

MEMORANDUM

To: Township of South Orange Village
Planning Board Chairman & Members

From: Eric L. Keller, PE, PP, LEED AP
Consulting Planning Board Engineer

Re: Application No. 253
101 South Orange Avenue Urban Renewal LLC
Preliminary & Final Site Plan with 'c' Variance
Block 1007, Lots 24, 25 & 26
Block 2006, Lot 5 & Block 2007, Lots 1 & 2
Technical Review #5
BCG Project # 080373-SO-007

Date: May 31, 2017

CC: Patrick Dwyer, Esq., Board Attorney
Ojetti Davis, Planning Board Secretary
Sal Renda, P.E., Village Engineer
Philip Abramson, PP, Board Planner
Jay Bohn, Esq., Applicant's Attorney

We have received the following documents for the purposes of conducting an engineering technical review:

1. Preliminary and Final Site Plan for Landmark Developers, Proposed Restaurant with Outdoor Seating, prepared by Bohler Engineering of Warren, New Jersey consisting of eleven (11) sheets dated May 20, 2016, last revised May 11, 2017.
2. Soil Movement Exhibit for Landmark Developers, Proposed Restaurant with Outdoor Seating, prepared by Bohler Engineering of Warren, New Jersey dated May 11, 2017, unrevised.
3. Architectural Plans, Proposed South Orange Landmark Restaurant, prepared by JCA Group, P.C. of Hackensack, New Jersey, consisting of nine (9) sheets. All sheets are originally dated May 19, 2016, except Sheets A-2.0 and A-2.1 which are originally dated March 22, 2016; all are last revised May 11, 2017, except for Sheet A-1.0 which is last revised April 20, 2017.

4. Traffic & Parking Assessment Report for Proposed Restaurant with Outdoor Seating, prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey dated November 15, 2016, last revised May 12, 2017.
5. Stormwater Management Report for Proposed Restaurant with Outdoor Seating, prepared by Bohler Engineering of Warren, New Jersey dated May 2016, last revised May 2017.

We received a cover letter from Bohler Engineering responding point by point to the comments in our Technical Review #4, including responses to the parking exhibit, stormwater management and general comments. We again note that this submittal did not contain a cover letter describing the changes that had been made to the architectural plans and traffic report, as has been repeatedly requested. Therefore, we had to take each document and compare it to the prior document in order to identify the various changes.

We also had a conference call including the applicant and their professionals, the Village Administrator and the Planning Board's professionals on May 30, 2017. The primary purpose of this conference call was to discuss remaining inconsistencies among the plans and reports and to gain clarity on key issues. The applicant indicated that they would prepare exhibits for presentation at the Planning Board meeting on June 5, 2017 to address the items raised during our call.

We have not received revised parking exhibits so the two drawings still have the same title and date but the information provided is different. These should be titled differently for clarity of the record.

Our comments on the revised documents listed above are as follows:

SITE PLANS

1. We believe the square footage of the building should be published on the site plans and not have the information removed. It should be consistent among the documents. There are still discrepancies among the site plans, architectural plans and the traffic/parking report regarding the proposed square footage of the building. This will be discussed further under the architectural plan review section as this is where the data is published. This affects the calculation of required parking per Village ordinance.
2. The Zoning Table on Sheet 5 indicates that the lot coverage has been reduced by approximately 700 square feet. We await testimony that will clarify this change in impervious areas.
3. The plans include a revised concrete pad for bike racks. We await testimony regarding the sufficiency of this concrete pad and how many bicycles it can accommodate.

4. The applicant's engineer has indicated that testimony will be provided regarding the grading differentials on the retaining wall along the west side of the outdoor seating area. The site plans show differences between the top of the wall and the outdoor seating level ranging between 0.8 and 1.5 feet which is now consistent with the detail on the architectural plans.
5. The applicant's engineer has indicated that testimony will be provided regarding the wall height and the lack of space behind the sidewalk to provide plantings to buffer the wall from pedestrians and motorists. This will be further discussed under the architectural plan review section as this is where an elevation of the wall has been published.
6. The applicant's engineer has indicated that they will provide testimony regarding the sizing of the grease trap and how it will be serviced.
7. Our prior comments regarding the stormwater collection system and grading with the outdoor seating area have not been addressed -evaluated. Additional inlets should be considered within the raised seating area, as we do not recommend the entire area draining to one inlet as designed. The storm sewer connection into Scotland Road has been modified.
8. A soil movement analysis has been provided and indicates that there will be a net import of soil onto the site of 303 cubic yards or approximately 20 truckloads. The relocation, filling, grading or excavation of more than five cubic yards requires a soil movement permit per Section 1352.B(2).
9. The applicant's engineer has indicated that they will provide testimony regarding the existing illumination for the balance of the parking lot.
10. The landscaping quantities should be verified. We note that the number of dwarf fountain grass is 132 not the 127 published.
11. The applicant's engineer has indicated that they will provide testimony regarding the existing 12 inch trees along Scotland Road, the proposed plantings in this area and the existing tree within the raised patio area and their continued viability post-construction.
12. The applicant's engineer has indicated that they will provide testimony regarding the proposed plantings along Scotland Road regarding their viability and survivability considering the limited space between the curb and the retaining wall/footings.

