



BRUCE M. KOCH, PE, PP, CME
LOUIS J. PLOSKONKA, PE, CME
TREVOR J. TAYLOR, PE, PP, CME
BEHRAM TURAN, PE, LSRP
LAURA J. NEUMANN, PE, PP
DOUGLAS ROHMEYER, PE, CFM, CME
ROBERT J. RUSSO, PE, PP, CME
JOHN J. HESS, PE, PP, CME
KEITH CHIARAVALLO, PE, CME

November 21, 2023

Atlantic Highlands Borough Planning Board 100 First Avenue Atlantic Highlands, NJ 07716

Attn: Nancy Tran – Planning Board Secretary

Re: Kalian Management, LLC (PB23-02)

Preliminary and Final Site Plan and 'D' Variance Application - Review #4

Location: 160 First Avenue (County Route 8)

Zone: CBD (Central Business District)

Block 101, Lot 4.01

Borough of Atlantic Highlands, Monmouth County, NJ

Our File: HAHP0101.03

Dear Planning Board Members:

Our office received the following information in support of the above-referenced application for site plan approval:

- Plans entitled "Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for Proposed Mixed-Use Development, Block 101, Lot 4.01, Tax Map Sheet #22, 160 First Avenue, Atlantic Highlands, Monmouth County, NJ," consisting of ten (10) sheets, prepared by InSite Engineering, LLC, dated January 24, 2023, *last* revised September 25, 2023;
- Architectural floor plans, elevations, renderings entitled "New Construction, Multi-Family Residential, 160 First Avenue, Atlantic Highlands, NJ 07716, Block:101, Lot 4.01, Hudson County," consisting of nineteen (19) sheets, prepared by GRO Architects, PLLC, dated January 27, 2023, last revised November 7, 2023 (Incorrect County on cover sheet);
- Stormwater Management Report for Proposed Mixed-Use Development, prepared by InSite Engineering, LLC, dated January 30, 2023, *last revised November 3, 2023*;
- Submission Letter prepared by InSite Engineering, LLC, dated November 9, 2023; and
- Various application documents and submission items previously provided.

We have reviewed this application for site plan approval and offer the following comments (updates to the comments from our previous report and new comments are indicated in **bold italics**):

- 1. Based upon our review of the most recent site plan submittal, several modifications have been made to the original submission including but not limited to the following:
 - a) The total number of residential units has been reduced to 25 units where 30 were previously proposed.



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 2

- b) The proposed FAR for the development has been reduced from 2.26 to 1.99, eliminating the need for a "d(4)" variance.
- c) The total area of the rooftop deck has been reduced from 3,899 square feet to 1,116 square feet. In addition, a modular green roof area of 1,159 square feet is now proposed.
- d) The compact parking spaces have been removed and 9'x18' parking spaces are proposed.
- e) An additional pedestrian access from the parking area to Garfield Avenue as well as a bicycle storage area have been provided.
- f) Approximately 6,950 square feet of permeable pavement is proposed to mitigate the drainage impact of the proposed improvements. The stormwater improvements within the East Garfield Avenue right-of-way have been removed.

The modifications noted above appear to have been made to address comments from our previous engineering review and to reduce the number of variances that are required in connection with the proposed development. These changes have not modified the proposed use of the site and the proposed improvements are generally consistent with the original submission.

2. Property Description

The subject ±19,905 square foot (0.457-acre) site is located at the northeast corner of the First Avenue (County Route 8) and East Garfield Avenue intersection. The site is situated within the Central Business District (CBD) Zone District and provides ±170.4 and ±117 feet of frontage along First Avenue and East Garfield Avenue, respectively. Currently, the site contains a ±3,600 square foot one-story building consisting of various retail uses with an associated parking area. As depicted on the FEMA Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map (P-FIRM), the property is situated in a Zone X, which is an area determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. Based upon the NJDEP NJ-GeoWeb online resource, there are no wetlands on or in the immediate proximity of the site, but the site is located within the CAFRA Zone.

