

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 3
Stonefield April 3rd Responses to Technical Review #1, shown in red.

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

From: Michael Lanzafama, PE, PLS, PP
Richard Keller, PE, PP, CME
Brian Conway, RLA, PP
Board Engineering Consultants

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
July 6, 2020, Updated solely to include Stonefield's responses.
September 18, 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 and 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. (actual date April 3, 2020).
August 25, 2020; amended to further respond to the board and its professionals comments consisting of 24 sheets.
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.](#)
11. [Transmittal from Stonefield Engineering & Design to the Planning Board dated August 25, 2020.](#)
12. [Soil Movement Exhibit prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design dated July 31, 2020 consisting of a single sheet.](#)

Brief Project Description:

The subject property is an 11.9 acre site located at 50 Division Avenue 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 the plan sheets should have the building numbers on them.
Residential building numbers and other building identifiers, such as the retail and community buildings, have been added to all plan sheets. A Site Identification Map has been added to all plan sheets to further clarify Building ID's, locations, and internal roadway names.
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.).
Roadway identifiers have been designated to all proposed on-site drive aisles. A Site Identification Map has been added to all plan sheets to further clarify Building ID's, locations, and internal roadway names.
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.
Will Serve requests have been sent to the relevant gas, electric, telecommunications, water, and sewer entities. Response letters from these entities will be issued to the municipality upon receipt.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
4. Architectural plans for the proposed retail building and clubhouse should be provided for the Board's review.
Revised Architectural Plans will be submitted under a separate cover.
~~Comment remains.~~
Architectural Plans prepared by Devereaux & Associates of McLean, VA. Dated June 20, 2019 consisting of 7 sheets.
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.
Testimony will be provided by the Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) engaged for the project. 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.
The Zoning Relief Table has been updated on the Cover Sheet (Sheet C-1).
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)
Amended plans continue to request waivers to exceed the overnight lighting levels (1.95 foot candles requested), and the maximum lumen per fixture. The cover sheet table indicating waivers for landscaping has not been updated to reflect the latest landscape plan.

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.

The list of “Agencies to be Notified” depicted on the Cover Sheet (Sheet C-1) were entities listed in the 200-foot Property Owners Lists provided by the Township of Long Hill and the Township of Bernard’s. The LSRP of record has been engaged by the Applicant and will coordinate with the NJDEP.

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. A revised survey, signed by the licensed land surveyor, will be submitted under a separate cover.
A revised survey, signed by the licensed land surveyor, will be submitted under a separate cover.
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.
A revised survey, signed by the licensed land surveyor, will be submitted under a separate cover.
Comment Remains.
3. The railroad ROW information should be indicated on this plan.
The approximate limits of the railroad ROW have been added to the Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2) for the Board’s reference.
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.
The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2) has been updated to clarify the depiction of the portion of the property subject to a Jersey Central Power Light Company easement.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
5. It would be helpful if the existing walkway from the public parking to the train station via River Road and Division Avenue were added to the plan.
The approximate limits of the exiting walkway from the public parking to the train station via River Road and Division Avenue have been added to the Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

