



JOHN H. ALLGAIER, PE, PP, LS (1983-2001)
DAVID J. SAMUEL, PE, PP, CME
JOHN J. STEFANI, PE, LS, PP, CME
JAY B. CORNELL, PE, PP, CME
MICHAEL J. McCLELLAND, PE, PP, CME
GREGORY R. VALES, PE, PP, CME

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

MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board

From: Kevin E. Chen, P.E., PTOE *KEC*
Office of the Planning Board Engineer

Date: July 26, 2024

Re: Application No. PB 24-01
West Essex Highlands, LLC
Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
Proposed 496 Multi-Family Residential Units
Block 179, Lot 32
Our File No.: 115.WRP0179.V01

CC: Geniece Gary-Adams – Zoning Official
Zayibeth Carballo, P.E., P.L.S., P.P., C.M.E., CFM, CFS – Township Engineer
Diana McGovern, Esq. – Planning Board Attorney
John J. Hess, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. – Planning Board Engineer
George Wheatle Williams, P.P. – Planning Board Planner
West Essex Highlands, LLC – Applicant
Bryan D. Plocker, Esq. – Applicant's Attorney
Paul W. Anderson, P.E., Applicant's Engineer
Laurance D. Appel, RA – Applicant's Architect
Karl A. Pehnke, P.E., PTOE – Applicant's Traffic Engineer
John McDonough, P.P., LA – Applicant's Planner
Jeffrey S. Gunn – Applicant's Surveyor

We have performed our review of the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the above referenced West Essex Highlands Residential Development Apartments. The following documents were received by our office via email:

- A. Traffic Impact Study for West Essex Highlands Township of West Orange, Essex County, New Jersey, prepared by Karl A. Pehnke, P.E., and Eric J. Vilorio, P.E., of Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc., dated June 19, 2024.
- B. "Preliminary and Final Site Plan West Essex Highlands", prepared by Paul W. Anderson, P.E., of Anderson Consulting Services, Inc., last revised June 24, 2024.
- C. Settlement of Litigation Agreement between West Essex Highlands, Inc., Township of West Orange, and West Essex Highlands Condominium Association, Inc., dated April 23, 2020



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 2

It is our understanding that this application is under the auspices of a settlement agreement dated April 23, 2020. The Applicant is proposing 496 Multi-Family Residential Units in six (6) 4-story buildings located in the Township of West Orange with proposed access to the development via direct extension of Warner Road. The plans currently depict an extension of Kuzik Drive with a swinging gate to allow emergency access only, and an extension of Howell Drive with a swinging gate to allow emergency access only.

We have the following comments relative to the Traffic Impact Study prepared for this proposed development:

1. This traffic review is limited to traffic, site circulation, intersection sight distances, parking, and off-site improvements related to such. All other issues are deferred to the respective professionals.
2. It should be noted that County Route 611 (Eagle Rock Avenue) is a roadway under the jurisdiction of Essex County and that approval from the Essex County Planning Board may be required.
3. The Applicant's Engineer conducted manual turning movement counts at the following locations on Tuesday, May 14, 2024 at the following times:
 - a. Eagle Rock Avenue (County Route 611) and Laurel Avenue (County Route 634) – 7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm
 - b. Eagle Rock Avenue and Oval Road – 7am to 7pm
 - c. Eagle Rock Avenue and Crestmont Country Club Driveway – 7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm
 - d. Eagle Rock Avenue and Crestmont Country Club Driveway – 7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm

It should be noted that a previous traffic study was performed in 2018 and was included as an attachment to the current traffic study. The Applicant's Engineer indicated that the 2024 counts are comparable to the 2018 traffic counts, the previous traffic study indicated that the levels of service were D or better for all movements, and with the reduction in proposed development from 683 to 496 units, the amount of traffic proposed at the internal intersections will be less than previously studied and the internal traffic intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service during the no-build and build conditions. We reviewed the 2018 traffic volumes from the previous traffic study and the 2024 traffic



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 3

volumes from the Applicant's current traffic study, and we did not arrive at the same conclusions. The AM Peak Hour traffic along Eagle Rock Avenue was generally less in 2024 versus 2018 and the PM Peak Hour Traffic along Eagle Rock Avenue was generally more westbound and less eastbound in 2024 vs 2018. The Applicant's Engineer should provide testimony on this issue.

