



November 3, 2022

John Hess, PE, PP, CME
Zoning Board Engineer
66 Main Street
West Orange, New Jersey 07052

Re: ZB-21-21
Daughters of Israel, Inc.
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan
Review #1
1155 Pleasant Valley Way
Block 171, Lot 12

Dear Mr. Hess:

Pursuant to your letter dated June 20th, we have prepared revised site plans that address your comments. Our revisions include the following documents:

- Site Plans
- Stormwater Report
- Maintenance Manual
- Tree Removal Plan
- Lighting cut sheets

B. DESIGN COMMENTS

- 1.** The Applicant has not requested any submission waivers in support of this application.

PETRY RESPONSE: Statement. No response required.

- 2.** The Applicant has not requested any design standard exceptions in support of this application.

PETRY RESPONSE: Statement. No response required.

155 Passaic Avenue, Suite 350, Fairfield, New Jersey 07004
973-227-7004 973-227-7074 (fax)
www.petryengineering.com

3. The Applicant has requested a de minimis exception from the Residential Site Improvement Standards to permit 381 parking spaces whereas 479 parking spaces are required.

PETRY RESPONSE: Statement. No response required.

4. It states on sheet SP-1 of the site plan drawings that the Applicant is JCF 1155 Pleasant Valley Way LLC whereas it states on the Application form that the Applicant is Daughters of Israel, Inc. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to state that the Applicant is Daughters of Israel, Inc. (See Sheet SP-1).

5. NJAC 40:55D-66.20 stipulates that electric vehicle supply equipment shall be installed in at least one-third of the EV parking spaces initially. Within three years following the date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy, electric vehicle supply equipment shall be installed in an additional one-third of the of the EV parking spaces. Finally, within six years following the date of issuance of the certificate of occupancy, electric vehicle supply equipment shall be installed in the final one-third of the EV parking spaces. The plans must be revised to identify the EV parking spaces in which the electric vehicle supply equipment will be installed initially, after 3 years and after 6 years.

PETRY RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised to identify which EV spaces will be installed initially, after 3 years, and after 6 years. (See Sheet SP-3).

6. Sheet SP-3 of the site plan drawings shows that the southerly driveway intersects Pleasant Valley Way at an obtuse angle. The Applicant should address the Board regarding the feasibility of improving the alignment of the southerly driveway at this location.

PETRY RESPONSE: The southern driveway entrance has been realigned to allow for better traffic circulation. (See Sheet SP-3).

7. Sheet SP-3 includes a note which states "Construct 5' wide concrete sidewalk (Typ.). However, the plan shows that some of the sidewalk will be wider than 5 ft such as by the drop off area and in the courtyards. Therefore, the plans must be revised to dimension the sidewalk areas which will be wider than 5 ft.



PETRY RESPONSE: Dimensions have been added to the plans for the areas that are not typical. (See Sheet SP-3).

- 8.** Sheet SP-3 must be revised to dimension the proposed front yard, rear yard and side yard setbacks to the proposed building.

PETRY RESPONSE: These dimensions are shown on the Overall Layout Plan (See Sheet SP-2). Sheet SP-3 is not at a scale that allows all the property lines to be shown. However, we have added the setbacks where practical.

- 9.** Sheet SP-3 must be revised to dimension the widths of the various landscape islands in the parking lot on the southerly side of the building.

PETRY RESPONSE: Dimensions have been added to the plans.
(See Sheet SP-3).

- 10.** Sheet SP-3 must be revised to dimension the width of the pickup/drop off aisle under the Porte Cochere.

PETRY RESPONSE: Dimensions have been added to the plans.
(See Sheet SP-3).

- 11.** Sheet SP-3 must be revised to dimension the length of the flush curb within the drop off area on the northerly side of the building.

PETRY RESPONSE: Dimensions have been added to the plans.
The proposed curb cut is 13 feet wide. (See Sheet SP-3).

- 12.** Sheet SP-3 must be revised to show the radii of the proposed curbing in front of the parking spaces in Employee Lot #1.

PETRY RESPONSE: Dimensions for the radii have been added to the plans. (See Sheet SP-3).



- 13.** Sheet SP-4 shows that 2 subsurface detention basins and 2 surface basins are proposed whereas it states on page 1 of the Stormwater Management Report that 1 subsurface and 3 surface basins are proposed. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE: The Stormwater Management Report has been revised to state that we are proposing 2 subsurface detention basins and 2 surface detention basins.

