from August 29th, I listed the 10 or so different parking lots for the ORD Zone that will remain, so that they're being used today, and they will continue to be in service for the campus. So assuming that that stasis continues, $I$ have every expectation that that's a valid sample.

If buildings are going down as part
of the redevelopment area, that's a different part of this discussion.

MR. MOENCH: And to be clear: I'm only asking you about the portions of the buildings that are in the ORD section. I'm not talking about the front portions of the buildings.

Is the security fence there now?
MR. DEAN: Yes.
MR. MOENCH: Was it there when the site was one tenant?

MR. DEAN: It's there today, yes.
MR. MOENCH: Was it there --
MR. DEAN: I don't know in the past.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. You don't know
when the site -- when the fence was put up?
MR. DEAN: I don't know when the fence was put up.

MR. MOENCH: And did you do any analysis with regard to how those buildings could be used internally within their maximum -- within the current approvals, those tenants being able to change how they internally use those buildings?

MR. DEAN: That exists with any
tenanted building. And looking at the fact that this is a multi-tenanted facility -- much like a shopping center, tenants come and go, but the overall demands remain consistent. So if one lower tenant moves in, but a higher tenant moves out, that'll reduce parking; conversely, it could increase.

But the fact that we have more than twice as much parking as is needed, I'm pretty confident that those speculative changes can readily be absorbed in the surplus.

MR. MOENCH: But the concern that, certainly, I have here, is that we're talking about eliminating over half of what's required, and the concern being, of course, that those tenants change in some capacity over the course of time, and therefore, now, we have a shortness of parking, which otherwise impacts the rest of the site, because it backs up in terms of the rest of the site.

So if $I$ understand correctly, your testimony is pretty much limited to two snapshots of time of counting parking spaces, but you have not done any analysis with regard to usage of the building or how that may impact or change parking
over time.
MR. DEAN: Just so we're clear, it's
11 snapshots in time.
MR. MOENCH: Within summer months. We got it. Thank you, sir.

MR. DEAN: I disagree with you.
June 5th is not a summer month.
MS. DORY: I just wanted to clarify
the last question: There's no buildings in the ORD Zone that are to come down as part of this application. The applicant understands that, if there are any changes to the buildings in the ORD Zone, that they would have to return to the board.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Is there any member of the public with questions of this witness regarding his testimony.

MR. FRESCO: Hello, Andy Fresco, 15 Glen Eagles Drive, Bridgewater.

Sir, you're obviously familiar with the ordinance. I'm quoting you roughly: You say that it overstates the amount needed. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Yes, we've proven that to
be the case.
MR. FRESCO: Are you aware of whether or not all the neighboring businesses on 202/206 are required to meet the same ordinance?

MR. DEAN: I've only studied, and analyzed, and provided empirical data for this portion of this site. I don't know about any other uses.

MR. FRESCO: But it is an ordinance, though. So maybe somebody on the panel can clarify for us whether or not everybody has to live by these rules or not. I think that's important, because if all the businesses in this corridor have to work within this ordinance, I think it's crazy to think that you shouldn't. It just seems like fair business.

Sir, who chose the time, this June date? Is that you personally? Is that your firm? Is that the applicant?

MR. DEAN: That's when the issue arose, and my firm was retained at that point in time to evaluate the parking.

MR. FRESCO: Right. Right.
MR. DEAN: So that's --
MR. FRESCO: And just so I
understand -- I thought you said you used drones. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Yes.
MR. FRESCO: All of the -- the 11, as you say, instances -- although I thought I heard two -- the 11 instances were all done by drone? You didn't have any feet on the ground?

MR. DEAN: I had feet on the ground at the same time as the drone. I said that. MR. FRESCO: Right. Is that the guy just controlling the drone, or is that actually people, like, looking and making sensible decisions, like, you know, that car is abandoned, or that may be -- some of these facilities have company cars, so maybe there were company cars there.

MR. DEAN: If it's a parked car, we saw it. The problem is there's a multi-level parking garage on the campus; the drone can't see through that. So I had to have personnel walk through the garage to count the number of parked vehicles in the garage.

MR. FRESCO: Okay. I just -- for
the planning board, if anybody can answer my question, though, as to whether or not all the
businesses in Bridgewater are supposed to adhere to this ordinance, $I$ think that's important for us to understand.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. Any other member of the public with questions, please come forward.

Good evening.
MR. GANGOLI: Hi. Good evening.
Gaurav Gangoli, 8 Garfield Avenue, Bridgewater.
MR. COLLINS: Could you spell your
last name?
MR. GANGOLI: G-A-N-G-O-L-I.
Just to give you some context, I'm a
business unit leader for a multinational in town, and $I$ do data analytics and modeling all day, so this is fun for me. We have this saying that, you know, the only thing worse than no model is a poorly constructed model --

MR. DEAN: I'm having a hard time hearing you, so if you don't mind just slowing down and articulating just a bit.

MR. GANGOLI: Sure. So my job all day is data analytics and modeling. So this is exciting to me. So my questions come from that
context.
Can you tell us a little bit about the other data inputs you've had in here? So, for example, specifically incremental and decremental over time, let's say over the next five, ten-year time horizon. I'm not sure what time horizon the board looks at, but, for example, 10 -year time horizon.

So what $I$ mean by that is, just to give you some examples, you look over the past 25 years, there's been an increase of 2.4 percent cars on the road in New Jersey. Right? So you extrapolate that out 10 years. Those are incrementals.

You've got decrementals, like snow in the wintertime doesn't always get picked up, so that's taking away space.

You've got changing workplace environments. So, for example, my multinational, we have a site in Titusville, New Jersey. They went open concept; tripled the capacity. So if that were to happen here, and if you pick up any business, periodically -- you'll see that it's the trend, there are various reasons for that, we won't get into that today -- but if that
happened, then your occupancy would automatically triple, then you'd be over.

I want to know what inputs in the model you've had, not over the past, but over the next 10-year time horizon.

MS. DORY: I'm sorry, can I use that?

MR. GANGOLI: Yeah.
MR. COAKLEY: Thank you.
Madame Chair, Mr. Dean is a traffic engineer, and he's provided his testimony in that field. I don't believe the question goes to his -- the scope of his testimony. You know, we've identified a parking variance that was previously granted for this entire site in 2008 by the board, Sanofi used this entire property, pretty much in the same way.

We will have another witness that
will provide information on the usage of the buildings in the ORD Zone, so I think these types of questions might be more appropriate for that. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.

Do you have a question regarding his specific testimony?

MR. GANGOLI: So if $I$-- correct me
if I'm wrong: So your scope is to look at current usage, and then project to the future based on that? What exactly is --

MR. DEAN: What $I$ did was provide a snapshot of the current trends, and I accounted for non-rented space. So I assumed that the facility, at some point in its existence, would be fully occupied, and that is the adjustment I made.

MR. GANGOLI: But it's a -- so if the new occupants made no changes whatsoever, and kept the status quo, that's what your model is based on. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. GANGOLI: So is it within your scope, then, to look what happens in the next, let's say, five years?

MR. DEAN: I cannot predict -- I
wish we all could. There's no way to effectively model that, but for one caveat --

MR. GANGOLI: I would disagree.
MR. DEAN: -- and that is that I
think I've demonstrated that there's sufficient buffer, there's sufficient reserve capacity in this parking lot, where the occupancy demands of
this entire campus could double, and there would still be sufficient parking.

After that, if it, for whatever reason, got to full occupancy, the market will then dictate the next step, and that is, does the applicant attract tenants who have higher employee parking demands? Perhaps they need to then consider, as counsel explained, an investment in going vertical, or finding other parking areas to accommodate those tenants; otherwise, those tenants can't be accommodated. So the market will ultimately dictate whether there's sufficient parking or not.

MR. GANGOLI: Right. And that's -I'm just projecting from market trends from the past. So if you look at the past, and how growth has happened over the future, you can somewhat use past trends to predict the future. So I'm just wondering if your model takes that into account.

So, for example, looking throughout the year, looking at, again, the increase in cars on the road, looking at shrinkage of -- or I should say increased density of workplaces, through open concept and other kinds of
arrangement --
MR. DEAN: Density ebbs and flows. Research and development facilities, as they have more elaborate technological needs, candidly, tend to wind up using more square footage with lower densities, contrasted with an office environment. Not universally, but this is a unique facility with -- I wouldn't characterize it as a traditional office environment.

MR. GANGOLI: Sure.
Last question: Besides the snapshots, what other inputs and assumptions and perimeters went into the model for your --

MR. DEAN: It's not a model, it was a study of actual conditions at the site, extrapolated to an assumed full occupancy. And the model itself is the site. It's not a prediction; it's what the site actually does. That provides us with a benchmark as to the parking demands of this particular site.

MR. GANGOLI: Just to save time, are there future testimony of folks that have done -that have looked out and said that, based on past trends, in the next five years, this is what it would look like, in terms of needs?

MS. DORY: We'll have another witness that will testify as to the use of the property and any anticipated -- you know, the fact that it would be unlikely for it to change from its current use.

MR. GANGOLI: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. Good evening.

MR. BLAIR: Hello, Bart Blair, 856 Bluestone Lane in Bridgewater.

I'm not an expert like you are, sir, with all the certifications and everything, but I have spent the last 14 and a half years working in the parking industry, specifically dealing with occupancy, scofflaw enforcement, and things like that. So I've got a little bit of experience.

We all have heard of the book Damn Lies in Statistics. We all know that statistics can be manipulated and shown to be used -- be used to show what we want to see.

You keep talking about June is not a summer month. Everybody in the room, when you said that, was kind of like, what? June is a summer month. And let's -- let's throw that out:

What statistics do you have that will show that that was a good time to sample, other than June is not a good -- a summer month?

MR. DEAN: I don't have a statistic, other than it is when schools are in session; it is what is widely considered to be pre-vacation time. It's early June, so we don't have the vagaries of weather and snow, when people who elect to telecommute and don't come to the office. So it is as representative -- as good representative a time as $I$ can conceive, and I've spent 32 years conducting parking studies, and doing nothing but looking at traffic and parking tends, and June is absolutely a representative month --

MR. BLAIR: I think you're right
about school --
MR. COLLINS: Sir, you have to -try to just ask questions at this time. Okay?

MR. BLAIR: Sure.
So you mentioned the July -- the studies you did in July had the highest numbers.

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. BLAIR: So why are we talking
about that? Because now, let's admit that July
is a summer month.
MR. DEAN: Sure.
MR. BLAIR: So what statistics do you have on what the occupancy percentage would be compared to June, or May, or April?

MR. DEAN: Well, the occupancy hasn't changed.

MR. BLAIR: The parking occupancy.
MR. DEAN: I can only share with you
the data that I've collected, and that's been presented to the board --

MR. BLAIR: In your experience, do you have -- do you have an estimate of what July's occupancy would look like compared to an April?

MR. DEAN: Well, I have the actual number: It was 529 parking spaces out of 1,190 .

MR. BLAIR: In what month?
MR. DEAN: July.
MR. BLAIR: Right. Do you have a comparison of July to April?

