

STANLEY T. OMLAND, PE, PP, LEED AP
ERIC L. KELLER, PE, PP, LEED AP
WILLIAM H. HAMILTON, PP, ACP, LLA, LEED AP
GEOFFREY R. LANZA, PE, PP, LEED AP, CFM
SEAN A. DELANY, PE, PP
JAMES GIURINTANO, PE, PP, CME
MARTIN F. TIRELLA, PLS
THEODORE D. CASSERA, PE, PP
KEVIN P. BOLLINGER, PLS
WAYNE A. CORSEY, PE, PP
ANTHONY J. DILODOVICO, MS
DAVID B. DIXON, PLS, PP
ANTHONY FACCHINO, PE, PP, PLS
R. MICHAEL MCKENNA, PE, PP
JARYD MORAN, LLA
MARC L. OLMEDA, PLS
MICHAEL J. ROTH, PE
JAMES M. WARD, PE
PAUL J. WINTERS, PE, CME
JAMES R. WOODS, PE

MEMORANDUM

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

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

Re: Application No. 268
109 & 115 South Orange Avenue
Ridgewood Commons
Preliminary & Final Site Plan
Technical Review #3
BCG Project # 080373-SO-018

Date: May 31, 2019

CC: Ojetti Davis, Planning Board Secretary
William Sullivan, Esq., Board Attorney
Greer Patras, AICP, PP, Board Planner
John Wyciskala, 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 set entitled "The Learning Experience, 109 & 115 South Orange Avenue West, Township of South Orange Village, Essex County, NJ, Block 1904, Lots 16 & 17" consisting of twelve (12) sheets prepared by Gerard P. Gesario, P.E., of Jarmel Kizel Architects and Engineers, Inc. dated January 3, 2019 and last revised May 17, 2019;
2. Plan set entitled "The Learning Experience Academy of Early Education, 109 W. South Orange Ave, South Orange, NJ" consisting of four (4) sheets prepared by Matthew B. Jarmel, AIA dated January 24, 2019 and last revised May 17, 2019;
3. Plan sheet entitled "Boundary and Topographic Survey of Property, Lot No 16 & 17, Block 1904, Township of South Orange, Essex County, New Jersey" prepared by David J. Von Steenburg, PLS dated 2/5/17 and last revised 5/16/19;
4. Letter dated May 17, 2019 from Gerard P. Gesario providing an itemized response to our Technical Review #2 Memorandum;
5. Correspondence from Inglesino Webster Wyciskala Taylor, LLC dated May 22, 2019;

This submission is made in response to our May 4, 2019 review memorandum.

We have eliminated those comments which were addressed from our prior memo. Those comments containing bold text have not addressed or partially addressed. Our comments on the various submitted documents are as follows:

