

STANLEY T. OMLAND, PE, PP, LEED AP
ERIC L. KELLER, PE, PP, LEED AP
WILLIAM H. HAMILTON, PP, AICP, 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
Board of Adjustment Chairman & Members Zoning Board**

**From: Eric L. Keller, PE, PP, LEED AP
Board of Adjustment Consulting Engineer**

**Re: Application No. 1037
BH Landmark LLC
D-Variance Relief
309 South Orange Avenue
Block 1009, Lot 32
Technical Review #2
BCG Project # 080373-SO-021**

Date: November 26, 2019

**CC: Ojetti Davis, Planning Board Secretary
Patrick Dwyer, Esq., Board Attorney
Greer Patras, Zoning Officer/Planner
Sean R. McGowan Esq., Applicant's Attorney**

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

1. Site Plan for BH Landmark LLC, entitled "Proposed Two-Family Residential Block 1009, Lot 32, 309 South Orange Avenue, Township of South Orange, Essex County, NJ", prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design of Rutherford, New Jersey consisting of five (5) sheets dated September 4, 2019, last revised November 14, 2019.
2. Response letter from Stonefield Engineering & Design dated November 13, 2019 addressing the comments from the Topology and Bowman Consulting reviews.

The applicant is seeking approval to convert an existing multi-unit building into a 2-family multifamily house. The lower unit floor is proposed to change from a medical use to a residential use. The applicant and their professionals provided testimony on this application at the Zoning Board hearing on November 5, 2019. The applicant was requested to submit revised plans to address the commentary provided at this hearing and clarify the extent of the requested variances.

Our technical review comments on the various submitted documents are as follows:

1. A list of proposed exterior improvements has been prepared which results in no altering of the layout of the site. Testimony should be provided as to the impact that any of these improvements will have on the existing drainage path(s).

Testimony was provided addressing these items. We concur with the limited placement of curbing to not impede the existing drainage patterns toward the street. While we appreciate the applicant's proposal to provide a rain garden, the selected location is too narrow and may result in long-term damage to the pavement by saturating the soil. We would suggest that the applicant provide additional landscaping materials around the site. These additional plants would draw water from the soil and would enhance the aesthetics of the property.

To improve the soil conditions in the proposed planting areas, the plans should contain a note that these planting areas, previously covered by asphalt are to be excavated to a depth of two feet, gravel and large cobbles are to be removed and that the existing soil is to be supplemented with an organic soil mix suitable for planting beds.

2. The locations of the proposed HVAC condensers should be shown on the plan.

One condenser is now shown on the plans, however, there are two units. The plans should indicate the location of the second condenser unit.

3. Testimony should be provided addressing the continued use of the driveway for lot 31 and interaction between the two properties. Any impacts during construction regarding the use of this driveway by lot 31 should be addressed in testimony. This should include the construction vehicles used and where they will remain when not in use due to the property being adjacent to a County Road.

This was addressed in testimony.

4. The limit of the driveway should be clearly shown and any provision for landscaping beds along the side and rear of the structure.

The plans have been satisfactorily revised to illustrate the limits of the parking area, which provides for adequate maneuverability to the parking spaces. We would suggest that the applicant consider increasing the narrow planting bed adjacent to the east side of the house. If the driveway was maintained at 20 feet in this area a larger planting area could be achieved which would also better direct residents into the parking space closest to the building. Plantings in such a narrow bed between pavement and the foundation will receive little runoff and be overly stressed.

5. The parking is compliant with RSIS for two apartments, however testimony should be provided regarding the need for an ADA parking space and associated accessibility.

While we recognize that the Village's parking standards require a greater number of parking spaces, the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) for parking are governing. As this is proposed to be a two-family structure, Table 4.4 of RSIS indicates that single family parking requirements are applicable. A two-bedroom dwelling requires 1.5 spaces and a 4 bedroom dwelling requires 2.5 spaces. Therefore, the provided parking is compliant with RSIS.

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.