4. The Applicant's Engineer generated trips based on the 11th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation and indicated that for the 496 proposed Mid-Rise Multi-Family Residential Units there are 207 expected AM Peak Hour Trips and 194 expected PM Peak Hour Trips to be added to the network. We reviewed the trip generation calculations and take no exception to same.
5. The Applicant's Engineer indicated that they grew the existing traffic volumes 3 years at a background growth rate of 1.75% to establish the 2027 No-Build Traffic Volumes. The Applicant's Engineer should include any nearby adjacent, approved but not yet constructed developments in the No-Build Traffic Volumes, if any, and revise the calculations, delays, levels of service, and conclusions as necessary.
6. The Applicant's Engineer indicated that the Build Conditions were analyzed with following mitigations in place:
 - a. *Signalization of the currently unsignalized intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Oval Road, including widening the eastbound Eagle Rock Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right turn lane; modifying the westbound Eagle Rock Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right turn lane; restriping the Oval Road southbound approach to provide an exclusive left turn lane and a shared through/right turn lane.*
 - b. *Relocate the existing exit-only Crestmont Country Club North Driveway along Eagle Rock Avenue to be located opposite Oval Road and converted into a two-way driveway*
 - c. *At the signalized intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Laurel Avenue, extend the westbound left turn lane*
 - d. *Coordinate the signal timings of the existing signalized intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Laurel Avenue and the proposed signalized intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Oval Road / Crestmont Country Club North Driveway*



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 4

- e. *At the signalized intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Laurel Avenue, increase the maximum cycle length to 90 seconds for both the AM and PM Peak Hours*

The Applicant's Engineer should indicate how the Crestmont Country Club North Driveway northbound approach will be configured for the intersection.

It should be noted that Item #21 of Exhibit D of the Settlement Agreement indicates that West Essex Highlands, Inc. will obtain approval for and install a traffic signal at the intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Oval Road. It is our understanding that the traffic signal will be part of a separate planning board application. Should this application for the 496 multifamily residential units be approved, it should be a condition of approval that the traffic signal at the intersection of Eagle Rock Avenue and Oval Road be built prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

7. The Applicant's Engineer indicated that the levels of service under the Build Conditions for all movements is projected to be a Level of Service D or better for both AM and PM Peak Hours. We take no exceptions to this conclusion.
8. The Applicant's Engineer provided a warrant analysis indicating that Warrants 1, 2, and 3 of the Current Manual on Uniform Traffic Control devices are met. We reviewed the warrants and the volumes in the warrant analysis and were not able to correlate the traffic volumes from the traffic counts to the traffic volumes utilized in the warrant analyses. The Applicant's Engineer should provide an explanation of how the traffic volumes in the warrant analyses were calculated. The Applicant's Engineer should review the warrant analysis calculations and revise them as necessary.
9. It should be noted that the settlement agreement indicates the Concept Plan had Kuzik Drive as a means of access ingress/egress and there was discussion within the agreement as to the status of Kuzik Drive going forward in this application as a point of access with respect to RSIS. It should be noted that the plan on sheet SP-7 currently shows a swinging gate on Kuzik Drive. The Applicant's Engineer should provide testimony on the intentions of Kuzik Drive with respect to the proposed application and include in the testimony compliance with RSIS.
10. The Applicant's Engineer provided parking requirement calculations on Sheet SP-3 that are based on RSIS. We take no exception to the parking requirement calculations shown.
11. The Applicant's Engineer provided parking spaces counts on Sheet SP-3 that do not align with the plans on several instances as follows:



