



LEBANON BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD & BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
Tuesday, April 27, 2021

The Regular meeting of the Lebanon Borough Planning Board/Board of Adjustment was called to order by Chairman at 7:00 P.M.

The meeting was convened in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act of 1975. Three local newspapers were notified, and a notice is posted at Borough Hall.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Attorney Jonathan Drill Esq. called for a moment of silence for our fallen soldiers.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Dr. Christopher Uchirin, Henry Hopkins, David Abeles, Councilman Berger, Mayor Pittinger, Joseph Hauck, Robert Weingart, and James Newman

Absent: William Wilson and William Skene

Also present: Karen M. Romano Planning Board Sec., Jonathan Drill Esq, Stan Slachetka PP, AICP, Harold Maltz, PE,PP

EXPENDITURE APPROVAL:

No Expenditure

400 and 500 Corporate Drive Lebanon, NJ 08833

Declaratory Action filed July of 2015.
Settlement agreement September 2019
MOV October 2019
New Multifamily ordinance 2020-08 adopted October 2020.

Henry Kent Smith attorney on the behalf of Town Center at Lebanon LLC

Witnesses Sworn and continued from April 13th:

Applicant:

Steve Patron managing member of Town Center at Lebanon LLC
John Hanson , PE
Kelley O'Such. PE- Stormwater
John Harter, PE -Traffic
Lawrence Appel, AIA
Martin Mortinque, AIA
David Roberts, PP

Borough:

Bob Brightly, PE
Stan Slachetka, PP
Harold Maltz, PE -Traffic

Witnesses Sworn:

Sam Gershwin Construction Management
Paul Ferriero PE,PP,CME,LEED,AP,CFM

Sam Gershwin of Sam Gershwin Construction Management presented his Bio:

- *Complete turnkey real estate construction management from project inception thru delivery.*
- *Entitlements, construction, marketing, and disposal (sale or rentals).*
- *Served as president of Garden Homes, Westminster Communities, Coddington Communities and Coddington Real Estate Advisors LLC.*

Projects: Entitlements and Construction

Country Club Village, Scotch Plains, NJ — 318 apartment flats and duplexes
Ashbrook Manor North, Scotch Plains, NJ — 47 garden apartments

Riverside Village, Scotch Plains, NJ — 150 apartment flats and duplexes
Forest Park Village, Scotch Plains, NJ — 47 garden apartments
Summit Hill, West Orange, NJ — 18 townhomes
Park Vue at Livingston, Livingston, NJ — 220 apartments over structured parking
Evergreen Meadows, Edison, NJ — 337 garden apartments and townhomes
Lakeside at Briant Park, Springfield, NJ — 84 apartments
Cottage Lane Village I, Berkeley Heights, NJ — 32 triplex rental units
Cottage Lane Village H, Berkeley Heights, NJ — 18 triplex rental units

The Highlands at West Essex, West Orange, NJ — 300 townhomes
Castle Ridge, East Hanover, NJ — 184 townhomes
Belantrae Greens, Florham Park, NJ — 194 townhomes
Southwyck Village, Scotch Plains, NJ — 192 townhomes
Cedar Gate, Livingston, NJ — 54 townhomes
Wyckoff Village, Wyckoff, NJ — 37 townhomes
Waterford at East Brunswick, East Brunswick, NJ — 148 age restricted condominiums
Berkeley Square, Berkeley Heights and Watchung, NJ — 37 townhomes

Wesley Grove, Asbury Park, NJ — 96 condo flats, duplexes, and townhomes for sale
Cranford Crossing, Cranford, NJ — 62 rental apartments, 15,000 sq. ft. retail, parking deck
The Landings at Harborside, Perth Amboy, NJ — 164 condo flats, duplexes, townhomes over and surrounding.
structured parking; 8,600 sq. ft. retail; reconstruction of a 20,000 sq. ft. building into a sales center and unit model
complex; construction of waterfront bulkhead and promenade
High Tor Estates, West Orange and Verona NJ — 54 single family homes
Pitching Way, Scotch Plains, NJ — 18 single family homes
Morris Oaks, Morris Township, NJ — 26 single family homes
Soldier Hill, Paramus, NJ — 138 single family homes
The Manor Homes at National Golf Club, Pinehurst, NC — 14 manor (narrow lot) single family homes
The Estate Homes at National Golf Club, Pinehurst, NC — 11 estate single family homes
The Highlands at Reeves, Riverhead, Long Island, NY — 68 single family home community
The Highlands at Aquebogue, Aquebogue, Long Island, NY — 70 single family home community
Estates at Pinecrest Lake Golf & Country Club, Pocono Pines, PA — 35 single family homes
The Preserve at Milford Hills, Milford, PA — 54 estate single family homes

All of the constructed communities previously listed, plus:

Bel Aire Estates, Livingston, NJ — 70 estate single family lots

Paddock Estates, West Orange, NJ — 62 single family homes

Belle Aire Woods, West Orange, NJ — 78 single family homes

The Manors at Colts Neck, Colts Neck, NJ — 48 manor home community

The Crest at Fishkill, Fishkill, NY — 106 townhome community

Hillside Estates, Livingston, NJ — 40 single family homes

Crestmont Country Club, West Orange, NJ — Various approvals for golf course improvements; new, expanded.

driving range and practice facilities; on-site staff housing; clubhouse expansion and improvements

Properties upon which the previously listed communities have been constructed and/or entitled, plus:

Sony Headquarters, Park Ridge and Montvale, NJ — 32 acres plus 150,000 sq. ft. commercial

building

for future development

Brooklyn Waterfront, Brooklyn, NY — Assemblage of three properties for which zoning to achieve 1,450,000 sq. ft. of residential development

James Street, Florham Park, NJ — 11,000 sq. ft. office building

Castle Ridge Plaza, East Hanover, NJ — 150,000 sq. ft. shopping plaza anchored by Best Buy and Michaels

Mr. Gershwin stated he and Steve Patron were partners. They would Develop, Build, Own and Operate. He went on to explain the layout of each building while displaying the plans. It was stated that each building would have three-yard trash compactors with regular scheduled trash pickup. The complex would have a Resident Super and Maintenance Staff to maintain the building as well as the grounds. All residents would have access to all amenities. There would also be an onsite leasing agent. All Stormwater requirements would be maintained by the Maintenance staff.

Mr. Hauck asked about Tandem and Electric car parking. Mr. Gershwin stated both would be accommodated according to the needs of the residents.

Borough Engineer, Paul Ferriero P.E. ask what the expected average vacancy rate. Mr. Gershwin stated

Most of their developments average 2%.

Mr. Gershwin Thanked the Board.

Larry Appeal and Matt Martinique of Appel Design Group Architects presented.

Draft of responses to Board Professional Reports ... Numbering corresponds to numbering contained within the individual reports.

Ferriero Engineering, Inc. Report (Robert Brightly dated 4/9/21):

B-1 (b): The 354' length comes from a cantilever of the upper floors. This was done to create the architectural corner elements and provide the facade breaks. We feel this to be a de minimus condition and is beneficial to the architectural design.

B-10: The loft space is not a bedroom, see exhibit A15.

B-16: All garage spaces, excluding EV charging, which will be designated solely to EV vehicle owners for charging only, will be assigned.

B-16 (e): At building #3 we would recommend removal of the 1 endcap stall at the dead end to create a turnaround space for the last stall. The access to the bike Room can be used as a turnaround space to help facilitate improved access to the first two spaces.

B-23: The backflow preventer will be located within the building, subject to any requirements from the AHJ and utility company.

B-24: There will be one transformer for each building that will be screened with landscaping. Exterior mounted meters will be screened.

B-25: Both building stairs, in each building, will have an exterior door with access to grade.

B-35 (d, e, & f): We will substitute architectural lanterns where possible, especially near pedestrian & vehicular entries. This will improve the appearance with lighting that is more residential in character and pedestrian scaled. At the courtyard, we will work with the site engineer to substitute the wall packs with wall mounted lanterns, post lighting, and bollards to facilitate a

more pedestrian scale. We will try to capture warmer lighting by limiting to the color temperature to what is prescribed within the ordinance where possible (2700k).

E-1: The parking will be in accordance with the requirements set forth in the in NJUCC and the appropriate referenced codes including the International Building Code (2018, NJ edition). In addition, we will comply with the additional requirements of FHA (Fair Housing Act) and where applicable, ADA. Please see memorandum dated 2/10/21 to Stan Slachetka. The architectural drawings supersede the site drawings with regard to the garage parking (2 van accessible stalls to be provided in the garage of each building). The balance of required parking will be provide on the surface lots adjacent to the main entries.

E-2: All storm and sanitary piping will be tucked behind the columns to minimize any conflicts.

E-3: See response B-16(3) above.

E-4: The parking garages are to be mechanically ventilated.

E-5: Each unit will have independent, self-contained HVAC systems. In addition, to service common areas, we anticipate that 4 pad mounted AC condensing units will be provided for buildings 2-4 and building 1 will possibly require up to 6 units due to the common amenity space.

E-6: Code required minimum is 8'-2" clear at the drive aisle for access to the accessible van stall. We will be aiming to maintain as close to a 9'-0" ceiling height as possible.

E-7: The entry porticos are shown on the drawings. The porticos on the West elevation of building 1 and the East elevation of building 2, project out about 10'-0", which leaves a 6'-0" sidewalk beyond. The portico on the South elevation of building 4 will project 4'-0", even with the bump out of the garage so as not to interfere with the accessible curb ramp. All the other courtyard porticos will project between 4'-0" to 8'-0".

E-8: The portico roofs and brow roofs at the 1st floor will be standing seam metal roofs.

E-9: We will add signature legends when the drawings are reissued as part of resolution compliance.

F-1: 2-3 yard containers will typically be used for the compactor with additional spare containers stored within the trash room and rolled out by maintenance personnel (or the hauler) for periodic servicing. Based upon the size of the building, it is anticipated that the job will be serviced approximately 1-2 times per week.

T&M Planning Report (Stan Slachetka):

G-1 & 3: We will substitute architectural lanterns where possible, especially near pedestrian & vehicular entries. This will improve the appearance with lighting that is more residential in character and pedestrian scaled. At the courtyard, we will work with the site engineer to substitute the wall packs with wall mounted lanterns, post lighting, and bollards to facilitate a more pedestrian scale. We will try to capture warmer lighting by limiting to the color temperature to what is prescribed within the ordinance where possible (2700k). Lighting shall be properly spaced to average the required 0.3 foot-candles at all pedestrian walkways.

H-1: We understand that lease restrictions shall be provided by the Owner such that dens will not be used or marketed as a bedroom.

H-2 (a): These walls have little articulation on the ground floor due to the program on the inside, parking and tenant storage. The building above these areas follows the rhythm of the rest of the elevations. As there is opportunity to tie in landscaping along the ground floor, we would recommend this in lieu of other architectural treatment.

H-2 (b): These walls have little articulation on the ground floor due to the program on the inside, parking and tenant storage. The building above these areas follows the rhythm of the rest of the elevations. Fenestration is provided where appropriate at the parking but would not advise providing fenestration at the tenant storage areas. We believe the best way to address these areas in to provide landscaping to help address this low area of the facade in lieu of other architectural treatment.

H-2 (c): The dormers at building #2 were not shown. This oversight will be corrected and dormers at this roof area will be provided similar to what is shown at building 1.

H-3: The articulation included in the design is within the 60'-0" limit. As well, the minimum depth of offset breaks is 1'-0" or greater.

H-5: Yes, please see response to H-2 (c) above.

3 (c): See exhibit A13 for the proposed building signage as well as a comparative analysis with the smaller ordinance conforming building sign.

Mr. Appeal reviewed exhibits A12, A16 and A17 explaining the Loft units, Trash, Tandem Spaces, Electric Spaces and ADA spaces and how everything compiled with ADA and Fair Share Housing regulations. No Variances were needed to compile.

Exhibit A13 explained building signs.

Mr. Ferriero asked about the in consistency's regarding the Site Plan and the Architect plans. Mr. Appeal stated all in consistency's would be brought up to date.

John R. Harter, P.E. Atlantic Traffic And Design

Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineering, LLC (AIDE) is in receipt of Hamal Associates, Inc. Traffic Review Letter #1 dated April 5, 2021. ATDE's responses are provided in **bold** below.

Section A: E&LP (ELP) Site Plan Review 1

- a. Phase I consists of: Building 1= 75 units (19-1 BE, 50-2 BR, 6-3BR) Building 2 = 80 units (1 8-1 BR, 56-2 BR, 6-3BR)
Total = 155 units (37-IBR, 106-2BR, 12-3 BR)

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- b. The Phase 1 required parking was based on the NJ Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). As shown on the Parking Schedule Calculations table, on Sheet 5, Buildings 1 & 2 respectively require 148 and 158 parking spaces, for a total of 306 spaces. HMA's review of the parking calculations indicated a rounding error for each building. Our analysis identified that the parking required for Buildings 1 & 2 are 147 and 157 spaces, respectively, for a total of 304 spaces. The parking table should be revised.

