

# CASEY & KELLER, INC.

LAND SURVEYORS + CIVIL ENGINEERS + PLANNERS

N.J. STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS  
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION NO. 24GA27985400

258 MAIN STREET, MILLBURN, NEW JERSEY, 07041  
VOICE: 973-379-3280 FAX: 973-379-7993

## Memorandum: Technical Review #1 2

To: Township of Long Hill Planning Board  
Board Chairman and Members

From: Michael Lanzafama, PE, PLS, PP  
Richard Keller, PE, PP, CME  
Board Engineering Consultant

Re: Application No. 19-13P  
Prism Millington LLC  
Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01  
50 Division Avenue, Millington, Long Hill, Morris County  
C&K Project #: 1190102-20 (19-13P)

Date: ~~February 28, 2020~~  
May 29, 2020

## Documents Reviewed:

As part of our engineering technical review, we have received and reviewed the following documents:

1. "Preliminary & Final Site Plan, Enclave at Millington, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey" prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 25 2019, consisting of 18 sheets.  
[In response to the first technical review an planning review, the applicant has submitted a revised set of documents with the same date as the initial submission. The revised submission now consists of 24 sheets all dated October 25 2019.](#)
2. "Stormwater Management Report, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey" prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 25 2019. [Revised April 3, 2020.](#)
3. "Drainage Area Maps, Enclave at Millington, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey" prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 30 2019, consisting of 3 sheets.
4. "Stormwater Operations & Maintenance Manual, Enclave at Millington, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey" prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 25 2019. [Revised April 3, 2020.](#)
5. "Environmental Impact Statement, Enclave at Millington, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township

of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey” prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 25 2019. [Revised April 3, 2020.](#)

6. “Traffic Impact Assessment Report, Proposed Mixed-Use Multi-Family and Commercial Development, Enclave at Millington, Block 12301, Lot 1 & Block 10100, Lot 7.01, 50 Division Avenue, Township of Long Hill, Morris County, New Jersey” prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated October 28 2019. [Revised April 3, 2020.](#)
7. Architecture Plans entitled “Prism Capital Partners, LLC, Millington, Apartments, Millington, NJ” prepared by Devereaux & Associates, PC of McLean, VA, dated 6/20/2019, consisting of 7 Sheets.
8. Site photo exhibit prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford dated October 28 2019..
9. Application and checklists.
10. [Review response letter prepared by Stonefield dated April 3, 2020.](#)

#### **Brief Project Description:**

The subject property is an 11.9 acre site located at 50 Millington Road in the Millington portion of Long Hill Township. The property is bound by Division Avenue to the east, River Road to the North, Stone House Road to the south and the Passaic River to the west and is currently occupied by a number of industrial and commercial buildings and associated paved parking and loading areas. The project site is just south of the Millington Train Station and a small commercial district that includes the local post office. The property is located wholly within the MU-O Mixed Use Overlay Zone.

The applicant proposes to develop the easterly two-thirds of the property with the remaining approximate one-third along the Passaic River remaining undeveloped due to environmental restrictions as a result of its history of contamination.

The applicant is proposing to demolish all existing structures and related site improvements. The proposed development will include fourteen 10-unit multi-family rental buildings containing 126 two-bedrooms and 14 three-bedroom apartments for a total of 140 units.

Fifteen percent of the proposed residential units (21 apartments) will be affordable in accordance with the Township's agreement with State's Fair Share Housing Center.

The proposed development also includes an 1,800 square foot community building, a swimming pool, and a 4,992 square foot retail building along with related site improvements, including 307 parking spaces.

The review of this application is based on the township ordinances, submitted plans and supporting documents and visits to the project site.

### General Observations & Comments:

1. For ease of review and reference during the municipal hearing, all of the plan sheets should have the building numbers on them. [Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
2. Also to aid in the review and reference during the municipal hearing, applicant should designate the different driveway/parking areas with letter identifiers (Road "A", Road "B", etc.).  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
3. The Applicant will need to obtain "will serve" letters from all the respective utility companies expected to provide service to this project. [Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
4. Architectural plans for the proposed retail building and clubhouse should be provided for the Board's review. [Comment remains.](#)
5. The site was part of an environmental remediation rendering a significant portion unusable. Signage in the unusable area indicates that a portion of the site is under the supervision of a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP). The Applicant should provide information as to any required or proposed role that the LSRP will play in the proposed construction. [The Applicant has offered that an LSRP has been engaged and will provide testimony before the Planning Board..](#)

### Technical Review Site Plan :

#### C-1: Cover Sheet

1. The Zoning Relief Table should be updated to include all waivers and variances being requested along with a reference as to which page those items can be found.