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 5

- a. On Sheet SP-6, 175 parking spaces under building and 90 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for Buildings A.1 and A.2. The table in SP-3 for Building C indicates 175 parking spaces under the building and 90 parking spaces on the surface. We take no exception to the provided parking in Buildings A.1 and A.2.
- b. On Sheet SP-5, 73 parking spaces under building and 48 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for Building B. The table in SP-3 for Building B indicates 73 parking spaces under the building and 68 parking spaces on the surface. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- c. On Sheet SP-5, 156 parking spaces under building and 104 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for Building C. The table in SP-3 for Building C indicates 205 parking spaces under the building and 84 parking spaces on the surface. There is a 32 parking space marker and an 8 parking space marker that appears to be incorrect (26 and 4 parking spaces respectively shown) and there are two parking space subcounts of 11 and 28 that appear to be extraneous. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- d. On Sheet SP-5, 55 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for the clubhouse. The table note 5 in SP-3 indicates that clubhouse parking of 55 spaces is included in the unit counts, but there are no separate entries for clubhouse units in the parking provided column of the table. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- e. On Sheet SP-5, 40 parking spaces under a building are shown on the plan Under Building C. The table note 5 in SP-3 indicates that clubhouse parking of 40 spaces is included in the unit counts, but there are no separate entries for clubhouse units in the parking provided column of the table and it appears that these 40 spaces may have been counted twice in calculating under building parking for Building C. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- f. On Sheet SP-6, 17 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for the dog park. The table note 5 in SP-3 indicates that dog park parking of 18 spaces is included in the unit counts, but there are no separate entries for dog park parking spaces. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- g. On Sheet SP-10, 92 parking spaces under building and 13 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan for Building D.1. The table in SP-3 for Building D.1



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 6

indicates 147 parking spaces under the building and 41 parking spaces on the surface. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.

- h. On Sheet SP-9, 97 parking spaces under building and 61 parking spaces on the surface are shown on the plan (the 27 parking space subcount appears to be erroneous as 25 parking spaces are shown in that area) for Building D.2. The table in SP-3 for Building D.2 indicates 146 parking spaces under the building and 41 parking spaces on the surface. There is also an extraneous 106 parking count marker on the plans. The Applicant's Engineer should resolve the discrepancy.
- 12. The Applicant's Engineer provided ADA parking spaces for the different buildings as follows:
 - a. The Applicant's Engineer should add ADA Parking compliance calculations and ADA parking proposed to the parking table on SP-3.
 - b. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 8 ADA parking spaces for the 265 parking space facility covering Buildings A.1 and A.2 where 7 ADA parking spaces are required. The Applicant's Engineer proposes at least 4 van accessible parking spaces where 2 van Accessible parking spaces are required. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces under Buildings A.1 and A.2. We take no exception to the ADA parking spaces pending confirmation of those dimensions. Should the parking for A.1 and A.2 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.
 - c. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 1 ADA parking spaces for the 17 parking space facility covering the proposed dog park where 1 ADA parking spaces are required. As it is the only ADA parking space in this parking facility, the ADA parking space proposed shall be a van accessible parking space. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces in the parking facility for the proposed dog park. We take no exception to the ADA parking spaces pending confirmation of those dimensions. Should the parking for the proposed dog park be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.
 - d. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 4 ADA parking spaces for the 121 (73 + 48) parking space facility covering Building B where 5 ADA parking spaces are required. The Applicant's Engineer proposes at least 2 van accessible parking spaces where 1 van Accessible parking spaces are required. The Applicant's



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 7

Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces in the parking facility under Building B. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with ADA regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building B be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.