MR. DEAN: No.
MR. BLAIR: Traditionally.
MR. DEAN: I didn't study April.
MR. BLAIR: And not just here at
this site. You keep talking about how this site will be similar to other sites. So if that's true, is July 60 percent of an April?

MR. DEAN: No.
MR. BLAIR: What would you say it is, and what --

MR. DEAN: I've studied this site.
I haven't looked at it for April, or November, or February. I haven't done that.

MR. BLAIR: So in 32 years, like you said, you don't have a way to tell us what July looks like compared to April?

MR. DEAN: Every site is different, and because this applicant is requesting a variance for this particular property, we've provided data when it was appropriate to do so.

MR. BLAIR: Okay. So your data, and not your expertise, is all we can get today?

MR. DEAN: Data, to me, is very compelling; buttressed by expert opinion.

MR. BLAIR: But you won't give me that expert opinion.

MR. DEAN: I haven't studied it. I've presented the data for this site.

MR. BLAIR: Thank you.

MR. DEAN: You're welcome.
MR. THAKKER: My name is Ketan
Thakker. I live on 80 Shaffer Road in
Bridgewater. I'm a resident from last 13 years in this town. Unfortunately, like the witness, I have not done any homework before coming here, I just came here to support the -- oppose the plan.

But as a professional, $I$ am a real estate broker, and $I$ know a little bit about Bridgewater real estate, how it's going on. When you say ordinance is not correct, it requiring some 2,000 some parking spaces, and you have shorted upon almost 50 percent, just a simple question is, in my mind -- most real estate in Bridgewater is 98 percent occupied. Now, if 98 percent occupied, and you already short of almost 50 percent parking, how can you accommodate? How can this variance can be granted? We're not developing in a third-world country; we're developing in Bridgewater.

MR. COLLINS: Sir, you asked a
question. You have to --
MR. THAKKER: That's my question.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you have to wait and let him try to answer it.

MR. THAKKER: Okay. Go. Answer.
MR. DEAN: Sure. We're not developing this site; we're seeking approval for what's already there.

MR. THAKKER: Yes.
MR. COLLINS: For this -- this part of the application is just about the rear office research lab portion; not about the front portion.

MR. THAKKER: My question to you: Have you ever done study, recently, similar lab, how many -- how much occupancy in that lab?

MR. DEAN: We looked at the overall site; it was 93 percent occupied when we did our study. So the number that we got of 529, we then assumed it was at 100 percent occupancy, which brought us to 569 parking spaces.

MR. THAKKER: And how many ordinance requires parking space?

MR. DEAN: Roughly 2,200.
MR. THAKKER: And you think that's wrong. Right? You think ordinance is wrong. Right?

MR. DEAN: I think, when we study a site that's 93 percent occupied, and it only
requires a quarter of what the ordinance requires, $I$ think there is a disconnect between that standard and this site's unique needs.

That's the purpose of the variance request.
MR. THAKKER: Ladies and
gentlemen --
MR. COLLINS: Sir, it's not time --
MR. THAKKER: -- I know, one second.
I'm a taxpayer, and $I$ have my opinion.
MR. COLLINS: Sir, it's not time --
MR. THAKKER: Every witness comes
don't have answer --
MR. COLLINS: Sir. Sir.
MR. THAKKER: -- and they're proving you wrong, and this should not be approved. Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: Sir, you're not making statements at this time. You are asking questions at this time.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Just to remind everybody, this is the time to ask questions of the witness regarding his testimony. After all the witnesses are completed, we're going to have time for comments from the public.

Thank you.

Is there any other member with a question of the witness regarding his testimony? Come forward, please.

MR. YU: Hi name is Robert Yu and I live at 1 Coventry Square.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Hi.
MR. YU: Hello.
Sir, I just had a question. You had, I think, somewhere in your testimony, you had mentioned that the timing of your survey, back in 2018, in June, was related to when the developer engaged your company to perform that parking survey. Correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. YU: So they engaged you, and then you, obviously wanting to serve them, you performed the survey as soon as possible after they engaged you. Would that be correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. YU: So if they had engaged you in September, or December, or in March, you would have performed your parking survey soon after whenever they engaged you?

MR. DEAN: That's correct.
MR. YU: Okay. So you had said that
you took empirical evidence of the parking demand in June, when you took your survey. Correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. YU: So you've been very clear, because of that, you're very sure about what it is in June, and in July, but you can't give any testimony with regard to what it was empirically in September, or December, or March.

MR. DEAN: I did not study those periods, correct.

MR. YU: Okay. And you also --
because you said it was a snapshot in time, that you're basing your analysis based on the existing situation with the existing tenants at the time of your survey, and that you're not looking either backyards or forwards. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. YU: And you're not the correct witness for saying what the parking demand will be when the proposed changes are put into place. MR. DEAN: The proposed change -there are no changes on the ORD campus, except for the removal of 22 parking spaces.

MR. YU: I'm sorry, I might have misheard, and I apologize for that. My
understanding, based on a question before, was that several buildings would be taken down in this zone, in the ORD.

MR. DEAN: That's incorrect.
MR. YU: That's incorrect?
MR. DEAN: That's incorrect.
MR. YU: And there are not going to be any other buildings erected in the ORD?

MR. DEAN: That is also correct.

MR. YU: And there's not going to be any adjoining properties that can access this parking space.

MR. DEAN: That is also correct.

MR. YU: Okay. I'm sorry, I just --
I believe that I thought that there was some mention of condominiums in this space, in this zone -- not the large one, but the small one --

MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. Dory
should help everyone. What is the condominium that you're referring to? It's not this particular reference, the condominium needs a little definition by the applicant's representative.

MR. COAKLEY: Yes, the property ownership scheme is that of a condominium. The

ORD Zone is held in two condominiums: Condominium 2 and 3. You know, it's just a form of ownership.

MR. COLLINS: It's not a
multi-family housing unit.
MR. COAKLEY: It's not a
multi-family, no, it's not.
MR. COLLINS: Okay.
MR. COAKLEY: So you have the use is what it is, it has nothing to do with anything, in terms of the condominiums, other than that's the form of ownership.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: So the form of ownership are two condominiums in the ORD section.

MR. COAKLEY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: And how
many buildings are in that section?
MR. COAKLEY: As testified by
Mr. Hermann, he testified as to the 10 buildings or so, whatever he testified to.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: So it could be five buildings are owned by Condo 2 and five owned by Condo 3 , something like that?

MR. COAKLEY: It could be, but I
think that's irrelevant to the board's consideration.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: I'm just trying to get a clearer picture of -- that these are entities that own the different buildings. Is that --

MR. COAKLEY: Yes, they own different parts of the ORD Zone, and different buildings, and different parking areas, but they are in unified ownership under the entity we're calling Thor.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: And there's no demolition in this area.

MR. COAKLEY: There's no demolition planned. There's no new building planned. It's what you have there right today, that's what this variance is about.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay.
MR. COLLINS: But there is going to be demolition of some -- of office research buildings in the front zone, the redevelopment zone. Is that correct?

MR. COAKLEY: Yes, that has -- this parking variance has nothing to do with the R-Seed development area.

MR. COLLINS: Does that help you, sir?

MR. YU: Yes, thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MS. MINE: Hello. Diane Mine, 743 Cedar Brook Road.

It seems like it's going around in circles, but the ORD area, you're claiming there's no new development. So, in my mind, there would be no need for a variance, because all you're doing is putting in a couple extra -7 percent since you were occupied in 93, 7 more percent, I'm not sure the need for that ordinance -- or that variance.

MR. DEAN: The reason is that the portion of the site which is in the ORD Zone is short on parking.

MS. MINE: You said there's twice as -- you already have two times more than you need.

MR. DEAN: That is my testimony.
MS. MINE: And, therefore, I question the variance, because you already have two times more than you need.

MS. DEAN: I'll say the rules, the
regulations under the land use code of the township, require 2,200 spaces for this campus. We only have 1,190. We only have, roughly, 1,200 today. We're short today. We're just looking for formal approval of that deficiency. But it already exists. We're not creating anything new here. It already exists.

MS. MINE: Have you been asked to do a survey for the front part of the property?

MR. DEAN: Yes.
MS. MINE: And that will also
probably require a variance to extend and expand? Maybe that's a question for the next people, but it sounds like you've had one variance already, years ago, and now you're requesting another one for what, to me, doesn't seem as if you've shown proof that you need it, other than what you're saying is already there for the variance.

MR. DEAN: That's our proof, is that we don't need the required amount of parking. MS. MINE: Then don't put it in. MR. DEAN: We're not putting any in. MR. COLLINS: It's already there. MS. MINE: Okay.

MR. COLLINS: They're not putting
any new building space in this section.
MS. MINE: And parking? No new parking?

MR. COLLINS: No new buildings, and they're reducing slightly the number of parking spaces in this section. The 7 percent is just that the buildings have 7 percent vacancy. The existing buildings in this section have 7 percent vacancy, so he's made a projection of how many additional parking spaces 7 percent would need. I think he's been very clear about that, so I hope you understand that.

MS. MINE: It just sounds like it's contradictory, when you're saying you already have twice as many as you need.

MR. COLLINS: You're sort of helping him. That's his point.

She doesn't quite understand, but I think he's answered the question.

MR. KULAK: John Kulak, 13 Ramsey Street. Couple of quick questions for you.

You testified just now that you will also -- you have conducted studies for the other part of this development. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: That's correct.

MR. KULAK: And as you're contemplating the work that you've done on this part -- I think the reason we're here -- and correct me if $I$ 'm wrong -- is that, after that parcel was sold off, you were employed by both Thor -- am I -- I don't know where the attorney went, but were you employed by Thor, or still employed by Advance?

MR. DEAN: I have been employed since this project's inception, which I think started in 2013, by the applicant, AR II/CIP (sic) -- whatever the acronym is, but not by Advance.

MR. KULAK: But you do know who they are, other than their acronym.

MR. DEAN: I do, yes.
MR. KULAK: So do you work for them, or do you work for Thor?

MR. DEAN: I have been retained by Advance.

MR. KULAK: So on behalf of Thor, you're being paid by Advance; you're making this assertion and requesting this variance to the planning board. I'm not sure that $I$ follow the logic there.

MR. DEAN: Okay.
MS. DORY: Excuse me. Madame Chair, I'm not sure that this question relates to Mr. Dean's testimony or his expertise.

MR. KULAK: Well, he did testify that he was also the representative for the other part of the development. He just said that.

MS. DORY: Yes, he's presenting on behalf of both applicants.

MR. COLLINS: Let's just let -- the questions could relate to credibility or something.

So, Mr. Kulak, let's try to -- try to focus in on what the witness testified about, and then, if you really have something about his -- who's paying him, you know, you -- it's somewhat relevant, about credibility, sometimes, but I don't think he actually said he's been retained by Thor. So you might want to --

MR. KULAK: No, he did not. He said he was being retained by the --

MR. COLLINS: You said that he was --

MR. KULAK: I'm sorry, if $I$ said that, I misspoke. I meant to find out who he's
being employed by.
MR. COLLINS: Go ahead, but try to bring it into what is -- how does this help the board understand something about this witness's testimony. Okay?