[This comment has been partially addressed. The waivers required are as follows:](#)

[Tree quantity requirement \(153.1.b & 153.1.g\)](#)

[Tree species groups \(153.1.b\)](#)

[Lighting 4,000 lumen fixtures \(153.2.a\)](#)

[Lighting 0.6 average fc for drives, 0.4 average fc for parking \(153.2.b\)](#)

[Lighting overnight, greater than 0.2 fc \(153.2.c\)](#)

2. The Applicant should clarify whether the "Agencies to be Notified" list needs to include the LSRP and the N.J. Department of Environmental Protection.

[This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

#### C-2: Existing Conditions Plan

1. The Existing Conditions Plan has a list of surveying notes to indicate that this is also a title survey. However, there is no direct reference to who prepared the original survey and when. (The only reference is Note 8, which indicates the survey was apparently prepared for the Chicago Title Insurance Company June 19, 2013.) The applicant must supply either a current survey or a certification by a surveyor that no changes to the project site have occurred since the original survey was done. Such a survey or certification shall be signed by a licensed land surveyor.

[Comment Remains.](#)

2. The survey notes references a horizontal datum in a deed book. The benchmark used and its elevation should be shown on the plans.  
[Comment Remains.](#)
3. The railroad ROW information should be indicated on this plan.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
4. A callout on Division Avenue indicates that the “Shaded area indicates portion of subject property subject to easement to Jersey Central Power Light Company.” However, the shading does not appear on the drawing submitted for review.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
5. It would be helpful if the exiting walkway from the public parking to the train station via River Road and Division Avenue were added to the plan.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

### **C-3: Demolition Plan**

1. The graphic scale is incorrect.  
[The graphic scale remains incorrect. \(the graphical depiction of 1” does not measure 1”\)](#)
2. There are 25 trees along Division Avenue and Stone House Lane that are indicated to “Remain and Be Protected During the Construction Process.” Most of these trees are in areas that will be significantly regraded and/or are in close proximity to proposed walls, stairs and walks that will significantly and adversely impact their viability. The Applicant should consider removing and replacing these trees or submit a report by a certified arborist outlining the measures or plan changes that would be required to conserve these trees.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed however trees are also noted as to remain, remove conflicting note.](#)
3. The plans call for all site improvements to be removed. The Applicant should verify that the existing transformer and transformer shed are to be removed.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
4. There is an existing sanitary manhole at the southeast corner of the project that is noted to remain and be protected yet does not appear to be used for the new sanitary sewer connection. The Applicant should advise as to the status of this manhole. If the manhole is not to be reused, the manhole and pipe should be removed and the adjacent manhole repaired.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

5. The notes should specifically indicate that all site demolition work is to be coordinated with the Township Engineer and Building Department. The applicant should clarify whether the LSRP or any other local and state agencies need to be part of the demolition process.  
[Comment was satisfactorily addressed at the Technical Review meeting.](#)
6. Since this project is contiguous to a Superfund site, the Applicant should confirm whether any additional precautions and systems may be required for the demolition work.  
[Comment was satisfactorily addressed at the Technical Review meeting.](#)
7. Notes need to be added to the plans for:
  - a. Dust control
  - b. Street Cleaning
  - c. Repair and/or replacement of damaged off-site structures and properties[Comments have been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
8. A note should be added to the plans that all soil erosion and sediment control features are to be in place before any demolition work begins.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
9. There is a note on the plans indicating that all existing utilities are to be cut at the respective main or source and removed. However, there is a separate note saying that the gas service line on the north side of the project is to be cut and capped at the property line. All utilities that are not being reused are to be abandoned and removed from the site as per the respective utility authority, which might require that the cut and cap take place closer to the main.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
10. Several water hydrants are shown on the existing conditions plan, however, no existing water mains are shown in the surrounding streets. The plan should be amended to show the size, location and pipe material of the existing water service..  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

**C-4 & 5: Site Plan** (Sheet 5 added)

1. General—The Existing Conditions Plan shows that a ten-foot wide strip of land along Division Avenue has been dedicated as a right-of-way to Morris County. The proposed retail building and other structures along Division Avenue should indicate the proposed setbacks based on this new proposed right-of-way line and clarify whether variance relief will be required.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)
2. Signage—the only signs shown seem to be for “stop” and “handicap parking” signs. All signs are to meet the requirements of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* and the Municipal Ordinance as applicable.
  - a. Traffic control—other signs to be considered include: “no parking—fire lane,” “one-way,” “keep right,” “enter,” “exit,” “pedestrian crossing—stop here,” and similar.  
[Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

- b. Project directional signs—street signs, signs directing residents, delivery persons, visitors to the various buildings, clubhouse, retail area, etc.

Comment still applies. Awaiting additional submittal.

- c. Project name sign—applicant needs to determine what kind of sign(s), if any, will be provided for the project—the dimensions, type of sign, location, and related details need to be placed on the plan.