E&LP will be revising the parking layout somewhat to address stormwater management issues. The associated parking table will also be updated.

- c. Building 1 & 2 each provide 77 garage spaces, of which 6 are tandem and 4 are handicap (HC) spaces, in each garage. There are 173 spaces provided in outside parking lots (incl. 3 HC). The total parking provided for Buildings 1 & 2 is 327 spaces, including 11 HC spaces. This exceeds the RSIS minimum.

parking requirement of 304 spaces. It is noted that the Parking Schedule table did not include the HC garage spaces in the total proposed parking. Also, in each garage, the parking row having the HC spaces was undercounted by two (2) standard spaces. ELP must revise the site plan (Sheet 5) and parking calculation table accordingly.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

d. HMA notes that 73 parking spaces are in an existing parking lot that is located in front of the Courtyard at Marriott hotel, but close to Corporate Drive. These spaces are on Lot 1.03. Does the allocation of the 73 spaces to the residential site have any impact on the parking required for the hotel site?

The reliance on the 73 parking spaces does not impact the hotel allocated parking supply.

e. There are no dead-end parking aisles proposed in the Phase I development area. The garages each provide parking on each side of a straight parking aisle that has an entrance/exit at each end of the aisle. The exterior parking is provided along or interconnecting with a circulation aisle that loops around the buildings with two access drive intersections with Corporate Drive. There are two means of access (circulation) provided throughout the site.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

2.

- a. Phase 2 consists of: Building 3 = 63 units (12-1 BE, 45-2 BR, 6-3BR) Building 4 = 62 units (13-1 BR, 43-2 BR, 6-3BR)
Total = 125 units (25-IBR, 88.2BR, 12-3 BR)

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- b. The Phase 2 required parking was based on the NJ Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). As shown on the Parking Schedule Calculations table, on Sheet 6, Buildings 3 & 4 respectively require 125 and 123 parking spaces, for a total of 248 spaces. HMA's review of the parking calculations indicated a rounding error for each building. Our analysis identified that the parking required for Buildings 3 & 4 are 124 and 122 spaces, respectively, for a total of 246 spaces. The parking table should be revised.

E&LP will be revising the parking layout somewhat to address stormwater management issues. The associated parking table will also be updated.

- c. Building 3 provides 52 garage spaces. of which 4 are tandem and 5 are handicap. It is noted that the parking row having the HC spaces was overcounted by 1 standard space. The site plan parking numbers identified.

parking requirement of 304 spaces. It is noted that the Parking Schedule table did not include the HC garage spaces in the total proposed parking. Also, in each garage, the parking row having the HC spaces was undercounted by two (2) standard spaces. ELP must revise the site plan (Sheet 5) and parking calculation table accordingly.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

d. HMA notes that 73 parking spaces are in an existing parkinglot that is located in front of the Courtyard at Marriott hotel, but close to Corporate Drive. These spaces are on Lot 1.03. Does the allocation of the 73 spaces to the residential site have any impact on the parking required for the hotel site?

The reliance on the 73 parking spaces does not impact the hotel allocated parking supply.

e. There are no dead-end parking aisles proposed in the Phase I development area. The garages each provide parking on each side of a straight parking aisle that has an entrance/exit at each end of the aisle. The exterior parking is provided along or interconnecting with a circulation aisle that loops around the buildings with two access drive intersections with Corporate Drive. There are two means of access (circulation) provided throughout the site.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

2.

- f. Phase 2 consists of: Building 3 = 63 units (12-1 BE, 45-2 BR, 6-3BR) Building 4 = 62 units (13-1 BR, 43-2 BR, 6-3BR)
Total = 125 units (25-IBR, 88.2BR, 12-3 BR)

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- g. The Phase 2 required parking was based on the NJ Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). As shown on the Parking Schedule Calculations table, on Sheet 6, Buildings 3 & 4 respectively require 125 and 123 parking spaces, for a total of 248 spaces. HMA's review of the parking calculations indicated a rounding error for each building. Our analysis identified that the parking required for Buildings 3 & 4 are 124 and 122 spaces, respectively, for a total of 246 spaces. The parking table should be revised.

E&LP will be revising the parking layout somewhat to address stormwater management issues. The associated parking table will also be updated.

- h. Building 3 provides 52 garage spaces. of which 4 are tandem and 5 are handicap. It is noted that the parking row having the HC spaces was overcounted by 1 standard space. The site plan parking numbers identified

Pedestrian Crossing' sign (WII-2) with supplemental downward pointing diagonal arrow plaque (W16-7P) assembly be posted at the crosswalk location facing exiting drivers.

The site plans will be revised to address this comment.

5.

- a. Will garage parking spaces be assigned?

Interior garage spaces will be number and assigned.

- b. How are moving vans accommodated on-site?

Through leasing and management move-ins and move-outs will be arranged so that only one apartment moves in/out at any given time. Time slots will be assigned during normal working hours. Management will "cone off" several strategic parking spaces during a move-in/move-out so the movers can have efficient access to building entry doors.

6. At the proposed easterly site access drive serving Buildings 1 & 2, it is proposed to remove part of the Corporate Drive median, so as to provide an eastbound left turn lane. Left turn pavement arrows and an ONLY pavement message should be provided. Also, the width of the left turn lane should be added to the site plans.

The width of the proposed left-turn lane on Corporate Drive will be added to the site plans.

7.

- a. ELP should review the existing pavement markings and signage at the several intersections along Corporate Drive and identify any modifications that have to be performed to conform with the MUTCD. ELP should consult with the project traffic engineer AID on this comment. HMA identified numerous incorrect or missing signs and pavement markings along Corporate Drive during our field inspection.

E&LP and AIDE will revise the site plans to address the pavement markings as required by the MUTCD.

- b. Existing pavement markings (arrow & ONLY) should be added to Site Plan Sheets 5 & 6.

Plans will be revised to reflect the existing arrow and only pavement markings on sheets 5 and 6.

8. Although Atlantic Traffic & Design is preparing a separate Pedestrian Facilities Assessment Report related to pedestrian facilities and circulation along Cokesbury Road, ELP has not identified any sidewalks proposed to be installed along Corporate Drive that would connect the residential sites to Cokesbury Road. ELP to address this.

comment.

As part of their site plan revisions, E&LP will include the sidewalk proposed along the Corporate Drive site frontage.

9. Site Plan Sheets 21, 22 and 23 identify the clear sight triangles at each of the three access drive intersections with Corporate Drive, that serve the two development sites. It is noted that two of the three access drives currently exist. HMA agrees with the sight lines identified at each location. With Corporate Drive having a posted 25 mph speed limit, the sight lines were based on a 30 mph design speed. Based on AASHTO standards, for a 30 mph design speed, stopping sight distance (SSD) is 200 feet and intersection sight distance (ISD) is 335 feet. The sight lines shown all met the higher ISD condition.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

10. Site Plan Sheet 24 (Emergency Vehicle Circulation Plan) indicates that an aerial ladder fire truck can circulate around both residential sites.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

Section B: Atlantic Traffic & Design (ATD) Traffic Impact Analysis Report Review

1. The ATD traffic study was prepared according to accepted traffic engineering procedures and methodologies.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

2. ATD noted that they are preparing a separate Pedestrian Facilities Assessment Report in an effort to improve pedestrian facilities and circulation along Cokesbury Road and with Corporate Drive. The noted report is based on consultations with the Borough of Lebanon and the NJDOT and is being prepared as a separate document from the Traffic Impact Analysis report.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

3. In the Proposed Condition section of ATD's report, they identify a total of 567 parking stalls being provided. Based on our review of the site plans and including handicap (HC) spaces, a total of 581 spaces are being provided. ATD is to validate the correct number of parking spaces proposed.

As noted, the site plans will be revised and the associated parking numbers will be updated.

4. ATD requested and received a Letter of No Interest (LONI) from the NJDOT concurring with ATD's findings that the proposed residential development will not have a significant increase in traffic (as per NJ Highway Access Management Code) at the Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive intersection. Consequently, a new access permit will not be required. The Jan. 7, 2021 NJDOT LONI appended to the ATD report.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

5. The existing roadway and intersection conditions within the study area have been properly described. The only comment HMA has is related to the ATD discussion of Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) for vehicles turning from Corporate Drive onto Cokesbury Road. ATD identified an AASHTO ISD of 475 feet based on the 35 mph posted speed limit on Cokesbury Road. This corresponds to a 40 mph design speed. HMA's review of the AASHTO table for an ISD of 40 mph identified a 445 foot distance, without any adjustment for roadway grade. Intersection sight distance provides for the main road driver to decelerate to approximately 70% of his initial operating speed, but not stopping, to accommodate the side road vehicle maneuver. The AASHTO Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) at 40 mph, is 305 feet. It is noted that SSD is the critical distance for safety.

ATD noted that the sight lines are somewhat constrained by overgrown vegetation to the north and south of Corporate Drive.

HMA recommends that interfering vegetation be cleared back, where possible. ATD to respond.

The Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) calculated for vehicles exiting Corporate Drive onto Cokesbury Road includes a higher critical gap (+0.5 seconds) due to the need for left-turn egress movements to cross 2 northbound lanes. This results in a higher ISD requirement of 475 feet. The Applicant agrees to clear and trim vegetation/trees inside the sight triangle within the public right-of-way.

6. As discussed by ATD, the current COVID-19 pandemic has caused significant reductions in traffic activity on roadways. To establish current baseline traffic volumes, ATD performed intersection traffic movement counts at the following locations:

- I. US Rt. 22 & Cokesbury Road (CR 639);
2. US Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive; and
3. Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive.

The manual turning movement counts were conducted on Thursday, December 3, 2020 from 7-9 am and 4-6 pm. The peak hours identified were 7:45-8:45 am and 4-5 pm.

The Dec. 2020 traffic volumes were adjusted based on comparison to pre-COVID-19 publicly available traffic data (NJDOT) and other historic area counts previously conducted by Dynamic Traffic, LLC and Tri-State Dada, Inc.

The Tri-State data consisted of traffic movement counts conducted at Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive, on Tuesday, Sept. 17, 2019 from 7 am- 7 pm.

The Dynamic Traffic data was limited to Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) count data, which consisted of hourly traffic volumes by direction at a point on a roadway. These

counts were conducted on Rt. 22 east of Corporate Drive, on Rt. 22 west of Corporate Drive and Corporate Drive north of Rt. 22. The counts were conducted from June 15, 2018 to June 21, 2018.

ATR counts were also obtained by ATD from the NJDOT, taken on Rt. 22 east of Cokesbury Road, in Oct. 2019.

ATD adjusted all the 2018 and 2019 traffic counts to 2020, based on NJDOT annual background traffic growth rates. This is the accepted source for performing this adjustment, the year corresponding to the 2020 base year counts performed by ATD.

By evaluation/analysis of the several 2020 adjusted historical traffic data and comparison to the ATD 2020 traffic counts, a percent increase to the ATD traffic volumes was identified. The ATD 2020 intersection volumes were grown by approximately 60% in the am peak hour and 35% in the pm peak hour. This adjustment is an attempt to reflect 2020 intersection volumes with no COVID-19 impact. HMA notes that the procedures applied by ATD are an accepted traffic engineering practice

and was discussed with HMA when ATD was establishing study procedures. The analyses performed by ATD and as summarized on their report figures are acceptable. It is requested that ATD present a brief summary, in testimony, of the analyses performed.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

7. At the time of the ATD December 2020 traffic counts, there was nominal peak hour traffic activity to/from Corporate Drive at the intersections with Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22. ATD noted that only the 92,926 sf office building closest to the western end of Corporate Drive was partially occupied and the remaining buildings completely w/occupied. To account for full occupancy of the office buildings and hotel activity, ATD calculated the am and pm peak hour trips for the office and hotel uses. These calculations were based on the ITE publication Trip Generation - 10th Edition, which is the accepted source for performing this analysis. The peak hour trip generation is summarized on report Table I and on report Fig. 2E, the latter distributing the volumes at the Corporate Drive intersections with Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22. HMA notes that ATD performed a conservative analysis, by adding the existing 2020 Corporate Drive traffic counts to the projected volumes. HMA agrees with the analysis performed.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

8. ATD expanded the December 2020 existing adjusted Peak Hour Volumes (see Fig. 2E) to the year 2023 based on NJDOT annual background traffic growth rates, which is the future buildout year for the project. Fig 5 identifies the 2023 Future No Build Traffic Volumes, plus the trip generation by the existing offices and hotel. HMA concurs with the analyses performed.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

9.
 - a. ATD applied trip generation rates from the ITE publication, Trip Generation 10th Edition, in developing peak hour traffic projections for the 280 unit residential project. This is the accepted source for performing this analysis and is required for use by the NJ Residential Site Improvements Standards (R515). As presented in Table 1, the residential weekday am and pm peak hour trip generation is, respectively, 94 and 119 trips. These are not large in magnitude with the volumes distributed between two access points, Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- b. AID identified the residential trip orientation percentages on Fig. 3, with the peak hour site generated traffic shown on Fig. 4. HMA concurs with the trip distributions identified.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- c. Report Fig. 6 summarizes the 2023 Build peak hour traffic volumes, which is a summation of the residential peak hour trip assignments (Fig. 4) and the 2023 No Build volumes (Fig. 5). HMA agrees with the summation presented.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- 10. Capacity analysis for signalized and unsignalized intersections were followed by ATD according to the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and associated SYNCHRO software. This is an accepted source for performing this analysis. Based on the analysis performed, we note the following:

- a. US Rt. 22 & Cokesbury Road

Under the No Build condition and both peak hours, all intersection approach movements function at a LOS 'E' or better, except the Cokesbury Road SB combined thru/right movements in the pm peak hour, which functions at a LOS 'F'.