C-3: Demolition Plan

1. The graphic scale is incorrect.
The graphic scale on the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3) has been updated to the correct scale.
The graphic scale remains incorrect. (the graphical depiction of 1" does not measure 1").
The graphic scales on all drawings have been corrected. Comment satisfactorily addressed.
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.
The Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3) has been revised to indicate the removal of all existing trees in the Stone House Road and Division Avenue Right-of-Ways.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed however trees are also noted as to remain, remove conflicting note.
Conflicting note has been removed.
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.
The existing transformer and associated structures have been called out to be demolished on the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3).
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.
The existing sanitary manhole in questions is now indicated to be removed on the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3). Any associated piping will be cut and capped at the existing sanitary manhole in the right- of-way.
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.
A note indicating that all site demolition work is to be coordinated with the Township Engineer and Building Department has been added to the Demolition Notes as Note #1 on the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3). The Licensed Site Remediation Professional to provide testimony.
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.
Testimony will be provided by the LSRP engaged for the project.
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
The requested notes have been added to the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3). See Dust Control Notes and Demolition Notes (#3 and #4).
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.
The requested note has been added to the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3). See Demolition Notes (#2)
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.
The Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3) has been updated to depict the existing gas service line to be cut and capped at the gas main on Division Avenue.
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.
The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2) has been updated to callout the approximate locations of the 8-inch cementitious water main in Commerce Street, the 6-inch cast iron water main in Division Avenue, and the 8-inch cast iron water main in Stone House Road as indicated in the water mapping obtained from New Jersey American Water.
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.
The proposed Retail Building and Building #8 have been relocated on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to conform to the zoning setback requirements of the updated right-of-way delineation.
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.
All traffic control signage is identified on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5).
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.
Revised project signage will be submitted under a separate cover.
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.
Project signage will be submitted under a separate cover.
Comment still applies. Awaiting additional submittal.
 - d. 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.
Retail signage will be submitted under a separate cover.
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.
The sidewalk layout has been revised on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to provide for adequate and safe navigation throughout the site as well as provide safe passage to the train station and post office area via crosswalk. Testimony will be provided. 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.
The sidewalks leading to the front doors of the residential buildings have been revised on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to conform to Ordinance Section 151.2e.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
 - c. Walk connections to the train station and surrounding neighborhood should be reviewed and coordinated with existing walks.
A proposed crosswalk has been added to the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) from the northeast property corner to the existing crosswalk leading to the train station and post office area.
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.
Walkways around residential buildings have been revised on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to accommodate for building foundation planting beds.
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.
All acute sidewalk angles have been removed from the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5).
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.
Proposed sidewalks that are perpendicular to head-on parking have been revised on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to comply with the 6FT wide requirement set forth in Ordinance Sections 151.2e and 153.1h.
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.
The six residential units with garages will have a space within the garage for individual refuse storage. The remaining four residential units will utilize one of the two refuse rooms on the sides of the residential buildings. Sufficient room is provided for the anticipated refuse generated by the ten total units. Refer to the Architectural floor plan and elevations for specific locations.
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.
Specific tenants are not determined at this time, testimony will be provided on anticipated general operations.
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.
A refuse / recycling area has been added to the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to the west of the retail building. Testimony will be provided. **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.

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to reflect a total of seven accessible parking spaces; two of which are residential unit garage accessible spaces.

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.

The amended plans provide for an improved distribution of ADA parking spaces for easier access to units on the southern end of the project.

- 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.

Vehicle circulation plans (Sheets C-22 through C-24) have been provided to ensure that fire apparatus, delivery vehicles, and sanitation trucks can safely maneuver the site. These spaces are proposed to be between the community and retail building and between buildings 13 & 14.

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).

No Parking Fire Zone signage and striping has been added to the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) adjacent to the proposed fire hydrant in front of Building #13.

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.

Testimony will be provided regarding visitor parking and assigned parking within the surface lot.

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

The amended plans have provided for 7 additional parking space by adding perpendicular parking just east of buildings 10 & 12 which provides for additional visitor parking on the southern end of the project. Additional “banked” parking is shown east of buildings 2, 3 & 4 which would further increase the parking supply by an additional 16 spaces should they be needed in the future. It is my opinion that this satisfies our concerns over 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.

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to show all proposed curbing to be Belgian block curbing except at flush curb areas along ADA pedestrian paths (concrete curbing will be utilized). Please refer to the Construction Details.

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.

Comment still applies. Recommendation is to utilize concrete at ADA access routes.

- 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.

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to show hairpin striping for all non-accessible parking spaces. Refer to the detail on the Construction Details (Sheet C-14, Detail #12).

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 modified to comply, or the Applicant provide substantiation in support of the deviation for the Board's consideration.

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised disconnect the parking rows over 15 spaces.

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

A mailbox type and location has been coordinated with the Postmaster, Ursula Clark-Green, and have been added to the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5).

Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

Detailed amenity plans will be provided to the Board as a condition of approval. Testimony will be provided on the general layout of the patio areas.

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. Depressed curb has been added to the Site Plans (Sheet C-4 & C-5) to separate the individual unit driveways from the interior road network. Testimony will be provided.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

Acknowledged, Title 39 designation will be provided as a condition of board approval.

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.

The driveway entrance/exit to Stone House Road has been revised on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) to be located between Building #7 and Building #8. Due to existing topography along the roadway frontage and on-site, a waiver is requested from RSIS standards to permit a driveway slope greater than 5% at both proposed driveways.

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

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

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to depict a total of six electric vehicle charging stations. Three are clustered near the retail building, the remaining three are located east of Building #1 and west of Buildings #11 and #13.

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. The requested note has been added to the Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3) as Note #11 under Demolition Notes. A more prominent framed note has been added to the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5).