The Applicant is proposing to demolish and remove the existing building to construct a new ±12,412 square foot four-story mixed-use building containing ±870 square feet of retail space on the first floor and a total of twenty-five (25) residential apartment units, consisting of one- and two-bedroom units, distributed throughout the second, third, and fourth floors, as well as one (1) three-bedroom affordable apartment. Additional improvements ancillary to the residential units are also proposed within the first-floor area, including but not limited to a gym, lobby, refuse room, mechanical room, and trash room. The four (4) existing access drives extending to / from the site will be removed and one (1) new full movement ingress / egress access drive extending to / from East Garfield Avenue is proposed. A total of forty-three (43) parking spaces are depicted on the site plan, twenty-six (26) spaces are located beneath the upper living areas of the building. It appears that water and sanitary sewer service are proposed via new connections to the off-site utility mains within the First Avenue right-of-way. Landscaping, lighting, and right-of-way improvements, including but not limited to new sidewalks and curbing, are also proposed. An



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application – Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 3

approximately 97.85 square foot area, at the southwesterly corner of the property, is proposed to be dedicated to the County. The Applicant is requesting preliminary and final site plan approval and use variance relief for the proposed mixed-use development.

3. Surrounding Uses

Properties surrounding the subject site to the north, south, and west are similarly zoned CBD and contain various retail and commercial uses as well as a new mixed-use development currently under construction within the adjacent lot to the north of the site. Properties to the east of the subject site are zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) and contain residential parcels.

4. Zoning Compliance

The subject property is situated within the CBD Zone District. Table 1 below summarizes the zone requirements for a mixed-use development (permitted conditional use) within the CBD Zone and Table 2 below summarizes the bulk measures and zone requirements for the subject property:

Standard	Required	Existing	Proposed
Residential dwelling units shall be confined to the upper stories of the building. Street-level space shall be occupied by the principal uses permitted in the district and required accessory uses. Parking for residential units may be proposed on site and shall comply with RSIS Standards.	Yes	N/A	Yes
No dwelling unit shall contain more than two-bedrooms	Maximum 2- Bedrooms	N/A	1- , 2-, and 3- Bedroom Units (V)
Minimum Habitable Floor Area			1 BY KURKE INC.
One-bedroom dwelling unit (sq. ft.)	750	N/A	≥750
Two-bedroom dwelling unit (sq. ft.)	900	N/A	>900

(V): Variance Required

Table 2: Bulk Standards, CBD Zone (§150-29(A)(2) Exhibit 5-2)					
Standard	Required	Existing	Proposed		
Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	10,000	19,905	19,807 ⁽¹⁾		
Minimum Lot Frontage and Width, Corner Lot (ft)	100	117	112.11 ⁽¹⁾		
Minimum Lot Shape Diameter, Corner Lot (ft.)	60	>60	>60		



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application - Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 4

Table 2: Bulk Standards, CBD Standard	Required	Existing	Proposed
Accessory Building/ Struct. Setbacks	rtoquirou		Порозси
Rear Yard (ft.)	10	N/A	N/A
Building Coverage	75%	18.2%	62.7%
Lot (Impervious Surface) Coverage	75%	95.5%	96.8% (V)
Maximum Building Height (Stories)	3	1	4 (V)
Maximum Building Height (ft.)	40	<40	57.92 (V)(2)
Maximum Acc. Building Height (Stories)	1	N/A	N/A
Maximum Acc. Building Height (ft.)	16	N/A	N/A
Maximum Usable Floor Area Ratio	2.00	0.18	1.99
Minimum Gross Floor Area,1-Story			His only
Total Floor (sq. ft.)	2,500	3,626	N/A
Minimum Gross Floor Area, More than 1- Story			
First Floor (sq. ft.)	2,000	N/A	3,779
Total Floors (sq. ft.)	3,000	N/A	39,464