MR. KULAK: Well, given his
expertise, and given his knowledge of both aspects of the site, I'm trying to make sense, in my head, out of his representation of this part of the development, as it compares to the other part of the development, when he'll come back and make, maybe, different assertions, I don't know, but he's going to have something to say, hopefully.

So I'm trying to figure out, if Thor
is making this representation, this request, why are they using an expert who is paid by somebody else?

MR. COLLINS: You have to ask the witness, sir.

MR. KULAK: Do you know?
MR. DEAN: I don't know. Thor is a relatively recent purchaser of a portion of the site that may be subsequent to when I did my analysis. So my findings don't change depending
on who happens to be the applicant.
MR. KULAK: Right. But do you know for whom he's testifying today?

MS. DORY: Yes, Mr. Dean is here on behalf of both Thor and Advance.

MR. KULAK: Both parties.
MS. DORY: Yes.
MR. KULAK: Okay. One question
about what you had said earlier. You said that there's a security fence that's going to segregate this portion from the other portion of the proposed development.

MR. DEAN: That's correct.
MR. KULAK: Could you outline where that would be? Because none of us --

MR. DEAN: I cannot. Candidly, I don't know where it is.

MR. KULAK: Does it exist today?
MR. DEAN: It exists around the perimeter of the entire campus, and, essentially, should the front portion receive the approvals, the fence around, I'll call it, the easterly perimeter, will then be moved and essentially bisect the site, separating the ORD westerly portion of the site with the $R$-Seed redevelopment
portion on the easterly side of the site.
MR. KULAK: And the purpose of that fence is to have no interaction between the two parcels. Is that fair to say?

MR. DEAN: It's a security protocol.
The interaction, as far as it does segregate parking and circulation, but it's principally to keep the R\&D campus secure.

MR. KULAK: Because there may be questions, and certainly $I$ will have them, about the interaction between the two parcels, now that you've bifurcated the site with the new owner, as it pertains to overflow parking from the proposed development of the other parking site. So if there's no fence currently, and we don't know where it's going to be, I don't see how the planning board can make a decision to grant a variance based on this testimony, when there are other mitigating factors or other dependencies which haven't been testified to.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MR. RING: Timothy Ring, 17 Lawton Road.

Sir, you just testified that there
was going to be a security fence that would bifurcate the two parcels. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. RING: Can you tell me a little bit more how the security fence will accomplish that?

MR. DEAN: I cannot answer that.
MR. RING: But yet you're able to
testify that it will do that.
MR. DEAN: Well, there's a security fence today.

MR. RING: Okay.
MR. DEAN: That restricts access to the site, but for a few, I'll call them, publicly accessible areas. As part of the zone boundary that was created for the R-Seed district to the east and the ORD Zone to the west, that fence, by and large -- and I'm not testifying as to its precise location -- will by and large stick to that zone line. So it will have -- whatever its materials are, it will have a guard, it will have employee keycards, as part of the redevelopment.

MR. RING: I'm not so much
interested in where it's going to be located; I'm more interested, because you're doing a parking
study, you would want to know -- while I understand this is now separated, basically, into two different projects, there's obviously still connections, and parking in one area can impact the other.

So, for example, if we're bifurcating this -- if $I$ understand what you're trying to suggest, the people that work in the ORD Zone would be able to park behind that bifurcated -- behind that fence, but the folks that utilize the rest of the property would not access to that. But if there's an overflow situation, because there's not enough parking in the ORD area, then employees could park out in the front portion and still traverse to the back. I'm just trying to understand the bifurcation of it.

MS. DORY: If I could just --
MR. RING: Sure.
MS. DORY: -- interject here a minute.

We testified to the Condominium
Units 2 and 3, and the buildings that are on those condominium units are required to use the parking in Units 2 and 3 , and not on the
remaining portions of the property.
MR. RING: Thank you.
My other question, sir, you
testified that July, generally, in your research, is a lighter month for parking in corporate facilities, research type facilities. Is that correct?

MR. DEAN: I don't believe that was my testimony, no.

MR. RING: I apologize, I thought I heard reference that July was relatively -- can be relatively light. Sorry.

I heard the number 529.
MR. DEAN: Correct. MR. RING: Was that for July 2019 or June --

MR. DEAN: It was.
MR. RING: What was the number in
June 2018?
MR. DEAN: 483.
MR. RING: So in July, when families are on vacation, children are away, people take time off from work, we saw a higher parking count than in June, when you did clearly testify is a statistically accurate month for testing parking.

Would that make you question why? Did tenants bring in additional -- did tenants bring in additional employees? Anything related to that?

Like, I guess if I was doing parking, I'm not a parking expert, but knowing July is a quiet month, if I saw 483 versus 529, I might say why is that.

MR. DEAN: Well, one of the things we found is that, while regular employees take summer vacations and go with families, work still needs to be done, and so that is augmented by interns, college staff, and summer hires, to supplant those that are on vacation. So for that reason, trends generally balance.

I don't know what the occupancy was when $I$ did my counts in June at the 483.

MR. RING: I wasn't aware research companies could bring in summer help to take over a research project that they've been working on for years, but thank you.

MR. DEAN: You're welcome.
MR. PLACEK: Pawel Placek, 13 Claire Drive.

So let's talk about the study. And so you had the study, the first sample in June of

2018, and then you repeated in July 2019. Did I understand correctly?

MR. DEAN: Yes, you did.
MR. PLACEK: And we didn't run anything for the whole year in between.

MR. DEAN: Correct.
MR. PLACEK: How many similar
studies did you perform or oversee in the past three years?

MR. DEAN: This was the only parking study or studies, these two that I've conducted, for this site.

MR. PLACEK: This is one study.
Right? With two different samples. One in June, one in July. So you've performed -- in the past three years, this is the only single study you've performed or parking study you've done.

MR. DEAN: It's not a single study. We sampled parking twice a day for five days in 2018, and one day, admittedly, in 2019, just as a litmus test, to see if we were still in the general ballpark.

MR. PLACEK: I understand. From the definition of a study, it's one study. We're doing studies by thousands. So you've done one
study in the past three years, one parking study. MR. DEAN: I'll agree to disagree. I have sampled more than once, but fewer than 100 times.

MR. PLACEK: But this was the single site you sampled in June and July over the past three years.

MR. DEAN: That's the purpose of this hearing, is for this site.

MR. PLACEK: I'm asking about your expertise. Have you done other studies like this for other clients?

MR. DEAN: Oh, of course, yes.
MR. PLACEK: In the past three years?

MR. DEAN: Yes.
MR. PLACEK: Okay. And how many of those -- how many, roughly? Do you know? Are we talking about -- I don't want to say the wrong number, but tens? hundreds?

MR. DEAN: Over the past three years, I would venture to say 50 to 60 different studies.

MR. PLACEK: How many of those were only on the data from June?

MR. DEAN: Some of them have to be conducted in the middle of summer.

MR. PLACEK: How many, roughly?
MR. DEAN: I would say -- a smaller sample, but $I$ would say, of those 50 or 60,10 percent required specific study during the summer.

MR. PLACEK: Okay. I have question for counsel, because one of the questions before -- and I don't know if I can ask it -- was to -- when we ask about will there ever be need to increase the parking spots, we've been told that the next witness will testify to it. Is it this witness or the next one?

MS. DORY: We have another witness that will testify as to the current use of the property, and that it will largely remain the same use, and that'll be the next witness.

MR. PLACEK: Okay. So it will be next. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
MS. SMITH: Hi, my name is Michelle Smith. I live on Foothill Road. I have a question.

And I know everybody's going back
over the June, July, and I appreciate it, but one of the questions $I$ have is, when you do a parking study, do you take into account the business that's there currently, and their deadlines?

MR. DEAN: I don't know what you mean by "deadlines," but we take into consideration the tenancy as it exists, yes.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Because what I'm asking is, for a research and development company, during August and September, they're usually working on grants, government grants, to get paid, which come out of the October 1st. So I'm just wondering why research isn't done into what type of business it is, and the accountability that they have.

MR. DEAN: I don't have an answer for that, and $I$ can't corroborate your opinion.

MS. SMITH: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the public that has a question for this witness regarding his testimony? If there is, please step forward, state your name and address.

MR. WONG: Sammy Wong, 36 Danberry.
Regarding the study or the snapshots
that you took, what prevented you guys from taking a monthly snapshot, or was it just a lack of resources, or a time constraint?

MR. DEAN: It's not designed to give us to an infinite percentile how close we are with parking. The purpose of doing a snapshot -and, candidly, to do it over two weeks in June, one early week, and then going into the next week -- was to not come before this board and testify and say, you know, I looked at this parking for one day, here's what $I$ found. So now I've studied it 10 different times over a two-week period, and $I$ came up with a number.

And when I resampled it this past July, I'm still pretty close to the same number, so it tells me that, look, maybe April is 10 percent higher in terms of parking than June.

We have 100 percent more parking on this site. So we can accommodate whatever marginal seasonal fluctuation there could exist -- and $I$ don't think it does -- but if I'm wrong, okay, I'm wrong, $I$ can be off by a factor of 100 percent, and we still have enough parking on this campus to support the variance.

MR. WONG: So, in your opinion, it's
better to sample two weeks at a time, as opposed to sampling it once a month, or once a quarter, et cetera?

MR. DEAN: I don't have the luxury, unfortunately, in land use proceedings, to come in with a year's worth of data. That seldom presents itself. So we provide a snapshot, and we consult with the applicant, and we look at things like occupancy, to make sure that the building was full, and we adjust accordingly.

But in my opinion, data that $I$
collected in early June is certainly
representative of any other month of the year for an employment-based center. It's not a golf course, it's not a school that might be out for the summer, it's a place where people come to work, and $I$ expect that that trend in early June is the same as it is every other month.

MR. WONG: Okay. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Is there any other member of the
public with a question for this witness?
COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: I have a question.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Yes.

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Why is this application even before this board as part of this overall plan? Why wouldn't -- we have separate ownership and a separate parking issue. Why isn't it handled as a separate application?

MS. DORY: The reason for this variance request is it's a technical variance that was identified since we were last before the board. We previously testified to variances created as a result of existing conditions in the split zoning of the property. So this was just another variance that was picked up in our review --

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: The previous application has nothing to do with that part of the property. Right?

MS. DORY: No, the previous application was actually for the entire property. So we did have testimony previously as to the conditions in the ORD Zone, and variances in the ORD Zone.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other questions from the board?

From the public?
Seeing none, Ms. Dory, at this time,
we have our -- Mr. Troutman, who we would like to bring forward.

MS. DORY: Okay. We actually have additional witnesses for this variance request. Could we proceed with those?

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: You think we'll have time to --

MR. COLLINS: I think it would be best -- well, Jay -- it might be best to hear these witnesses on this variance, if Jay could stay.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DORY: And Mr. Coakley will
finish the remaining witnesses for this variance.
MR. COAKLEY: I'd like to call
Daniel Loughlin.
I just -- and, Councilman, in answer to your question, this application always involved the entirety of this 100-plus-acre property, it involved these three tax lots, 17, 18, and 19. And we did discuss this very question with board staff before we filed this application.

