

DRESDNER ROBIN

DRESDNER ROBIN
1 EVERTRUST PLAZA, SUITE 901
JERSEY CITY, NJ 07302
201.217.9200
WWW.DRESDNERROBIN.COM

John J. Hess, PE, PP, CME
Zoning Board Engineer
66 Main Street
West Orange, NJ 07052

DR Project No. 10461-003
CME File: VWRZ0111.02
August 09, 2021

**RE: Application No. ZB-20-16
Comment Response letter – May 18, 2021
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan with 'C' and 'D' Variances - Review # 1
424 Eagle Rock Avenue
Block 111, Lot 1.08
Township of West Orange, Essex County, New Jersey**

Dear Mr. Hess:

Attached kindly find the following documents which are submitted for your review relative to the above captioned matter.

- **Amended Preliminary/Final Site Plan set for 424 Eagle Rock Avenue, Block 111, Lot 1.08; Township of West Orange, Essex County, New Jersey.** The plans are dated November 19th, 2020 and have been revised on August 09 2021.
- **Traffic Generation Report prepared by Dolan & Dean Consulting, for 424 Eagle Rock Avenue, Block 111, Lot 1.08 dated July 21, 2021**
- **Environmental Impact Statement, prepared by Dresdner Robin, for 424 Eagle Rock Avenue, Block 111, Lot 1.08 dated August 6, 2021**
- **Stormwater Report, prepared by Dresdner Robin, for 424 Eagle Rock Avenue, Block 111, Lot 1.08 last revised August 2021**
- **Soil Resource Report for Project Site;**

CHECK LIST COMMENTS:

1. Based on our review, we find that the following items from the Township's the Site Plan / Subdivision Checklist must be addressed:
 - a) Item #20 – Copy and/or delineation of any existing or proposed deed restrictions or covenants.
 - b) Item #23 – List of required regulatory approvals or permits.
 - c) Items #31 – Contours to extend at least 200' beyond subject property.
 - d) Items #48 – Sight triangles
 - e) Item #52 – Plans and legal documents for compliance with west orange COAH ordinance.

WAIVER COMMENTS:

2. The Applicant has requested the following waivers:
 - a) Item #46 – Solid Waste management plan**Response: Noted**

DESIGN COMMENTS:

3. As stipulated in section 25-13 of the Ordinance, an environmental impact statement must be submitted to the board.
Response:
Comment noted. Environmental impact statement will be submitted under separate cover.
4. The Applicant should address the board regarding the total number of storage units that are proposed in the building.
Response:
Total number of storage units will be addressed during testimony by the Project Architect.