In the 2023 Build condition and both peak hours, only small increases in average vehicle delay were experienced by any approach movement, except for the Cokesbury Road SB thru/right turn movements which will operate at LOS with a large increase in average vehicle delay. ATD mitigated all or most of this impact by a minor retiming of the signal; 2 seconds in the am peak hour and 1 second in the pm peak hour.

HMA notes that the Lebanon Town Center project added only 17 and 7 trips to the Cokesbury Road All thru/right turn lane in the respective am and pm peak hours. We note that, in the LOS 'F' range, the capacity software tends to calculate disproportionately large increases in average vehicle delay for very small increases in trips. On average, the Town Center project will add only one trip to the noted southbound thru/right movements every 4-10 minutes. **Item acknowledged. No response necessary.**

- b. US Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive/La Bella Salon

Under the No Build condition and both peak hours, all intersection approach movements function at a LOS 'E' or better.

In the Build condition and both peak hours, only small increases in average vehicle delay will be experienced by any approach movement. The largest increase was 6.3 seconds to the Rt. 22 EB left/U-turn lane in the pm peak hour. No mitigation is required at this intersection, due to the Town Center project.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

- c. Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive

This 'Stop' controlled T-intersection, in the No Build condition and both peak hours, will experience a good LOS 'B-C' on the

Corporate Drive approach and a LOS 'A' for the Cokesbury Road SB left turn. In the Build scenario, no changes to the good LOS are experienced. The greatest impact is an increase of approximately 2-1/2 seconds of average vehicle delay to the Corporate Drive WB left turn lane. Other than pruning/clearing vegetation that might obstruct lines of sight, at this intersection, no mitigation is required due to the Town Center project.

HMA notes that all the signalized and unsignalized capacity analyses were properly performed and accurate as to all data entries.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

11. ATD projected pedestrian peak hour trip generation for the proposed 280 unit, mid-rise, multi-family residential project based on the ITE publication Trip Generation 10th Edition. As noted in report Table 2 (p. 10), the residential site will generate 6 am and 11 pm peak hour pedestrian trips. HMA agrees with the analysis performed.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

12. ATD evaluated Traffic Signal Warrants at the intersection of Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive under future Build volume conditions. This assumed that the existing office buildings, the hotel and the proposed residential development were fully occupied. HMA reviewed the ATD signal warrant analysis and concurs with their conclusion that a signal warrant is not met at this location. ATD should present a brief summary of their findings in testimony.

Item acknowledged. ATDE will present in testimony.

13. ATD should present in testimony a summary of their accident investigation findings, within the study area, and how it relates to the Town Center project.

Item acknowledged. ATDE will present in testimony.

14. Related to ATD's comments on site access, circulation and parking, HMA had provided a detailed review of the preceding in the Site Plan Review section of this traffic review report. Consequently, we have not provided a separate site plan review related to the ATD traffic report.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary.

Section C: General Comments

1. All traffic related review comments by other Board professionals shall be addressed by ELP and ATD.
- 2.

Item acknowledged. No response necessary

Chairman Saharic asked about the traffic arrows on Cokesbury Rd. The right lane currently is Right and Straight with the left Lane as a turn left only. Mr. Harter stated the Left and Straight would be addressed. With the hope of making the Right lane Right only and the Left Lane Straight and Left.

Borough Traffic Engineer Harold Maltz stated:

No Traffic impacts

All Sight Triangle looked good.

All Parking Will meet RSI

NJ State Police records were reviewed. Accidents from 2016 -2019 were reviewed. 195 records, 1 Fatality, 2 accidents over a 3 year period.

Pedestrian Circulation

It was determined the best placement of the sidewalk for foot traffic to town would be on the east side of Cokesbury Road.

Mr. Weingart ask about a crosswalk at Clark Road to the extended sidewalk to the half circle. Attorney Drill state many of these issues would be addressed in the Redevelopment Ordinance.

Dave Roberts PP Town Center Planner

All variances explained in A21 Attached.

Borough Professional Reports Submitted

Ferriero Engineering Inc. Bob Brightly PE,PP,CME

This office is in receipt of the following information submitted in connection with the above referenced project:

- Preliminary Major Site Plan drawings prepared by E&LP, consisting of thirty-four (34) sheets dated December 8, 2020 and revised through February 4, 2021.
- Boundary and Topographic Survey prepared by E&LP, dated April 3, 2018 and revised through September 18, 2018.
- Stormwater Management Report prepared by E&LP, dated December 8, 2020.
- Stormwater Management Maintenance Manual prepared by E&LP, December 8, 2020.
- Environmental Impact Report prepared by DuBois & Associates, dated December 21, 2020.
- Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Atlantic Traffic & Design, dated January 18, 2021.
- Architectural drawings prepared by Appel Design Group, consisting of fourteen (14) sheets, dated December 21, 2020.

This project proposes a phased, residential development consisting of 280 residential units within four multi-story buildings and associated improvements. We have the following comments and or recommendations:

A. General

2. 1. The property in question is located in the newly created R-MF-12, Multifamily Residence 12 District, which consists of Lots 1.03 and 1.04, in Block 4. Lot 1.03, known as 400 Corporate Drive, contains approximately 531,408 square feet or 12.20 acres. Presently, the property contains a parking area consisting of 73 spaces with an access driveway to Corporate Drive and connecting drive aisles to Lot 1.06, the adjacent hotel use. A sanitary sewer line runs through the southwest portion of the property and a retaining wall was previously constructed in the northeast portion of the property. Otherwise, the property is vacant land. *(Under prior approvals, 65 of the parking spaces in the westerly parking area were reserved for use by the office building on Lot 1.01 located on the opposite, southwest side of Corporate Drive. Testimony should be provided to confirm that this agreement has expired)*
3. Lot 1.04, known as 500 Corporate Drive, contains approximately 435,547 square feet or 10.00 acres. A sanitary sewer line runs through the southeast portion of the property, a storm drain easement runs along the northerly line and a retaining wall was previously constructed in the westerly portion of the property. Otherwise, the property is vacant land.
4. Sheet 1 of the site plan drawings includes a list of variances from Chapter 295 that are required for approval of the application. Concurrent with this report, the list of variances should be confirmed by the Zoning Officer and the Board Planner

B. Site Plan Drawings

1. The table of zoning requirements on sheet 1 of the plans should be revised to include the following standards:
 - a. Minimum distance between buildings, where 22 feet is required and 28.8 feet and 53.0 feet is provided for Lots 1.03 and 1.04 respectively.
 - b. Maximum building length of any façade, where 350 feet is required and 354 feet and 250 feet is provided for Lots 1.03 and 1.04 respectively.
 - c. Maximum number of principal buildings, where two per lot, four per zone is permitted and two principal buildings are proposed for both Lots 1.03 and 1.04.
2. The variance required under §295-115.D(6) from the maximum building façade length for Lot 1.03 should be added to the list of variances required on sheet 1 of the site plan drawings.
3. Under the list of variances on sheet 1, the relief required under §295-115.E(4) should be identified. It appears based on the architectural plans, that the required bedroom distribution of the affordable units is met and generally evenly spread out between the four buildings. The income distribution across each bedroom category should be identified.
4. Under the list of variances on sheet 1, the relief required under §295-115.F(2) should be identified. The table lists the maximum parking lot fixture height allowed, but does not indicate the proposed fixture height. (Phase 1 proposes 8 light fixtures with a pole mounting height of 25 feet and 8 wall mounts at a height of 22 feet. Phase 2 proposes 5 light poles with fixtures mounted at a height of 25 feet.)
5. Similarly, the list of variances on sheet 1 should identify the relief required under §295-115.K and L. The required standard is provided without any indication of the proposed extent of the deviation. The monument sign appears to have a face area of 42.75 feet, minus the cusp areas in the upper corners.

6. There appears to be a significant difference in the impervious coverage figures listed in the table of zoning requirements for both lots when compared to the stormwater management report. Also, it appears that the existing parking area at the westerly end of Lot 1.03, as well as the portion of Corporate Drive that exists on both lots, is not included in the impervious coverage figures. *(These developed areas are included in the lot density calculations.)*
7. The building numbers should be added to the phasing plan, as well as the grading, drainage and utility plan sheets for clarity.
8. The freshwater wetland boundary lines on both properties should be identified and labeled with the NJDEP file number on the demolition plan as well as the site plan and grading plans. The proposed freshwater wetland transition area compensation and reduction area lines should also be shown on these plan sheets.
9. The minimum setback dimensions indicated in the zoning table are not consistent with the dimensions shown on site plan sheets 5 and 6. It appears that some of the dimensions may be to recessed areas or not to the closest point of the building.
10. There is a discrepancy between the bedroom distribution count shown in the parking schedule on sheet 5 and the architectural plans for both buildings 1 and 2. Based on the architectural plans, we count 18 one-bedroom units; 54 two-bedroom units and; 3 three-bedroom units for building 1 and 19 one-bedroom units; 58 two-bedroom units and; 3 three-bedroom units for building 2. This count assumes that the loft, which is proposed for several units, does not count as a bedroom. *(Floor plans for the loft units are not included on architectural sheet PBI-2.1.)*
11. Based on the bedroom distribution count discussed above, we calculate that 147 parking spaces are required for building 1 and 156 parking spaces are required for building 2. Allowing for 6 tandem parking spaces in the parking garage for each building, plus 73 spaces in the existing, westerly parking area, we calculate 327 parking spaces are provided

for buildings 1 and 2. This represents a surplus of 24 parking spaces. *(This provided figure assumes that 65 parking spaces in the westerly parking area, formerly dedicated to Lot 1.01 are in fact available. If the agreement remains in effect, there would be a shortfall of 41 spaces.)*
12. There is a discrepancy between the bedroom distribution count shown in the parking schedule on sheet 6 and the architectural plans for both buildings 3 and 4. Based on the architectural plans, we count 15 one-bedroom units; 45 two-bedroom units and; 3 three-bedroom units for building 3 and 13 one-bedroom units; 46 two-bedroom units and; 3 three-bedroom units for building 2. This count assumes that the loft, which is proposed for several units, does not count as a bedroom.
13. Based on the bedroom distribution count discussed above, we calculate that 123 parking spaces are required for building 3 and 116 parking spaces are required for building 4. Allowing for 4 tandem parking spaces in the parking garage for each building, we calculate 239 parking spaces are provided for buildings 3 and 4. This represents a parking surplus of 15 spaces.

14. Typical dimensions of the parking area on the north side of building 1 and the parking area on the south side of building 4 should be added to the plans. The site plan drawings should indicate the number and location of any proposed compact spaces.
15. The parking spaces located near the overhead garage doors will have constrained access due to the doorway and the adjacent car and or column. The architectural drawings indicate that the parking spaces closest to the garage doors in building 3 will be compact, which we find problematic.
16. Testimony should be provided to confirm whether or not the garage parking spaces will be assigned to specific units. We note the following:
 - a. Garage parking, building 1: The garage parking includes a total of 77 spaces consisting of 4 barrier-free/ADA spaces; 2 electric car charging spaces; 12 parking spaces in six tandem slots; and 59 standard parking spaces. Assuming that the tandem parking spaces will need to be assigned and that the ADA spaces and the charging spaces are not assigned, the 59 remaining garage spaces are available for the remaining 69 units (tandem parking assigned to 6 units).
 - b. Garage parking, building 2: The garage parking includes a total of 77 spaces consisting of 5 barrier-free/ADA spaces; 2 electric car charging spaces; 12 parking spaces in six tandem slots; and 38 standard parking spaces. Assuming that the tandem parking spaces will need to be assigned and that the ADA spaces and the charging spaces are not assigned, the 59 remaining garage spaces are available for the remaining 74 units (tandem parking assigned to 6 units).
 - c. Garage parking, building 3: The garage parking includes a total of 53 spaces consisting of 5 barrier-free/ADA spaces; 2 electric car charging spaces; 8 parking spaces in four tandem slots; and 38 standard parking spaces. Assuming that the tandem parking spaces will need to be assigned and that the ADA spaces and the charging spaces are not assigned, the 38 remaining garage spaces are available for the remaining 59 units (tandem parking assigned to 4 units).
 - d. Garage parking, building 4: The garage parking includes a total of 53 spaces consisting of 4 barrier-free/ADA spaces; 2 electric car charging spaces; 8 parking spaces in four tandem slots; 6 compact parking spaces; and 33 standard parking spaces. Assuming that the tandem parking spaces will need to be assigned and that the ADA spaces and the charging spaces are not assigned, the 39 remaining garage spaces are available for the remaining 58 units (tandem parking assigned to 4 units).
 - e. Building 3 has only one garage entrance, which furthers the need for assigned spaces.
17. The number and distribution of the barrier-free/ADA parking spaces will need to be clarified. The garage parking spaces within each building should be considered separate lots since guests will not have access to the garage parking stalls. Based on the site plan drawings, buildings 1 and 2 appear to meet the ADA parking requirements with 4 garage spaces each. Buildings 3 and 4 appear to require 3 ADA garage spaces, while 5 and 4 are provided respectively. Based on RSIS standards for guest parking, it appears that at least 1 exterior ADA parking space is required for building 3 use.