Comment still applies. Awaiting additional submittal.

Retail sign—applicant needs to present a design and details for the retail building and indicate whether it will be attached to the building or a freestanding sign.

Comment still applies. Awaiting additional submittal.

- 3. Sidewalk, size, locations and connectivity—Sidewalk locations need to be re-examined to provide complete and adequate pedestrian circulation consistent with the RSIS.

- a. The Applicant should be prepared to discuss the adequacy and safety of sidewalk connectivity throughout the site, including sidewalks connecting the parking to individual units and to the train station and post office area. The design appears to be driven by the maximum lot coverage restrictions.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. Sidewalks leading to the front doors of the units are only three feet wide whereas Ordinance Section 151.2e requires 4.0 feet. In addition, people parking in their driveways would need to walk back into the street to access the sidewalk or would end up walking through the landscaping to enter their unit. Walk width and layout should be reviewed.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- c. Walk connections to the train station and surrounding neighborhood should be reviewed and coordinated with existing walks.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- d. Review walks at the ends of the residential buildings. Walk width and access should be kept to minimal safe and serviceable level and planting beds provided where possible to provide some plantings at the ends of the building and to reduce impervious coverage.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- e. The Applicant should address the functionality of acute angle beds created by the sidewalks, particularly on the sides of the residential buildings near the screened refuse areas.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- f. Proposed four foot wide sidewalks that area parallel to head-on parking are not compliant with Ordinance Sections 151.2e and 153.1h which requires six feet wide walks to allow for a two-foot vehicle overhang and a four-foot wide walking area. These areas should be made compliant with the ordinance or relief should be requested.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- g. The plans show small trash/recycling enclosures (3 ft. by 8 ft.) next to each residential building. The Applicant should confirm that this size is adequate and provide details.

Trash rooms within the buildings have been provided instead of enclosures. Revised architectural plans have NOT been submitted for review. Comment still applies.

4. Retail Building—As noted above, no architectural plans were submitted in our review set. Such plans need to be submitted including building elevations.

- a. The applicant should provide information on the type of tenants that might be considered for the retail building. Certain uses, such as a restaurant, would have a different parking demand from a general retail operation.

This comment still applies. The Applicant has indicated that testimony will be provided on this issue.

- b. The Applicant should provide testimony supporting the lack of retail support facilities such as a loading area, refuse area & recycling provisions.

These comments have been partially addressed. A dumpster area has been provided, but no building plans-Awaiting Submittal.

5. Parking and Circulation—Additional information needs to be included in the plan set.

- a. Handicap parking—The Off-Street Parking Requirements Table indicates seven handicap parking spaces are required based on a 2% multiplier. However The Americans with Disabilities Act uses a chart up to the first 500 spaces and based on the same eight spaces are required, two of which must be van accessible. The Site Plan table indicates that ten handicap spaces are provided, including two “garage” handicap spaces. The plans show seven surface handicap spaces. The plans should be revised to show the additional required handicap space and the “garage” handicap locations in buildings 13 & 14 should be labeled

Comment partially addressed. Handicapped units have been labeled and the remaining required parking spaces have been designated on the site plan however all of the handicapped parking spaces are on the north of the site, confirm that all units will be served by these handicapped spaces consistent with ADA and any other applicable requirements

- b. The Applicant should provide truck turning template overlays to ensure that fire apparatus, delivery vehicles and sanitation trucks can safely maneuver around the site.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed on ‘Truck Circulation Plans’ C-22, C-23, & C-24.

- c. “No Parking” and/or “Fire Zone” areas should be shown on the plans and detailed appropriately (including paint striping and/or signage)

This comment has been partially addressed with the limited addition of “No Parking” and “Fire Zone” striping / signage in the area of Building #13. The applicant shall confirm the adequacy of all such measures and the need for any additional such measures with the Township Fire Department.

- d. The visitor parking distribution is biased to the northerly portion of the site. It appears that the south and west parts of the site may be underserved. The Applicant should verify

parking requirements and proximity/access to each of the buildings and make modifications as required.

This comment still applies. The Applicant has indicated that testimony will be provided on this issue.

- e. Ordinance Section 151.2F requires that granite block curbing be used throughout the project site. The proposed plans indicate concrete curbing is to be employed. The Applicant should present testimony in support of this change or request a waiver.

Comment satisfactorily addressed.

However, the Site plan notes flush granite block curb for ADA pedestrian paths, plan and details show concrete flush curbs; plan and detail should be coordinated.

- f. Ordinance Section 151.2G requires that hairpin striping is to be used for the parking areas. This should be depicted on the plans and in the details.

Comment satisfactorily addressed.