(EC): Existing Condition (V): Variance Required

- (1): After right-of-way dedication to the County.(2): Height to top of elevator tower.
- 5. The Applicant has requested a "d" variance / use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d(3), with the application forms indicating that the "d" variance is necessary due to the three-bedroom apartment and not meeting the requirements for the permitted conditional use within the CBD Zone.
- 6. The Applicant has requested variance relief and/or design waiver(s) from the following:
 - a) <u>Section 150-29.A(2)(Exhibit 5-2)</u> The maximum lot (impervious surface) coverage permitted is 75%, whereas approximately 95.5% lot coverage is existing and 96.8% is proposed.
 - b) <u>Section 150-29.A(2)(Exhibit 5-2)</u> The maximum building height permitted is 3-stories, whereas a 4-story building with roof-top deck is proposed.
 - c) <u>Section 150-29.A(2)(Exhibit 5-2)</u> The maximum building height permitted is 40 feet, whereas a building height of 43.92 feet is proposed to the roof deck, **46.38 feet is proposed to roof** parapet, and **57.92 feet is proposed to the elevator tower**.
 - d) <u>Section 150-42.A(2)</u> No dwelling unit shall contain more than two bedrooms, whereas one (1) three-bedroom apartment is proposed.



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 5

- e) <u>Section 150-42.A(1) / Section 150-89.B(1)(h)(Exhibit 9-2)</u> The minimum number of parking spaces required for a one-, two-, and three-bedroom garden apartment, per RSIS Standards, is 1.8, 2.0, and 2.1 parking spaces, respectively; for a retail use, per Borough requirements, one (1) parking space is required per 200 square feet of gross floor area.. A total of 54 parking spaces are required for the proposed development, where only *43* spaces are provided on site, including two (2) ADA parking spaces. *Five (5) additional* spaces may be included as EV credit. *It appears variance relief is required for insufficient off-street parking.*
- f) Section 150-85.E(2) All uses, other than single- and two-family detached dwellings and their accessory uses, shall provide buffers alongside rear property lines which abut areas zoned residentially or used for residential purpose. The required buffer strip shall be 25 feet wide but not exceed 10% of the lot area; a minimum 17-foot wide buffer area is required where no buffer area is proposed along the easterly property line.
- g) Section 150-87.A(1) At least 30% of the developable acreage of a tract proposed for development shall be set aside as common open space, whereas approximately 5.63% of common open space is proposed.
- h) Section 150-89.B(2) Each off-street parking space shall measure at least 9 feet in width by 18 feet in length, and parking spaces for the physically handicapped shall be 12 feet wide and 20 feet long. The Applicant is proposing two (2) ADA parking spaces which do not comply with the required dimensions; one (1) is 8 feet wide by 18 feet in length and one (1) is 11 feet wide and 18 feet in length. The compact parking spaces have been eliminated and the ADA parking stalls have been revised to comply with the current preferred standards, but do not comply with the Borough Ordinance.
- Section 150-89.C(1) The minimum number of loading spaces required for a commercial use with 5,000 to 10,000 square feet in total floor area is one (1) loading space, whereas no loading space is proposed.
- 7. In addition to the above, variances and/or design waivers would also appear necessary for the following:
 - a) Section 150-57.C(2) In the CBD Zone District, elevator towers attached to buildings may exceed height limitations by a maximum of 15 feet, whereas the proposed elevator tower exceeds height limitations by approximately 18 feet. The maximum height permitted in the CBD Zone is 40 feet, whereas the elevator bulkhead will reach a height of 57.92 feet. A variance appears to be required.
 - b) Section 150-57.C(2) In the CBD Zone District, stair towers, antennae, chimneys, water tanks, ventilators, skylights, HVAC Equipment, and other appurtenances may exceed height limitations by a maximum of 10 feet, whereas the proposed stair tower exceeds height limitations by approximately 13.42 feet. The maximum height permitted in the CBD Zone is 40



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 6

feet, whereas the stair bulkhead will reach a height of 53.42 feet. A variance appears to be required.

- c) <u>Section 150-85.F</u> In parking lots, at least 5% of the interior parking area shall be landscaped and one (1) tree shall be provided for every five (5) parking stalls; whereas landscaping and trees have not been proposed.
- d) Section 150-87.B(2) Recreation areas shall be provided at a rate of at least 250 square feet per dwelling unit; a total of 6,250 square feet of recreation area appears to be required for the 25 residential units, whereas a total of 1,749 square feet of recreational appears to be provided which includes the common roof area and gym.