18. The flush curb ramp shown near the main entrance to building 3 appears to be partially blocked by a parking space. Once the required ADA space is added, the ramp will be accessible, and available for use during move-ins.
19. The plans should include a sidewalk along Corporate Drive from the signalized intersection at Route 22 to Cokesbury Road. A minimum width of 5 feet is recommended for the sidewalk along Corporate Drive. The sidewalk should be set back as far as feasible from the curb line of Corporate Drive. While the alignment will need to be finalized, the sidewalk should continue along Cokesbury Road in order to allow pedestrian access to local business and the Borough's Main Street sidewalk.

Sidewalk connections from the buildings to the Corporate Drive sidewalk should be required. Crosswalks will be required at the driveway crossings. Stop signs and stop bars should be setback at least 4 feet from these crosswalks

21. We question why the ingress/egress driveway at the southwest corner of Lot 1.03 is offset from the parking area aisle.
22. The setback dimensions to the proposed monument signs from the right-of-way of Corporate Drive should be indicated. It appears that the sign on Lot 1.04 is setback more than the required 10 feet, while the sign on Lot 1.03 is setback approximately 6 feet.
23. The site plan drawings, sheets 5 and 6, should indicate the location of the proposed water service meter pits. Additionally, it needs to be determined if the back flow preventer will be located within the garage or in a separate, exterior enclosure. These facilities can be unattractive, large and above ground structures, particularly if the meter is included within the enclosure. The backflow preventer is often located a required distance from the meter.
24. Similarly, the site plan sheets should indicate the location of any transformers or similar structures, as well as the proposed location of the electric and gas meters. The architectural drawings indicate that the gas meters will be on the Corporate Drive facade for buildings 2 and 3 and that the electric and gas meters will be at the southeast corner of building 4, facing Corporate Drive. Typically, each unit will have its own meter so the Board may wish to consider how screening of the electrical and gas meters will be accomplished.
25. Testimony should be provided with regard to the exterior staircase shown at the northwest corner of building 1. The staircase is not shown on the architectural drawings.
26. Details and additional information and calculations will need to be provided by the Applicant in order to demonstrate compliance with §295-115.I, recreation and open space.
27. The following comments are offered for discussion regarding the proposed site plan amenities:
 - a. We anticipate there will be noise complaints will be an issue from the popping sound that comes from pickleball paddles. The courts are only 10 feet from building 2 and the sound could be worsened by being within the court yard area. Consideration should be given to moving the pickleball courts to the northeast corner of Lot 1.04, where the noise will normally be muffled by the sound of Route 78.

- b. The parking plan for Lot 1.03 has a surplus of 24 spaces. Consideration should be given to eliminating some of the westerly most spaces within the appended parking area in order to provide a pocket park or perhaps a relocation of the dog park.

28. The following comments pertain to the grading plans, sheets 7 and 8:

- a. The TW 262.75 spot grade for the top of wall at the outer curb line near the northeast corner of building 1 should be adjusted to match the top of curb elevation.
- b. The crosswalk across the southerly garage driveway of building 4 should have a maximum cross slope of 2%.
- c. It appears crosswalks will be necessary at both of the garage driveways for building 2, which will also require a maximum cross slope of 2%. Similarly, crosswalks will be required at the driveway connections to Corporate Drive. Barrier-free ramps and crosswalk slopes will need to conform to ADA requirements.
- d. The retaining wall proposed between Corporate Drive and building 4 will have a maximum height of approximately 12 feet, excluding the 4-foot fence, where a maximum height of 4 feet is permitted. The highest point of the retaining wall will be at the southwest corner of the front yard parking area, approximately 8 feet from the easement line of Corporate Drive

29. The following comments pertain to the drainage plans, sheets 9 and 10.

- a. Stormwater Manhole A 14 should be moved to be outside of the sidewalk area. Similarly, A inlet A13 should be moved outside of the patio area or fitted with a grate suitable for pedestrians and ADA compliant.
- b. Cleanouts or suitable risers should be indicated at all angle and end points along the 8" HDPE leader drain lines.
- c. B Inlet/OCS A4 should be located at the corner of the parking area, where there will be a low-point.
- d. It should be specified that the un-numbered storm manhole at the outfall from bioretention basin A6 must be precast or constructed with 12-inch thick block walls.

30. The utility plans, sheets 11 and 12, should indicate the location of the gas and electric meters, backflow preventors, transformer pads.

31. The utility plans do not indicate separate fire and domestic water lines to the buildings. The plans should confirm that the fire line includes a backfill preventor and that it will be located within the building water rooms and not within an exterior hot box in front of the building.

32. We question the proposed location of the water meter for building 2. The placement will result in an access cover located in the sidewalk, with air vent risers on each side of the sidewalk.

33 The rim and invert information for the existing sanitary sewer Manhole MAR-1 (island area of

Corporate Drive) is not legible due to building 2 being depicted by shading. It appears that the invert out of proposed sanitary sewer manhole A2 is higher than the existing invert of Manhole MAR-2. The plans indicate the same invert for Manholes MAR-1 and MAR-2. The inverts need to be confirmed since the proposed relocated sanitary sewer line is designed at the minimum allowable slope.

34. While we would defer to the Board's Planner with regard to the proposed landscaping plans, sheets 13 and 14, we do offer the following:
- a. The plans should show the existing trees along Corporate Drive. It will need to be determined if the existing trees will need to be removed for sidewalk construction.
 - b. The landscaping plans propose large shade trees (White Oak and Green Mountain Sugar Maple) in front of building 2, along Corporate Drive. These trees may not be appropriate so close (9 feet) to the building, due to their large spread. If the existing street trees need to be removed for the sidewalk, perhaps the trees can be pulled away from the building, made part of the sidewalk plans and the spacing between trees decreased.
 - c. We question the remaining landscape proposed along the Corporate drive façade of building 2. As indicated on the architectural drawings, 12 to 13 feet of foundation and parking garage window screens will be exposed. The landscaping plan includes some taller deciduous shrubs and some lower evergreens. There appears to be an opportunity to raise the finished grade along the façade and bolster the evergreen plantings.
 - d. There is no landscaping proposed along the courtyard façades of buildings 1 and 2, which will contain a long, exposed foundation.
35. The following comments pertain to the lighting plans, sheets 15 and 16:
- a. We question the use of wall packs at a mounting height of 22 feet in the courtyard area between buildings 1 and 2. At this height and the spacing shown, the lights will be near the elevation of the third floor, directly above windows of second floor units. The details also indicate that the wall pack fixtures will have a color temperature of 4,000K. Lighting of the courtyard should be pedestrian scale. Bollards or pedestrian scale pole mounted fixtures with a color temperature of 2,700K should be provided. Is an average of 1.1 fc required in the courtyard?
 - b. The parking area lights for buildings 1 and 2 are proposed with a 25-foot mounting height, where 20 feet is permitted. The proposed fixture is a roadway, cobra head style. A color temperature of 4000/5000 K is proposed. The parking area fixtures should be more decorative, lowered and provided with a maximum color temperature of 3000K. Generally, the residential window heights will be around 15-16 feet. Fixtures at this height that minimize vertical illuminance should be considered. Lighting of walkways leading from parking areas to entrances could be supplemented with bollards in order to create a warmer, pedestrian accent.
 - c. The wall packs at the northwest corner of building 1 should be replaced with pole mounted fixtures, as discussed above, and fitted with house side shields.

- d. With a 15-foot mounting height, the wall pack shown at the entrance near the easterly end of the north façade, will be in conflict with the second-floor window. Wall sconces at and in scale with the entrances should be considered.
- e. We question whether or not the wall packs proposed at the westerly garage door of building 2; the westerly garage door of building 3; and the northerly garage door of building 4, with 15-foot mounting heights, can be replaced with 2 decorative wall sconces. We note that no lighting is proposed for the remaining garage doors.
- f. We also question the use and location of the wall packs proposed for buildings 3 and 4. With the 15-foot mounting heights, the wall pack shown at the entrances appears to conflict with the entryway roofs. Lighting of the parking lot, sidewalks and courtyard for buildings 3 and 4 should be modified as discussed above.

36. The stabilized construction access pad shown on the soil erosion and sediment control plans should be 100 feet long.

C. Construction Details (Sheets 28 through 34)

1. The monument sign detail should provide information to determine if the sign is to be lit, either internally or with ground mounted fixtures.
2. The B Inlet detail should specify that ECO-Messaging castings are required. A detail for the type A inlets, with similar messaging should be provided.
3. The water meter chamber detail does not include a backflow preventor within the structure. It will need to be confirmed whether or not the backflow preventors will be located inside the garages. If the backflow preventor will be located in an exterior hotbox, details will need to be provided.
4. The outlet control structure details should indicate that a copy of the shop drawings for these structures shall be submitted to the Borough Engineer, as well as to the design engineer.
5. A detail should be provided for the precast sanitary doghouse manhole, which should be subject to the approval of the LBSA Engineer.
6. The following comments pertain to the porous asphalt details on sheet 34.
 - a. The storage bed aggregate must be clean, open-graded rather than uniformly graded.
 - b. The detail for basins SWM-A2 and SWM-A3 must eliminate the bottom layer of filter fabric since these systems are intended for infiltration.
 - c. A note should be added to indicate that the porosity of the permeable asphalt surface course must be 15% to 25%.

- d. A note should be added to specify polymer modified binder PG 64E-22 for the parking lot wearing surface.
 - e. A note should be added to indicate that the porosity of the permeable asphalt base course must be >25%.
 - f. A note should be added to indicate that post construction testing of the permeable asphalt is required in accordance with Chapter 9.6 of the BMP Manual and that the minimum tested infiltration rate of the surface course is 6.4 inches per hour. Systems designed to address quantity control must have a minimum tested infiltration rate of the surface course of 20 inches per hour.
 - g. A note should be added to indicate that sealant, prime coat and other surface treatments that could reduce the rate of infiltration shall not be applied to the porous asphalt.
 - h. A note should be added to indicate that testing must be performed on the subsoil below the storage bed after excavation but prior to placement of the stone in accordance with the Construction and Post-Construction Oversight and Soil Permeability Testing section in Chapter 12: Soil Testing Criteria of the NJDEP BMP manual. Where as-built testing shows a longer drain time than designed, corrective action must be taken.
7. Additionally, at least one inspection port, with a removable cap, must be provided at the upstream and downstream ends of the perforated section of the network in accordance with Chapter 9.6 of the BMP Manual. The additional detailing should be shown on plan view as well as in the details for the porous asphalt. The cleanouts should be placed in cast iron boxes.
8. The following comments pertain to the bio-retention basin details on sheet 34:
- a. The minimum permeability rates for various components of the bio-retention basins need to be indicated.
 - b. A 6" minimum thick sand layer needs to be provided in accordance with then NJDEP BMP Manual.
 - c. The sand layer, which acts as a transition between the soil bed and the subsequent layers, must be at least 6 inches in depth and must consist of clean, medium-aggregate concrete sand (AASHTO M-6/ASTM C-33). To ensure proper system operation, the permeability rate of the sand layer must be at least twice the design permeability rate of the soil bed.
 - d. The gravel layer must have sufficient depth to provide at least 3 inches of gravel above and below the pipe network and must consist of 0.5 to 1.5-inch clean, broken stone or pea gravel (AASHTO M-43). To ensure proper system operation, the permeability rate of the gravel layer must be at least twice the design permeability rate of the sand layer.
 - e. Within the gravel layer, the network of pipes, excluding any manifolds and inspection ports, must be perforated. All remaining pipes must be non-perforated. All joints must be secure and watertight. To ensure proper system operation, the network of pipes must have a conveyance rate at least twice as fast as the design flow rate through the sand layer.

f. Inspection ports must be located at the upstream and downstream ends of the perforated section of the network of pipes and extend above the surface of the soil bed. The inspection port exterior must be covered in such a way as to prevent the migration of material into the structure. The depth of runoff generated by the maximum design storm must be marked on all inspection ports and those levels included in the design report and maintenance plan.

g. The overflow pipe should not be connected to the perforated portion of the underdrain pipe. However, the overflow pipe and the underdrain pipe may discharge to the same conveyance system down-gradient of the bioretention system, provided that the overflow discharge will New Jersey Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual

March 2021 Green Infrastructure BMPs with Waiver or Variance, Chapter 10.1: Bioretention Systems Page 11 not back up to the perforated portion of the underdrain pipe nor affect the drainage capacity of the underdrain pipe system.

h. Flexible corrugated perforated plastic drain pipe should not be used as underdrain pipe.