- g. Ordinance Section 153.1G.1 requires that 5% of the interior parking is to contain "islands" and no more than 15 parking spaces in a row are permitted without an island. The plans should be modify the plan to comply or the Applicant provide substantiation in support of the deviation for the Board's consideration.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- h. Coordinate mailbox type and location with Postmaster. Provide on plans and accommodate any access requirements.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- i. The Applicant should provide a detailed plans of the proposed patio areas showing materials, finishes, and amenities.

This comment has been partially addressed, detailed landscape plans are provided for the patios, but no other materials, finishes, or amenities are detailed.

- j. The Applicant should describe how the individual unit driveways will be defined and separated from the interior road network.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- k. Applicant will need to apply to the Township Council for Title 39 designation.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

The applicant has requested that Title 39 designation be provided as a condition of approval should the Board decide to act favorably on this application. We take no exception to this request.

- l. There is a proposed entrance/exit drive at the southwest corner of the project into Stone House Road, which happens to be one of the steeper areas of the project site. The proposed driveway is at a relatively steep slope of 12.5% and would be slightly off-centered from the intersection with River Road (south) and Waverly Avenue (currently a "paper" street). Under the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS), the first 50 feet from the intersection can be at a grade of no more than 5%. Confirm compliance or request relief.



Comment has been satisfactorily addressed, the driveway has been relocated and redesigned.

- m. Will any parking spaces have provisions for electric car charging?

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed, electric car charging stations have been provided.

- n. A note should be added to the plans indicating that the existing fence between the proposed project site and the restricted area is to be examined for damage and is to be repaired, provide any required signage.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-6: Grading Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-5)

1. The ADA Notes discuss accessibility paths, however no specific accessible path is shown to provide complete site access (see comments above in the Site Plan section). Accessibility, including ramps, sidewalks and curb openings require further definition on the plans.

The Review Response Letter provided by the applicant refers to a 'accessible paths' being shown on the site plan.

The handicap spaces and accessible path shall be clearly defined with spot grades to ensure that slopes are in compliance with ADA regulations.

2. Per the Morris County Soil Conservation District requirements, the maximum allowable vegetative slopes should be 3 horizontal to 1 vertical.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

3. Several contours behind Buildings 9 and 10 appear to be missing, and additional labeling is required to the contours behind Building 12.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. Staircases will require ADA compliant railings with details of the same provided.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

5. The Applicant may wish to review the grading at the north end of the project near River Road and the public driveway on Lot 7.0 (AKA Commerce Avenue) to provide a more usable (flatter) area for recreation. (Coordinate with landscape comments)

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

6. The legend shows a symbol for top and bottom of retaining wall elevations; however, no such elevations are shown on the plans.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

7. Substantial grading work is to take place on Stone House Road including around an existing electric service pole that is to remain. Applicant may need to take special precautions in this area to maintain the integrity of the pole and wire system.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-7: Drainage Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-6)

1. Overall the proposed drainage system appears suitable for the proposed development. The post-development impervious cover would be less than the existing impervious cover, which in turn means the overall stormwater runoff volume would be less. Accordingly no detention system is required.
2. The proposed drainage system would discharge into four existing drainage lines, which presumably discharge into the Passaic River.
  - a. The four connection points should be clearly labeled as the discharge points on the plans (existing inlet D-400 on Stone House Road; proposed inlet D-300 on an existing 15-inch RCP; proposed stormwater manhole D-201 to existing manhole D-200 on an existing 42-inch RCP; proposed stormwater manhole D-100 on an existing 18-inch RCP).

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. It should be clarified if the connection drainage structures are standard units (inlet, manhole) or “doghouse” type structures.
  - c. As the post-development drainage areas are different from the existing drainage patterns, the applicant should provide an analysis to ensure that the downstream drainage system can handle the projected storm runoff from each new drainage pattern.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

3. The existing 42-inch RCP passes through Existing Building No. 2 and seems to begin in the area of the possibly “paved over railroad tracks” between existing Buildings No. 1 and No. 2. Based upon the large size of the pipe, the Applicant should verify that this 42-inch pipe does not pass through Existing Building No. 1 and act as part of the drainage system for Division Avenue or other areas.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. For drainage pipes equal to or larger than 12”, the stormwater management system should be modified to reduce the number of angle points or replace the proposed cleanouts with manholes or catch basins at all angle points. The upstream end of the proposed 15” drainage line that parallels Stone House Road should begin at a standard stormwater manhole and not a cleanout.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-8: Utility Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-7)