- e. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 5 ADA parking spaces for the 260 (156 + 104) parking space facility covering Building C where 7 ADA parking spaces are required. The Applicant's Engineer proposes at least 2 van accessible parking spaces where 2 van Accessible parking spaces are required. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces in the parking facility under Building C. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with ADA regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building C be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.
- f. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 ADA parking spaces for the 95 (55 + 40) parking space facility covering the clubhouse where 4 ADA parking spaces are required. No dimensions are given so it is not known if the ADA parking spaces proposed are van accessible parking spaces, and at least 1 of the 4 accessible parking spaces is required to be van accessible. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces for the clubhouse. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with ADA regulations. Should the parking for the proposed clubhouse be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.
- g. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 6 ADA parking spaces for the 105 (92 + 13) parking space facility covering Building D.1 where 5 ADA parking spaces are required. No dimensions are given so it is not known if the ADA parking spaces proposed are van accessible parking spaces, and at least 1 of the 6 accessible parking spaces is required to be van accessible. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces for Building D.1. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with ADA regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building D.1 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.
- h. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 ADA parking spaces for the 158 (97 + 61) parking space facility covering Building D.2 where 6 ADA parking spaces are



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 8

required. No dimensions are given so it is not known if the ADA parking spaces proposed are van accessible parking spaces, and at least 1 of the 2 accessible parking spaces is required to be van accessible. The Applicant's Engineer should indicate the dimensions of the proposed ADA parking spaces for Building D.2. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with ADA regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building D.2 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the ADA parking as necessary to meet the regulations for ADA parking spaces.

13. The Applicant's Engineer provided EV parking spaces for the different buildings as follows:
 - a. The Applicant's Engineer should add EV parking calculations and EV parking proposed to the parking table on SP-3. Should the Applicant's Engineer calculate EV parking credits per State Requirements, the credits shall be calculated toward the parking requirement with a 10% hard cap on the parking credit. The Applicant should include calculations for ADA Make-Ready parking spaces as per State regulations on EV parking.
 - b. Note 2 on The Parking Table on SP-3 indicates EV parking spaces will be provided for 5% of parking spaces on site. The Regulations require at least 15% of off-street parking spaces to be make-ready, and at least 1/3 of the Make-Ready parking spaces be outfitted with EV equipment. The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plans to propose additional make-ready or EV parking spaces and should provide testimony on this subject, including but not limited to the timeline of installation.
 - c. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 4 EV parking spaces for the 265 parking space facility covering Buildings A.1 and A.2 where 40 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($265 * 15\% = 39.75$, rounded up to 40). Of those 40 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 14 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($39.75 * 1/3 = 13.25$, rounded up to 14). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building A.1 and A.2 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking space.
 - d. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 17 parking space facility covering the proposed dog park where 3 EV parking spaces are required ($17 * 15\% = 2.55$, rounded up to 3). Of those 3 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 1 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($2.55 * 1/3 = 0.85$, rounded up to 1). The Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 9

with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building B be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking spaces.

- e. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 121 (73 + 48) parking space facility covering Building B where 19 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($121 * 15\% = 18.15$, rounded up to 19). Of those 19 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 7 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($18.15 * 1/3 = 6.05$, rounded up to 7). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building B be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking space.
- f. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 260 (156 + 104) parking space facility covering Building C where 39 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($260 * 15\% = 39$). Of those 39 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 13 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($39 * 1/3 = 13$). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building C be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking spaces.
- g. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 95 (55 + 40) parking space facility covering the clubhouse where 15 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($95 * 15\% = 14.25$, rounded up to 15). Of those 15 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 5 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($14.25 * 1/3 = 4.75$, rounded up to 5). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Clubhouse be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking spaces.
- h. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 105 (92 + 13) parking space facility covering Building D.1 where 16 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($105 * 15\% = 15.75$, rounded up to 16). Of those 16 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 6 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($15.75 * 1/3 = 5.25$, rounded up to 6). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building D.1 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking spaces.