The Applicant should be prepared to discuss the following issues with the Board:

8. General

- a) Reasons supporting the granting of the requested bulk variances and/or design waivers and continuance of the existing condition nonconformities.
- b) The Applicant should provide detailed calculations to verify the proposed building height, which is currently identified in the Zoning Compliance Chart on Sheet 3 of the site plan as 43.92 feet, where a maximum height of 40 feet is permitted. Pursuant to Borough definition, building height is measured from the average elevation of the grade at the front of the building to the highest point of the roof. If the building height is determined to be greater than 44 feet, a "d(6)" variance would be required as the height of the principal structure would exceed 10% the maximum height permitted in the subject zone district for the principal structure.
- c) The application requires "d(3)" use variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(3) to permit a deviation from a specification or standard pertaining solely to a conditional use. The Applicant or their professionals shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding the following proofs:

i. Positive Criteria

There must be special reasons to grant the requested / required variances. This
means that the proposed deviation from the conditional use requirements would
advance the purposes of zoning as spelled out in the Municipal Land Use Law, and
that this site is particularly suited to allow for the construction of a building of this size.

ii. Negative Criteria

That the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. This
requires an evaluation of the impact(s) associated with the granting of the proposed
use variance relief on surrounding properties and a determination as to whether or not



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 7

it causes such damage to the character of the neighborhood as to constitute a substantial detriment to the public good.

- 2. That the variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning Plan and Municipal Ordinance.
- d) Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed location of the building and the need for / feasibility of relocating same. We note that there are various portions of the building which encroach into the right-of-way. In addition, it is possible that there may be additional encroachments within the right-of-way relative to the building footings / foundation. It appears that a portion of the building overhang will encroach within the First Avenue right-of-way, due to the dedication to the County. Testimony should be provided regarding the need for same to encroach the right-of-way and feasibility of redesigning the building to eliminate this encroachment.
- e) Testimony relating to the overall operations of the proposed use and site, including but limited to: hours of operation, number of employees and employees per shift; truck/trailer traffic, loading/unloading and overall site circulation; refuse management, including mandatory recyclables; landscaping, buffering/screening and overall site aesthetics; etc. should be provided.
- f) The Applicant shall confirm that the proposed use is fully compliant with the performance standard requirements of §150-67, including but not limited to noise, air pollution, glare, and lighting and illumination.
- g) Applicant should provide site photos depicting existing conditions.
- h) Testimony should be provided regarding the timing, frequency, collection organization and other details of trash collection from and deliveries to the site. We note that the first-floor area includes a Trash Room and Refuse area.
- i) The Applicant should provide testimony discussing the applicable COAH regulations for the proposed development. We note a variance is requested for three-bedroom affordable units. We recommend the Board solicit guidance from the Borough's Affordable Housing Special Counsel or Borough Attorney.
- j) The Applicant should present the architectural plans, elevations, and renderings for the proposed mixed-use building and discuss how architectural diversity and interest will be incorporated into the overall design and layout. In addition, the Applicant should address the design standards outlined in §150-83.G of the Borough Development Regulations pertaining to architectural and building design.
- k) The site plan does not include any information relative to existing or proposed signage, noting that the development checklist indicates that same was provided. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding any proposed signage relating to the proposed mixed-use. The Applicant shall confirm that any proposed façade and ground signs will comply with §150-69



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application – Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 8

(Signs) of the Borough Development Regulations and details of any signage shall be provided to confirm compliance with the applicable zoning requirements.

The Applicant should address the Board regarding any required outside agency approvals for the site. It appears that the property is located within a CAFRA zone. In addition, copies of all outside agency approvals shall be forwarded to this office.

9. Traffic / Parking

- a) The Applicant must address the anticipated traffic impact of the proposed development on the adjacent roadway network and nearby intersection. The Applicant has provided a Traffic and Parking Study for the proposed development. It appears that only an analysis of the proposed conditions has been provided and no detailed analysis of the existing conditions was performed.
- b) The Applicant's Engineer implied in the traffic study that the trips generated for the proposed 870 SF Retail and the proposed 25 multifamily housing low rise is lower than the trips currently generated by the current convenience store and current liquor store. The Applicant's Engineer indicated that the existing traffic is 70 trips in the AM Peak Hour and 40 trips in the PM Peak Hour.
- c) The Applicant's Engineer indicated in the traffic study that they performed the following actions between the following time periods: observations of traffic during school dismissal between 2:00pm and 3:30pm on Wednesday, February 8, 2023; manual turning movement traffic counts between 4:00pm to 5:00pm on Wednesday, February 8, 2023; and manual turning movement traffic counts between 7:00 am to 8:30 am on Friday, February 10, 2023.