Site Plans

1. The survey provided is called out as a "Topographic Survey". It is assumed that this survey will also be the source of the boundary information. If this assumption is correct, the survey should be updated per statutory requirements and titled accordingly, including metes and bounds of the internal lot lines. **The survey as submitted is acceptable, the site plans should be updated to reference the latest revision date;**
2. (Former Comment #3) Further the title policy indicates that there is a deed notice related to Parcel 2 (Lot 16). The terms and conditions of this deed notice and any impact on the proposed development should be addressed. Copies of these various documents are to be submitted to the Planning Board.
 - a. **Our office reviewed the correspondence from the applicant's attorney which included a deed notice and RAO. Based upon the deed notice, the engineering controls in place include both concrete and asphalt;**
 - b. **The deed notice under Section I – Restricted Land Uses clearly states "Contaminated sites remediated to non-residential soil remediation standards that require the maintenance of engineering and/or institutional controls cannot be converted to a child care facility, public, private or charter school without the Department's prior approval, unless a presumptive remedy is implemented pursuant to the Presumptive Remedies for Soil contamination at Schools, Child Care Centers, and Residences {N.J.A.C. 7:26E-5.3}" Testimony should be provided with regard to this condition;**
 - c. **Appropriate notes with regard to notice to the NJDEP, requirements for a health and safety plan during construction, monitoring and testing per site remediation standards, LSRP requirements, and engineering control requirements shall be appended to the plans;**
3. (Former Comment #6) The Demolition Plan indicates several areas where existing pavers will be removed. Testimony should be provided with regard to the reuse of the pavers and/or the ability to match the paver color. We note that the pavers may have faded since installation and our office has concerns with regard to matching the color;
4. (Former Comment #7) The proposed realignment of the crosswalk will be subject to approval from Essex County; **The applicant has met with Essex County to discuss the crosswalk. Testimony on the results of the meeting should be provided. Any correspondence from the County should be forwarded to the Board;**
5. (Former Comment #9) The Site Layout and Utility Plan shows the head in parking to the first floor area will have bollards at the head of the stall as well as wheel stops. Testimony should be provided as to why full height curb cannot be installed and the wheel stops and bollards removed. **Testimony should be provided in support of not utilizing full height curb;**
6. (Former Comment #11) The two (2) southerly parking stalls on the east side of the entry drive will conflict with incoming traffic. Additionally, these spaces will have no visibility as there is a building wall on the south side of the stalls which will impact sight distance. Our office recommends at a minimum removing one of the stalls and providing an opening in the wall which will provide additional visibility for traffic entering the site while the parking stall is accessed; **The**

solid building wall adjacent to these spaces has been replaced with a glass storefront which will provide visibility to/from these spaces.

7. (Former Comment #12) The plans propose a dead end parking alignment with an eight (8') foot wide striped area between the building wall and a building column at the end of the striped area. From a circulation standpoint, this is an undesirable condition. Vehicles will have to execute turning movements against a building wall with no buffer; **The applicant has indicated that the striped area will be for the northerly vehicle parked in the end space to back straight into the striped area. While this addresses the movement out of the parking stall, there is concern with regard to vehicles having to turn around in this area due to lack of parking. Testimony should be provided with regard to vehicle circulation and the ability to turn around at this dead end.**
8. (Former Comment #13) The plans propose four (4) parallel parking stalls on the west side of the entry drive. Parallel stalls are very inefficient for turn over parking and will impact a vehicle's ability to enter the site. Furthermore, for these parking stalls to be accessed, vehicles will need to drive to the end of the dead end row and utilize the striped area noted above. The applicant should consider an alternative to this arrangement; **Testimony should be provided with regard to circulation for vehicles entering and exiting the stalls;**
9. (Former Comment #15) A curb is proposed along the easterly property line which is adjacent to the existing parking area on Lot 15. The grades on the adjacent parking lot should be determined to clearly illustrate grading in this area. **Existing grades on lot 15 show that the property slopes to the east. Proposed grades along the property line should be further reviewed. We note that the sidewalk is proposed to be above elevation 140 where the existing grades are less than 140. In addition, it appears that the proposed curb at the rear of the property will be exposed on both sides with the side facing lot 15 having a height greater than six (6") inches;**
10. (Former Comment #16) Testimony should be provided as to how trash collection will occur. We note that the entry driveway clearance to the parking area under the building is limited to approximately nine (9') per the architectural elevations (which should be dimensioned). Additionally, if a trash collection vehicle is able to access the enclosure under the building, it will need to back out onto South Orange Avenue;
11. (Former Comment #17) Testimony should be provided as to the need to sprinkler the trash enclosure as it is beneath the second floor. The Fire Official should provide commentary with regards to this design;
12. (Former Comment #18) The location of the nearest fire hydrant should be identified and the need for an additional hydrant proximate to this building be discussed. The Fire Official should provide commentary with regards to this issue. **The plans are amended to show the location of an existing fire hydrant across South Orange Avenue. Testimony should be provided if the applicant has contacted the Fire Official;**
13. (Former Comment #19) Testimony should be provided as to how emergency services will access the site;
14. (Former Comment #21) It is difficult to determine which direction grade is sloping at the rear of the structure. A section should be provided in this area. **A section is provided however the contours are not labeled. Furthermore, the 140 contour in the parking lot on Lot 3 appears to be in error and should be further reviewed with all other contours;**
15. (Former Comment #23) Roof leader discharge locations should be provided. **The applicant has requested that the roof leader location be made a condition of approval. Our office**

has no objection to same provided the applicant demonstrates that the discharge locations (i.e. how much water is discharged to the front and to the rear) will remain unchanged as a result of the development;