- 14.** Sheet SP-4 must be revised to specify the type of pipe that is proposed from OS #8-4 to MH #1-1.

PETRY RESPONSE: The pipe information has been added to the plans. The pipe size and slope are 15" HDPE and 5.0%, respectively. (See Sheet SP-4). Also please note that OS #8-4 and MH #1-1 are now called out as OS #8-5 and MH #8-1, respectively.

- 15.** Sheet SP-4 must be revised to show the length, slope, pipe size and type of pipe from Type "B" #7-2 to Type "B" #7-1.

PETRY RESPONSE: The pipe information has been added to the plans. The pipe size and slope are 15" HDPE and 1.0%, respectively. (See Sheet SP-4).

- 16.** Sheet SP-4 must be revised to label OS #1-10 and to show the appropriate information for this structure such as rim, elevation, invert elevation, etc.

PETRY RESPONSE: The outlet structure information has been added to the plans. Please note that the outlet structure is now called OS #1-9.

- 17.** The callout for the pipe from Type "B" #6-1 to Type "B" #7-1 is illegible on sheet SP-4.

PETRY RESPONSE: The callout has been revised to be more legible. The pipe size and slope are 15" HDPE and 1.0%, respectively. (See Sheet SP-4).



18. The site plan drawings must be revised to include profiles of the following storm sewer lines:

- a. Basin #1B to Structure — (61).
- b. Structure — (62) to Structure — (60).

PETRY RESPONSE: The profile from Basin #1B to MH #8-1 has been added to the plans (See Sheet SP-11). It should be noted that Structures 60, 61, and 62 are existing structures that are to remain. The plans have been revised to clarify this.

19. Sheet SP-4 shows that Basin #1B will have 2-80 ft lengths and 2-40 ft lengths of 48" HDPE pipe (total 240 ft). However, the Pond No. 3 — Basin #1B Pond Report in the Stormwater Management Report shows 5-60 ft lengths of 48" pipe (total 300 ft). This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE: Basin #1B has been revised to call out for 5-60 ft lengths of 48" HDPE pipe, totaling 300 ft (See Sheet SP-4).

20. Sheet SP-4 shows that the 48" HDPE pipes in Basin #1B will have an invert elevation of 404.00 whereas the Pond No. 3 — Basin #1B Pond Report shows that the invert elevation will be 409. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE: The Pond Report has been revised to show the correct invert elevation of 404.00.

21. Sheet SP-4 shows that perforated HDPE pipe is proposed in Basin #1A and Basin #1B. We note that 25-29.4h stipulates that whenever a stormwater management design includes one or more BMPs that will infiltrate stormwater into subsoil, the design engineer shall assess the hydraulic impact on the groundwater table and design the site so as to avoid hydraulic impacts.

PETRY RESPONSE: The site plan has been revised show that the pipes are not perforated, as the systems are detention basins and are not designed for infiltration. (See Sheet SP-4).



22. It shows on sheet SP-6 that PVC sanitary sewer pipe is proposed. The type of PVC pipe must be specified on the plans.

PETRY RESPONSE: A note has been added to the plan calling for SDR-35 PVC pipe to be used for the sanitary sewers. (See Sheet SP-6).

23. Sheet SP-6 must be revised to specify the type of water main pipe that is proposed.

PETRY RESPONSE: The water main callouts have been revised to call out for Blue Brute pipe to be used. (See sheet SP-6).

24. Sheet SP-6 must be revised to clarify the meaning of the "W" and "R" symbols that are shown on the water main at the point of connection to the existing water main in Pleasant Valley Way.

PETRY RESPONSE: The "W" symbols are existing water meter pits and the "R" symbol is an existing water riser. Callouts have been added to the plans to indicate that they will be replaced (See Sheet SP-6).

25. Sheet SP-6 must be revised to show the size and type of pipe for the existing water main and sewer main in Pleasant Valley Way.

PETRY RESPONSE: The existing water and sewer main information have been added to the plans. (See Sheet SP-6).

26. Sheets SP-6 and SP-13 show San. MH #1-10 having a 6" pipe with an invert out elevation of 422.00 and an 8" pipe with an invert out elevation of 422.14 which is incorrect. The plans should be revised to indicate that the 6" pipe is entering the manhole. In addition, the 6" pipe invert elevation cannot be lower than the invert elevation of the 8" pipe exiting the manhole.