It should be noted that the Ordinance § 150-19 G.(1)(a)[3] indicates that the Planning Board has the right to hire a traffic expert to analyze two weekdays and one weekend, at least four one-hour recording periods per day, two of which must occur during peak hours, in the location of the development.

The Applicant's Engineer should consider reviewing the traffic conditions for two weekdays and one weekend in order to establish consistent peak hours. It should also be noted that the collection of data on a Friday may have different peaking characteristics than a Wednesday.

d) The Applicant's Engineer indicated that during their field observations, it was observed that traffic would occasionally queue up from the signalized of First Avenue and NJ State Highway 36 intersection towards the unsignalized intersection of First Avenue and Garfield Intersection. Testimony should be provided that the additional site generated trips to and from the proposed mixed-use development will not cause less than acceptable levels of service to the roadway network.

In addition, there is a sign on NJ 36 which indicates that First Avenue is a Scenic Route to the Municipal Harbor as depicted in a Google Earth / Google Maps Street View of the Interchange of First Avenue and NJ Route 36. As this sign is relatively uncommon, the Applicant's Engineer



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application – Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 9

should provide testimony on the effects to traffic that a Scenic Route to Municipal Harbor sign has on local traffic.

- e) It should be noted that the proposed southernmost parking stall near the proposed entrance/exit driveway of the mixed-use development, has the potential to present operational issues for motorists backing out of that parking stall, motorists stopped at the stop bar trying to exit the development, and motorists along East Garfield Avenue attempting to enter the development. Consideration should be given to removing this southernmost parking stall.
- f) Verify that proposed parking for the retail space complies with all Borough regulations, noting that parking requirements for a retail space is 1 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) per §150-89B.(1)(h)(Exhibit 9-2). In addition, the Applicant should verify that parking for the residential units complies with RSIS regulations, noting that one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartment units required 1.8, 2.0, and 2.1 spaces per unit, respectively. Given that the proposed mixed-use development will include six (6) one-bedroom apartments, eighteen (18) two-bedroom apartments, one (1) three-bedroom apartment, and 870 SF of retail area, the required number of parking spaces for this proposed mixed-use site is fifty-four (54) parking spaces. However, the Applicant's Engineer is proposing a total of forty-three (43) spaces on the site which does not include the 10 percent EV Credit of five (5) spaces. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the site plan to comply with the ordinance or submit a request for a variance and provide testimony on this issue.
- g) Testimony should be provided regarding the adequacy of the proposed number of parking spaces for the anticipated number of customers, employees, and residents and whether any restrictions, including but not limited to signage, will be placed prohibiting individuals from using parking spaces other than those associated with the respective use. As noted above, variance relief appears to be required as the proposed number of parking spaces is less than the minimum required. We note that per Borough Ordinance 150-89.B.(5)(i) only public parking lots within 300 feet walking distance can be used in parking calculations. On-street public parking cannot be used for this calculation.
- h) In accordance with the Model Statewide Municipal Electric Vehicle (EV) Ordinance published by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) on or about September 1, 2021, to comply with P.L. 2021 c. 171, Electric Vehicle Supply / Service Equipment (EVSE) and/or Make-Ready parking spaces shall be provided for all new development applications. As outlined in the model ordinance, as a condition of preliminary site plan approval for an application involving a multiple dwelling with five or more units, the developer or owner shall prepare as Make-Ready parking spaces at least 15% of the required off-street parking spaces and install EVSE in at least one-third of the 15% of Make-Ready parking spaces. It appears that nine (9) Make-Ready parking spaces are proposed with three (3) parking spaces with EVSE. *Nine (9)* make-Ready/EV spaces are proposed under the building coverage on the exterior parking lot. Testimony relative to same should be provided. Details of the charging equipment, any parking space signage, and parking striping should be provided on revised plans for review.