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 development has been revised to indicate additional accessible paths throughout the site based on the discussion held at the March 3, 2020 TRC meeting. Additional details regarding these areas can be found on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) and on the Grading Plan (Sheet C-6).
The Review Response Letter provided by the applicant refers to ‘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. No vegetative area on site exceed a 3H : 1V slope; refer to the Grading Plan (Sheet C-6).
No vegetative area on site exceed a 3H: 1V slope; refer to the Grading Plan (Sheet C-6).
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.
The contours around Buildings #9, #10, and #12 have been revised on the Grading Plan (Sheet C-6).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
4. Staircases will require ADA compliant railings with details of the same provided.
The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to show ADA compliant railings at all staircases and relevant details have been added to the Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Detail #20).
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).
The Grading Plan (Sheet C-6) has been updated to provide a flatter area to the north of the site adjacent to Commerce Street for recreation purposes.
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.
The Grading Plan (Sheet C-6) has been revised to show top and bottom wall elevations.
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.
The Demolition Plan (Sheet C-3) has been updated to indicate the removal of this utility pole as it was only providing service to the existing buildings on site. The Applicant will coordinate the removal of the overhead wiring with the appropriate utility provider.
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. **Acknowledged.**
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).
The Drainage Plan (Sheet C-7) has been updated to label each of the four connection points to the existing stormwater infrastructure. The connection points are proposed at structures D-100, D-200, D-300, & D-400.
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.
The Drainage Plan (Sheet C-7) has been revised to clarify the existing structures that will be reutilized.
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
 - 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.
The proposed development will add 2.32 additional acres of vegetative open space which allows for a reduction in peak flow rates and volumes to all downstream drainage systems.

Please refer to the Stormwater Management Statement included with this submission.
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. A field inspection of this pipe was performed on March 17, 2020 and it was confirmed that the pipe terminates at the existing inlet adjacent to existing building #2. No off-site drainage is collected by this pipe.
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. The proposed stormwater conveyance system on the Drainage Plan (Sheet C-7) has been updated to ensure adequate spacing is provided between all incoming pipes at a structure. A manhole has been added to the referenced stormwater line along Stone House Road.
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. The size and approximate location of the water mains on Commerce Street, Division Avenue, and Stone House Road has been added to the Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2). The Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) has been revised to show the connection of the proposed water supply system to the existing water supply system, one connection at Commerce Street and one at Stone House Road.
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 pipeline 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. New Jersey American Water (NJAW) is the service provider for the region and maintains the mains along the project frontage. A proposed private water system is not required. A will serve letter has been issued to NJAW and any correspondence will be forwarded to the Board and its professionals. Please refer to the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) for the proposed

water main infrastructure.

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.
All proposed water infrastructure and appurtenances are indicated on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) and referenced in the legend.
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.
The size and approximate location of the water mains on Commerce Street, Division Avenue, and Stone House Road has been added to the Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2). The water main layout has been revised on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) to show connections on Commerce Street and Stone House Road.
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 retail building.
The water main layout has been revised on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) to create two internal loops within the site and complete the water loop between Commerce Street and Stone House Road with two proposed connections.
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.
Per discussion with Patrick White, Millington Fire Chief, fire hydrants are not required at the ends of Court A and Court B.
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.)
Water service will be metered as it enters the property at Stone House Road and Commerce Street. The Applicant will coordinate with NJAW to finalize the location and vault sizing based on flow requirements.
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. **The water service line will split in the meter room of the proposed buildings. Testimony will be provided by the Architect.**
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.
Acknowledged. The Applicant will forward all outside agency permits and entitlements to