\\PANZURA-JC\DR\PRJ\10461-003 PUBLIC\STORWO\EG\CORRESPONDENCE\2021-08-09 - ENGINEERING RESPONSE LETTER-FINAL.DOCX

5. The plans do not show that any loading zones are proposed. The Applicant should address the board regarding the need to provide loading zones to accommodate larger deliveries to the site.
Response: Please see sheet C-301 which includes oversized (10'x20') parking spaces for customer loading and unloading. This is based on similar projects by the applicant and will be discussed during testimony.
6. As discussed at the Site Plans Review Advisory Board meeting on January 26, 2021, the Applicant should address the Board regarding their plans to provide access to Crystal Lake which is owed by the Township.
Response:
Applicant will coordinate with Township to make plan revisions in this area if requested.
7. Note # 4 on the ALTA.NSPS Land Title Survey states that a portion of the property lies within a specific flood hazard area. Therefore, the flood hazard area limits must be shown on the Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-301)
Response:
Flood hazard line was added to survey directly from FEMA map, however, based upon additional analysis, we have determined that the site is not located within a flood hazard area. According to the NJDEP Flood Hazard Control Act (Date last amended 07/15/2019) section 7:13-2.3 Regulated Areas part (b), A flood hazard area exist along every regulated water that has a drainage area of 50 acres or greater. Dresdner Robin used the methods described in section 7:13-3.1 to determine the flood hazard area for Crystal Lake. The area was determined to be less than 40 acres, and thus, does not possess a flood hazard area under this chapter. Additional information will be provided under separate cover if requested.
8. The sheet Index on G-001 lists sheet C-304 which is included in the submitted plan set.
Response: Sheet index has been revised to add Sheet C-304.
9. The sheet Index on G-001 lists sheet L-791 which is not included in the submitted plan set.
Response: Sheet index has been revised to remove Sheet L-791.
10. The Certification Block on Sheet G-001 must be revised to eliminate the reference to the Planning Board.
Response: Certification block has been updated to reference the Zoning Board of Adjustment in lieu of the Planning Board.
11. It shows on sheet c-301 that 27 parking spaces are proposed for the self-storage facility. In addition, the parking area with 66 spaces on the front portion of the lot is proposed to remain, since these are not required for the self-storage facility, the Applicant should address the Board regarding the reasons for keeping these spaces.
Response:
Comment noted. Testimony will be provided in regard to the existing parking spaces to remain.
12. The Site Plan Notes on sheet C-301 must be revised be revised to eliminate all reference to the City of Jersey City.
Response:
Site Plan notes on C-301 have been revised to eliminate references to the City of Jersey City.

13. Sheet C-301 must be revised to show the radii of all proposed curved curbing.

Response:

Sheet C-301 has been revised to show the radii of all proposed curved curbing as requested.

14. Sheet C-301 must be revised to dimension the stripped areas that are proposed around the perimeter of the building including the southwest corner of the building.

Response:

Sheet C-301 has been revised to show the dimension of the stripped areas around the perimeter of the building as requested.

15. It shows on sheet C-301 that flushed curbing is proposed along the front of the parking spaces in front of the building. The Applicant should address the board regarding their plans to install wheel stops or bollards at the head of the parking spaces to prevent vehicles from driving onto the sidewalk and striking the building.

Response:

Sheet C-301 has been revised to show wheel stops along the flush curb in front of the building near the parking spaces as requested.

16. It states on sheet C-301 that the parking spaces in the office/visitor areas will be 9-ft x 18-ft. In addition, it shows that the parking spaces in the secure area will be 10-ft x 20-ft. The Applicant clarify why two different parking spaces sizes are proposed.

Response:

The 9'x18' spaces will be for potential new customers or office visitors. The oversized (10'x20') are for customer loading and unloading. This will be addressed during testimony.

17. It shows on sheet C-301 that two (2) vehicular gates are proposed in the fence surrounding the building. A detail of the proposed gates must be added to the plans.

Response:

Sheet C-903 has been revised to include a gate detail.

18. Sheet C-301 includes a callout for a "Bioswale along curb". The limits of the bioswale must be indicated on the plans. In addition, the proposed grading on C-401 does not reflect that a bioswale is proposed.

Response:

Bioswale is no longer proposed. All reference and notes regarding the bioswale have been removed from the plans.

19. It shows on sheet C-301 that a 3-yard trash dumpster is proposed. The Applicant should provide testimony to the Board to demonstrate that the dumpster will have adequate capacity to accommodate the trash that will be generated at the site. In addition, the Applicant should address the Board regarding their plans to address the recyclables that will be generated at the site.

Response:

Dumpster is for office use only as customers are required to carry out any materials that they carry in. This will be further addressed during testimony.

20. It shows on sheet C-301 that the Applicant proposes to eliminate several vehicular connections to the existing parking lot on adjoining lot 1.07. The Applicant should provide testimony to the Board to demonstrate that the elimination of these connections will not cause any circulation issues on the adjoining property.

Response:

There does not appear to be easements associated with these vehicle connections. Additionally, closing of these connections does not appear to create circulation issues on the adjoining property.