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application - Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03 Page 10

- i) Additional installation of EVSE and Make-Ready parking spaces above what is required per the in new State regulations may be encouraged but shall not be required. A parking space prepared with EVSE or Make-Ready equipment shall count as at least two parking spaces for the purpose of complying with a minimum parking space requirement. This shall result in a reduction of no more than 10% of the total required parking. Based upon the total required parking for the proposed mixed-use development, a maximum reduction of 5.3 parking spaces is permitted. In order to comply with the new state regulations, the Applicant's Engineer must round down in order not to exceed 10% of the required parking spaces. The site plan indicates that there will be an EV parking credit of five (5) spaces.
- in accordance with §150-19.F(2), the developer of a new project within the CBD District, which application proposes development with a deficiency in the required number of off-street parking spaces, shall contribute to the parking fund a fee of \$25,000 for each deficient parking space. The parking requirement calculations included on Sheet 3 of 10 of the site plans indicate that a total of *forty-eight (48)* parking spaces will be provided *(calculations include EV credit)*, where a minimum of forty-nine (49) parking spaces are required for the residential units. As noted above, a maximum of five (5) spaces can be reduced in accordance with EV parking credit.
- k) Per Atlantic Highland's Borough Ordinance § 150-89 B.(2), parking stall dimensions shall have a required size dimension of 9'x18' for a standard parking stall, and 12'x20' for handicap parking stalls. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the site plan to comply with the ordinance or submit a request for a waiver and provide testimony on this issue. The site plan has been revised to depict the required 9'x18' parking stalls, except for one (1) 8'x18' compact space and the ADA parking stalls have been revised to comply with the current preferred standards which do not comply with the Borough Ordinance. As noted above, variance relief appears to be required.
- The Applicant's Engineer does not provide any loading spaces. Per Atlantic Highland's Borough Ordinance § 150-89 C.(1), The number of required loading spaces for a site is one (1). The Applicant's Engineer should revise the site plan to comply with the ordinance or submit a request for a waiver and provide testimony on this issue.
- m) It should be noted that First Avenue (County Route 8) is under the jurisdiction of Monmouth County and this application is subject to review and approval by the Monmouth County Planning Board.
- n) Bollards and/or additional concrete wheel stops should be placed at parking spaces which abut the proposed building where vehicular impacts are possible. The Applicant should confirm that same will be provided where recommended by the Board and/or its professionals.
- o) The design and placement of all traffic signs and striping shall follow the requirements specified in "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways," published by the U.S. Department of Transportation and adopted by the N.J. Department of



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 11

Transportation. Details of all proposed signs, striping, markings should be provided to ensure compliance with current MUTCD Standards.

- p) The Applicant's Engineer should provide a site circulation plan showing the travel paths of the design vehicle to verify that the on-site circulation is adequate for the service vehicles (i.e. fire trucks, garbage trucks, delivery trucks). The circulating vehicles should not conflict with vehicles in any of the proposed parking spaces.
- q) The Applicant should provide an overview of the functionality of the tandem parking spaces, specifically whether these spaces will be restricted to the two-bedroom units which are more likely to have occupants with two (2) vehicles, whereas occupants of the one-bedroom units may only have one (1) vehicle and parking in the tandem spaces will create significant conflicts with other units.

10. Stormwater Management, Grading, and Utilities

- a) The stormwater management of the property should be reviewed with the Board. The roof leaders of the building are proposed to be directly connected to a recharge trench comprised of three (3) rows of 6" perforated HDPE pipe. In addition, approximately 6,950 square feet of the parking area will be comprised of permeable pavement designed to infiltrate into the subsoil.
- b) The Applicant should clarify the party responsible for the ownership and maintenance of the proposed stormwater management facility (recharge trench & permeable pavement). It appears that the establishment of a Homeowner's Association or similar legal entity will be required. Our office recommends that the Applicant provide an Operations and Maintenance Manual. Same should include specific preventative maintenance tasks and schedules; cost estimates; the party responsible for ownership and maintenance of the stormwater management facilities; sample maintenance logs; location map and any other information as may be required.
- c) In accordance with Borough requirements, the Applicant is required to demonstrate that the post-development peak runoff will not exceed the pre-development peak runoff. The stormwater management report indicates that the post-development peak runoff for the two-, ten-, and 25-year deign storm will not exceed existing peak runoff. The revised stormwater management plan indicates that peak runoff in the post-development conditions will not exceed peak runoff in the pre-development conditions for all design storms (i.e., 2-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year storms). Testimony confirming same should be provided. Section 5 of the SWM report should be revised to include language indicating same.
- d) We note that an exfiltration rate of 10 in./hr. was used in the routing calculations for the post-development peak runoff, which is the maximum permitted per the New Jersey Best Management Practices (NJBMP) Manual. Post-development permeability testing will be required to confirm that soils beneath the permeable pavement areas will function as per the intended design. Applicant should confirm compliance with same.