The construction requirements listed in the BMP Manual should be included as part of the details for basins A6 and E5, including the notes regarding bioretention systems with underdrains as they pertain to basin A6.

9. A detail for the basin access road should be added to the plans.

D. Stormwater Management

1. Some of the time-of-concentration (T_c) calculations utilize a default minimum value of 6 minutes. According to Chapter 5 of the NJDEP BMP Manual, there is no longer a minimum or default value that may be used for the time of concentration. The T_c for pre-and post-construction conditions must be calculated based on the aforementioned requirements.
2. The sheet flow length of drainage area PDA-A4-Pervious should be limited to a total length of 100 feet in accordance with NJDEP post developed requirements.
3. T_c calculation needs to be provided for drainage area PRDA A6 — Post Dev (Pervious).
4. The Curve Number (CN) for drainage area PRDA-F2-Pervious used in the analysis (77) is not consistent with the calculated CN (78).
5. The report should include a description of the mapped soils and discussion to confirm that the default hydrologic soil group is consistent with the on-site field testing.
6. Soil Log SL-7 located within SWM E5 (bioretention basin) indicates mottling (ESHGW) above the bottom of the soil bed. A 2-foot minimum separation distance is required.
7. Soil Log SL-1 should be shown on the drainage plan. The soil log indicates mottling at 40" (approximately elevation of 248.6), which may indicate that the water table is above the top of the porous pavement, SWM-F1. An additional soil test should be provided at the northerly end of the basin to

confirm the depth to the seasonal high groundwater table. A 1-foot minimum separation distance is required for an under-drained basin.

8. The additional inflow areas to basins A1, A2, A3, E2, E3 and F1 exceed the 3:1 maximum ratio of additional inflow drainage area to surface area for these pervious paving systems.

A waiver(s) from the Green Infrastructure Standards pursuant to Section 252-4.0.(4) are required and must be justified in accordance with the requirements of the ordinance.

9. The two proposed bioretention basins do meet the requirements for "small-scale bioretention systems" since the contributory drainage area to each basin exceeds 2.5 acres. Therefore, the bioretention basins do not meet green infrastructure requirements for groundwater recharge and stormwater runoff quality. Waivers are required and must be justified in accordance with the requirements of the ordinance.
10. Additional information is required in order for this office to comment on whether or not it is technically impracticable to meet the green infrastructure standards, which would allow for a waiver pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:8-4.6(a). As currently designed, not all the porous pavement areas meet green infrastructure (GI) for water quality, water quantity, and groundwater recharge. The bio-retention basins do not meet GI for water quality and groundwater recharge. The proposed manufactured treatment device, (MTD) does not meet GI for water quality.
11. It does not appear that the required 1-foot separation distance between the groundwater level and the bottom of basin SWM-A6 has been met. Soil log 24 indicates a ground water elevation of approximately 249.6 while the bottom of the gravel layer is 249.42, or 248.92 when a 6-inch sand layer is incorporated as required.
12. The stormwater management report should include an overall analysis point that compares the combined runoff from both Lots 1.03 and 1.04, which are both tributary to the stream and culvert.
13. There is a low area located at the upper portion of EXDA-A that needs to be accounted for in the analysis. It appears any runoff from the low area would split between EXDA-A and EXDA-C around elevation 272.
14. We question whether or not the Tc flow path indicated for drainage area EDA-A is the hydraulically most distant. It appears the northwesterly portion of the drainage area would produce a more distant flow path.
15. Attachment D — Major Stormwater Summary must be completed by the applicant. The form is available on the NJDEP web site.
16. The routings of the porous pavement areas that do not rely on infiltration should exclude the volume associated with the stone below the lowest outlet (basins A1 and A4, E1-E4, F1). The hydrograph volume in should match the hydrograph volume out for each basin since there would be no volume loss due to infiltration.

17. The groundwater recharge analysis needs to demonstrate a minimum of 125% of the percentage of the average annual preconstruction groundwater recharge volume for the site in accordance with 252-4.P.(4)(a).
18. The groundwater recharge requirements need to be met within each drainage area pursuant to Section 252-4.L.
19. Clarification is required on how the recharge bmp input parameters (effective depth) within the BMP analysis were determined for each BMP. It appears the dEXC dimension within SWM-A2 should be 12" lower to account for the pavement thickness. Clarification on how the dEXC and the dBMPu were calculated for SWM-E5 should be provided. The land segments for the pervious pavement systems should be specified as being in the impervious area segment. Also, it appears that the bio-retention basin land segment should be modeled with meadow.
20. Based on the soil testing provided, porous pavement areas A1, A3 and A4 are below or do not meet the minimum separation distances to the groundwater levels indicated within the soil logs. Additional information is required.
21. No permeability testing has been provided for porous pavement areas A2 and A3, which have been modeled to infiltrate (for groundwater recharge). Two soil logs with permeability testing should be provided within each porous pavement area that is intended to infiltrate. The soil logs need to extend at least 8 feet below the lowest point in each bmp, or two times the maximum water depth in the basins, whichever results in a deeper depth.
22. The tube permeameter test for SL-6 (located within bioretention basin SWM E5) indicates a permeability rate of 0.22 in/hr, which does not provide the minimum infiltration rate required for use with infiltration. The basin design needs to be revised.
23. Bioretention basin SWM-E5 requires a waiver or variance from NJAC 7:8-5.3 (Table 2 within the Section 252-4) for groundwater recharge and stormwater runoff quality.
24. Inlet/Outlet calculations need to be provided for the porous pavement discharge pipes since they ultimately discharge to the bio-retention basin, and any effect of tailwater, pipe losses etc. need to be included with the routings of the porous pavement areas.
25. Additional information should be provided for each of the outlet control structures used for the porous pavement areas. It is not clear if the inflow will bypass the storage beds.
26. It is not clear if any portion of the water quality design storm will bypass the porous pavement surfaces (for each system) and drain directly to the outlet control structure. Additional information is required.
27. The report should address the requirements of Chapter 9.6 of the NJDEP BMP Manual with regard to any roof runoff that bypasses the surface course. The BMP Manual indicates that the runoff must be pretreated by leaf screens, first flush diverters or roof washers.

28. Additional detailing/design features should be provided to eliminate the blind connections from the roof runoff to the porous pavement systems.
29. The outlet pipe from basin A1 was modeled with a one-foot length, which does not match the plans.
30. The outlet pipe from basin A2 was modeled with a slope of 1%, while the plan depicts a slope of 0.5%.
31. The outlet pipe from basin A4 was modeled with a slope of 0.6%, while the plan depicts a slope of 2.0%.
32. The porous pavement areas include a 20' weir within the routings. Clarification on where the weirs are being utilized should be provided. We note that the 100-year routed water surface elevation is below the crest of the weirs.
33. Is seepage through the retaining wall that runs along the easterly side of basin A2 a concern? The depth of the stone storage bed for the porous pavement sections are not indicated in the details.
34. Additional information how water quality is being achieved for the drainage areas that bypass the proposed BMP areas should be provided.
35. The routing calculations for basin A6 include two 20' weirs (one at elevation 257.20', and one at elevation 257.50'). It is not clear where the 20' weir at elevation 257.20' is located.
36. The 4" diameter underdrain (or bed/gravel material if permeability is slower) should be modeled in the routing analysis of bio-retention basin A6 since the underdrain will discharge through the control structure.
37. The plan and detail information provided for the outlet control structure of basin A6 are not consistent with the information used in the routing analysis.
38. The outlet pipes for bioretention basins A6 and E5 should account for any tailwater associated with the flood hazard area of the stream they discharge to. The current analysis assumes no tailwater was used in the calculations.
39. The emergency spillway for basin A6 is labeled as 75' wide on the Grading Plan Phase 1 (sheet 7) while it is identified as 65' in the calculations and elsewhere in the plans.
40. Basin A6 and E5 meet the classification of a dam and the berm width needs to be increased to 10' wide.
41. Clarification is required with regard to the storm distribution used in the analysis for basin A6 and E5. The NJDEP dam safety standards appear to require a 24-hour, 100-year frequency, Type III storm plus 50% for Class IV dams, while the analysis utilizes a Type C storm distribution.
42. The top of berm elevation (258.90) at Basin A6 and berm elevation (252.6) at Basin E5 are depicted as a line in the middle of the berms. The top of the berm elevation should extend across the full required width of the berm.

43. The crest length of the emergency spillway for basin E5 scales at 25' wide, while the calculations are based on a 30' wide crest length. The crest elevation of the emergency spillway should be corrected on the drainage plan, sheet 10. Also, the width of the spillway is labeled as 35' on detail sheet 34.
44. The invert of the 4" orifice shown on the drainage plan for SWM E1 should be corrected.
45. The weir and outlet pipe information for Basin E5 used in the calculations does not match the drainage plan and detail plan.
46. The outlet pipe information used in the routing of SWM E2 and E3 porous pavement does not match the drainage plan.
47. The length of the porous pavement for SWM E4 scales to 135' on the drainage plan, while the calculations utilize a length of 162'. Also, the 4" perforated pipe length is incorrectly identified as 72' on the drainage plan. The drainage plan should be revised to be consistent with the calculations.
48. The top of the gravel storage bed used in the calculations for porous pavement Basins A1-A4, E2, E3 and E4 is within the elevation of the choker course layer provided on the drainage plans.
49. While the basin bottom area appears to be correct, clarification is required with regard to the volume of SWM E5.
50. The length of the porous asphalt for SWM F1 scales to 80' on the drainage plan, while the calculations utilize a length of 90'. The width and length of each porous pavement area should be dimensioned on the plans.
51. The outlet pipe information used in the routing of SWM F1 porous pavement does not match the drainage plan.
52. The groundwater mounding analysis, indicated to be included in Appendix I, does not appear to have been included within the drainage report.
53. Based on the parking lot grades in the area of SWM E2, it appears a portion of the slope over the surface of the basin will exceed the 5% maximum. Additional elevations need to be provided to confirm the maximum permitted slope over the basin will not be exceeded.
54. Additional information is required in order for this office to determine if relief from the requirements under Section 252-4.L, which requires groundwater recharge, stormwater runoff quality, and stormwater runoff quantity standards at 252-4. subsections O, P, Q and R be met in each drainage area is reasonable. It will need to be confirmed that the runoff from the drainage areas converge onsite and no adverse environmental impact would occur as a result of compliance with any one or more of the individual standards being determined, utilizing a weighted average of the results achieved for that individual standard across the affected drainage areas.
55. Sizing calculations, including the tributary drainage area, runoff coefficients etc. should be provided for the proposed water quality MTD Up-Flo Filter EMC.

56. Since the water quality Up-Flo Filter is being utilized to meet water quality standards and is not considered green infrastructure, it should be determined whether an alternate MTD, certified by NJDEP for 80% TSS removal and certified as green infrastructure can be incorporated into the design.
57. The impervious coverage created by buildings should be provided (Section F, page A-9) within the LID.
58. The reference to the office building and warehouse within section 3.4 of the LID should be corrected.
59. The outlet pipe analysis included with the storm sewer system analysis from Basin A6 to the stream is not consistent with the plan information. Revise as necessary.
61. Additional information should be provided on how the starting HGL elevation was determined for the storm sewer system inflow point at the HW's located at the bio- retention basin inflow points. The tailwater elevations based on the routed storm events within the bio-retention basins are higher.
62. A final review of drain time calculations will be necessary once a revised stormwater management report is submitted.
63. The low-level outlet within bioretention basin A6 needs to be lowered to be just above the elevation of the water quality design storm as required by Chapter 10.1 of the NJDEP BMP Manual.
64. A review of the Stormwater Management Maintenance Manual has not been performed. This document will need to be reviewed and approved once the stormwater management design and plans have been finalized. A final review of the document will be required upon completion of construction and the submittal of as-built plans.

E. Architectural Drawings/Garage Parking

1. The garage floor plans are not consistent with the site plans with regard to the required number of accessible/ADA parking stalls.
2. Testimony should be provided to indicate if any pipe projections, (fire lines, sanitary sewers, ducts or other utilities) will be mounted on the interior walls of the underground parking garage, as well as any bollards that would be required to protect these facilities. Pipe projections and bollards could have an impact on the actual parking stall depth and or width.
3. Testimony should be provided with regard to parking maneuvers required for the spaces closest to the garage doors at building 3. Buildings 1, 2 and 4 have garage doors at both ends, which would at least allow an approach to these spaces from the far door, particularly if the spaces were assigned.
4. The parking level plans do not indicate any air ventilation systems. Will these be required or are the garage screens sufficient?
5. Testimony should be provided with regard to the location of HVAC units. Is air drawn from the outside or from the roof through the center corridors?