1. WATER—The most significant issue with the utility plan is that no local water supply system is shown in Division Avenue or Stone House Road. A water line is shown connecting into the subject property from Lot 7 to the north. This line terminates in a hydrant and no project connection is proposed. No other water system is indicated.
  - a. Applicant must supply information as to how the project site is to be serviced with water. If there is an existing water system in the local area it must be shown on the plans with such information as pipe size, material, valve locations etc.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. If there is no existing water line network the applicant will need to show a proposed water system. Applicant will need to work with the local water supplier to ensure there is an adequate supply for domestic, fire suppression (sprinklers), and hydrants. Plans will need to be revised to show the complete proposed system including pipe line locations, pipe material and sizes, valves, hydrants, and all other appurtenances for a fully functioning system. Information on proposed water demand, hydrant flow and pressure, and related details will need to be supplied to the water supplier, the municipal engineer, fire code official, and the Planning Board engineer.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- c. The legend shows a symbol for hydrants, valves, and other water appurtenances, but none are shown on the plans.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- d. Proposed water lines between Buildings 7-10 and between Buildings 11-13 are shown continuing to Division Avenue and just ending; as noted above they must be shown connecting into an existing or proposed water system.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- e. A third water line in the northerly most parking area is shown as simply ending in the middle of the parking area near Proposed Building #14. This line should be extended to provide a looped system connection, either directly to presumed local water network in Division Avenue or the water service behind the proposed retain building.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- f. Hydrants will need to be placed at the ends of the drive aisles of Buildings 1 and 2 and 3 and 4.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- g. Additional information is required as to how the water will be metered and distributed. Will there be one meter for the entire project or will each building have its own meter? Also, will the buildings contain a meter room or will the meters be located in pits outside? (If the latter, the tentative location of the meter pits should be shown.)

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- h. The Applicant will need to provide a detail as to how the water system will be split into service for domestic service lines and sprinkler systems.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- i. The applicant will need to apply to the N.J. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for a water main extension permit. A complete copy of the application package is to be forwarded to the municipal engineer and the Planning Board engineer.

This comment will be addressed upon DEP application.

- 2. SANITARY—It is proposed for the sanitary sewage to be collected into a gravity system and discharged into an existing sewer line at the southwest corner of the project site in Stone House Road.

- a. The Storm/Sanitary Crossing data for the crossing near the proposed retail building should be corrected.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. The applicant will need to provide a sewer study of the immediate downstream sanitary system to the next larger pipe size or interceptor sewer. The study should include type and condition of the pipe system, proposed and existing sanitary flows, and pipe capacity. Video inspection tapes/disks should be made available to the Municipal Engineer and the Board Engineer.

Comment still applies. The applicant had indicated that such a study will be performed but has not provided said report or a timeline for completion. However, we take no exception to this information being provided as a condition of approval should the Board decide to act favorably on this application.

- c. Where sanitary laterals exit the respective buildings a cleanout must be provided.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- d. The applicant should provide information relating to the availability and allocation of sewer capacity given that the Township is operating under a voluntary sewer service moratorium since 2000.

The applicant indicated that they have requested “will-serve” letters from utility providers serving the property, including the Township sewerage authority and will provide such letters upon receipt. We take no exception to this condition being satisfied as a condition of approval should the Board decide to act favorably on this application.

- e. The applicant will need to apply to the N.J. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for a sanitary sewer extension permit. A complete copy of the application package is to be forwarded to the municipal engineer and the Planning Board engineer.

The applicant indicated that they will provide the Board and its professionals with all copies of all outside agency permits and entitlements upon receipt. We take no exception to this condition being satisfied as a condition of approval should the Board decide to act favorably on this application.

3. ELECTRICAL—The actual location of the underground electric system will be subject to the requirements of the local electric utility.

- a. The proposed underground electric system is not shown on the plans.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. Anticipated transformer requirements should be determined and transformer locations should be shown on the plan.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. TELEPHONE/CABLE/GAS—Similar to the water system, these proposed utility connections are shown going out to Division Avenue but no connection points to existing utility services are shown.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-9: Lighting Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-8)

1. The lighting plan is unbalanced with poor uniformity. Lighting plan should be redesigned to comply with ordinance requirements and where possible with best industry practices as outlined by the Illuminating Engineering Society.

The lighting plan has been revised extensively. Fixture manufacturer, fixture quantities, fixture mounting heights, and fixture locations have been changed. The revised lighting plan is better, more balanced plan.

However, in our opinion the light levels proposed remain too bright and too uneven. Current industry standards recommend a Uniformity (a ratio of average light level and the minimum light level) of 5:1. The plan as proposed a Uniformity of 11.67:1. The applicant may wish to explore varying the mounting height and lower lumen fixtures to achieve a more uniformly distributed lighting plan.

The ordinance specifies a fixture lumen output of 4,000 lumens for "Street Lights." The proposed fixtures have lumen outputs ranging between 6,500 and 9,250 lumens.

a. Building Mounted Lights

- i. Specified 'Omega' building mounted lights are too powerful for proposed mounting height, consider replacing with a lantern style 'Seville' fixture and reducing light output compatible with the proposed mounting height.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- ii. Too many fixtures are proposed at the garage areas. Appropriate fixture selection will reduce the number of fixtures required (likely by half).