the Board and its professionals as they are received.
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.
A Utility Crossings Table has been added to the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) to clarify all proposed sanitary, water, and storm crossings.
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.
Acknowledged. The Applicant will perform a sewer study and forward to the Municipal Engineer and Board Engineer upon completion.
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.
The Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) has been revised to reflect cleanouts for each building's sanitary lateral.
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 has requested will serve letters from the applicable utility providers serving the site and will forward to the Board and its professionals as they are received. The estimated sewer demand can be found on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8).
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 will forward all outside agency permits and entitlements to the Board and its professionals as they are received.
The applicant indicated that they would 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.
The proposed underground electric system has been added to the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8). This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
 - b. Anticipated transformer requirements should be determined, and transformer locations should be shown on the plan.
The Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) has been revised to depict preliminary transformer size and locations. Final location and sizing of the transformers will be coordinated with JCP&L prior to construction.
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.
As depicted on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8), residential electrical and telecommunication services will be provided from a proposed utility pole along Stone House Road and the retail building electrical and telecommunication services will be provided from an existing utility pole along Division Avenue. Overhead wire installation will be coordinated with the appropriate utility provider.
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 building mounted fixtures have been revised to Pacific Lighting lantern-style fixtures. Updated lighting intensities and fixtures cut sheets can be found on the Lighting Plan (Sheet C-9) and the Construction Details (Sheet C-17, Details #1 through #4).
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.
Light levels have been reduced and uniformity is under 5:1, this satisfactorily addresses our concerns. The lumen outputs however still require a waiver as they exceed the 4,000 lumen maximum output required by the Township’s standards.
 - 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.
The building mounted fixtures have been revised to Pacific Lighting lantern-style fixtures. Updated lighting intensities and fixtures cut sheets can be found on the Lighting

Plan (Sheet C-9) and the Construction Details (Sheet C-17, Details #1 through #4).
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).

The newer lighting fixtures depicted in the Lighting Plan (Sheet C-9) provide better coverage at a lower intensity resulting in the reduction of light levels in front of the garage areas by approximately 33% and reducing the quantity of fixtures by 50%.
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.

Pole mounted lantern style fixtures are proposed on the sides of each residential building on the Lighting Plan (Sheet C-9). Please refer to the Construction Details (Sheet C-17, Details #1 through #4) for the specifications of the lighting fixtures.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

The Applicant will evaluate the possibility of dimmers for overnight lighting levels.

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

- c. All lights should be 3000K.

Acknowledged. Please refer to the Construction Details (Sheet C-17, Details #1 through #4).
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. Acknowledged.
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."

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been prepared under the supervision of Paul Devitto III, licensed New Jersey Landscape Architect (# 21AS00123500).

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

- b. Per ordinance 153.1.I “The approving authority shall reserve the right to impose additional landscaping requirements given consideration of the size and type of the proposed development...”
Acknowledged.
- c. Perennials and ornamental grasses should be included.
Perennials and ornamental grasses have been included to the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13).
This item has been satisfactorily addressed.
- d. Approximately 80% of the evergreen shrubs proposed are Japanese Holly. Plant selection should be much more diverse.
The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to provide a more diverse variety of proposed evergreen shrubs.
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.
The proposed tree plantings have been revised on the Landscaping Plan (Sheet C-9) to ensure more appropriate species and locations based on purpose and appearance.
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
- f. Red Sunset & October Glory Maple trees are very similar. There is no reason to have both specified.
Neither planting is proposed in the revised landscaping design.
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
- g. Upright Hornbeam gets very wide if not pruned, it will outgrow most locations where it is proposed.
The Upright Hornbeam is no longer proposed in the revised landscaping design.
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.
The Douglas Fir is no longer proposed in the revised landscaping design.
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
- i. Perimeter buffer plantings are ineffective and should be enhanced with addition plantings.
The perimeter buffer plantings have been revised on the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) to create a more effective buffer from adjoining parcels.
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. Additional buffer plantings have been provided around the perimeter of the site. Comment satisfactorily addressed.
- j. Deciduous Shrubs specified (such as Twig Dogwood & Rugosa Rose) will outgrow many of the areas where proposed. Review and revise planting plan accordingly.
The deciduous shrubs proposed in the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) have been revised. The Twig Dogwood and Rugosa Rose is no longer proposed in the landscaping design.
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
- k. Japanese Holly proposed between walks and driveways will outgrow spaces allocated. Review and revise planting plan accordingly.
The Japanese Holly is no longer proposed in the revised landscaping design. Please refer to the Landscaping Plan (Sheet C-11 to C-13).
This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

The Heller Holly is no longer proposed in the revised landscaping design. Please refer to the Landscaping Plan (Sheet C-11 to C-13).

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.

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to provide a more diverse variety of proposed shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees, evergreen shrubs, flowering shrubs, groundcovers, perennials, & ornamental grasses.

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

Group A ornamental trees proposed in the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) are: Eastern Red Bud, Flowering Dogwood, and Serviceberry.

- 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)

The only Group B mid-sized tree proposed in the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) is the Honeylocust.

- 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

The Group C large trees proposed in the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) are the Red Maple and the Willow Oak.

o. Trees Required By Ordinance:

i. Trees required per 153.1.b

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

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to accommodate for 96 proposed trees. A design waiver is requested.