6. Testimony should be provided with regard to the minimum (by code) and proposed overhead height within the parking garage, including any under hanging ducts, piping and sprinkler systems.
7. Testimony should be provided to clarify the various entrance porticos depicted in the elevation views. It does not appear that the porticos are shown on the side views, where applicable or on the floor plan or site plan drawings. Setback dimensions should be drawn to the portico when applicable. The minimum side yard for Lot 1.03 appears to be ± 75 if measured to the portico.
8. Testimony should be provided to confirm the roof material on the portion of the garage/1st floor that extends beyond the upper levels. (Flat, metal canopy or asphalt shingles?)
9. Signature legends for the Board's approval should be added to the architectural plans.

F. Miscellaneous Items

1. Testimony should be provided with regard to refuse collection. The architectural drawings indicate that each building will have trash chutes and a trash room in the garage. The site plan drawings indicate that trash will be picked up by private haulers. With 8-foot garage doors, it appears that trash bins will need to be wheeled out for pick-up. Will this be done by a property manager, or the private hauler? If set out by a property manager, how many bins are anticipated and where will they be stationed prior to pick up?
2. The plans should be reviewed by the appropriate fire official.
3. The sanitary sewer connection and system relocation should be reviewed by the LBSA.
4. Review of the traffic impact analysis will be done by others.
5. Approval will be required from the Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District.
6. Approval will be required from the Hunterdon County Planning Board.
7. Treatment works approval will be required from NJDEP with regard to the sanitary sewer service.
8. A water main extension permit will be required from NJDEP.
9. Approval will also be required from NJDEP for the following permits:
 - a. Flood hazard area individual permit.
 - b. Freshwater wetlands transition area averaging permit.
 - c. Freshwater wetlands General Permit 6 for disturbance of the isolated wetland area.
 - d. Freshwater wetlands General Permit 11 for construction of the stormwater outfalls.
 - e. Freshwater wetlands General Permit 16 for habitat enhancement activities.
- f. Approval will be required from the Lebanon Borough Sewer Authority (LB SA).
- g. Approval will be required from the Town of Clinton Water Department.

- h. Approval will be required from the New Jersey Department of Transportation for the Cokesbury Road sidewalk.
- i. The Highlands Council Consistency Determination is subject to specific conditions to be satisfied by the Applicant.
- j. Prior to the start of construction, a deed notice meeting the requirements of §252-4M. must be recorded in the Office of the Hunterdon County Clerk with regard to stormwater management measures.
- k. Any approval should be subject to requiring the Applicant's Engineer prepare a detailed engineering cost estimates for each phase of the project in order to establish performance guarantees and inspection escrow.
- l. Any approval should require the submission of an as-built plan prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- m. Additional comments may be offered as a result of testimony or clarification by the Applicant during the Board review process.

We trust this information is useful to the Board in its consideration of the application. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Hamal Associates, Inc Harold K. Maltz PE, PP

Based on our review, we have the following comments:

A. E & LP (ELP) Site Plan Review

1.a. Phase 1 consists of: Building 1 = 75 units (19-1 BE, 50-2 BR, 6-3BR) Building
2 = 80 units (18-1 BR, 56-2 BR, 6-3BR)
Total = 155 units (37-1BR, 106-2BR, 12-3 BR)

- b. The Phase 1 required parking was based on the NJ Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). As shown on the Parking Schedule Calculations table, on Sheet 5, Buildings 1 & 2 respectively require 148 and 158 parking spaces, for a total of 306 spaces. HMA's review of the parking calculations indicated a rounding error for each building. Our analysis identified that the parking required for Buildings 1 & 2 are 147 and 157 spaces, respectively, for a total of 304 spaces. The parking table should be revised.
- c. Building 1 & 2 each provide 77 garage spaces, of which 6 are tandem and 4 are handicap (HC) spaces, in each garage. There are 173 spaces provided in outside parking lots (incl. 3 HC). The total parking provided for Buildings 1 & 2 is 327 spaces, including 11 HC spaces. This exceeds the RSIS minimum parking requirement of 304 spaces. It is noted that the Parking Schedule table did not include the HC garage spaces in the total proposed parking. Also, in each garage, the parking row having the HC spaces

located to the east of Buildings 3 & 4. This is accomplished through interconnection with the office site's internal parking aisles. Consequently, two means of ingress/egress are available for the residential site.

3. All parking is provided with 9'x18' parking stalls and 24 foot wide parking aisles. These dimensions all conform to RSIS requirements.
- 4.a. On Sheet 6, all 'Stop' signs should be labeled R1-1.
 - b. On Sheet 6, at the southern exit from the Building 4 garage, a 'Stop' sign (R1-1) and adjoining stop line should be installed facing exiting drivers. Also, as there is a pedestrian crosswalk shown at this location, it is requested that a 'Pedestrian Crossing' sign (W11-2) with supplemental downward pointing diagonal arrow plaque (W16-7P) assembly be posted at the crosswalk location facing exiting drivers.
- 5.a. Will garage parking spaces be assigned?
 - b. How are moving vans accommodated on-site?
6. At the proposed easterly site access drive serving Buildings 1 & 2, it is proposed to remove part of the Corporate Drive median, so as to provide an eastbound left turn lane. Left turn pavement arrows and an ONLY pavement message should be provided. Also, the width of the left turn lane should be added to the site plans.
- 7.a. ELP should review the existing pavement markings and signage at the several intersections along Corporate Drive and identify any modifications that have to be performed to conform with the MUTCD. ELP should consult with the project traffic engineer ATD on this comment. HMA identified numerous incorrect or missing signs and pavement markings along Corporate Drive during our field inspection.
 - b. Existing pavement markings (arrow & ONLY) should be added to Site Plan Sheets 5 & 6.
8. Although Atlantic Traffic & Design is preparing a separate Pedestrian Facilities Assessment Report related to pedestrian facilities and circulation along Cokesbury Road, ELP has not identified any sidewalks proposed to be installed along Corporate Drive that would connect the residential sites to Cokesbury Road. ELP to address this comment.
9. Site Plan Sheets 21, 22 and 23 identify the clear sight triangles at each of the three access drive intersections with Corporate Drive, that serve the two development sites. It is noted that two of the three access drives currently exist. HMA agrees with the sight lines identified at each location. With Corporate Drive having a posted 25 mph speed limit, the sight lines were based on a 30 mph design speed. Based on AASHTO standards, for a 30 mph design speed, stopping sight distance (SSD) is 200 feet and intersection sight distance (ISD) is 335 feet. The sight lines shown all met the higher ISD condition.
10. Site Plan Sheet 24 (Emergency Vehicle Circulation Plan) indicates that an aerial ladder fire truck can circulate around both residential sites.

B. Atlantic Traffic & Design (ATD) Traffic Impact Analysis Report Review

- I. The ATD traffic study was prepared according to accepted traffic engineering procedures and methodologies.
2. ATD noted that they are preparing a separate Pedestrian Facilities Assessment Report in an effort to improve pedestrian facilities and circulation along Cokesbury Road and with Corporate Drive. The noted report is based on consultations with the Borough of Lebanon and the NJDOT and is being prepared as a separate document from the Traffic Impact Analysis report.
3. In the Proposed Condition section of ATD's report, they identify a total of 567 parking stalls being provided. Based on our review of the site plans and including handicap (HC) spaces, a total of 581 spaces are being provided. ATD is to validate the correct number of parking spaces proposed.
4. ATD requested and received a Letter of No Interest (LONI) from the NJDOT concurring with ATD's findings that the proposed residential development will not have a significant increase in traffic (as per NJ Highway Access Management Code) at the Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive intersection. Consequently, a new access permit will not be required. The Jan. 7, 2021 NJDOT LONI was appended to the ATD report.
5. The existing roadway and intersection conditions within the study area have been properly described. The only comment HMA has is related to the ATD discussion of Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) for vehicles turning from Corporate Drive onto Cokesbury Road. ATD identified an AASHTO ISD of 475 feet based on the 35 mph posted speed limit on Cokesbury Road. This corresponds to a 40 mph design speed. HMA's review of the AASHTO table for an ISD of 40 mph identified a 445 foot distance, without any adjustment for roadway grade. Intersection sight distance provides for the main road driver to decelerate to approximately 70% of his initial operating speed, but not stopping, to accommodate the side road vehicle maneuver. The AASHTO Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) at 40 mph, is 305 feet. It is noted that SSD is the critical distance for safety.

ATD noted that the sight lines are somewhat constrained by overgrown vegetation to the north and south of Corporate Drive. HMA recommends that interfering vegetation be cleared back, where possible. ATD to respond.

6. As discussed by ATD, the current COVID-19 pandemic has caused significant reductions in traffic activity on roadways. To establish current baseline traffic volumes, ATD performed intersection traffic movement counts at the following locations:
 1. US Rt. 22 & Cokesbury Road (CR 639);
 2. US Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive; and
 3. Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive.

The manual turning movement counts were conducted on Thursday, December 3, 2020 from 7-9 am and 4-6 pm. The peak hours identified were 7:45-8:45 am and 4-5 pm.

The Dec. 2020 traffic volumes were adjusted based on comparison to pre-COVID-19 publicly available traffic data (NJDOT) and other historic area counts previously conducted by Dynamic

Traffic, LLC and Tri-State Dada, Inc.

The Tri-State data consisted of traffic movement counts conducted at Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive, on Tuesday, Sept. 17, 2019 from 7 am — 7 pm.

The Dynamic Traffic data was limited to Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) count data, which consisted of hourly traffic volumes by direction at a point on a roadway. These counts were conducted on Rt. 22 east of Corporate Drive, on Rt. 22 west of Corporate Drive and Corporate Drive north of Rt. 22. The counts were conducted from June 15, 2018 to June 21, 2018.

ATR counts were also obtained by ATD from the NJDOT, taken on Rt. 22 east of Cokesbury Road, in Oct. 2019.

ATD adjusted all the 2018 and 2019 traffic counts to 2020, based on NJDOT annual background traffic growth rates. This is the accepted source for performing this adjustment, the year corresponding to the 2020 base year counts performed by ATD.

By evaluation/analysis of the several 2020 adjusted historical traffic data and comparison to the ATD 2020 traffic counts, a percent increase to the ATD traffic volumes was identified. The ATD 2020 intersection volumes were grown by approximately 60% in the am peak hour and 35% in the pm peak hour. This adjustment is an attempt to reflect 2020 intersection volumes with no COVID-19 impact. HMA notes that the procedures applied by ATD are an accepted traffic engineering practice and was discussed with HMA when ATD was establishing study procedures. The analyses performed by ATD and as summarized on their report figures are acceptable. It is requested that ATD present a brief summary, in testimony, of the analyses performed.

7. At the time of the ATD December 2020 traffic counts, there was nominal peak hour traffic activity to/from Corporate Drive at the intersections with Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22. ATD noted that only the 92,926 sf office building closest to the western end of Corporate Drive was partially occupied and the remaining buildings completely unoccupied. To account for full occupancy of the office buildings and hotel activity, ATD calculated the am and pm peak hour trips for the office and hotel uses. These calculations were based on the ITE publication Trip Generation — 10th Edition, which is the accepted source for performing this analysis. The peak hour trip generation is summarized on report Table 1 and on report Fig. 2E, the latter distributing the volumes at the Corporate Drive intersections with Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22. HMA notes that ATD performed a conservative analysis, by adding the existing 2020 Corporate Drive traffic counts to the projected volumes. HMA agrees with the analysis performed.
8. ATD expanded the December 2020 existing adjusted Peak Hour Volumes (see Fig. 2E) to the year 2023 based on NJDOT annual background traffic growth rates, which is the future buildout year for the project. Fig 5 identifies the 2023 Future No Build Traffic Volumes, plus the trip generation by the existing offices and hotel. HMA concurs with the analyses performed.
- 9.a. ATD applied trip generation rates from the ITE publication, Trip Generation — 10th Edition, in

developing peak hour traffic projections for the 280 unit residential project. This is the accepted source for performing this analysis and is required for use by the NJ Residential Site Improvements Standards (RSIS). As presented in Table 1, the residential weekday am and pm peak hour trip generation is, respectively, 94 and 119 trips. These are not large in magnitude with the volumes distributed between two access points, Cokesbury Road and Rt. 22.

- b. ATD identified the residential trip orientation percentages on Fig. 3, with the peak hour site generated traffic shown on Fig. 4. HMA concurs with the trip distributions identified.
 - c. Report Fig. 6 summarizes the 2023 Build peak hour traffic volumes, which is a summation of the residential peak hour trip assignments (Fig. 4) and the 2023 No Build volumes (Fig. 5). HMA agrees with the summation presented.
10. Capacity analysis for signalized and unsignalized intersections were followed by ATD according to the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and associated SYNCHRO software. This is an accepted source for performing this analysis. Based on the analysis performed, we note the following:
- a. US Rt. 22 & Cokesbury Road

Under the No Build condition and both peak hours, all intersection approach movements function at a LOS 'E' or better, except the Cokesbury Road SB combined thru/right movements in the pm peak hour, which functions at a LOS 'F'.