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- iii. Building mounted lights on the ends of the buildings are not compatible with the architecture and should be replaced with pole mounted units.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- iv. Luminaire mounting location & height should be coordinated with the building architecture.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. The Applicant should consider using dimmers to reduce overnight light levels.

This comment still applies, lights should be dimmed at night to comply with ordinance requirements.

- c. All lights should be 3000K.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-10: Soil Erosion And Sediment Control Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-9)

1. We defer to Morris County SCD for certification & comment.  
Comment still applies.

**C-11 & 12: Landscaping Plan** (Previously designated as Sheet C-10)

1. Overall, the landscape plan is lacking in creativity, detail, and execution. The planting layout, massing, diversity, and plant selections are not consistent with many sections of the Municipal Ordinance or with industry standards for a project of this magnitude.

The Landscaping plan has been extensively revised and most of the comments have been addressed. The ordinance specifies tree planting quantities and tree type distribution. The current plan does not meet either criteria and should be revised accordingly.

- a. Per ordinance 153.1.a “All landscaping plans should be prepared by a New Jersey Landscape Architect or other individual deemed suitably qualified by the approving authority.”

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. Per ordinance 153.1.l “The approving authority shall reserve the right to impose additional landscaping requirements given consideration of the size and type of the proposed development...”

- c. Perennials and ornamental grasses should be included.

This item has been satisfactorily addressed.

- d. Approximately 80% of the evergreen shrubs proposed are Japanese Holly. Plant selection should be much more diverse.

This item has been satisfactorily addressed.

- e. Armstrong Maple is a fastigate (columnar) shade tree. The plan calls for these to be planted in areas where a tree that develops a full canopy may be more appropriate.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- f. Red Sunset & October Glory Maple trees are very similar. There is no reason to have both specified.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- g. Upright Hornbeam gets very wide if not pruned, it will outgrow most locations where it is proposed.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- h. Douglas Fir does not thrive in New Jersey. It does not tolerate hot humid summers and drought. Consider other evergreen trees.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- i. Perimeter buffer plantings are ineffective and should be enhanced with addition plantings.

This comment has been partially addressed. The buffer plantings along Commerce Street are satisfactory however, the landscaped area along Division Avenue and Stonehouse Road should be revised with additional plantings such as evergreen trees to supplement the proposed deciduous trees.

- j. Deciduous Shrubs specified (such as Twig Dogwood & Rugosa Rose) will outgrow many of the areas where proposed. Review and revise planting plan accordingly.

[This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

- k. Japanese Holly proposed between walks and driveways will outgrow spaces allocated. Review and revise planting plan accordingly.

[This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

- l. Heller Holly are small brittle plants and will be troublesome when planted along walks subjected to snow loads.

[This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

- m. Additional varieties of shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees, evergreen shrubs, flowering shrubs, groundcovers, perennials, & ornamental grasses should be incorporated into the landscape plan.

[This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.](#)

- n. Design standards specify 3 groups of trees: (Consider omitting Alien Invasive plant from plant lists)

- i. Group A Ornamentals (Examples Include):

- 1. White Flowering Dogwood
    - 2. Red Flowering Dogwood
    - 3. Crimson Cloud Hawthorne
    - 4. Washington Hawthorne

- ii. Group B Mid-Sized Trees (Examples Include):

- 1. American Beauty Crabapple
    - 2. Snow Crabapple
    - 3. Shademaster Honeylocust
    - 4. Katsura Tree
    - 5. Crimson King Maple (Alien Invasive)
    - 6. Callery Pear (Alien Invasive)

- iii. Group C Large Trees (Examples Include):

- 1. Princeton Sentry Ginkgo
    - 2. Emerald Queen Maple (Alien Invasive)
    - 3. Sugar Maple
    - 4. Red Maple
    - 5. Northern Oak
    - 6. Sweetgum

o. Trees Required By Ordinance:

i. Trees required per 153.1.b

a. 11.9 Acres @ 10 tree/acre=119 Trees Required

The revised plan proposes a total of 96 trees. The applicant should amend the plan to be compliant with the ordinance requirement or offer testimony in support of a variance from this section of the ordinance.

ii. Trees required per 153.1.g.2

a. 223 Surface Parking Spaces 1 tree/10 Parking Spaces=22 Trees Required

This requirement is in addition to the shade tree requirements contained in §153.1.b. This results in a total ordinance requirement of 141 trees (119 + 22). The applicant should amend the plan to be compliant with the ordinance requirement of 141 trees or offer testimony in support of a variance from this section of the ordinance.

iii. Tree Planting Requirements per 153.1.b.4 (Evergreen trees in buffer areas do not count towards requirements)

a. 141 Trees Required By Ordinance

i. 20% Group A=28 Proposed: 44 trees = 45.8%

ii. 30% Group B=42 Proposed: 19 trees = 19.8%

iii. 30% Group C=42 Proposed: 28 trees = 29.2%

iv. 20% Other=29 Proposed: 5 trees = 5.28%

TOTAL Proposed: 96 trees

The applicant should amend the plan to be compliant or offer testimony in support of a variance from this section of the ordinance.

p. Street trees should be provided on all street frontages

This item has been partially addressed.