PETRY RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to correct the invert information. There will be a 6" pipe entering the manhole with an invert of 422.31 and an 8" pipe exiting the manhole with an invert of 422.14 (See Sheets SP-6 & SP-13).



27. Sheets SP-6 and SP-13 show San. MH #1-9 having 1 pipe entering the manhole and 2 pipes exiting the manhole which is incorrect. The plans must be revised to show that 2 pipes (6" & 8") are entering the manhole and one pipe (8") is leaving the manhole. In addition, the 6" pipe invert elevation cannot be lower than the invert elevation of the 8" pipe exiting the manhole.

PETRY RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to correct the invert information. The 8" pipe inverts are correct, while the 6" pipe will be revised to enter the manhole at an invert of 421.39 (See Sheets SP-6 & SP-13).

28. Sheets SP-6 and SP-13 show San. MH #1-6 having 1 pipe entering the manhole and 2 pipes exiting the manhole which is incorrect. The plans must be revised to show that 2 pipes (6" & 8") are entering the manhole and one pipe (8") is leaving the manhole. In addition, the 6" pipe invert elevation cannot be lower than the invert elevation of the 8" pipe exiting the manhole.

PETRY RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to correct the invert information. The 8" pipe inverts are correct, while the 6" pipe will be revised to enter the manhole at an invert of 414.51 (See Sheets SP-6 & SP-13).

29. The pipe slopes shown on Sheet SP-6 do not agree with the slopes shown on sheet SP-13 for the following pipe runs:
- San. MH #1-9 to San. MH #1-8_{sc}
 - San. MH #1-8 to San. MH #1-7_{sc}
 - San. MH #1-7 to San. MH #1-6_{sc}
 - San. MH #1-6 to San. MH #1-5_{sc}

PETRY RESPONSE: The pipe slopes on Sheet SP-13 are correct. The pipe slopes on Sheet SP-6 have been revised to match.

30. It shows on sheet SP-6 that the 8" sewer line from the grease trap to San. MH #1-7 will have a slope of 0.0% which is unacceptable.

PETRY RESPONSE: This pipe slope has been revised to reflect the correct slope of 0.010 ft/ft.

31. Sheets SP-6 and SP-14 show both a 6" pipe and an 8" pipe exiting San. MH #2-7 which is incorrect. The plans must be revised to show that the 6" pipe is entering the manhole and the 8" pipe is leaving the manhole.



PETRY RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to correct the invert information. The 8" pipe invert is correct, while the 6" pipe will be revised to enter the manhole at an invert of 408.23 (See Sheets SP-6 & SP-14).

32. The callout for the pipe length from San. MH #2-3 to MH #2-2 is illegible. In addition, it points to San. MH #2-3 instead of to the pipe run.

PETRY RESPONSE: The callout has been revised. It reads "59' of 8" PVC @ 0.050 FT/FT".

33. The pipe slopes shown on Sheet SP-6 do not agree with the slopes shown on sheet SP-14 for the following pipe runs:

- e. San. MH #2-7 to San. MH #2-6.
- f. San. MH #2-6 to San. MH #2-5.
- g. San. MH #2-5 to San. MH #2-4.
- h. San. MH #2-4 to San. MH #2-3.

PETRY RESPONSE: The pipe slopes on Sheet SP-14 are correct. The pipe slopes on Sheet SP-6 have been revised to match.

34. The Basin #2 Profile and the Basin #3 Profile on sheet SP-12 must be revised to specify the material to be installed on the basin bottom.

PETRY RESPONSE: The profiles have been revised to indicate that the basin bottom will be 4" of topsoil over native soil. Please note these are both detention basins, not infiltration basins. The soils in these portions of the site do not have adequate permeability.

35. Sheet SP-19 includes a Typical Hi-Visibility Crosswalk Pavement Markings detail. Therefore, the plans must be revised to show the locations where crosswalk pavement markings are proposed.

PETRY RESPONSE: The plans have been revised to show the location of the crosswalks (See Sheet SP-3).



36. Sheet SP-19 includes a Typical Sign Detail. Therefore, the plans must be revised to identify where each type of sign is proposed.

PETRY RESPONSE: The Sign Detail has been revised to only show the signs that are proposed (See Sheet SP-19).