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS

13. On Sheet A-1.0 there remains a gap between the beer garden area and the outdoor seating area and also in the southern outdoor seating area which appear to be drafting errors. This remains to be rectified.
14. The retaining wall detail on the architectural plans has been revised to be consistent with the site plans and also the dimensions/construction of the wall has been updated. The interior face of the wall (toward the patio) has been changed to provide a brick facing and a poured concrete base provided in place of block. This provides more substantial wall construction technique than the prior plan.

15. The elevation of the wall along Scotland Road as shown on Sheet A-1.0 does not scale and also does not appear to accurately reflect the height of the proposed wall. Based upon the site plans, the height of the wall from the grade on the Scotland Road side to the top of the wall ranges between 6 and 6.5 feet.
16. In comparing the floor plan to the occupancy table we find the following discrepancies:
 - a. The floor plan shows 134 seats in the restaurant area versus the 133 seats in the chart. This should be corrected.
 - b. The floor plan shows 70 seats in the indoor beer garden area versus the 63 seats in the chart. This should be corrected.
 - c. The entry for the outdoor beer garden has included the benches along the perimeter. How the number of seats was calculated (linear feet per person and total liner footage of benches) should be provided.
 - d. The areas of the various spaces within the building have changed from the prior plans. Testimony should be provided as to the reason for these changes in area.
 - e. Summing the areas devoted to patron use (which is used to calculate the parking requirement) we calculate 6,722 square feet of internal patron area (Areas 4+5+7+10+11+12) and 3,530 square feet of outdoor patron area (Areas 6+8), for a total of 10,252 square feet. This yields a parking requirement (1 space per 50 SF of area devoted to patron use) of 205 spaces. The site plans and traffic/parking report indicate that the area devoted to patron use is 10,050 square feet with a parking requirement of 201 spaces. This discrepancy is to be reconciled.

PARKING EXHIBITS

17. The applicant's engineer has indicated that they will provide testimony regarding the shuttle routing and the impact to four (4) valet spaces.

TRAFFIC & PARKING ASSESSMENT REPORT

18. On Page 3 of the report, the ordinance parking requirements are based upon 7,140 square feet of indoor patron space and 2,910 square feet of outdoor patron space. As identified above this is inconsistent with the revised architectural plans. Using the patron space identified on those plans, the ordinance requirement is 205 spaces. This discrepancy should be addressed.
19. On Page 5 of the report, it states that there are 443 seats in the restaurant including the 125 seats on the second floor. However, as noted above, there is an inconsistency in the architectural plans between the floor plan and the summary chart. Based upon the floor plan there are 451 seats in patron areas. This discrepancy should be addressed.

20. Given the change in the number of seats, the required parking per the ITE Parking Generation Manual will increase. This needs to be reconciled as this impacts the parking analysis as contained in Tables 3 through 6 for the columns "Demand by Seats" and "Demand by Ordinance".
21. On Page 8 there is a statement that "impacts from SOPAC events would likely present minimal differences in the data collected." The basis for this statement should be provided.
22. The information contained in Tables 11 through 14 cannot be evaluated until the questions raised above have been addressed (the required demand by seats and ordinance requirements).

GENERAL COMMENTS

23. Should the Board ultimately act in the affirmative on this application, an engineer's estimate of probable construction costs should be submitted in order to determine the engineering inspection fees associated with the proposed site work, as well as the bonding requirements for the proposed utilities and any restoration bonding that might be required. This could be made a condition of any approval of this application.
24. As part of any approvals, we would suggest an as-built of the completed stormwater management system within the limits of disturbance and in the immediately adjacent area be submitted prior to the release of any bonding or the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. This could be made a condition of any approval of this application.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

25. The revised report is acceptable.

Any revised plans and other documents should be accompanied by a cover letter responding individually to each of the comments presented in this review letter. The cover letter should also outline those changes to the plans that were required, as well as those not readily apparent.