Shade trees and buffer planting have been provided along Commerce Avenue.  
Street trees have been provided along Division Avenue and part of Stonehouse Road.

Given the terraced walls proposed along the southwest corner of the property, street trees continuing for the entire length of the property along Stonehouse Road is appropriate.  
Street trees should relate to the street and be located near the property line where possible.

q. Provide tree plantings and other plantings along interior drives, at internal islands in driveways and parking lot islands.

This item has been partially addressed.

Additional islands have been provided and ornamental trees are proposed for some of these



locations. Given the building height, building massing, and site density the tree planting should occur on a larger scale both in terms of tree type and distribution throughout the site.

Appropriate shade tree selection from group 'B' and group 'C' type trees will be more impactful than those from Group 'A' (§153.1.b.) as proposed and would bring the distribution of trees closer to conformance with the requirements of this Ordinance

- r. Reduce unnecessary sidewalk area at ends of building and provide foundation plantings.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- s. Consider landscape area at the north end of the project in conjunction with grading to create a usable amenity space. Provide flatter lawn area and group planting on the periphery. Coordinate with grading comments.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- t. Review ordinance and demonstrate compliance, including plant size, guarantee, etc.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed

- u. The terraced wall at the southwest corner of the property are proposed to be planted with a low maintenance 'Meadow Mix' which is a reasonable solution for the upper terraces. A different approach should be used in front of the lower wall at the street level. A planting approach that provides some height and structure to soften the wall would be appropriate.

### **C-13: Landscaping Detail** (Previously designated as Sheet C-11)

1. Tree planting detail does not call for stakes; per ordinance 153.1.c.2 trees to be properly staked. Amend detail or seek relief.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

2. Given the industrial history of the site, there is likely no native topsoil. Amend detail note specifying "native topsoil".

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

3. Provide a note specifying 2 year plant guarantee per ordinance.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. Provide a note specifying that the "Site landscaping is a condition of approval that requires perpetual maintenance and care.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

5. Provide specification for seed or sod.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

6. Will an irrigation system be provided?

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

### **Critical Area Plan C-14**

The critical area plan submitted is acceptable.

### **Construction Details—C-15** (Previously designated as Sheet C-12)

1. Supplement sign data table as required due to additional signs.  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
2. Provide street sign detail.  
Comment still applies. No street signs or project direction signage details are provided.
3. Verify appropriateness of concrete wall detail based on wall heights. Detail specifies maximum wall height of 36".  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
4. Provide appropriate barrier for fall protection for walls per applicable codes.  
Comment has been partially addressed: Notes on the site plan have been provided.  
The Wall detail should be modified to show fence installation and fence/wall connection.  
The fencing at the terraced walls should also be shown.
5. Two wall details are provided. Coordinate wall type on detail and plan sheets.  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
6. Show hairpin striping per ordinance.  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
7. Change bottom of sign height to 7'.  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
8. Provide additional white stripe in first standard parking space adjacent to handicapped parking spaces.  
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

### **Construction Details C-16** (Previously designated as Sheet C-13)

1. Water Connection Detail
  - a. Confirm water main diameter, location, & type.
  - b. Confirm water service(s) pipe sizeComments have been satisfactorily addressed.
2. Sewer Connection Detail
  - a. Confirm pipe size & type?
  - b. Confirm sewer main diameter, location, and type.Comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

**Construction Details—C-17** (New Sheet Previously part of C-13)

1. Confirm lighting assembly for pole mounted lights.
  - a. Luminaire height.
  - b. Pole height.
  - c. Footing height/elevation.

The applicant shall clarify the proposed luminaire mounting height.

The construction detail indicates a mounting height of +/- 12', whereas a 10' mounting height is noted on the lighting plan. (15' is maximum mounting height per ordinance).

2. Trash/Recycle Detail is not appropriate for ends of residential building. Provide appropriate detail

The applicant has indicated that the six residential units within each building will have space within the garages for refuse storage. The remaining four residential units will utilize one of the two refuse rooms within each building. Revised architectural plans have NOT been submitted for review for the Board to be assured that the internal storage will be sufficient in size to accommodate refuse and recycling.