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 10

- i. The Applicant's Engineer proposes 2 EV parking spaces for the 158 (97 + 61) parking space facility covering Building D.2 where 24 Make-Ready parking spaces are required ($158 * 15\% = 23.7$, rounded up to 24). Of those 24 Make-Ready parking spaces, at least 8 shall be EV parking spaces upon completion of construction ($23.7 * 1/3 = 7.9$, rounded up to 8). Applicant's Engineer should revise the plan to comply with EV parking regulations. Should the parking for the proposed Building D.2 be revised, the Applicant's Engineer should revise the EV parking as necessary to meet the regulations for EV parking spaces.
14. The Applicant's Engineer should propose EV parking signs and markings for proposed EV parking signs.
15. The Applicant's Engineer proposes tandem parking within the various buildings. The Applicant's Engineer should provide testimony on the expected operations of the proposed tandem parking.
16. The Applicant should propose a detail of the Keep Right sign proposed in the roundabout adjacent to Building A.2. The Applicant's Engineer should also address a potential conflict between roundabout traffic and the 2 parking spaces proposed.
17. The Applicant's Engineer proposes a clockwise roundabout adjacent to the clubhouse. The Applicant's Engineer should explain the proposed circulation here. If one-way circulation patterns are proposed, the appropriate signs should be proposed on the plans and detailed, such as but not limited to one way and do not enter signs.
18. The Applicant's Engineer proposes a multi-lane roundabout to the south of the proposed clubhouse at the intersection of Warner Road, Kuzik Drive, and Road D. The Applicant's Engineer should give testimony on the proposed roundabout. It should be noted that there is only one receiving lane on each exit of the roundabout and proposing a two-lane exit into each roundabout approach may be inappropriate. The roundabout should be designed in accordance with the MUTCD.
19. The Applicant's Engineer should propose a detail of the R6-5P Keep Right around roundabout / Roundabout Circulation sign.
20. The Applicant's Engineer proposes a one-way circulation adjacent to Building D.1. If one-way circulation patterns are proposed, the appropriate signs should be proposed on the plans and detailed, such as but not limited to one way and do not enter signs.



Chairman and Members of the West Orange Planning Board
West Orange Planning Board
Re: Traffic Impact Study and Site Plan – Review #1
West Essex Highlands, LLC

July 26, 2024
Our File No. 115.WRP0179.V01
Page 11

21. The Applicant's Engineer proposes an offset roundabout at the end of Road D. The Applicant's Engineer should give testimony on the proposed roundabout. The roundabout should be designed in accordance with the MUTCD. It should be noted that there is a lack of deflection proposes for vehicles approaching this roundabout on Road D.
22. The Applicant's Engineer should provide a sight triangle for all of the proposed stop sign and stop line locations within the proposed development. The Applicant's Engineer should review the sight triangles to ensure that no existing or proposed objects will obstruct sight triangles. The intersection sight distance triangles provided should be in accordance with the latest AASHTO guidelines.
23. The Applicant's Engineer should propose a stop line and double yellow centerline for any driveway intersecting with Warner Road, Kuzik Drive, and Road D.
24. The Applicant's Engineer should design the proposed curb ramps, sidewalks, warning surfaces, and crosswalks, to meet the latest ADA and MUTCD requirements. The Applicant's Engineer should provide landing areas as required before and after the curb ramps at the appropriate slopes and the locations of the proposed detectable warning surfaces should be clearly indicated. This ADA compliance issue should be reviewed relative to all ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks, pushbuttons, and pedestrian signal heads currently proposed under this project.
25. The design and placement of all traffic signs and striping shall follow the requirements specified in "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways," published by the U.S. Department of Transportation and adopted by the N.J. Department of Transportation.
26. The Applicant's Engineer should provide a site circulation plan showing the travel paths of the design vehicles (garbage truck/fire truck/rescue squad/delivery trucks) to verify that the on-site circulation is adequate for the required service and emergency vehicle access.
27. Fire lanes and striping would be subject to the approval of the Fire Subcode Official.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact our office.