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Okay. Thank
you.
D A N I E L L O U G H L I N, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COAKLEY:
Q. Mr. Loughlin, you've been sworn. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, first, just tell the board: What is your professional background?
A. I am a corporate real estate broker advisor, and I've been involved in this property since the sale of it, $I$ represented Sanofi Aventis at the time in the sale of the property to Advance.

Prior to selling the property to Advance, we leased two buildings in the ORD Zone to Ashland Chemical and Kashiv Pharma.
Q. Let me slow you down for a second. So you're a professional real estate broker --
A. Yeah, I'm the broker of record for Jones Lang LaSalle. We're a Fortune 250 global company. I co-chair our life science practice group. I'm the broker of record in New Jersey. And I'm a Bridgewater High School graduate.

West.
Q. So in your capacity as a broker, have you concentrated in office and pharma projects?
A. Yes, both. And the unique thing about this ORD property is that this 800,000 square feet was really designed as laboratory research space, not office space. Out of the roughly 650,000 square feet of net area, there's only one building out of the 10 buildings that's office space. Everything else is lab space.
Q. All right. And are you familiar with what the market normally requires for parking for an office use?
A. Yes.
Q. What's a ratio that's typical?
A. It's normally three to four per thousand.
Q. Okay. And for space like this, do you have a rule of thumb as to what ratio would be appropriate for this type of utilization?
A. I think the practical ratio is one per thousand.
Q. And the Bridgewater ordinance is --
A. 3.3, I believe.
Q. 3.3 per thousand.
A. But that's for office and lab.
Q. So you mentioned a minute ago that you were involved for Sanofi in the initial sale of the property. Is that to CIP?
A. To Advance.
Q. Okay. To Advance.
A. We also -- go ahead.
Q. When did that happen, what year?

Approximately five or six years ago?
A. Seems like a long time ago, but it's probably five, six years ago.
Q. Okay. And you were also involved in the property when it was sold more recently to Thor?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Were you also involved in leasing the property to tenants?
A. Yes, we leased all of the space that's currently occupied in the ORD Zone.
Q. All right. So you -- you're very familiar with how this property is used and who the tenants are?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. In general, could you
describe how this property operates? Just in general.
A. Yeah, it's primarily a research and development use. The buildings are specifically designed to function as research space. Nestle Health Sciences operates what they call a pilot plant in the facility, which is predominantly what they call a clinical-scale manufacturing research function. So, you know, all the buildings are designed around laboratory, research, and as $I$ mentioned, only one of the buildings at Ashland Chemical occupies as an office building.
Q. And would you say that the utilization of research equipment characterizes this type of space?
A. Yes. Typically, a scientist will have an office, but he'll also have a lab. So he moves from his office to his lab, and inside the lab, there's normally a service corridor, and then there's a host of different types of equipment, benchtop equipment, fume hoods, hot and cold boxes, autoclaves, a number of different equipment and functional uses go on in these labs.
Q. And so your basic point is this type of equipment doesn't demand parking. Is that fair to say?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you mentioned Nestle. And they have how many square feet?
A. Roughly 180,000 square feet.
Q. All right. And what about a company called Clinical Geonomics?
A. You know, they're in one of -they're one of our smaller tenants, they're probably in 15,000 feet.
Q. Okay. PTC Therapeutics?
A. PTC Therapeutics is a new company to the campus; they're roughly 40,000 square feet.
Q. All right. And they'd be similar laboratory types of uses?
A. They are in JR-1, which is 100 percent a laboratory building.
Q. All right. And Ashland, how much space do they have?
A. Ashland is roughly 200,000 feet: 150 of it is lab, and 45 to 50 of it is an office building.
Q. All right. So, now, there was some testimony about how -- what is the level of occupancy. Do you have a feeling for that?
A. It's roughly 90 percent.
Q. So that was consistent with Mr. Dean's testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.
A. I think we have one floor left in JR-1, I believe.
Q. That's one of the buildings. Right?
A. Right, roughly 40,000 feet.
Q. And you're trying to lease that space?
A. Correct.
Q. And is the parking on the campus a problem in leasing the space?
A. No.
Q. There's enough parking?
A. There's enough parking.

MR. COAKLEY: No further questions.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Does any member of the board have a question of this witness regarding his testimony?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: I do. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Mr. Lerner, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is converting a lab building to an office building normally feasible, should somebody come in and decide they want to change the use?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Not really. Most of these buildings are designed with service corridors, and loading docks, and mechanically, the HVAC equipment, it's designed for once-through air. So it's -- to operate these buildings is about twice as much as it is to operate an office building, to give you a sense.

MR. COAKLEY: So your testimony is it would be very expensive to --

MR. LOUGHLIN: Well, the highest and best use is the R\&D that goes on there right now. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other member of the board?

COMMISSIONER PANDYA: Is it accurate to say that, of the 650,000 square feet, 600,000 is research, and only 50,000 is office?

MR. LOUGHLIN: There is some pockets of office space inside each of the lab buildings,
but it's minimal.
COMMISSIONER PANDYA: So what percentage of the 650,000 is office space?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Ten to fifteen percent.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other member of the board?

Is there any member of the public with a question for this witness regarding his testimony?

Please come forward.
MR. MOENCH: Good evening, Matthew Moench, 1303 Roger Avenue.

I had a question, I guess, for
Mr. Collins. I didn't hear whether this expert -- this witness was actually sworn in as an expert. I heard testimony that sounded as if it was --

MR. COLLINS: He wasn't.
MR. MOENCH: So given that,
Mr. Collins, $I$ would suggest to you that all the testimony is nothing but net opinion that hasn't been backed up by either expertise or a finding by this board, or some sort of facts to back that up. So if that's the point, I'm not sure what
value the expert -- what value this testimony has.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Coakley, you want to address that?

MR. COAKLEY: Let me offer Mr. Loughlin as an expert in the field of commercial brokerage for research and development and lab-type properties.

MR. COLLINS: And Mr. Moench, would you like to voir dire him as to those qualifications, ask him questions as to those qualifications?

MR. MOENCH: Yeah, I don't have any -- well, back it up.

Sir, can you give us the benefit of your background? I heard you're from West; I was when it was still combined. So what was it --

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yeah, so I'm in
business 33 years. I represented Hoffman LaRoche in the sale of their Nutley campus. I represented Merck in the sale of their Union, Summit, and Whitehouse headquarters. I currently represent Bristol-Myers Squibb in the disposition of their 1.2-million-square-foot campus in Hopewell, which we just signed a lease with PTC

Therapeutics there as well for 200,000 feet.
So this is what $I$ do, and, you know, as I mentioned, I co-chair a life science practice group nationally for JLL.

MR. MOENCH: Understood. Where did you go to school, sir? After West, where did you go?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Long Island University.

MR. MOENCH: What did you get a degree in there?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Business.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. I don't have any objections to this witness being qualified as an expert in the subject matter with which Mr. Coakley has offered him for, but Mr. Collins, I still object to the fact that nothing that I've heard so far would indicate to me that this is a witness who can testify regarding the sufficiency of parking to the extent that this witness has.

We've heard from engineers; we've heard from somebody with 33 years of experience in parking. I don't understand what somebody who is what sounds to be a relatively experienced broker in this field is going to be able to tell
us about the sufficiency of parking under our ordinances, and whether or not this meets the criteria for planning purposes as to whether or not this is, in fact, valid parking here.

There's nothing in his experience or background that suggests that that testimony is included within his scope as an expert witness.

MR. COLLINS: I don't determine what the value to an applicant is of their witness, and Mr. Coakley has presented him, and what he's presenting him for is up to Mr. Coakley. If you want to make a statement later about what you think is the probative value of this witness, you can do that, but you can't do it when you're cross-examining a witness. But you might be able to elicit something from him on this subject that would help your cause. I think it's clear that he is an expert in real estate.

MR. MOENCH: Understood. Okay.
Thank you.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah, so Mr. Coakley's offer is that he's an expert in real estate.

MR. MOENCH: Yes, with that, I don't disagree.

Sir, could you just clarify for me,
for the audience, what is your -- what, if any, is your current role with regard to this site?

MR. LOUGHLIN: We are currently the leasing agents on behalf of Thor equities, the new owner.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. And you've been involved with the site continuously from the time it was first sold?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yes.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. I asked a witness earlier who didn't know, but can you provide for us information with regard to what, if any -- what new tenants, if any, have come on to the site within the past five years?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Past five years, all of them.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. So anything that existed prior to that time -- it was a completely different site prior to approximately five or six years ago?

MR. LOUGHLIN: You know, I think the way Sanofi designed and built the site, and the parking that they allocated for, is what we're using now.

MR. MOENCH: I understand.

MR. LOUGHLIN: It's the same use.
MR. MOENCH: I understand, but my question is anything that predates about five or six years ago was a single use Sanofi site, as opposed to what we currently have. So comparisons to looking at the site 10 years ago, towards now, it's two completely different sites.

MR. LOUGHLIN: You know, the front of the site was always office space; the back of the site is the ORD site. And that's why it's been bifurcated, because that's what the highest and best use is for the back portion of the site. MR. MOENCH: Thank you. I don't have any more questions.

MR. LOUGHLIN: All right. Thanks. MR. STANDER: Hello. I'm Ross Stander, 662 Cedar Brook Road, Bridgewater, also chairman of the Crisis Environmental Group for the last 30 years or so. We've been dealing with the American Hoechst site.

You may be aware from the past planning board meetings that there's a very high degree of benzene --

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Stander, you have to ask a question.

MR. STANDER: I'm going to ask a question.

MR. COLLINS: That's all you can do.
MR. STANDER: I promise. One more sentence, and $I$ will ask a question, sir.

MR. COLLINS: No, you can't make a statement.

MR. STANDER: All right. I will ask the question.

MR. COLLINS: You can ask this witness a question related to his testimony.

MR. STANDER: All right. Witness, can you tell us who, which of the companies, Sanofi, Ashland, et cetera, is responsible for the high degree of benzene contamination under this site?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I'm not aware of it.
MR. STANDER: Well, we are.
MR. COAKLEY: Not a proper question, obviously.

MR. STANDER: I'm sorry?
MR. COLLINS: Yeah, the witness doesn't know anything to answer your question, so you have to --

MR. STANDER: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: -- focus on what he testified to.

MR. FRESCO: Hello. Andy Fresco, Glen Eagles Drive, Bridgewater.

So, Mr. Loughlin, do you still live
in Bridgewater?
MR. LOUGHLIN: No, I live in North Branch.

MR. FRESCO: Okay. Yeah, I'm an East guy, actually, and $I$ do live in Bridgewater still, for 40 years, as do my parents.

Okay. So can you tell us what percent of this ORD portion is occupied by Nestle? Do you know, roughly? Maybe you know, sir.

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yeah, it's the entire JR-2 building.

MR. FRESCO: Exactly. And it is a Nestle pilot program. Right?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. FRESCO: You're aware of that?
MR. LOUGHLIN: Yes.
MR. FRESCO: So the nature of how
the program, it's a test. Right?
MR. LOUGHLIN: It's research, yes.