In the 2023 Build condition and both peak hours, only small increases in average vehicle delay were experienced by any approach movement, except for the Cokesbury Road SB thru/right turn movements which will operate at LOS 'F' with a large increase in average vehicle delay. ATD mitigated all or most of this impact by a minor retiming of the signal; 2 seconds in the am peak hour and 1 second in the pm peak hour.

HMA notes that the Lebanon Town Center project added only 17 and 7 trips to the Cokesbury Road SB thru/right turn lane in the respective am and pm peak hours. We note that, in the LOS 'F' range, the capacity software tends to calculate disproportionately large increases in average vehicle delay for very small increases in trips. On average, the Town Center project will add only one trip to the noted southbound thru/right movements every 4-10 minutes.

- b. US Rt. 22 & Corporate Drive/La Bella Salon

Under the No Build condition and both peak hours, all intersection approach movements function at a LOS 'E' or better.

In the Build condition and both peak hours, only small increases in average vehicle delay will be experienced by any approach movement. The largest increase was 6.3 seconds to the Rt. 22 EB left/U-turn lane in the pm peak hour. No mitigation is required at this intersection, due to the Town Center project.

- c. Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive

This 'Stop' controlled T-intersection, in the No Build condition and both peak hours, will experience a good LOS 'WC' on the Corporate Drive approach and a LOS 'A' for the Cokesbury Road SB left turn. In the Build scenario, no changes to the good LOS are experienced. The greatest impact is an increase of approximately 2-1/2 seconds of average vehicle delay to the Corporate Drive WB left turn lane. Other than pruning/clearing vegetation that might obstruct lines of sight, at this intersection, no mitigation is required due to the Town Center project.

HMA notes that all the signalized and unsignalized capacity analyses were properly performed and accurate as to all data entries.

11. ATD projected pedestrian peak hour trip generation for the proposed 280 unit, mid-rise, multi-family residential project based on the ITE publication Trip Generation — 10th Edition. As noted in report Table 2 (p. 10), the residential site will generate 6 am and 11 pm peak hour pedestrian trips. HMA agrees with the analysis performed.
12. ATD evaluated Traffic Signal Warrants at the intersection of Cokesbury Road & Corporate Drive under future Build volume conditions. This assumed that the existing office buildings, the hotel and the proposed residential development were fully occupied. HMA reviewed the ATD signal warrant analysis and concurs with their conclusion that a signal warrant is not met at this location. ATD should present a brief summary of their findings in testimony.
13. ATD should present in testimony a summary of their accident investigation findings, within the study area, and how it relates to the Town Center project.
14. Related to ATD's comments on site access, circulation and parking, HMA had provided a detailed review of the preceding in the Site Plan Review section of this traffic review report. Consequently, we have not provided a separate site plan review related to the ATD traffic report.

C. General Comments

1. All traffic related review comments by other Board professionals shall be addressed by ELP and ATD.

The foregoing represents our traffic review of the subject application. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

T & M Associates Stan C. Slachetka PP, AICP

We have reviewed the following materials submitted by the applicant as part of the above-referenced application:

- *Borough of Lebanon Planning Board Application and Rider;*
- *Preliminary Site Plan, prepared by E&PL association, dated February 4, 2021, consisting of thirty four (34) sheets;*
- *NJDEP Mitigation Plan, prepared by E&PL association, dated December 4, 2020;*
- *Freshwater Wetlands Report, prepared by E&PL association, dated December 28, 2020;*

- *Flood Hazard Area verification and permit report, prepared by E&PL association, dated December 28, 2020;*
- *Traffic Impact Analysis for Lebanon Town Center prepared by Atlantic Traffic and Design, dated January 18, 2021;*
- *Stormwater Management Report, prepared by E&PL association, dated December 8, 2020; and*
- *Corporate Drive Realignment A Map, prepared by Atlantic Traffic and Design, dated January 12, 2021.*

We have reviewed the above-referenced application and documents for the preliminary major site plan approvals, and we offer the following comments:

A. Property Description

The subject property is a tract of land comprised of Block 4, Lots 1.03, and Lot 1.04, located on the North side of Highway 22 and along Corporate Drive. The Interstate 78 right-of-way is directly to the North adjoining the subject site. The site is generally unimproved except for a surface parking lot located at the western end of the Lot 1.03, as well as Corporate Drive and associated infrastructure improvements, which extend across Lots 1.03 and 1.04 from east to west. A hotel is to the west of the site adjoining Cokesbury Road. Various corporate office uses and commercial/residential uses fronting on Route 22 are located to the east and south.

A Category One stream traverses the site flowing in southern direction. Wetlands of exceptional and ordinary resource value that are associate with the stream corridor are located on the property.

There are retaining walls located to the east of the stream. The applicant proposes to remove the existing structures on the site.

The subject parcel is located in the R-MF-12 (Residential Multifamily) zone district, as well as in the inclusionary multi-family Affordable Housing Overlay District. Surrounding lands on the west and south of the subject site are in Commercial-Research-Office-Manufacturing zone. To the north, across Highway 78 is the Residential Multifamily/Affordable Housing zone.

The site also is located within an area designated by the Borough Council as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment and an area in need of rehabilitation with the adoption Resolution 136-2020 on December 13, 2020. A redevelopment plan for the properties is currently being prepared.

B. Project Description

The applicant is requesting a Preliminary Major Site Plan approval to construct four (4) new four-story multi-family residential building with associated parking, landscaping, lighting, community facilities and stormwater management improvements. The four residential building will contain a total of 280 rental units, of which, 56 units will be deed restricted affordable housing units.

The applicant proposes the development in two phases as follows:

- Phase I will consist of two apartment buildings on Block 4, Lot 1.03, with associated parking areas, amenities, and stormwater management facilities. The amenities include a pool, tot lots, barbecue area and game courts.
- Phase II will consist of two apartment buildings on Block 4, Lot 1.04, with associated parking areas and stormwater management facilities.

Variances are required for the following per the R-MF¹-12 zone requirements:

- Excessive building height for the proposed residential buildings
- Inadequate landscaping (see Section F)
- Excessive light pole size
- Excessive monument sign area
- Excessive size of retaining walls
- Excessive length of building facades
- Roofline offsets (see Section H)

C. Planning and Zoning

1. Affordable Housing Plan, Ordinance, and Court Approved Settlement Agreement

The subject property is included in the Borough's Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan ("Housing Plan"), adopted by the Planning Board on May 20, 2020 and subsequently endorsed by the Borough Governing Body and approved by the Court in the Borough's Affordable Housing litigation involving Fair Share Housing Corporation (FSHC). The Housing Plan anticipates that the development would be built in the manner now proposed: as an inclusionary development to satisfy a portion of the Borough's affordable housing obligation. This development is a required component of the Borough's Final Judgment of Compliance and Repose and related settlement agreements.

In accordance with the provisions of the Housing Plan, the Borough adopted ordinance No. 2020-20 on October 21, 2020 to establish an Overlay Zone that permits inclusionary multifamily affordable housing on the subject site.

A Settlement Agreement between the Borough and Town Center, the property owner, was executed on October 16, 2019. Per the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Town Center, will construct a 280-unit inclusionary housing development with 56 affordable units, which equates to a 20 percent affordable housing set-aside. The affordable units will consist of 28 moderate-income units, 20 low-income units, and eight very-low income units. The affordable units will comply with the bedroom distribution requirements specified in the Uniform Housing Affordability Controls ("UHAC"; N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.1 et seq.), including 12 three-bedroom units, 33 two-bedroom units, and 11 one-bedroom units. All units will be family rental units.

Accordingly, the site plan is being reviewed per the settlement agreement and requirements of the R-MF-2 zone.

2. Use

The project site is in the R-MF-12 (Residential Multi-family) Zone, which allows multifamily dwellings as a principal use and a variety of related accessory uses. The proposed residential multi-family residential development on Lots 1.03 and 1.04 is a permitted use.

3. Bulk and Yard Requirements

An analysis of the bulk and yard requirements of the R-MF-12 zone district is as follows:

Standard	Required	Proposed (Lot 1.03) Proposed	(Lot 1.04)
Minimum Tract Area	22 Acres	22.2 Acres (Lot 1.03 and Lot 1.04)	22.2 acres (Lot 1.03 and Lot 1.04)
Minimum Front Yard Setback	20 ft	22.4 ft	74.8 ft

Minimum Side Yard Setback	40 ft	81.6 ft	48.5 ft
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	30 ft	48.3 ft	49.1 ft
Maximum Building Coverage	15%	13.8%	13.2%
Maximum Lot Coverage	60%	26.7%	26.6%
Minimum Distance between the buildings	22 ft	28.8 ft	75.7 ft
Maximum building length of any façade	350 ft	354 ft (V)	<350 ft
Maximum Building Height	4 stories/ 55 feet	>55 ft (V)	>55 ft (V)
Maximum Density	12.7 units per acre	12.7	12.5

(V) Variance Required

As shown in the table above, the following variances are required for the proposed development:

- a. **Building Height:** A maximum 55-foot building height is required per section 3. D. (9) of the R-MF-12 ordinance. Proposed building heights for Buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4 are 58.28 ft, 57.64 ft, 58.88 ft and 57.16 ft respectively. All four of these heights exceed the permitted height in the zone. As a result, four (4) variances are required.
- b. **Maximum Length of Building Façade:** Per Section 295-115D(6), 350 feet is required, while Buildings 1 and 2 on Lot 1.03 are 354 feet in length. Therefore, two (2) variances are required.

For consideration of "c" bulk variances, as well as the other 'c' variances noted in this report, the applicant shall provide testimony to the Board that addresses the positive and negative criteria. The applicant's testimony should focus on the following:

- **Positive Criteria:** The applicant shall provide testimony to the Board regarding the physical conditions of the property and how the strict application of the provisions of the ordinance would result in a hardship that is inconsistent with the purpose and intent of the ordinance. Alternatively, the applicant may testify that the required variance furthers the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law and that the benefits of granting the variance will substantially outweigh any detriments.
- **Negative Criteria:** The applicant must demonstrate that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, and that the granting of the variance will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

The testimony should address why the applicant cannot comply with the required bulk standards for the proposed development and the reasons that the deviation from the requirement advances a planning purpose.

D. On-Site Parkin and Circulation

1. **The applicant proposes a total 155 units in Buildings 1 and 2 in Phase I.** Per the architectural plans there are total 37 one-bedroom units, 112 two-bedroom units, and six (6) three-bedroom units. Therefore, the required number of parking spaces is 306 as per the RSIS standards. The applicant proposes 327 parking spaces for Phase I of the proposed development, which includes two (2) spaces for *each of the* tandem spaces shown in the parking garages. Therefore, the parking requirement is met.
2. The applicant proposes a total 125 units in Buildings 3 and 4 in Phase II development. Per the architectural plans there are total 37 one-bedroom units, 112 two-bedroom units and six (6) three-bedroom units. Therefore, the required number of parking spaces is 247 as per the RSIS standards. The applicant proposes

254 parking spaces for the Phase II of the proposed development. Therefore, the parking requirement is met.

3. There is discrepancy between the bedroom distribution count shown in the parking schedule shown on Sheet 6 of the site plan and the architectural plans. The count for the three-bedroom units does not match the architectural plans. No market-rate three-bedroom units shall be provided pursuant to the requirements of the ordinance. The site plans should be revised.
4. The applicant proposes shared access with the commercial property directly to the west of Phase 2 (600 Corporate Drive). A cross-access easement shall be provided between the properties to ensure access to the parking spaces located on the site. All parking spaces along the easternmost row on the site (westernmost row related to the office building) shall be identified as being for the exclusive use of the residential development.
5. A cross-access easement also shall be provided between the hotel property to the west of Phase I and the proposed development.
6. The site plan does not show any sidewalks or lighting along Corporate Drive on the site plan or any pedestrian connections between the development and Corporate Drive. Per the Corporate Drive Realignment Concept, A Map, sidewalks are proposed along the north side of Corporate Drive along with restriping and realignment of some of the drive aisles and turning

lanes. The design of Corporate Drive and associated pedestrian sidewalks and pathways are discussed in detail in Section E of this report.

7. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115H(2), where walkways and/or sidewalks traverse streets, driveways, and/or access aisles, crosswalks shall be delineated by striping of a contrasting color or material. The site plan shows the striping; however, the applicant shall provide connections between the proposed walkway and the new sidewalk along the Corporate Drive. This is discussed in further detail in Section E.
8. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115H(3) Benches shall be located throughout the site along the pedestrian network. Benches shall be installed, at a minimum of one (1) for every six hundred (600) linear feet of walkway. There are no benches shown on the site plan. The applicant provide benches, street furniture, lighting, and pedestrian resting areas along Corporate Drive as further discussed in Section E below.