November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03 Page 12

- e) Applicant should discuss groundwater mounding analysis.
- f) The Applicant is responsible that the development will not concentrate stormwater runoff, so as to adversely impact the existing drainage patterns, which may negatively impact neighboring properties or municipal infrastructure.
- g) A copy of the most recent pre- and post-development drainage area maps should be provided. Details of the subdrainage areas should be consistent with the SWM report.
- h) The site plan indicates that there is a 24-foot wide 6-inch-tall scupper for permeable pavement emergency overflow near the westerly side of the building. Site specific details for same should be provided for review. It does not appear that overflow runoff would reach the scupper as spot elevations to the west of the inlets are higher than the grate elevations. *Applicant should discuss this item.*
- i) The Applicant is proposing to provide water and sanitary sewer service to the proposed building via service connections to the existing utility mains within the First Avenue right-ofway. The Applicant should provide a status update relative to the required applications for the proposed utility service connections and clarify whether there have been any comments and/or recommendations received from the applicable agencies.

11. Landscaping and Lighting

- a) Existing conditions for the site include a row of trees along the east property line and shade trees on First Avenue and Garfield Avenue. However, this information has not been provided on a tree save plan, in accordance with §150-85C(4). Same should be provided. The plan should specifically indicate the existing trees to remain or be removed. It appears that the Applicant would be able to preserve the existing plantings along the easterly property line if the existing curb line is maintained within the parking area. This would provide a buffer, although very minimal, to the residential units to the east.
- b) Consent from the Shade Tree Commission must be obtained prior to any street shade tree removal, in accordance with §340-5.
- c) Revise the lighting plans to reduce the excess spillage onto Garfield Avenue.
- d) The submitted Architectural Plan depicts a greater quantity of light fixtures than the Construction set. Review and revise the Lighting Plan to clarify.
- e) We note the applicant's escrow is deficient at this time. Escrow should be replenished and made current prior to any hearing.
- f) Our office reserves the right to require the installation of additional plantings if and where required. Any substitution to approved plantings shall be requested in writing and reviewed by this office prior to installation. A note indicating same should be included on the plan. The Applicant should confirm compliance.



Prelim & Final Site Plan and Use Variance Application - Review #4

November 21, 2023 Our File: HAHP0101.03

Page 13

- 12. Based on our review, the site plan should be revised as follows:
 - a) A circulation plan should be provided to verify vehicles entering the site will be able to safely navigate through the site. The circulation plan should include the following vehicles:
 - i. Fire truck
 - ii. Garbage Truck
 - iii. Largest vehicle for deliveries
 - b) A sight triangle along the East Garfield Avenue access driveway should be provided. A sight triangle easement should be provided if and where required.
 - c) Detailed calculations should be provided to substantiate the 5.63% of common open space indicated in the Zoning Compliance Chart.

The right is reserved to present additional comments pending the receipt of revised plans and/or testimony of the Applicant before the Board.

If you have any questions with regard to the above matter, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

CME Associates

Douglas M. Rohmeyer, PE, CME, CFM Planning Board Engineer's Office

DMR/DEP/dol

cc: Robert Ferragina – Borough Administrator
Michelle Clark – Zoning Officer
Michael B. Steib, Esq. – Board Attorney
Kevin Chen, PE, PTOE – CME Associates
Kalian Management, LLC – Applicant
Rick Brodsky, Esq. – Applicant's Attorney
Patrick R. Ward, PE, PP – Applicant's Engineer
GRO Architects, PLLC – Applicant's Architect