MR. FRESCO: But it's not like it's Nestle candy bars, or water, or things that we're familiar with. It is R\&D. So what would you say the likelihood was that they are even here in five years?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I think it's actually Nestle Nutritional Health Sciences is the name of the entity, and it's all about nutrition, and pharmaceuticals and nutraceuticals meeting each other. I think they're going to be here for a while.

MR. FRESCO: Okay. Good. Because the press release that $I$ read, you know, said that -- it implied that it was a new program that they were investing and exploring.

MR. LOUGHLIN: They signed a 17-year lease.

MR. FRESCO: Seventeen years. Okay. Good. Well, that's helpful.

Sir, how many times have you testified on behalf of a client, I suppose, for a parking variance?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Not often. This is actually my second testimony in the last two months.

MR. FRESCO: Okay. So then I think we can call into question, then -- no offense, of course, $I$ 'm not an attorney -- but this isn't really your thing. I mean, you're a realtor. I mean, you sell all high-end realty.

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yeah, so you really can't, you know, finalize a lease without addressing parking. Parking is, you know, a key component of any lease transaction.

MR. FRESCO: That's right. So you haven't seen a lot of this, and you're saying -I'm asking -- this is the only time, just to clarify, that you've ever had to testify on behalf of a client --

MR. LOUGHLIN: In front of a board on this kind of site.

MR. FRESCO: Do you think it's fair, sir, that businesses in Bridgewater all have to adhere to this ordinance, yet this applicant is asking for a variance? Do you think so it's fair to the other businesses?

MR. COAKLEY: Objection to the question.

MR. FRESCO: He's not an expert.
He's giving his opinion --

MR. COAKLEY: Objection to the statement.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: If you could just direct your questions to his testimony, that would be helpful.

MR. FRESCO: Okay. I own a business nearby. I don't think it's fair --

MR. COLLINS: You have to ask a question.

MR. FRESCO: Do you think it's fair -- okay. That's fine. I think we all agree it's not fair to any of the other businesses in this corridor.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you.
Is there any other members of the public with questions of this witness regarding his testimony?

Please come forward.
MS. SMITH: Hi, my name is Michelle Smith. I just have a couple of different questions.

You indicated that it's a research and manufacturing plant, Nestle?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Research and pilot plant.

MS. SMITH: No, you used -somebody -- you used the word manufacturing.

MR. LOUGHLIN: Clinical-scale manufacturing, which is kind of a research function.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Because, living in this area, I'm sure you grew up, and that company was where Sanofi is, where there is contamination in the ground. That was my first question.

My second question is, in the past, you and Advance have had testimony in Bedminster, when I lived there, about solar panel plants. Is that still an issue that's going to be reviewed?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I'm not aware of that.

MR. COAKLEY: Objection.
MR. LOUGHLIN: I wasn't involved in that.

MS. SMITH: You were. Okay. So we're two for two. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other member with a question?

MR. PLACEK: Pawel Placek, 13 Claire Drive.

It might not be related to
testimony, so I apologize, but this testimony was offered as outside the question whether there would be future request for the parking increase. So I wanted to ask, which -- how can you -- which part of your testimony proves that point, that there will not be future requests for additional parking?

MR. COAKLEY: I don't think that that was his testimony at all. It's a misstatement, mischaracterization of his testimony, and it should not be allowed.

What we've said repeatedly is, if there's -- if they come in for a new building, then it comes before the board, but that's not the case here. This application is based on the existing buildings; the existing parking. It seems a variance based on those two existing conditions.

MR. PLACEK: I agree with the statement on the testimony --

MR. COLLINS: Sir, you have to -you cannot -- you have to just ask questions.

MR. PLACEK: I understand, but --
MR. COLLINS: You can ask them, and
then, if there's an objection, because it's outside the scope of the direct testimony, we'll have to decide that. Go ahead and ask questions, but don't make statements. Don't try to tell him what he's supposed to tell you. Ask him what you want to hear, and see if he answers it.

MR. PLACEK: I understand that. And
I don't have a question for the --
MR. COLLINS: Then you're done. If you don't have any questions, you can't speak at this stage, because this witness is just open for questions. But if you do have a question, and it's within the scope of his direct testimony, ask, and ask him, and then, if there's an objection, we'll deal with it.

MR. PLACEK: Okay. I have question for counsel, then, when the time comes, because they offered --

MR. COLLINS: They don't have to answer questions. Counsel, they might answer questions, but they don't have to.

So you're saying you would like to ask Mr. Coakley a question; maybe you want to ask him that during a break.

MR. PLACEK: No, it wasn't -- we asked the question --

MR. COLLINS: I understand your point, but that's a statement.

MR. PLACEK: Okay.
MR. COLLINS: Just go ahead and ask questions.

MR. PLACEK: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the public with a question for this witness regarding his testimony?

MR. GARDNER: Jay Gardner, 31 Ray Street.

You've made some great deals. I'm in the pharmaceutical industry; you've been involved in most of the big ones.

You know, we've talked -- heard a
lot about 93 percent occupancy. Right? But that's really tenants, or that's the -- like, if we could take ten tenants there; we have nine tenants now. Do I understand that correctly?

MR. LOUGHLIN: No, I mean, I think what I'm -- what 90 percent occupancy means is that 90 percent of the space is committed to by leases.

MR. GARDNER: Right. So is there a
restriction in the lease? Does the lease spell out how many people they can have in there? Is there a restriction in the lease on that?

MR. LOUGHLIN: Not necessarily, but that's usually based on the current plan of the building, and the use of the building, which is for $R \& D$ functions.

MR. GARDNER: Right, I understand the use.

Okay. Thank you.
MR. GANGOLI: Hello, Gaurav Gangoli, Garfield Avenue. I'm also an industry man myself, so I've been on a few sites all around New Jersey.

What can you tell us about any
studies, or analyses, or your expert opinion on
transient traffic, that's different from R\&D facilities like this versus office buildings?

So as an example, there's things that are transient across all office parks. Right? Snow piles up; you can't park there.

Then there are ones that are more specific to R\&D facilities. So if you think about the cooling trucks that have to come in, the chemical trucks that have to come in, so
they're a lot different than the WB Mason who just has to drop off office supplies.

So what can you tell us about this that's different, and was that accounted for in the parking analyses that are done for this?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I think there's
several liquid nitrogen tanks on the property, but they're designed and already approved -- you know, when they were built --

MR. GANGOLI: No, it's not that, I'm sorry. So it means there's transient traffic, meaning -- like, when the previous gentleman spoke, he's talking about, I guess, like, you know, how the parking was occupied by workers there. What about delivery trucks and other sorts of parties that have to come in, which are greater need for an $R \& D$ facility versus an office building, because they've got to drop off chemicals; they've got to stay there longer. I also don't know how many of them show up, you know, in the summertime.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I mean, we're 90
percent occupied and each building has its own separate loading areas dedicated for loading.

MR. GANGOLI: Okay. I just
want folks to be aware -- again, speaking from personal experience, you kind of have that --

MR. COLLINS: Sir, you can't testify at this stage. When it's open to the public for testimony, you'll be able to make statements.

MR. GANGOLI: Okay. Thank you.
MR. TERI: Hi, my name is Mike Teri. I am a resident of 1048 Route 202, right across the street.

Just a question for you, because I think the timeline with the 90 percent occupancy has been coming into question a bit. Did Mr. Dean's organization contact you? You seem to have a lot of understanding of the tenants that are in the building, the square footage that has been occupied, the timeline of the occupation of that square footage. Has his firm worked with yours at all to determine, although leases may have been in effect, what occupancy or what tenants were actually occupying the buildings that were under lease?

MR. LOUGHLIN: They didn't consult me, but I assume they consulted the owner of the building, Advance and Thor.

MR. TERI: Well, he already said he
didn't do that, so that's why I'm asking you if he contacted you about it.

The second question $I$ have is, there has been probably over 30 percent of that space, that commercial space, of that 800,000 square footage, offered for lease on commercial real estate platforms. And from my perspective as a resident, that, to me, means that you have some tenants that are leaving, tenants that are coming in, especially over the last two-year period. Some of these listings, at least 250,000-square-foot of these listings, have been up since 2018 .

MR. LOUGHLIN: Actually, before that --

MR. TERI: It's about two years.
MR. LOUGHLIN: -- we're marketing the property --

MR. TERI: And the representative of JLL, which is your company --

MR. LOUGHLIN: Yeah, which is us, right, and we've signed -- I don't know how many square feet, but maybe 150,000 feet of leases in the last year.

MR. TERI: And what is the typical
turnaround time, after a lease is executed, to where, you know, you have -- obviously, one company is not doing the exact same thing as another, they have to come in, they have to reconfigure the building, air lines, whatever -what is the typical turnaround time between a lease being executed and somebody entering and occupying fully their business?

MR. LOUGHLIN: These buildings are so well equipped with what Sanofi left behind, most of the tenants -- other than Nestle had to do a lot of work with their pilot plant -- but most of the tenants have actually just moved in and used a lot of the equipment, and the furniture, and other things that were left behind by Sanofi. Everybody's different, but, predominantly, most of them have just moved right in fairly quickly after the lease was signed.

MR. TERI: So was that fairly
quickly, relatively speaking --
MR. LOUGHLIN: Sixty to ninety days.
MR. TERI: So during the last two years, would you say that about 30 percent of that space that is available in total, that 800,000, would have been in transitional periods?

MR. LOUGHLIN: No, I think, you know, we've leased 150,000 feet in the last year, and once they signed the lease, they're occupying in 90 days.

MR. TERI: That's understood. So my question there would be -- you said 150,000 square feet. Okay? That's -- without a calculator, that's about 20 percent of the size of the property in the last year. And Mr. Dean's readings were taken June 5th of 2018 , which is a year ago. Okay?

So now you have 20 percent of the total square footage of the property that was unused within the last year, or in transition, and now you go from -- and I don't want to put you on the spot for what Mr. Dean said, because I can't get you guys here together, but Mr. Dean alleges that, although his number of parking spaces that were actually used went up from July of 2018 -- or 2019 , from June of 2018 , he doesn't see that whole summer month thing to be any type of -- alarming to him, because, in his essence, you know, his first numbers, which he took when the properties were all in transition, or listed as being available, those numbers he took are now
being replicated by a summer month in July.
So my question to you would be -and this is based on your expert opinion -- those numbers going up during the timeline of these companies coming and occupying space, would you argue that that is an increase in occupancy that is driving up those numbers from June 2018?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I mean, if more people are moving in from 2018 to 2019, there should be more cars parked there.

MR. TERI: So would Mr. Dean's numbers then be apples to oranges? Because the tenancy -- he argues the occupancy in 2018 was 93 percent. You argue that you've leased 150,000 square footage of space in the last --

MR. LOUGHLIN: In the last year -from 2018, yeah.

MR. TERI: So that 7 percent
occupancy -- 150,000 square feet, you would agree, is 20 percent occupancy. Correct?

MR. COAKLEY: This is much more appropriate for making a statement or argument --

MR. TERI: I'm not allowed to make a statement now, sir.