E. Corporate Drive Design

The design of Corporate Drive, including pedestrian and bicycle pathways and access is a critical planning issue that need to be addressed as part of this development. This is of particular concern, given the significant distance between the two phases of the development. As some of the recreation and community facilities that are being provided in Phase I are not included in Phase II, it can be anticipated that residents, including those residing in the affordable units, will require a safe and reasonable way to travel between the two phases of the development in order to have access to all such facilities.

In addition, Corporate Drive will be an important connecting element and common public open space between all anticipated developments located within the Corporate Drive redevelopment area. Therefore, the design of the sidewalks and pedestrian pathways, bicycle lanes, cross-walks, traffic control and traffic calming elements, and all other related improvements, including lighting, street furniture, and pedestrian gathering points and resting areas must be coordinated in a manner to create a "complete" street accounting for all modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular. This will be ultimately incorporated into the redevelopment plan for the area.

Given the fact that a substantial portion of Corporate Drive is located on Lots 1.03 and 1.04, the design of Corporate Drive must be addressed as part of the review of the proposed application. Accordingly, we recommend a working session with the applicant and Borough professionals to review the design of Corporate Drive and the related improvements discussed above. As a result of these discussions, the applicant shall prepare revised plans showing the agreed upon design elements on the plans.

F. Landscaping

- 1. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115K(3) (a) of parking lot landscaping, one (1) landscaped area of at least 162 square feet, shall be provided for every twenty (20) surface parking spaces. Said landscaping may be located around the perimeter of the parking area, within five feet of the curb, instead of within the parking area. Total of 2,089 sq.ft. landscaped area is required for parking spaces on Lot 1.04 and total of 2,640 sq.ft. landscaped area is required for the parking spaces on Lot 1.03. The proposed landscaping of the parking areas on Lot 1.04 and Lot 1.03 does not meet this requirement. The variance list on the site plan indicates that this requirement is not met, and variances are required. The applicant shall provide a specific calculation of the landscaped areas for each of the two lots.**
- 2. According to Ordinance Section 295-115K(3Xc), parking areas visible from Corporate Drive shall be screened by landscaping at least four (4) feet in height at the time of planting, except within sight triangle easements. Based on the planning schedule in the landscaping plan, the proposed landscaping along Corporate Drive is not four (4) feet in height. A variance is required.**
- 3. According to Ordinance Section 295-115K(3)(b), each of the landscaped areas in the parking lot shall contain one (1) tree with a caliper of at least three (3) inches or three (3) shrubs planted at a height of at least two and a half (2.5) feet. The proposed landscaping meets this requirement.**
- 4. According to Ordinance Section 295-115K(4), foundation plantings shall be provided around all buildings. These plantings shall include species that provide seasonal interest at varying heights to complement and provide pedestrian scale to the proposed architectural design of the buildings. The foundation planting shall incorporate evergreen shrubs and groupings of small trees to provide a human scale to building facades and winter interest. The applicant's professional shall testify regarding the proposed foundation plantings and consistency with this ordinance section. The landscaping plan does not show foundation plantings along all the edges of the proposed buildings. Foundation plantings should be added to all the edges of the building.**
- 5. The applicant shall discuss the proposed screening between Lot 1.03 and Lot 1.06 (the hotel site). The proposed combination of evergreen and ornamental shrubs along the lot boundary may not provide an adequate visual screen. We recommend taller evergreen plantings along the property edge.**

G. Lighting

- 1. The proposed lighting plan shall be revised to show less corporate-style and more residential-style and pedestrian friendly decorative lighting fixtures along walkways and in common areas**

of the proposed development. Specifically, we recommend avoiding the use of wall pack fixtures in the central court yards.

- 2. According to Ordinance Section 295-115F(2), parking lot lighting shall be no more than twenty (20) feet in height. The applicant proposes the mounting height of 25 feet for the parking area lights. A variance is required. If the Board is inclined to grant this variance, we recommend that the height and design of the parking lot lighting fixtures in the front of the site proximate to Corporate Drive transition to the height and style of the fixture to be provided along Corporate Drive as discussed in Section E.**

3. According to Ordinance Section 295-115F (3), A minimum of one-fifth (0.2) foot-candle and an average of one (1) foot-candle shall be maintained within parking areas. A minimum average of 0.3 foot-candle shall be maintained over all pedestrian walkways. Per the lighting plan submitted on Sheet 15 and 16 of the site plan the lighting levels at the pedestrian areas along Corporate Drive will not meet this requirement. The applicant shall revise the plans to provide adequate lighting.
4. The applicant shall testify to confirm that the proposed building mounted and parking area lighting fixtures comply with all other provisions of Section F of the Ordinance

H. Building Design

1. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-11541), there shall be no market-rate units containing more than two bedrooms. Any market-rate units proposed to include a den shall include a lease restriction prohibiting the use of the den as a bedroom. The architectural plan shows 2-bedroom units with den are proposed in all four buildings. The applicant shall confirm that lease restriction shall be included.
2. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115J(2), building wall offsets, including projections and recesses, shall be provided in order to provide architectural interest and variety to the massing of a building and relieve the negative visual effect of a single, long wall. The proposed building elevations show architectural elements as described in this section to avoid long, monotonous, uninterrupted walls and roof planed; however, the following areas need improvements.
 - a. The ground floor walls of Buildings 1 and 2 facing the common space areas have a monotonous wall with very few offsets.
 - b. The ground floor wall of Building 3 facing highway 78 and the ground floor wall of Building 4 facing the parking lot should be improved with additional fenestrations or offsets.
 - c. The roof area of building 2 should be articulated with architectural elements such as dormers or gables.
3. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-11543), the maximum spacing between such offsets shall be sixty (60) feet. The minimum projection or depth of any individual vertical offset shall not be less than one (1) foot. The applicant shall testify if the proposed offsets meet the depth requirement.
4. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115J(5), the architectural treatment of a facade shall be completely continued around all street-facing facades of a building. All sides of a building shall be architecturally designed to be consistent regarding style, materials, colors, and details. The colors and materials of the proposed buildings should be presented for review.
5. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115J(6), roofline offsets, such as dormers and gables, shall be provided along any roof measuring more than ninety (90) feet in length to relieve the visual effect of a single long roof. The maximum spacing between such offsets shall be forty-five (45) feet. It appears that the roof for the proposed Building 2 does not meet this requirement.
6. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115J(7), building facades visible from any public or private street shall consist of durable, long-lasting materials such as brick, stone, cast stone, vinyl, Hardie Plank, or other high-quality material. The proposed building facade materials are consistent with this requirement.
7. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115410), all building entrances shall be clearly articulated by architectural elements such as lintels, pediments, pilasters, columns, porticoes, porches, overhangs, railings, etc. The proposed facade design meets this requirement.
8. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-115411), heating, ventilating and air-conditioning systems, utility meters and regulators, emergency generators, exhaust pipes and stacks, satellite dishes and other telecommunications receiving devices shall be screened or otherwise specially treated to be, as much as

possible, inconspicuous as viewed from the public right-of-way and adjacent properties. The applicant shall discuss this with the Board and confirm that the items in this list are appropriately screened from Corporate Drive and adjacent properties.

I. Affordable Housing Requirements.

1. According to Ordinance Section 295-115E(1), fifty-six (56) units shall be reserved for, and affordable to, very-low, low- and moderate-income households regardless of tenure. The affordable units shall be family rental units. The applicant proposes fifty-six (56) affordable units.
2. According to Ordinance Section 295-115E(2), the income distribution of the affordable units shall be: twenty-eight (28) units reserved for moderate-income households, twenty (20) units shall be reserved for low-income households, and eight (8) units shall be reserved for very-low income households. The applicant shall testify and confirm that this requirement is met.
3. According to Ordinance Section 295-115E(3), the affordable units shall have at least a thirty-year deed restriction. Any such affordable unit shall comply with UHAC, applicable affordable housing regulations, the Fair Housing Act, any applicable order of the Court, and other applicable laws. The applicant shall testify how they intend to meet this requirement.
4. According to Ordinance Section 295-115E(4), the bedroom distribution shall be: twelve (12) three-bedroom units, thirty-three (33) two-bedroom units, and eleven (11) one-bedroom units. Each income distribution of the affordable units shall be proportionally distributed across each bedroom category. The site plan and architectural plans show the required bedroom mix for the affordable units. The applicant shall testify regarding the income distribution of the affordable units.
5. The affordable units are subject to the affirmative marketing requirements of the Borough's affordable housing ordinance and UHAC.
6. According to Ordinance Section 295-115E(7), the affordable units shall be dispersed throughout the site and provided in accordance with the phasing schedule in N.J.A.C. 5:935.6(d). Per the architectural plans, this requirement is met.
7. We note that in Phase I, a total of 155 residential are being developed but only 28 affordable units are being provided in this phase. This is half of the affordable units required in the development but less than 20 percent of the units in this phase. Whereas, in Phase II a total 125 residential units are being developed, of which 28 units are affordable, which is greater than 20 percent of the units in this phase. This should be discussed, given the fact that most of the recreation facilities and amenities are in Phase I.

J. Environmental

- a. Per the Freshwater Wetlands Permitting Plan, the proposed Building 3 on Lot 1.04 will be located within the freshwater wetlands transition area. The proposed wetlands transition compensation areas are shown on Lot 1.03 and Lot 1.04. The applicant should discuss whether there may be an additional compensation area required for the new sidewalk construction along Corporate Drive.
- b. General Permits. The applicant shall discuss the status of the required individual permits and general permits from NJ DEP for the proposed development of the subject property.
- c. The applicant shall discuss the status of all required permits from the Highlands Council.

The environmentally sensitive areas and areas with steep slopes shall be placed in conservation easement. The applicant shall confirm.

- e. The applicant shall testify regarding the protection of environmental resources while the project is under construction.
- f. The applicant shall take all necessary precautions to limit the disturbance to the wetland areas delineated on the site plan. It is critical that the existing vegetation remain undisturbed along the streambank for stabilization. We defer to the Board Engineer regarding the specific design standards and requirements to be followed in this regard.

2 Recreation and open space.

- a. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-1151(1), a minimum of five (5%) percent of the tract shall be open space for the use of residents. This may be linear walking paths, passive spaces, active recreation areas or the like. The applicant shall testify if a total of 1.1 acre is dedicated for the use of residents as open space and describe in detail the nature and use of the common open space areas.
- b. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 295-1151(2), due to the zone's location, on the opposite side of Route 22 as the Borough's park, an active recreation area shall be provided for children living within the development. This recreation area shall include, at a minimum, three pieces of equipment. Examples include, but are not limited to swings, slide, nets, and climbers. The applicant proposes tot lot at Buildings 1 and 2 for phase I, however, the requirement must be satisfied for the Phase II as well. We note that most of the recreation facilities are in Phase I in comparison to Phase II. As discussed, we have concerns over distribution of these facilities and the ability for all residents, including the residents of the affordable units, to have reasonable and equitable access to these facilities. This underscores the need for appropriate pedestrian connections between the two phases.

3 Other Planning Comments

- a. If a new redevelopment is adopted for the tract and the applicant wishes to take advantage of the opportunities that may be afforded by that redevelopment plan, an amended site plan may be submitted for a development that is consistent with the standards and requirements of the new redevelopment plan.
 - b. The site plan indicates that a variance is required for the bedroom distribution for the affordable units. However, a review of the architectural plans indicates that the required bedroom distribution will be followed. The site plan should be corrected.
 - c. The applicant shall testify regarding any building mounted signs for this development.
 - d. Location of the freestanding signs shall be shown on the site plan.
- e. Testimony for directional signs and wayfinding signs shall be provided.
- 1. The traffic engineering consultant for the applicant should provide testimony to the Board to review the results of their study and conclusions concerning potential traffic impacts. The traffic engineering consultant should also provide testimony as to the operation of the site circulation and pedestrian linkages.
- g. The zoning chart/site plan notes should be corrected as described in the previous comments.
 - h. Police, Fire and Emergency Services: The site plan should be submitted for review of the police, fire and emergency services agencies and comments provided prior to the public hearing.
 - i. Outside agency approvals: The applicant shall provide evidence to the Planning Board that all required approvals are obtained prior to any construction. These will include but not be limited to the County Planning Board, the Soil Conservation District, and sewer and water approvals.

We reserve the right to make additional comment upon the presentation of any additional information to the Board. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please advise.

Being 10:00, Attorney Drill stated the meeting would continue May 25, 2021 at 7 pm. No need to notice.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Attorney Drill opened the floor for public comment. There being none the floor was closed.

MISCELLANEOUS:

ADJOURN

Councilman Berger moved, Mr. Abeles seconded a motion to adjourn, there being no further business to come before the Board. The motion was passed by unanimous vote. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Romano
Planning Board Secretary

LBPB
5-10-16
60

LBPB
PAGE 62
6-10-15