21. It shows on sheet C-301 that the existing parking lot closest to Eagle Rock Avenue is to be milled, paved and restriped to match the existing. The depth of the proposed milling must be indicated in the plans.

Response:

Call out on C-301 has been revised to include the dimension of the milling and overlay. A detail as also added to C-901 for reference.

22. It shows on sheet C-301 that the existing parking lot closest to Eagle Rock Avenue encroaches on adjoining lot 1.01 to the west. The Applicant should address the Board regarding their plans to eliminate the existing encroachments when the parking lot is milled and overlayed.

Response:

The plans show milling, paving and restriping up to the western curb to the parking stripe roughly parallel to the eastern property line. This approach was taken in order to minimize impacts on the adjacent parking lot to the east. The applicant has adequate property (60 feet) to rearrange parking such that no encroachments occur, however this would impact several parking spaces on the property to the east.

23. The size of the parking spaces on the existing parking lot closest to Eagle Rock Avenue must dimensioned on sheet C-301.

Response:

Sheet C-301 has been revised to include typical parking dimension.

24. Sheet C-301 shows that new concrete curb is proposed along the property line adjacent to lot 1.07. The limits of the proposed curb must be clarified. is the curb proposed only across the points of connection to the parking lot on adjoining lot 1.07 or along the entire property line?

Response:

Comment noted. Additional notes have been added for clarity. Additionally, an enlargement plan view of this area has been added to the plans for further clarity.

25. Sheet C-301 includes a callout which states "D/F Monument Sign, see C-902 for more details. We note that the monument sign detail is on sheet C-901. Therefore, the callout should be revised accordingly.

Response: Sheet C-301 has been revised to update the callout.

26. Sheet C-301 should be revised to provide a stop sign at the exit onto Eagle Rock Avenue.

Response: Sheet C-301 has been updated to include a stop sign at the exit onto Eagle Rock as required.

27. Sheet C-301 should be revised to show the required sight triangles at the exit onto Eagle Rock Avenue. In addition, the Applicant must demonstrate that the proposed monument sign will not be located within the sight triangle.

Response:

Sheet C-301 has been revised to show a detail, based on the West Orange and Essex County sight triangles requirements. Monument sign is not located within either sight triangle.

28. Sheets C-302 and C-303 show the turning movements for a Pierce Arrow XT 2016 fire truck. Since a 3-story building is proposed, the Applicant should check with the Fire Department to determine if a larger fire truck would be required to protect the site.

Response:

The Arrow XT was recommended by the West Orange Fire Department for use in our modeling, based on the TRC meeting. No additional comments have been received to-date from the fire department.

29. Sheet C-401 shows that Class 52 DIP pipe is proposed to convey stormwater from the inlets in the parking lot and emergency access drive surrounding the building. The plans must be revised to specify the pipe size that is proposed for each pipe run.

Response: C-401 has been revised to include pipe size for each proposed pipe.

30. Sheet C-401 must be revised to show the invert elevations of the pipes that connect to the subsurface detention chamber.

Response: C-401 has been revised to include invert to all structures.

31. Sheet C-401 includes a callout for "1,670 'R-Tank XD' 9-stacked subsurface detention chamber". Our office is unclear regarding the meaning of this callout.

Response:

Callout has been updated to provide additional information and clarification regarding the proposed subsurface detention basin.

32. It shows on sheet C-401 that the Type-B inlet at the southwest corner of the parking lot will have an invert elevation of 614.83 and a grate elevation of 616.83. Depending on the proposed pipe size, the depth of cover will be approximately over the pipe could be less than 12". The Applicant should address the Board regarding why the pipes are proposed to be so shallow with limited cover.

Response: Ductile Iron Pipe (DIP) was chosen, rather than Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP) due to the need for shallow cover. DIP is a more resilient material and requires less cover than RCP, which is necessary to reach the shallow discharge point to Crystal Lake.

33. Sheet C-401 must be revised to provide top of curb and gutter elevations along the northerly and southerly sides of the building.