MR. COAKLEY: No, you're not, so
rather than asking a witness --
MR. COLLINS: The objection is
correct. You have to focus your attention on the questions of this witness. And that does allow you to make a preface to a question, but not to make an argumentative statement to the witness.

MR. TERI: I haven't made a
statement. I've been asking questions of this man, and he's been answering them, which $I$ appreciate. Thank you.

So my last question, then, is from the date that -- let's say June 5, 2018, not even referencing Mr. Dean's numbers that he came up with earlier, from that date until now, you have leased at least 100,000 square footage --

MR. LOUGHLIN: I don't know the exact number of square footage --

MR. TERI: You seem to.
MR. LOUGHLIN: -- but it's around --
MR. TERI: You seem to. You seem to have a very good understanding --

MR. LOUGHLIN: My position is that it's one space per thousand square feet that gets leased for lab space. It's kind of a practical rule of thumb in my opinion.

MR. TERI: Understood. Thank you.
MR. RING: Timothy Ring, 17 Lawton Road.

Sir, I don't -- all of the buildings in the ORD Zone, what is the total occupancy load as rated by the fire construction official in the town?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I don't know.
MR. RING: Okay. Are you aware of anyone that would know?

MR. LOUGHLIN: I would think the owners or the property managers might know.

MR. RING: So then you're not aware of anyone that would have looked at that -- that you're aware of, that would have looked at that, as to how many occupants are allowed -- this room is allowed 254 people in it -- if we added that up for all the buildings -- that no one you're aware of looked at that for the number of parking spaces.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I think each tenant gets their own individual certificate of occupancy, which I believe addresses those issues.

```
MR. RING: I understand, I'm just
```

trying to understand if anybody's looked at -there was testimony earlier about additional people moving in. We don't know if that may or may not happen, but if there's -- and I'm sure you would agree, if the town gives Nestle, and says out of your total space, your load occupancy on each floor is 200 people, times however many floors, Nestle, theoretically, needs that number of parking spaces.

When you do sign your leases, is there any commitment to each tenant as to how many parking spaces they get?

MR. LOUGHLIN: We give them, like, a pro rata share.

MR. RING: So it is spelled out in
the lease?
MR. LOUGHLIN: Sometimes.
MR. RING: But not always?
MR. LOUGHLIN: Not always.
MR. RING: Okay. So, potentially, somebody could come in with more people; based upon the occupancy load, they could need more parking, possibly?

MR. LOUGHLIN: You know, if somebody changed the buildings to another use --

MR. RING: Without changing them, because we don't know if anybody's actually looked at the occupancy loads that the town's --

MR. LOUGHLIN: I think you have -the Cos do that.

MR. RING: But not overall for the project.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I'm sorry?
MR. RING: Not overall for the project.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I believe each
tenant --
MR. RING: Each tenant, but nobody overall for the project, for the ORD area collectively.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I don't know. That's not something I'm aware of.

MR. RING: Okay. Thank you.
MR. LOUGHLIN: You're welcome.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the public with a question for this witness?

Mayor Hayes?
MAYOR HAYES: I've got a question.
Thank you.

So, in short, so you are -- so it's your testimony that availability or unavailability of parking has never been a problem in leasing the space?

MR. LOUGHLIN: That's correct.
MAYOR HAYES: And that the use of the space tends to drive the parking requirement. Correct?

MR. LOUGHLIN: That's correct.
MAYOR HAYES: And then, lastly, you're saying that the use of this space, or the volume of this space, is not likely to change for years to come.

MR. LOUGHLIN: I don't see it. I mean, we leased 800,000 feet at this part, roughly. It's successful.

MAYOR HAYES: So, in your opinion, how parking has been, the parking as it will be, is not going to be an impact in your ability to rent the space?

MR. LOUGHLIN: No.
MAYOR HAYES: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other questions from the public?

Seeing none, thank you.

```
MR. LOUGHLIN: Thank you.
    COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: At this
    time, I'd like to take a five-minute recess. We
    will reconvene -- that clock is fast on the wall
    in the back. I have 9:27. So we'll reconvene in
        five minutes.
                            (Whereupon, there is a brief pause
        in the proceeding.)
                            COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Scarlett,
        can you please do a roll call?
    MS. DOYLE: Yes.
    Mr. Rodzinak?
    COMMISSIONER RODZINAK: Here.
    MS. DOYLE: Ms. Casamento?
    COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Here.
    MS. DOYLE: Mr. Franco?
    COMMISSIONER FRANCO: Here.
    MS. DOYLE: Councilman Norgalis?
    COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Here.
MS. DOYLE: Ms. Powers?
COMMISSIONER POWERS: Here.
MS. DOYLE: Mr. Lerner?
COMMISSIONER LERNER: Here.
MS. DOYLE: Mayor Hayes?
MAYOR HAYES: Here.
```

MS. DOYLE: Mr. Pandya?
COMMISSIONER PANDYA: Here.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO:
Mr. Coakley, your next witness?
MR. COAKLEY: Yes, Paul Phillips.
He's been previously sworn; he's been previously qualified by this board as an expert witness in the field of land use planning, and $I$ offer him as such.

MR. COLLINS: Yes. Mr. Phillips, you understand you're still under oath?

MR. PHILLIPS: I do, Mr. Collins.
MR. COLLINS: Go ahead, gentlemen.
P A U L P H I L L I P S, having
been previously sworn, remained under oath and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COAKLEY:
Q. Mr. Phillips, have you heard the testimony this evening of the three prior witnesses?
A. I have.
Q. And you're familiar with the project? You've testified about this property previously, have you not?
A. I have.
Q. And based on that, do you have an opinion as to whether or not the criteria of the land use act for a variance like this has been satisfied?
A. I do.
Q. All right. What is that opinion?
A. So what we are here for this evening is a parking variance, essentially, due to the proposal to change the configuration of the entrance drive to the ORD campus, there's going to be a net loss of 22 parking spaces. The decrease will be from 1,190 , which currently exists, to 1,168, as proposed as part of the current application. The Bridgewater ordinance requires 2,183 spaces, based on a ratio of one space per 300 square feet of floor area.

The planning board has heard from both Mr. Dean and Mr. Loughlin. I believe they have each made compeling arguments in support of the variance relief.

In terms of a planning basis for
the parking variance, $I$ believe the key considerations are as follows:

First, and Mr. Collins brought this
up, and perhaps this is more a point of information, but the planning board did previously grant a variance, a parking variance, back in 2008, which was for the then entire 110-acre Sanofi campus, and that variance would be -- was to allow as many as 655 fewer spaces than was required by ordinance. So the board, back in 2008, recognized that there was a basis to relax the ordinance with regard to parking, and at least for the Sanofi R\&D use which existed on the property roughly 10 years ago.

I will also point out, I've read that resolution from 2008, there was already a parking variance that had previously been granted to Sanofi, which is cited in that 2008 resolution. There was actually a parking variance originally granted to Sanofi back in 2000. So at least two instances, the parking standard was relaxed in connection with applications involving the full 110-acre Sanofi application.

Secondly, the R\&D or the ORD portion of the campus, as you've heard, is now almost fully leased. So there's a reliable base of information regarding the type of tenants,
the space utilization, and the actual parking demands. So what we now know is that most of the space is leased for research and development and laboratory-type activities, which typically do not generate as many employees on a per-square-foot basis, as compared to strictly office use.

And by way of example, and you heard this from Mr. Loughlin, you have certain amounts of floor area that are devoted to things such as the clinical trials for the product of manufacturing; you have incidental storage; you have a lot of specialized equipment for the R\&D and lab-type use. None of these type uses on their own generate any or very little parking demand.

I would also concur with the testimony of Mr. Loughlin that, in many of these facilities, scientists often have their own office and lab space, which essentially provides a more generous amount of space on a per-employee basis.

Now, Mr. Dean's parking counts indicate that only about half of the available supply is likely to be occupied based on the
current tenant mix, and his basically upping that figure to an 100 percent occupancy rate. I think it was at 93 percent when he did the study, but he basically upped that to 100 percent.

I calculated, on a-square-foot basis, that amounts to about one space per every 1,150 square feet. That's the empirical evidence of parking based on Mr. Dean's counts.

The proposed parking supply on the site in the ORD Zone is at a rate of one space per 560 square feet. So, essentially, there's double the amount of available parking in ORD as compared to what the empirical counts basically indicate.

I will also offer for you, since I've been doing this a long time, $I$ draft zoning ordinances, $I$ review zoning ordinances, $I$ will say that, with regard to parking ratios for research and development and lab use throughout the state, if you look at zoning ordinances, I will acknowledge that they are all over the map. They are all over the map.

I will also say that, based on my experience, that the Bridgewater requirement of
one space per 300 square feet is highly conservative. Interestingly, Bridgewater, basically, has the same parking ratio for research/lab-type use as it does for office use. This is atypical, and quite frankly it is onerous, all else being equal.

Just to give you an example -- and I've seen other municipalities with one per 300 . You're not the only one out there with one per 300, but more typically defined standards, you can see one per 500. I've seen one per 800 . I've seen one per 1,000, for this type of use.

Importantly, notwithstanding the existing conditions, I think the fact that the actual parking demand -- parking supply, rather, is still roughly double what the most recent empirical evidence shows, in terms of demand or need, will provide appropriate safeguards for the site, and ultimately for the municipality, even if the tenant mix changes over time, which is obviously something that can happen, notwithstanding the fact that there may be long-term leases on this property.

But the key is, I think, what
Mr. Loughlin mentioned, which is that you have
to understand that these buildings have been basically designed for research and development and lab-type use with very little office space. It goes hand in hand with that predominant use. So I think, as a practical matter, considering that this R\&D space has been used this way historically, it's been proposed this way, I think there's basically little or virtually no chance that there's going to be a parking issue in the future on this site, based upon how these buildings have been designed and how they've historically been used.

I think the parking variance can be granted on both the $c(1)$ and $c(2)$ grounds.

With regard to the former, I think the strict application of the parking standard does present some practical difficulty for this applicant, as, again, the generic ordinance standard of one per 300 would require this applicant to construct significantly greater parking than is actually needed, based on the evidence.

I also believe that, to ask this applicant to construct what $I$ characterize as unnecessary parking would add new paved surfaces
to the site. And $I$ would note that, in the ORD portion of the development, as proposed, the applicant is well below the allowable improved lot coverage at this point. So in that sense, I think the benefits that would be gained, basically, by allowing these couple areas to stay as green space, in terms of aesthetics, keeping within the coverage, well below the coverage requirement, and also, basically providing -- or not having the applicant to go provide additional stormwater management to service these unnecessary paved areas, would substantially outweigh any detriments associated with the variance relief.

I think the number of purposes of the statute would be advanced:

I think purpose A, which is to guide development in a manner that promotes the public welfare.

Purposes C and J, which basically have to do with providing adequate open space, and promoting open space.

And purpose $M$, which is to encourage a more efficient use of the land.