16. (Former Comment #24) A drainage narrative should be provided. While the site is reducing runoff, it appears that a majority of the site will have the site stormwater directed toward South Orange Avenue where in the existing condition a significant portion of the site may not have flowed in this direction. **The applicant has requested additional discussion with our office on this comment;**
17. (Former Comment #26) Testimony should be provided with regard to site lighting and its compliance to the code;
18. (Former Comment 27) The plans should be updated to show where the various pavement treatments such as road and sidewalk pavers are proposed. We note that the road paver should be used in the site driveway. **Roadway pavers should be shown for the driveway on Lot 15;**
19. (Former Comment #31) The building mounted sign details have been eliminated from the site plans. Sign details are to be provided. **The details provided on sheet C-902 are not consistent with the south elevation provided on the architectural plans. Same should be coordinated.**
20. (Former Comment #32) Sheet C-902 includes a Temporary Sign Detail. This sign is depicted as 14' wide by 6' tall. The site plan shows a temporary sign which scales to be 6' wide. This discrepancy should be resolved;
21. The sign details provided on Sheet C-902 are not the same size as provided on Sheet SA-1.3. Testimony should be provided with regard to the correct size and the plans coordinated;
22. Note 20 on Sheet C-200 indicates that existing storm piping could not be located at the time of design and indicates that same will be located during construction. Our office recommends that the drainage system be located prior to final sign off of the plans for resolution compliance. The Board may consider having this as a condition should the project be approved;
23. The topographic information provided for Lot 3 shows that there is a low area along the property line. Our office recommends the applicant provide grading information on the subject lot to alleviate this condition;
24. The grading along the property line with Lot 15 should be further reviewed. We note that the proposed sidewalk along the property line will be significantly higher than the existing parking lot grades shown on the survey;

Architectural Plans

25. (Former Comment #34) The area of the play area has been reduced from 5,038 square feet to 4,017 square feet. It appears this is a result of shifting the fence in a southerly direction away from the parapet wall. Testimony should be provided as to the sufficiency of this outdoor play area for the number of children
26. (Former Comment #35) There are minor changes to the floor plans, including a reconfiguration of the Pre-K/K space, various door locations, the addition of an electrical room and a change to Stair A. It does not appear that the floor area has changed however testimony should be provided affirming this.
27. (Former Comment #36) The façade elevations have been modified, with the building mounted sign moved lower on the building to a more pedestrian scale. It appears storefront windows

extend across the mechanical space, testimony should be provided as to how these windows will be treated so as not to view this space.

Traffic Impact Study

28. (Former Comment #39) The applicant's traffic engineer should provide testimony as to the appropriateness of relocating the crosswalk from the easterly approach of South Orange Avenue to the westerly side. Curb bump outs are provided at the current location to minimize the distance that pedestrians are in the roadway. Moving this crosswalk to the westerly approach will create a much longer crossing distance as South Orange Avenue widens out. Testimony should also be provided as to the need to reconstruct the median island to accommodate pedestrian traffic as it appears the median is within the desired crosswalk alignment.
29. (Former Comment #42) Testimony should be provided as to the appropriateness of a driveway serving a more intense traffic use than what exists being located within the full width of a left turn lane. Observations as to the typical and maximum queue in the westbound left turn lane should be provided in testimony; and the ability of site traffic to make lefts into and out of the site driveway.
30. (Former Comment #44) Testimony should be provided on the utility of and how the parallel parking spaces will be accessed/used. Turning templates may be necessary to illustrate the required maneuvers.

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.