Response: Sheet C-401 has been revised to provide top of curb and gutter elevations along the northerly and southerly sides of the building as requested.

34. For the purpose of clarity, the inlets and roof drainpipes shown on sheet C-401 should be numbered.

Response:

Plans have been updated to number all inlets and roof drainpipes as requested.

35. Sheet C-401 shows that grading is proposed at the southeast corner of the site. However, it shows on sheet C-811 that the existing wooded area at this location is to remain. This discrepancy must be resolved.

Response: Proposed surface grading was adjusted on C-401 to match the extent depicted on C-811.

36. Sheet 401 must be revised to show the pipe size, length of pipe, pipe slope and type of pipe from the Outlet Control Structure to the headwall. In addition, a headwall detail must be added to the plans.

Response: C-401 was updated to show pipe length, slope, and type. Headwall was removed and replaced with a flared end section. Please see C-902 for more details.

37. As required by Section 25-28.7.a of the Land Use Regulations, sheet C-410 must be revised to superimpose all existing trees and mark the trees that are proposed to be removed.

Response: C-410 has been revised to show all existing surveyed trees and sizes. Trees that are being scheduled for removal have been marked accordingly on C-410 and a tree removal table has been added to sheet C-811.

38. As required by Section 25-28.7.b of the Land Use Regulations, sheet C-410 must be revised to address the following requirements:
- a) Identification of soil types on the property, with specific reference to highly erodible soils as identified by the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service or other recognized authority;
 - b) Length, steepness and surface roughness of exposed slopes;
 - c) Resistance of soil to compaction and stability of soil aggregates;
 - d) High water table, water infiltration capacity and capacity of soil profile;
 - e) A stabilization and revegetation plan prepared, signed and sealed by a New Jersey professional engineer, including a complete description of the existing vegetation, the vegetation to be planted and slope stabilization measures to be installed.

Response:

Please find enclosed WebSoils Survey which identifies soil types on the property. Please note, that while located in a steep slopes area, this site is generally flat. The final site will be leveled, and we do not anticipate stabilization issues on-site. Additional information will be provided under separate cover if required.

39. It shows on sheet C-501 that the existing water service is to be reused. The size of the existing water service and the type of pipe must be shown on the plans.

Response:

Existing water service size was not determined at the time of the field survey. Note has been added to Sheet C-501 to perform test-pits to determine existing size and coordinate with the Township engineer prior to making any connections. Plans will be updated if existing water needs to be upgraded.

40. At the January 26, 2021 Site Plan Review Advisory Board meeting, the Applicant stated that the building will be sprinklered. Therefore, sheet C-501 must be revised to show the proposed fire service line. In addition, the appropriate fire service details must be added to the plans.

Response:

Comment noted. We will coordinate with project architect to determine the water size required to support the sprinkler system and update the service line is necessary. We will coordinate any required changes with the Township at that time.

41. Sheet L-691 includes a Typical Bioswale Detail. The detail includes callouts to "see site plan" for side slope width, bottom width, and depth. However, sheet C-301 does not include any of this information.

Response: Bio-swale is no longer proposed. Call out and details have been removed from the drawings.

42. Sheet L-701 should be revised to show existing light levels in the parking lot closest to Eagle Rock Avenue.

Response:

Dresdner Robin will perform a night-time light level study to document the existing light level at the parking lot. The results will be added to the plan and submitted under separate cover.