And lastly, as there will still be
roughly double the amount of parking available relative to the current demand, I would see no substantial detriment to the public good or substantial impairment of the zone plan and zoning ordinance if this variance is granted. MR. COAKLEY: No further questions. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. Is there any member of the board with a question of this witness regarding his testimony?

COUNCILMAN NORGALIS: Can you give us the numbers -- you said there's other towns that happen to use 300 square foot. Do you know, offhand, who they are?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know offhand, but I will state that $I$ am familiar with other ordinances that are as low as the one per 300 . But, again, the point $I$ was trying to make is that $I$ think planners basically don't have a good handle on what the right standard is, and $I$ think Bridgewater has probably been very, very conservative in that regard, which is why we're here requesting the variance relief. Other towns are not so conservative, and they're more in line -- which $I$ think is more the empirical
demand, which is at anywhere from maybe one per 500 to one per thousand.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Any other questions?

Seeing none, is there any member of the public with questions of this witness regarding his testimony?

MR. FRESCO: Good evening, Andy Fresco, 15 Glen Eagles Drive.

Sir, I can't -- you guys, man. You guys are -- it's -- you can't blame you for trying.

Sir, in 2008, sir, was there -- was there a retail component on this parcel?

MR. PHILLIPS: No.
MR. FRESCO: Sir, in 2008, were
there 400 apartments being applied for?
MR. PHILLIPS: No.
MR. FRESCO: Sir, in 2008 --
MR. COAKLEY: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with 400 units --

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, you are way beyond the scope of the direct testimony, sir.

MR. FRESCO: Why? It's one application. Correct?

MR. COLLINS: It's one application, but this is not about the commercial parking or the condominium --

MR. FRESCO: Sir, I think that the residents of Bridgewater are concerned -- this is on the same parcel of land. Come on, planning board.

MR. COLLINS: The question -- the only testimony by this witness tonight is about the ORD parking variance for the buildings that exist there now.

MR. FRESCO: I understand.
MR. COLLINS: So you can ask questions that --

MR. FRESCO: I get it.
MR. COLLINS: -- focus on that subject, but you can't focus on something -they're not even asking for relief on the parking --

MR. FRESCO: Right, but it has to be considered, sir, that --

MR. COLLINS: No, it does not --
MR. FRESCO: -- 11 years ago --
MR. COLLINS: In other words,
there's already been a hearing about the parking
for the residential and the --
MR. FRESCO: Fair enough. I yield, sir.

Okay. So, sir, in 2008, was there a parking garage adjacent to this property, which is -- and I'm eluding to the parking garage at the Indian temple. Was that --

MR. PHILLIPS: You're talking about something off site?

MR. FRESCO: That's correct.
MR. PHILLIPS: I have no idea.
MR. FRESCO: Okay. It was not.
Sir, do you think that the planning board should consider this when making a decision about the retail component?

MR. PHILLIPS: What is -- what do you mean by "this"?

MR. FRESCO: This, as in this variance request.

MR. PHILLIPS: No.
MR. FRESCO: Okay.
MR. PHILLIPS: I do not.
MR. FRESCO: Sir, I just want you to
tell me if you can identify what -- for the record, this is a -- this is an overhead map of
the applicant's COE. I just want to make sure you can see that. And let the record show that this property is surrounded --

MR. COLLINS: You have to -- you have to try --

MR. FRESCO: I have to ask him a question, you're right.

MR. COLLINS: You can preface a question, and you can show him something, and you can ask him if he recognizes --

MR. FRESCO: I don't want to waste time. I want to get through it quickly, that's all. I'm just trying to move quickly.

Sir, do you see any other ORDs in that image?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, this is an aerial map that shows, basically, the existing uses on the ground. It doesn't show overlay zoning.

What $I$ will say is that it appears to show a portion of the subject property, as well as certain surrounding areas which look to be largely residential.

MR. FRESCO: Largely residential, that's correct, sir. And that's why Bridgewater
has a very strict ordinance about the 1 for 300 , is because we don't want unnecessary parking lots in our residential communities.

No further.
MR. MOENCH: Good evening, Matthew Moench, 1303 Roger Avenue.

Sir, would you mind describing for the board and the audience what the conditions of the site were in 2008? And I'm talking about the entire site, sir.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, the site was basically one campus, 110 acres, and included the buildings, which are still a part of the rear ORD campus, and the buildings in the front of the campus, which have subsequently been placed within the $R$-Seed zone.

MR. MOENCH: And do you know, in 2008, at that time, specifically, was the building still occupied, or was it -- the campus still occupied at that time, or was it available? Do you know?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not sure. I believe it was, but $I$ can't tell you with any accuracy how much may have been vacant at the time.

MR. MOENCH: Sure. And so we talk about 2008. The current proposal for the site is significantly different than existed in 2008 . Correct? There was no hotel proposed in 2008 .

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, the front portion of the site, as part of this overall proposal, is consistent with the change in the land use designation for the front portion of the property, correct.

MR. MOENCH: Sure. No residential component in 2008?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't believe so.
MR. COAKLEY: Again, this has nothing to do with the residential application --

MR. MOENCH: Sure. Mr. Collins, we've heard, now, testimony -- we've heard quasi-testimony from counsel earlier; we've now heard testimony tonight from this witness regarding a 2008 planning board waiver regarding parking, which the witness specifically indicated was for the entire site.

So, therefore, if they're trying to use the waiver in 2008 as some sort of precedent for this board to grant this parking waiver, we should be entitled to delve into what the
conditions were in 2008, and what was predicated in that 2008 waiver, and how it exists with the current site. Because if the two sites aren't the same, then the --

MR. COLLINS: You can go ahead and asked the questions, but keep it focused on the direct.

MR. MOENCH: Sure.
So just to make sure the record's complete, $I$ don't want to be repetitive, but there was no residential component in 2008?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's correct.
MR. MOENCH: No retail in 2008?
MR. PHILLIPS: That's my
understanding, yes.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. So the parking waiver that you referenced earlier in 2008, that was for the entire site, you testified. Correct, sir?

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct.
MR. MOENCH: Did you review the
submissions before the board in 2008 to
understand the dynamics of the parking application at that time?

```
MR. PHILLIPS: I reviewed only the
```

resolution and the magnitude of the variance relief, as $I$ so testified this evening.

MR. MOENCH: And that variance -that magnitude was for the entire 110-acre site?

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct.
MR. MOENCH: Did you look at what, if any, discussion occurred at the board, with regard to that parking waiver in 2008 , as it applies to the back portion of the now designated ORD Zone?

MR. PHILLIPS: I only reviewed the resolution, and again, that resolution and the parking relief went with the entirety of the site.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. So to answer my question, you did not review whether there were any comments with -- at the time that the board passed the resolution in 2008, that dealt with parking or traffic specifically in this section of the site.

MR. PHILLIPS: When you say
"comments" --
MR. MOENCH: Well, there's board discussion --

MR. PHILLIPS: As I mentioned, I
only reviewed the resolution of approval granting the parking variance.

MR. MOENCH: You didn't review any submissions, parking reports, traffic studies, parking studies, in 2008?

MR. PHILLIPS: If there was, I didn't review them.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. Was there a fence up in 2008? We've heard discussion about the security fence.

MR. PHILLIPS: I can't answer that with 100 percent certainty. I wasn't here, I didn't participate in that application, so I'm not going to delve into that.

MR. MOENCH: Last question on this topic: Do you know whether or not the flow of traffic within the site in 2008 was unencumbered, or was there some barrier that stopped cars from getting to this back portion of the site compared to the front?

MR. PHILLIPS: Again, I didn't study, specifically, the internal flows as part of the 2008; $I$ focused on the parking variance relief that was granted by the board.

MR. MOENCH: Understood.

You testified tonight about -- you gave some conclusions regarding your opinion about parking, and the sufficiency of parking. Did you conduct any independent analysis with regard to occupancy of the buildings?

MR. PHILLIPS: No.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. Did you use Mr. Dean's figures or Mr. Loughlin's figures, or did you use any figures, in terms of -- whose figures did you use?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, the testimony that $I$ provided, in terms of the existing parking ratios, were based on Mr. Dean's report.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. You heard the testimony earlier this evening?

MR. PHILLIPS: I was here the whole evening, yes.

MR. MOENCH: Did you hear testimony from Mr. Loughlin -- I apologize if I'm not saying that right, to the witness -- but did you hear testimony from that witness about the amount of retail space that has been -- or amount of space, I should say, that has been leased between 2018 and 2019?

MR. PHILLIPS: I heard the
testimony, yes.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. Do you have any opinion with regard to whether or not the figures Mr. Dean offered for consideration and the testimony of Mr. Loughlin are compatible?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, $I$ think they are, based upon what $I$ heard from Mr. Dean. And Mr. Dean, if $I$ understand his testimony correctly, his count from 2019 basically supported his counts from 2018, there was very little change in the existing parking demand over the course of that time frame, which is -- as I understand the time frame, which Mr. Loughlin testified with regards to leasing of space.

MR. MOENCH: We heard some testimony that suggested that there was a significant amount of space leased within 2018-2019, which would suggest that, I heard, we're at a higher occupancy than 93 percent now, or we were at a lower occupancy in 2018. Do you agree with that, sir?

MR. PHILLIPS: What I based my testimony on was Mr. Dean's report, was that, at the time of his counts, there was 93 percent occupancy.

MR. MOENCH: Understood.
What's the -- can you provide some explanation as to what exactly is the change in the entranceway that's predicating the reduction of 24 spots?

MR. PHILLIPS: I mean, I'm familiar with it, but I'd really defer any specifics to Mr. Hermann. I know the general area where it's located, which is basically here, but he would have to bring up the site plan, to kind of go through the actual loss of parking and where it is. I'll defer to him on the specifics as the site engineer.

MR. MOENCH: What -- are you able to provide any testimony as to where the entranceway -- or how that road would be configured, if you weren't permitted to eliminate those 24 parking spots?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, I didn't review that or study that at all.

MR. MOENCH: More broadly, if the planning board were to require you to comply with the ordinance as it stands right now, what would the impact be on the application?

MR. PHILLIPS: The board can deny
the application, obviously. And I think you heard from another witness that, should there be a need for additional parking, there may be areas on the site that presently aren't improved. But, again, $I$ didn't independently study that.

MR. MOENCH: Okay. Have you seen any data from anybody else that would indicate what would happen, what buildings might have to be taken down, or changes to the site configuration to --

MR. PHILLIPS: No.
MR. MOENCH: Sir, you talked about a c(1) variance, and you went through some discussion about why you thought that the current number of -- ratio in the ordinance is really too high for the use of this site. Correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.
MR. MOENCH: Okay. And $C(1)$ is a hardship variance?

MR. PHILLIPS: C(1) is hardship.
MR. MOENCH: So I guess my question to you, sir, is the predicate of a c(1) hardship variance is not could the number be less than what it is, but the applicant first has the burden of proving that there is, in fact, a
hardship to them, that would otherwise get to the second phase, which is could it be reduced.

But how do we get to whether there's a hardship to the applicant if nobody here, including yourself, has testified to what the hardship would be to the applicant, since nobody has studied what would the impact to the site be for the parking spaces, what changes would have to be made, or what the alternative plan would be for the parking spaces?