37. Sheet SP-20 includes a Doghouse Structure detail. Therefore, the plans must be revised to identify the locations where Doghouse Structures are proposed.

PETRY RESPONSE: The doghouse structure detail is now noted as “if required” (See Sheet SP-20).

38. Sheet SP-20 includes a Type "E" Inlet Detail. Therefore, the plans must be revised to identify the locations where Type "E" Inlets are proposed.

PETRY RESPONSE: The Type “E” Inlet Detail has been removed from the plans.

39. The Basin #1A — OS #5-7 detail on sheet SP-20 shows that it will be installed within a paved area whereas sheet SP-6 shows no pavement in the area. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE: Basin #1A is proposed within a parking lot, therefore the detail is correct.

40. The elevations of the 4"x 7" orifice, the 6" x 18" orifice and the 4' weir shown on the Basin #1B — OS #8-4 detail on sheet SP-20 do not agree with the elevations shown on the Pond No. 3 — Basin #1B Pond Report in the Stormwater Management Report.

PETRY RESPONSE: The orifice elevations on the outlet structure details have been revised to match the Pond Report.



41. The Basin #2 — OS #5-6A detail on sheet SP-20 shows that the grate will be at elevation 418.00 whereas it shows on sheet SP-6 that the grate will be at elevation 419.00. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE:
elevation of 418.00.

Sheet SP-6 has been revised to show a grate

42. The Basin #2 — OS #5-6A detail on sheet SP-20 and Pond No. 1 — Basin #2 Pond Report in the Stormwater Management Report show that a 10 ft weir is proposed at elevation 418.00. The Applicant should clarify how a weir length of 10 ft was determined.

PETRY RESPONSE:
at an elevation of 418.00.

The weir length has been revised to be 4 feet

43. The Basin #3 — OS #1-10 detail on sheet SP-20 shows that two 6" x 10" orifices are proposed at elevation 418.00 whereas the Pond No. 2 — Basin #3 Pond Report shows that two 6" x 10" orifices are proposed at elevation 417.00 and two 6" x 10" orifices are proposed at elevation 418.00. These discrepancies must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE:
revised to match the Pond Report.

The outlet structure details have been

44. The Basin #3 — OS #1-10 detail on sheet SP-20 shows that a 6' weir is proposed at elevation 420.00 whereas the Pond No. 2 — Basin #3 Pond Report shows that the weir will be 4 ft long. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE:
the detail.

The weir length has been revised to 4 feet on

45. The Stormwater Management Report includes a New Jersey 24 Hour Rainfall Frequency Data chart which shows that the 100-year storm has a rainfall of 8.66" in Essex County. However, the Precipitation Reports show that a rainfall of 8.24" was used in the calculations for the 100-year, 24-hour storm. This discrepancy must be resolved.

PETRY RESPONSE:
use a rainfall of 8.66" for the 100-year, 24-hour storm.

The hydrograph models have been revised to



46. As stipulated in §25-29 of the Ordinance, this project is classified as a Major Development. As a result, the development shall incorporate a maintenance plan for the stormwater management measures as stipulated in §25-29.10. A copy of the maintenance plan must be submitted to the Board for review and approval. In addition, the maintenance plan and any future revisions must be recorded upon the deed of record for the property.

PETRY RESPONSE:

A maintenance plan is included as a part of this submittal.

47. As required by §25-29.3a, the minimum standards for groundwater recharge, stormwater quality and stormwater runoff quantity shall be met by incorporating green infrastructure. Since the property in question is located in the Metropolitan Planning Area, the Applicant is not required to address groundwater recharge. In addition, it states in §25-29.4q that stormwater runoff quality standards are only applicable when the major development results in an increase of one-quarter acre or more of regulated motor vehicle surface which this project does not. Therefore, the Applicant must demonstrate that the project meets the minimum standards for stormwater runoff quantity set forth in §25-29.4o and r. As stipulated in §25-29.4o3, the design engineer shall utilize BMPs from Table 1 or from Table 2 and/or an alternative stormwater management measure approved in accordance with §25-29.4g.

PETRY RESPONSE:

The soils from the site that were tested did not have adequate permeability for infiltration. (See permeability results in Stormwater Management Report Appendix). Therefore, we are requesting a waiver to allow us to not use green infrastructure.