The revised plan proposes a total of 96 trees. The applicant should amend the plan to be complaint 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 Spaces1 tree/10 Parking Spaces=22 Trees Required

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to accommodate for 96 proposed trees. A design waiver is requested.

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 complaint with the ordinance requirement of 141 trees or offer testimony in support of a variance from this section of the ordinance.

The number of required trees changes due to the additional parking provided. The required number is 150. The number of trees to be planted has been increased to 150 trees. Comment satisfactorily addressed.

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
-------	-----------	----------

A design waiver will be requested for the requirements set forth in Code Section 153.1.b.4

- i. 20% Group A = 44 Proposed
- ii. 30% Group B = 19 Proposed
- iii. 30% Group C = 28 Proposed
- iv. 20% Other = 5 Proposed

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

Comment still applies. Spoke with Stonefield and they will adjust species to be in compliance with the ordinance, should be confirmed in testimony.

- p. Street trees should be provided on all street frontages.

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been updated to propose street trees on all 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.

Comment addressed. Street trees and plantings are now proposed along all street frontages.

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

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been updated to propose tree plantings and other plantings along interior drives, at internal islands, 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.

Comment addressed. Additional trees have been provided and the species selection adjusted.

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

The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to reduce unnecessary sidewalk areas. The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been updated to 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.

The Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to create a usable amenity space to the North end of the project.

This comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

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.

Comment addressed. Plantings have been provided in front of the lower wall.

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.
The tree detail in the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been revised to show trees to be properly staked.
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”.
The note specifying “native topsoil” on the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13) has been amended.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
3. Provide a note specifying 2 year plant guarantee per ordinance.
A note specifying a 2-year plant guarantee, per the ordinance, has been added to the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13.)
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.”
A note specifying that the “Site landscaping is a condition of approval that requires perpetual maintenance and care” has been added to the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
5. Provide specification for seed or sod.
A specification for seed has been added to the Landscaping Plan (Sheets C-11 to C-13).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
6. Will an irrigation system be provided?
An irrigation note is provided on the Landscaping Plan (Sheet C-11 to C-13) specifying that the system be designed and constructed by the irrigation contractor.
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.
The Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Detail #3) has been revised to reflect all proposed signage in the Sign Data Table.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
2. Provide street sign detail.
The signpost detail and Sign Data Table have been updated per the town ordinance in the Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Details #2 and #3).
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”.
Concrete walls are no longer proposed on site. Segmental block walls (e.g. Keystone) are proposed; see

Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Detail #14).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

4. Provide appropriate barrier for fall protection for walls per applicable codes.
A split rail fence has been added along sections of retaining walls over four feet in height as depicted on the Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5). Please refer to the Construction Details (Sheet 16, Detail #14).
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.
Concrete walls are no longer proposed on site. Segmental block walls (e.g. Keystone) are proposed; see Construction Details (Sheet 15, Detail #14).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
6. Show hairpin striping per ordinance.
The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 to C-5) has been updated to depict hairpin striping per town ordinance. Please refer to the Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Detail #12).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
7. Change bottom of sign height to 7'.
The mounting height has been increased to 84" on the signpost detail in the Construction Details (Sheet C-12, Detail #02).
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.
8. Provide additional white stripe in first standard parking space adjacent to handicapped parking spaces.
The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 to C-5) has been updated to depict an additional white stripe in standard parking spaces adjacent to handicapped parking spaces. Please refer to the Construction Details (Sheet C-15, Detail # 11).
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.

The Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-2) has been revised to show the existing 8" water mains that the proposed water system will connect to. It is anticipated that the proposed water supply network on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) will be an 8" water main pending hydrant flow test results.

- b. Confirm water service(s) pipe size

The water service pipe size is anticipated to be 8" diameter pending hydrant flow test results.

Comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

2. Sewer Connection Detail

- a. Confirm pipe size & type?

The Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) has been revised to show the proposed 8" PVC sewer main and 6" PVC laterals on site.

- b. Confirm sewer main diameter, location, and type.

The Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) has been revised to show the proposed 8" PVC sewer main which ties into an existing manhole in the Stone House Road right-of-way. The existing manhole sewer main has an 8" vitrified clay pipe exiting the structure.

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 lighting assembly specifications for pole mounted lights has been added to the Construction Details (Sheet C-17, Details #1 through #3). The proposed luminaire height is 36 inches, the pole height is 10 feet, and the footing height is 23 inches.