MR. PHILLIPS: You don't, in my professional opinion, have to provide those proofs to basically put forth the hardship argument. In the MLUL, if you can basically demonstrate that there is a unique or extraordinary situation affecting a particular property -- and here, I think we have that, we have a built condition, we have an established parking area -- we're only talking about the net loss of 22 parking spaces here -- we have the history of the use, and we have prior precedent, where variances were granted for similar uses on the entirety of the site -- albeit, 10 years ago -- which indicate to me that the strict application of that one-per-300 standard, as
applied to this unique particular property, given its context, would result in practical difficulties for this applicant.

MR. MOENCH: Certainly, the board, at some point, will make their conclusions on that, except, you know, what $I$ have not heard from you, sir, is $I$ still, in my reading of the language, require a hardship, and $I$ have not yet heard what hardship, if any, actually applies to this applicant.

I have no further questions. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
MR. BROOKNER: I almost just said good morning. Good afternoon -- or good evening.

MR. PHILLIPS: The hours just go by quickly.

MR. BROOKNER: It's been quite a day. Jeffrey Brookner, 60 Nicole Terrace in Bridgewater.

I have a series of questions. You mentioned the rezoning of the property from the front part of the property to the $R$-Seed, the newly designed $R$-Seed development. When the township council did that, did that impact the
buildings that can be built legally in the back of the property, behind the fence that you're talking about?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not sure I
understand the basis of your question.
MR. BROOKNER: So the R-Seed zoning impacted what can be built in the front of the property.

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct.
MR. BROOKNER: And all of the stuff about the ability to build a hotel, and the ability to build apartments, and retail, and the supermarket, all of that came from the ordinance that the township council passed creating the R-Seed district.

My question is, did that ordinance also impact what can be built in the -- I forget the name -- the ORD Zone?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it did to the extent that it reduced the land area within what was part of the ORD Zone. So any zoning requirement that goes with land area, whether it's floor area ratio, how much you can build, what the coverage is, all those kinds of things are obviously affected, because there's less
land.
But, basically, most -- basically, all the buildings existed at the time that zone line was created, which are now still left within the $O R D$ Zone portion.

MR. BROOKNER: So the existing number of spaces, is that number -- I believe it's 1,190, I believe it was.

MR. PHILLIPS: It's 1,190 right now, in the ORD.

MR. BROOKNER: In the ORD. Is that a preexisting condition that's grandfathered in, to your understanding?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, it's an interesting legal question. I'm going to defer to counsel. But, obviously, the governing body decided to put the line where the line was. There was an existing parking variance that went with the whole site. The fact that now we have a lesser amount of land area within ORD, I don't know how that dovetails with the prior variance, so I'm not so sure it's a -- you know, I characterize it as a preexisting non-condition, but I'll defer to learned counsel on that.

MR. BROOKNER: Understood.

I guess the point I'm making is that the situation that exists with the parking is not because, all of a sudden, there's an actual shortfall in parking; it's because, all of a sudden, the property was rezoned.

MR. PHILLIPS: Not entirely, because, remember, when you looked at the entirety of the site, the 110 acres, there was a significant parking variance that was granted back in 2008, to the tune of 655 spaces. So I don't know exactly what those ratios are; the resolution of approval basically didn't provide the square footage of the entire campus at the time. But, clearly, the parking standard that went part and parcel with that variance back in 2008 provided for a much more relaxed parking standard than the one per 300 which exists.

And, obviously, on the site now, meaning the ORD campus, the existing parking ratio also is short of that one per 300 standard.

MR. BROOKNER: Fair enough.
Last question: All of the
development that's being talked about on this application for the front of the property, the hotel, the apartments, all of that, it's my
understanding -- and $I$ just want you to confirm this -- your testimony has nothing to do with any of that, your testimony here today.

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct.
MR. BROOKNER: So you have previously provided testimony, and you may again provide testimony at a later date on the parking for the other property; that's completely separate from what we're talking about here today. Is that correct?

MR. PHILLIPS: That's correct.
MR. BROOKNER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. GANGOLI: Gaurav Gangoli,
Garfield Avenue.
Just so I can make sure my questions are focused, can you please just recap your scope here, your role here and responsibility? Just so I'm not keeping my questioning --

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm a professional planner, and $I$ provided testimony in support of the parking variance on the ORD portion of the site, hopefully consistent with the statutory proofs for same.

MR. GANGOLI: How certain are you
that you're correct? I'm not being facetious --

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm highly confident that I'm correct.

MR. GANGOLI: Close to 100 percent?
MR. PHILLIPS: I'm highly confident.
You can put whatever percentage you want on that. I'm highly confident that I'm correct.

MR. GANGOLI: With that degree of certainty, would you say that an OBA, an outcomes-based agreement, would help grease the wheels of the process?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not familiar with
the terminology.
MR. GANGOLI: It's very common in the healthcare manufacturing industry -- I myself put together a lot of these; I'm not offering my services, $I{ }^{\prime} m$ just saying -- but basically, if you're correct, then a variance gets approved, and you get what you're looking for; if you're incorrect, in a lot of these outcomes-based agreements -- and there's precedence for that outside Bridgewater -- that the applicant would then pay recurring fees for that. So that's an outcomes-based agreement. It satisfies both parties, because, then, if you're right, you get what you want, but if you're incorrect, is
that --
MR. COAKLEY: Madame Chairwoman, that is a question that has nothing to do with his testimony.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Yes, if you could please focus your questions on his testimony, that would be helpful.

MR. GANGOLI: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Thank you. MR. GANGOLI: That was it. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
MR. PLACEK: Pawel Placek, 13 Claire Drive.

So quick question so $I$ understand just the numbers, so it will be easy for me. The current ordinance is one spot for 300 square feet?

MR. PHILLIPS: Correct.
MR. PLACEK: And you cited the relief to ordinance in 2008. Do you know -- do you remember the ratio? The ratio of the relief. I mean, you said there was, like, significant relief of the spaces.

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know, because
the resolution that $I$ reviewed didn't, basically, list the total square footage of the entire 110-acre campus, it just gave the magnitude of the parking variance, which was 655 spaces.

MR. PLACEK: Does anyone know the ratio, what was the relief of the ordinance in $2008 ?$

MR. PHILLIPS: I just indicated, without knowing what the total square footage was, $I$ can't do that calculation. Maybe someone -- maybe Scarlett or someone has that; I don't.

MR. PLACEK: Okay. But 655 of the total amount, that is probably -- you had less relief in 2008 than you're asking right now. How much bigger relief are you asking right now compared to 2008?

MR. PHILLIPS: Again, $I$ can't answer that without knowing what the square footage was. The only other thing which $I$ think is somewhat pertinent to the 2008 is that, as opposed to the rear existing campus, whereas you heard from Mr. Loughlin that the bulk of the space is $R \& D$, and only about 10 to 15 percent office, there was more office space in that front portion of the
premises back in 2008 .
So it may not be an apples and apples comparison; even if we did know the total square footage, we might want to also potentially investigate how that space was broken down. But, again, $I$ didn't do the calculation --

MR. PLACEK: Understand. I mean, I would like to understand it, because we're missing the 650 for the total campus. Right now, you're missing over a thousand for a much smaller portion of it. So the relief -- the ratio you're asking is much greater than it was in 2008 .

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, $I$ don't know that, you may or may not be right, but again, my point of bringing up the 2008 approval is basically to indicate to the board and the public that, for an R\&D use, largely R\&D use, even back in 2008, the board saw fit to basically grant relief from that one per 300-square-foot standard, which $I$ think is a highly conservative if not onerous standard for $R \& D$ type use, as opposed to exclusively or predominantly office use. That was my point.

MR. PLACEK: So last question. So what's the ratio we're asking for relief for
right now?
MR. PHILLIPS: So the parking requirement is one per 300 , and I've calculated the proposed parking supply at a rate of one space per 560.

MR. PLACEK: Thank you.
MR. PHILLIPS: You're welcome.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other member of the public with a question for this witness?

MR. GARDNER: Jay Gardner, 31 Ray Street.

I'm confused about what variance --
what ordinance are you looking for a variance to. So is it the 126-169?

MR. COAKLEY: Yes.
MR. GARDNER: Okay. And you're looking for a variance of -- help me -- what's the variance that you're looking for here?

MR. PHILLIPS: So we're looking for relief from the one space per 300 square foot parking standard.

MR. GARDNER: When I look at this variance -- and $I$ could have this wrong -- it says, for research and development facilities,
right, it's one space per thousand feet. Right?
MR. PHILLIPS: I don't know what you're referring to.

MR. GARDNER: I'm just seeking clarity on what's in the ordinance.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, my reading of the ordinance is that the use here, research and development, is one space per 300 square feet, that's the requirement. I don't know what you're reading.

MR. GARDNER: All right. I mean, that is the ordinance, though. Right? I mean, I don't know how we proceed with this --

MR. COLLINS: I think what you should do is, if you're looking at something, and you have something, you should show him what you're looking at, and he will just tell you whether he's looking at the same thing.

MR. GARDNER: Sure.
MR. PHILLIPS: Where do you see one per thousand?

MR. GARDNER: (Indicating).
MR. PHILLIPS: It's one per 300 .
MR. GARDNER: It is one per 300 . Okay.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is there any other -- are there any other questions for this witness from the public?

Seeing none, Mr. Coakley?
MR. COAKLEY: All right. So we have one more witness to call on regarding the other aspect of this overall case. I don't know whether you want to do that tonight or --

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: We cannot do that tonight.

MR. COAKLEY: Okay. Do you have a date in mind.

MR. COLLINS: Scarlett, October 28th?

MS. DOYLE: We have two possible dates. October $28 t h$ and October $29 t h$ are the two possible dates, or both dates.

MR. COAKLEY: I'd heard a rumor about October 15th --

MS. DOYLE: Unfortunately, October 15th, we have an issue of membership.

MR. COAKLEY: I see.
MS. DOYLE: Attendance. But I don't even know about the 28 th and 29th. Well, the

28th is the normal, regular planning board meeting. The 29th happens to be the fifth Tuesday of the month, and we don't have a scheduled meeting on that night.

MR. COAKLEY: Well, we'll be available whenever the board is available. MAYOR HAYES: I'm comfortable with the $28 t h$, and being prepared for the $29 t h$ as well.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: 28th, everybody good?

MS. DOYLE: The 28 th is a regular meeting.

MAYOR HAYES: And I'm saying that we, the board members, I'm comfortable holding the $29 t h$ in reserve on my schedule.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Is
everybody good for the 28 th and 29th?
Okay. Mr. Coakley?
MR. COAKLEY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: That work?
MR. COAKLEY: We'll be here.
COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay.
Thank you.
MR. COLLINS: So this application

1
will be carried without additional notices to October 28 th at $7 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. Sounds like it'll also be on for October 29 th.

MR. COAKLEY: And we waive time periods to that date.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: I'm sorry? MR. COAKLEY: We waive time periods to that date.

COMMISSIONER CASAMENTO: Okay. MR. COLLINS: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

```
    10:19 p.m.)
```
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