48. The plans must be revised to include the following details:

- a) Depressed curb.
- b) Guide rail.
- c) Fence.*
- d) Screening fence.*
- e) EV charging station.*
- f) Fire hydrant.
- g) Wet tap.
- h) Thrust blocks or harnessing.
- i) Grease trap.*
- j) Emergency generator.*
- k) County curb, sidewalk, and trench restoration.

PETRY RESPONSE:

The details have been added to the plans. Please note that the pavement detail has been revised to show different sections for the loop road and the parking/aisle areas (See Sheet SP-19).



* Indicates that these details will be included in a future submittal of the Architectural plans.

C. LANDSCAPING COMMENTS

1. In accordance with Section 25-27.8g, the Applicant is to provide 153 major trees and 43 major or minor trees for a total of 196 replacement trees. Currently, the Applicant has provided 86 major trees and 110 minor trees, which leaves a deficit of 57 major trees, even though the total quantity of trees has been provided. This should be discussed with the Board.

PETRY RESPONSE: Testimony was provided

2. Revise the plans to graphically depict and specifically label the location for tree protection fencing in accordance with Section 25-27.9.

PETRY RESPONSE: Tree protection fencing has been added to the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the shade trees along Pleasant Valley Way (See Sheet SP-15).

3. Our office has concerns regarding the accuracy of the provided tree inventory as some of the listed trees are vines; however, the size indicates a semi-mature tree and not a size a vine would be.

PETRY RESPONSE: The tree removal plan has been updated to reflect the correct species. (See TR-1 and TR-2)

4. Our office has concerns regarding the close proximity of proposed oak trees near the proposed retaining wall along the southeast side of the property. The Applicant might provide an alternative species in this spatially constrained location.

KDA RESPONSE: Testimony will be proposed.

5. Revise the plans to provide native plant materials and seed mix for the proposed detention basins, in accordance with the updated stormwater management regulations, for further review.



KDA RESPONSE:
Architectural plans.

This will be included in a future submittal of the

6. Revise the plans to provide an alternative for proposed PS (White Pine) due to the species' mature habit of losing its lower limbs, which does not provide for an adequate buffer.

KDA RESPONSE:

Testimony will be provided.

7. Revise the plans to provide building foundation shrubs, perennials, and grasses, to enhance aesthetics. Currently, plant material has not been provided.

KDA RESPONSE:

Testimony will be provided.

8. Revise the plans to indicate the Township Engineer within the 'Landscape Specifications' on sheet L2.0 for plant relocations and substitutions, prior to install.

KDA RESPONSE:
Architectural plans.

This will be included in a future submittal of the

9. Revise the plans to provide rigid, plastic, open mesh trunk guards for all deciduous trees, to protect from the irreparable damage from buck rub.

KDA RESPONSE:
Architectural plans.

This will be included in a future submittal of the

10. Revise the plans to indicate the proposed disposition for all open areas, such as lawn, stone, mulch, etc., to prevent confusion during construction.

KDA RESPONSE:
Architectural plans.

This will be included in a future submittal of the



D. LIGHTING COMMENTS

1. Revise the plans to provide a three (3) foot high stanchion for all light poles within the parking areas.

PETRY RESPONSE: The light pole detail has been revised to show a 3-foot stanchion for poles within the parking areas (See Sheet SP-17).

2. Revise the plans to provide the concrete strength for proposed light pole foundation details on sheet SP-17. Staff recommends a strength of 4,500 PSI.

PETRY RESPONSE: The light pole foundation details will be revised to indicate a concrete strength of 4,500 PSI.

3. Revise the plans to indicate proposed timers and hours of operation. Also, indicate proposed color and finish for all fixtures and poles.

PETRY RESPONSE: Testimony will be provided with regard to hours of operation. Pole and Fixture colors will be chosen during the construction. The colors will be coordinated with the building façade and dependent on availability.

4. Revise the plans to provide isolux pattern details with a scale and graph to correspond with the proposed fixtures. Also, provide the manufacturer's catalog cuts and ordering information for the proposed light poles, for further review.

PETRY RESPONSE: The manufacturer catalog cut sheets are included in this submittal. The ordering information is contained in the schedule.



We trust that we have provided sufficient information for your continued review. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact us.

Very truly yours,

PETRY ENGINEERING, LLC

J. Michael Petry

J. Michael Petry, PE, PP, AIA