43. Sheet C-901 includes a Precast Concrete Wheel Stop detail. The plans should be revised to show where wheel stops are proposed.
Response:
Wheel stops have been added to site plan. Please see revised Sheet C-301.
44. Sheet C-902 includes both a Typical House Connection detail and a Sewer Lateral detail. Since both details show the same information, one of the details can be eliminated.
Response: **Sewer lateral detail has been removed from C-902**
45. Sheet C-902 includes a Sewer Manhole Frame and Grate detail. The title of the detail should be changed to Frame and Cover. In addition, the plans should be revised to show where new frame and covers are proposed.
Response: **Detail was renamed to Frame and Cover as requested. Call outs have been added to Sheet C-301 to clarify where covers will be used.**
46. The Outlet Control Structure Detail on sheet C-902 shows that the 4' wide weir will be at elevation 104.20 whereas sheet C-401 shows the weir at elevation 614.20. This discrepancy must be resolved.
Response: **Outlet control detail has been updated to show a weir elevation of 614.20 to be consistent with Sheet C-401.**
47. Sheet C-902 includes a R-Tank-XD Detention System detail with a callout for a forebay area 9 units deeper than the rest of the system. The location and size of the forebay unit must be shown on the plans. In addition, the overall dimensions and number of units in each part of the detention system must be shown. Also, a detail of an R-Tank-XD Unit must be added to the plans. Finally, sheet C-401 shows that the top of the chamber will be at elevation 615.31 and the bottom of the chamber will be at 613.81 which is only 1.5 ft deep. We question if this depth is to the bottom of the forebay unit or the bottom of the rest of the system. In addition, the depth of the system at the inlet and outlet connections must be shown on the detail.
Response: **The detail on C-902 was a general section, taken from the R-Tank manual. The detail on C-902 was updated to reflect the proposed design. Detention volume calculation was added to the top of C-401 for clarity.**
48. The proposed development will result in the disturbance of more than one acre. As a result, it is classified as a Major Development and is subject to the stormwater management requirements set forth in Section 25-29.4 of the Land Use Regulations.
Response: **The project is classified as a Major Development and is subject to the Stormwater Management Requirements. Please refer to Stormwater Management report which explains the project's compliance with said regulations. Please note that the groundwater recharge is not required because the site was previously developed. A subsurface detention basin is proposed to meet stormwater volume rate reduction requirements. Structural and/or non-structural The site ac the water quality requirements by decreasing the impervious surface.**
49. The Stormwater Management Report should be revised to include a Low Impact Development Checklist.
Response:
Low Impact Development Checklist has been added to the Stormwater Management Report. Please see enclosed revised Stormwater Management Report.
50. Section 2.4.2 of the Stormwater Management Report references a paved-emergency-egress area and a double

inlet catch basin which discharge to the detention basin. We note that neither of these features are shown on the plans. Therefore, the report should be revised accordingly.

Response:

Comment noted. Section 2.4.2 has been revised revised to reflect the site conditions. Please see enclosed revised Stormwater Management Report.

51. The Storm Pipe Conveyance Calculations in Appendix D of the Stormwater Management and Engineer's Report are incomplete. The table only lists the pipe runs from Inlet 101 to MH102, MH102 to Basin, RD1 to Basin and RD2 to Basin whereas it shows on sheet C-401 that 5 inlets, a basin outlet pipe and no manholes are proposed.

Response:

Storm Pipe Conveyance Calculations Table was updated to accurately represent the proposed design. Please see enclosed revised Stormwater Management Report.

52. The Stormwater Management Report must be revised to include calculations for the riprap at the detention basin outlet headwall.

53. **Response:**

Riprap calculations have been added to the Stormwater Management Report. Please see enclosed revised Stormwater Management Report.

54. As stipulated in Section 25-29.10(b)(1) of the Ordinance, the design engineer shall prepare a maintenance plan for the stormwater management measures incorporated into the design of a major development. It further stipulates in Section 25-29.10(b)(4) of the Ordinance that the maintenance plan and any future revisions shall be recorded upon the deed of record for each property on which the maintenance described in the maintenance plan must be undertaken. Prior to recording, the form of the deed must be approved by the Zoning Board Attorney and our office.

Response:

Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Manual has been prepared and included in this submission.

55. In accordance with Section 25-14.3, a minimum of 2.0 footcandles shall be provided for parking lots; whereas parking lots are provided with a minimum of 0.5 footcandles.