**C-18, C-19, & C-20: Storm Sewer Profiles**

**C-21: Sanitary Profiles** (Previously designated as Sheets C-15 - C18)

Profile sheet comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

**C-22, C-23, & C-24: Truck Circulation Plans**

These new sheets satisfactorily address truck circulation comments from the prior review.

**Technical Review: Stormwater Management Report:**

1. Overall analysis and individual points of interest are acceptable.
2. Collection system analysis is acceptable.

**Technical Review: Traffic Impact Assessment Report**

1. The Traffic Impact Assessment Report cites an RSIS requirement of 70 guest parking spaces where 114 guest spaces are available. The Applicant should discuss the distribution of these spaces relative each of the residential buildings across the site. For instance there are between 11 and 14 visitor spaces proximate to the 50 residential units contained in Buildings 6 through 9.

With regard to the RSIS requirements and the adequacy of the proposed overall and visitor parking inventory, see Note 4 below.

With regard to the distribution of the visitor parking relative to the residential units served, the applicant has indicated that testimony will be provided for the Board’s consideration.

2. The Applicant should also discuss the distribution of handicap parking relative to the 14 residential buildings.

The plans have been revised to reflect a total of seven accessible parking spaces; two of which are residential unit garage accessible spaces. The Applicant has indicated that testimony will be provided regarding the distribution of the spaces throughout the site for the Board’s consideration.

3. The Traffic Impact Assessment Report correctly compares the effect of traffic on the surrounding road network from the existing site condition along with both the no-build and projected development scenarios. The report concludes that “the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the traffic operations of the adjacent roadway network.” While the analysis applies industry standard methods throughout, the Planning Board may wish to engage the services of a traffic engineer to review the report and to confirm these findings.

This comment remains.

4. RSIS parking requirements for this project are as follows:

Residential Unit Type		# Units	Required Parking	Comment
Units with garage & driveway parking	Resident	84	168	2 cars per unit. (RSIS criteria of 2 cars per unit does NOT include visitor parking)
Units with garage & driveway parking	Visitor	84	42	0.5 Spaces per Unit
2 Bedroom Units without garage or driveway parking	Resident & Visitor	42	84	2 cars per unit. (RSIS criteria of 2 cars per unit includes visitor parking)
3 Bedroom Units without garage or driveway parking	Resident & Visitor	14	29	2.1 cars per unit. (RSIS criteria of 2.1 cars per unit includes visitor parking)
Retail			20	Based upon Floor Area.
Total Required			343	

Based upon RSIS parking requirements, it would appear that the parking provided is deficient by 36 spaces when considering visitor parking requirements for the 84 units that provide parking within the private driveways and garages.

The Traffic Impact Study submitted by the applicant correctly notes that:

*Section 5:21-4.14(c) of the RSIS intends for there to be flexibility in the parking requirements. Specifically: "Alternative standards to those shown in Table 4.4 shall be accepted if the applicant demonstrates these standards better reflect local conditions. Factors affecting minimum number of parking spaces include household characteristics, availability of mass transit, urban versus suburban location, and available off-site parking."*

The Traffic Impact Assessment Report provides empirically based parking demand data from the ITE manual "Parking Generation, 5th Edition" for the proposed mix of uses. The Report also posits that the parking demand for the two uses that will share the site will be less than the aggregate of the 2 uses if they were not sharing some of the parking inventory.

The applicant has indicated that testimony will be provided regarding the adequacy of parking including visitor parking for the Board's consideration.

#### **Technical Review: Environmental Impact Statement:**

The applicant has submitted a revised and significantly more comprehensive EIS that addresses most all of our questions and concerns. The applicant has further offered that the LSRP will provide confirming and/or supplemental supporting testimony to the Board.

1. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) incorrectly states that the project site is abandoned and not being used. The report should be corrected and identify any associated impact.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

2. The EIS states that "The subject property was previously occupied by an unknown industrial use." As a Superfund site the information about the "unknown industrial use" should be readily available and should be included in the EIS.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

3. The EIS should include information as to why a portion of the property is "off limits" and what has been done to protect the environment and area residents.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. The Applicant should provide testimony as to whether the existing bituminous pavement on the portion of the site to be developed may cover any contaminated soils. The EIS should address this possibility and whether testing will be required to confirm or deny the presence of potential hazardous materials. The EIS should discuss any potential impact of exposing underlying soils and the possible need for dust control when exposed.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

5. The EIS also needs to present the anticipated water demand and potential sewage flow based on the N.J. DEP criteria for this type of project. The discussion should gauge the potential impacts and the ability of the municipality and/or local utility agencies to supply the necessary services.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

6. The Long Hill Environmental Commission should review the EIS as appropriate.

Comment remains

**Any revised plans or other documents should be accompanied by a cover letter responding individually to each of the comments presented in this review letter.** The cover letter should also outline those changes to the plans that were requested as well as those not requested or readily apparent.