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 six residential units with garages will have a space within the garage for individual refuse storage. The remaining four residential units will utilize one of the two refuse rooms on the sides of the residential buildings. Sufficient room is provided for the anticipated refuse generated by the ten total units. Refer to the Architectural floor plan and elevations for specific locations.

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)

Stormwater and sanitary profiles have been updated and are depicted on the Storm Sewer Profiles (Sheets C-18 to C-19) and the Sanitary Profiles (Sheet C-21). All storm, sanitary, and water crossings are indicated on the profiles for reference and a utility crossings table has been added to the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8).

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.
Acknowledged.
2. Collection system analysis is acceptable.
Minor updates to the stormwater conveyance system were made to accommodate other site plan revisions. The stormwater management statement has been updated to reflect the new landcover configurations and pipe network.

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.
Additional language regarding the adequacy of guest parking spaces within the site has been included in the revised Traffic Impact Assessment Report. Testimony will be provided regarding visitor parking and assigned parking within the surface lot.
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.
The amended plans adequately address this issue.
2. The Applicant should also discuss the distribution of handicap parking relative to the 14 residential buildings.
The Site Plan (Sheets C-4 & C-5) has been revised to reflect a total of seven accessible parking spaces; two of which are residential unit garage accessible spaces. Testimony will be provided regarding the distribution of the spaces throughout the site.
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.
The amended plans adequately address this issue.
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.
Acknowledged.
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.

The amended plans increase the provide parking to 314 spaces with the ability to convert the parallel spaces along buildings 2, 3 & 4 to perpendicular spaces bringing the total number of available spaces to 330. Given the site's location to the train station it is our opinion that adequate parking is now being provided, including visitor spaces.

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.
Section 2.10 of the Statement has been revised to remove the reference to the site being abandoned. Sections 1.0 and 4.0 of the Statement has been revised indicate that the site is currently occupied with a variety of industrial tenants (approximately 60% leased). All current tenants would be vacated prior to the start of construction.
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.
Section 1.0 of the Statement has been revised to state that the property has historically operated as an asbestos products manufacturer, a pesticide application equipment manufacturer, and a pesticide packaging distribution facility. A more detailed outline of historic and current tenants is included within the 2019 Preliminary Assessment / Site Investigation prepared by EWMA which has been included in the Appendix of the Statement.
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.
The “Restricted Area” on the project site is an asbestos landfill closed under CERCLA (Superfund) and is a delisted NPL site. Deed notice / use restrictions and engineering controls have been established as part of the remedial measures. NGC and EPA completed response measures at the site including investigation and remediation of the landfill via capping, soil stabilization and institutional controls. Additional information can be found within the 2019 Preliminary Assessment / Site Investigation prepared by EWMA which has been included in the Appendix of the Statement.
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.
Section 3.7 of the Environmental Impact Statement has been updated to address air quality and dust control during construction. The 2019 Preliminary Assessment / Site Investigation prepared by EWMA has been included in the Appendix of the Statement further outlining site conditions.

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.

Sections 2.6, 2.8, 2.9 and 3.12 of the Environmental Impact Statement have been updated to further detail utility services to the project site. Will serve letters have been issued to the relevant utility authorities and responses will be forwarded to the municipality upon receipt. The Applicant is agreeable to performing a sewer study to confirm downstream capacity. Additionally, demand calculations for water and sewer demand are provided on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-8) that is included in the Preliminary & Final Major Site Plans prepared by our office.
Comment has been satisfactorily addressed.

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

Acknowledged.

Comment remains

Technical Review: Soil Movement Exhibit:

The applicant has submitted an exhibit depicting the proposed changes in grade from the existing conditions. The plan presents the data in a typical “grid pattern” often used by engineers. It also provides a series of summary tables indicating not only the overall cut and fill volumes but demolition takeoffs as well. Of interest to the Board is the following data.

1. The total volume of debris generated by the demolition of existing structures on site will be 11,407 cubic yards.
2. The volume of material to bring the site to the grades depicted on the grading plan will be 24,664 cubic yards. The analysis proposes to utilize the volume from the demolished structures to offset the total volume of material needed. Therefore, the total amount of material needed will be 21,816 cubic yards. The applicant should provide testimony on over what period do they anticipate that the trucking will occur as well as what hours of the day. Have any sources of the fill been identified yet?

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.