Response:

The proposed light levels meet typical IES standards for parking lot areas. The area with reduced light levels inside the gated areas will be further addressed during testimony. We will coordinate with Township as needed if revisions are determined to be necessary.

56. In accordance with Section 25-14.1(e), the Board shall review and determine duration of lighting proposed; whereas proposed timers and hours of operation have not been provided. The Applicant should also discuss whether proposed lighting will be reduced during the overnight hours.

Response:

This will be addressed during testimony.

57. It appears the existing utility pole with cobra head light fixture located within the existing 66 stall parking lot will be situated within a proposed stall based on the re-striping plan. This should be reviewed.

Response:

Existing utility poles with cobra head light fixtures are to remain. Note that the existing striping in this area is proposed to remain in the same location. Plan has been updated to show the poles for clarity.

58. The Applicant has proposed to maintain the 66-stall parking lot; however, current light levels were not provided. Revise the plans to provide existing light levels, to ensure the lot is adequately lit.

Response:

Comment noted. As previously mentioned in this response letter, Dresdner Robin will perform a night-time light level study to document the existing light level at the parking lot. The results will be added to the plan and submitted under separate cover

59. It appears existing parking stall pavement that extends over the west property line is to remain, even though the rest of this area will be demolished. Our office recommends removing the pavement and repairing this area to lawn. Shade trees can be planted just into the property line, which will provide future trees with more soil volume for roots to establish than currently proposed.

Response:

The plans show milling, paving and restriping up to the western curb to the parking stripe roughly parallel to the eastern property line in the "flagpole" portion of the site. This approach was taken in order to minimize impacts on the adjacent parking lot to the east.

60. It appears a grouping of QPH (Willow Oak) is proposed under overhead wires along the north side of the building. This is not recommended based on their mature size. The Applicant should propose a tree species more appropriate to be installed under wires.

Response:

Tree species has been changed. Please see revised Sheet L-601.

61. Our office has concerns with the proposed landscaping along the wood line, due to shade and the trees' ability to successfully establish and thrive. At a minimum, a note should be provided that plant materials to be field located under the direction of the Township Engineer.

Response:

Note has been added C-601 "Landscape buffer along southern property line to include existing trees and underbrush to remain. Proposed landscaping along Woodline to be field located under the direction if the township engineer"

62. In accordance with Section 25-12.10, one (1) tree shall be provided for every ten (10) stalls. The maximum length of a row of parking stalls shall not exceed twenty (20) stalls with an eight (8) foot wide landscaped area provided in between. The Applicant has indicated three (3) trees are provided for the 27 stalls west of the building; however, the Applicant is also proposing 66 stalls north of the building, which requires an additional seven (7) trees. Landscaped islands are not proposed in this area.

Response:

Required number of shade trees are proposed for the new parking spaces, however, no additional trees are proposed in conjunction with the existing parking spaces to remain. Existing stand of medium to large trees is located along the western side of this parking area and these trees are to remain.

63. Revised the plans to add rigid, plastic, open mesh truck guards to the planting detail to protect from the irreparable damage from buck rub.

Response:

Planing detail has been updated to include rigid, plastic, open mesh truck guards as requested. Please see revised Sheet L-691.

Application No. ZB-20-16
Comment Response letter – May 18, 2021
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan with 'C' and 'D'
Variances - Review # 1
424 Eagle Rock Avenue
Block 111, Lot 1.08
Township of West Orange, Essex County, New Jersey

August 6, 2021
Page 10 of 10

We trust you will find the above information and the attached documents in order. Please feel free to contact the undersigned at 201.297-4205 or via email to mneuls@dresdnerrobin.com if you should have any questions or require any additional information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
DRESDNER ROBIN


Matthew J. Neuls, P.E.
Senior Project Manager

CC: Diana L. Chandler, Township of West Orange Zoning Board of Adjustment Secretary (16 copies)