



UNLOCKING POTENTIAL
IN PLACES YOU LOVE

Planning Report #2

Date: August 29, 2020

To: South Orange Planning Board

From: Greer Patras, AICP, PP, Board Planner

Applicant: Jared Lustbader of Vose Avenue Apartments Urban Renewal, LLC
447 Northfield Avenue, Suite 200, West Orange, NJ

Subject: **Application #274 – Vose + Taylor Redevelopment**
57- 65 South Orange Avenue; 12-14 Vose Avenue;
52-62 Taylor Place; and 11 Scotland Road
Block 1006, Lots 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of Application #274 submitted by Vose Avenue Apartments Urban Renewal, LLC. The site is within the Vose & Taylor Redevelopment Zone. The Applicant requests Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval, with bulk variances and design waivers.

On July 29, 2020, we issued Completeness Report #1, which was discussed at Planning Board Completeness Hearing on August 3, 2020. The Applicant agreed to provide outstanding items.

On August 5 and August 12, 2020, our office participated in teleconferences with our colleague Board Professionals as well as the Applicant's professionals to discuss technical review items.

Between August 7 and 10, 2020, our office received revised plans, which had several changes regarding ground floor uses, utility information, and parking configurations. On August 17, 2020, we issued Planning Report #1 in response to the Applicant's revised plans.

On August 17, 2020, the Applicant's Engineer and Architect provided testimony at Hearing #1 which addressed some of our comments from Planning Report #1. On August 21, 2020, our office received revised plans Engineering Plans and Landscape Architecture Plans. This Planning Report #2 serves to update our comments to include testimony given and the revised report. resolved items have been ~~stricken~~, any new comments have been added in **bold**.

The following items were reviewed:

- **Planning Board Application Form and Submission Checklist**, filed July 14, 2020.
- **Preliminary and Final Site Plan**, consisting of seven sheets, signed and sealed by Petry Engineering, LLC, dated May 28, 2020, last revised August 20, 2020.
- **Petry Engineering Response Memo**, dated August 20, 2020.
- **Stormwater Management Report**, prepared by Petry Engineering LLC, dated March 26, 2020, last revised August 20, 2020.
- **Stormwater Management Facility Maintenance Manual**, prepared by Petry Engineering, dated March 26, 2020.
- **Traffic Impact Study**, prepared by Stonefield Engineering and Design LLC, dated March 20, 2020, last revised August 20, 2020.
- **Stonefield Response Memo**, dated August 20, 2020.

- **Architecture Plans**, consisting of sixteen sheets, prepared by Marchetto Higgins Stieve, dated July 7, 2020, last revised August 6, 2020.
- **Boundary and Topographic Survey**, prepared by Pronesti, dated May 23, 2014, last revised August 4, 2020.
- **Material Lookbook**, prepared by Marchetto Higgins Stieve, dated July 7, 2020.
- **Landscape Architecture Plans**, consisting of eleven sheets, prepared by Arterial, dated July 7, 2020, last revised August 21, 2020.
- **Arterial Response Memo**, dated August 21, 2020.
- **Marchetto Higgins Stieve Response Memo**, dated August 6, 2020.
- **Turning Radius for Upper Parking Deck**, consisting of two sheets prepared by Petry Engineering, undated.
- **Rubber Tree Well Information Sheet**, consisting of three pages prepared by Rubberway.

I. EXISTING CONDITIONS

- A. **Site Background:** As early as 1860, the block between Vose Avenue and Taylor Place contained a General Store across from Village Plaza and a forge. During the 20th Century, Lots 1, 3, and 14 were almost exclusively used for surface parking, as shown in historical imagery. On the other hand, Lots 2, 9, 10, 11, and 14 show consistent commercial use. On April 2, 2020, the Vose + Taylor Redevelopment Plan was adopted, creating a new zone for Block 1006, Lots 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, & 14. This area is now zoned as the Vose + Taylor Redevelopment Area, which was previously zoned as the Central Business District.
- B. **Current Conditions:** The Site consists of Block 1006, Lots 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, & 14, and occupy an area of approximately 61,000 square feet (1.40 acres). The Site has a range of uses, from a municipally owned parking lot, to commercial institutions along the Village's primary thoroughfare. Additionally, the Area covers nearly an entire block in downtown South Orange, as lots 9, 10, and 11 front South Orange Avenue, while lots 1, 2, 3, 13, and 14, contain significant frontages along Taylor Place and Vose Avenue. Lot 3 is a municipally owned surface parking area that has vehicular entrances along Taylor Place, and Lots 9, 10, and 11 comprise of one- and two-story commercial buildings. Lot 13 consists of a two and a half story structure with a residential appearance fronting Vose Avenue and portion of a two-story masonry building towards the rear which traverses onto Lots 2 and 10. Lots 1 and 14 are privately-owned surface parking lots and provide access to the Area's commercial uses.



- C. **Neighborhood Context:** The Site is within Downtown South Orange which contains major transportation, commercial, and civic assets, and is less than a five-minute walk from the train station. Properties to the north contain a mix of commercial, office, and civic uses.

The Site includes properties that contain significant frontage along South Orange Avenue, which is the Village's primary commercial thoroughfare and county road. Scotland Road, located east of the Site, is another right-of-way owned by Essex County, and is a north-south thoroughfare that connects the downtown area to Maplewood (southbound) and the City of Orange (northbound). Vose Avenue, a north-south thoroughfare to the west of the Area, is a municipally owned right-of-way that connects to US Post Office, residential uses, and, farther to the north, the Mountain Avenue train station.

II. PROPOSAL

- A. **Proposed Demolition:** The Applicant proposes to demolish all buildings on Lots 2, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14.
- B. **Proposed Construction:** The Applicant proposes to consolidate the lots and construct a new 5-story mixed-use building that will have frontage along South Orange Avenue, Vose Avenue, and Taylor Place. The development will contain 111 residential units, 12,105 SF of commercial space on the first floors, 9,940 SF of office space on the second floor, indoor and outdoor residential amenity spaces, a 205-space parking garage, and other site improvements. The following is a breakdown of what is proposed on each floor:
1. **Vose Avenue Ground Floor:**
 - Parking garage with 125 vehicle spaces
 - Retail space fronting Vose Avenue: 2,410 SF
 - Residential lobby: 1,965 SF
 - Other improvements associated with the residential apartment include bike storage, trash room, office lobby, and mail & package room.
 2. **South Orange Avenue Ground Floor:**
 - Parking garage with 80 vehicle spaces
 - Retail space fronting Vose Avenue: 7,695 SF
 - Community retail space fronting Vose Avenue: 2,000 SF
 - Residential amenity space: 6,335 SF
 - Building superintendent's apartment (2-bedroom)
 - Move-in lobby accessed from Taylor Place
 - Utility room accessed from Taylor Place
 - Bike storage (44 spaces) and undefined storage room
 3. **Second Floor:**
 - 23 residential units (5 one-bedroom, 17 two-bedroom, 1 three-bedroom)
 - Office space: 9,940 SF
 - Indoor amenity space: 1,260 SF
 - Outdoor amenity deck (approx. 6,000 SF)
 4. **Third Floor:**
 - 31 residential units (8 one-bedroom, 23 two-bedroom)
 5. **Fourth Floor:**
 - 31 residential units (8 one-bedroom, 22 two-bedroom, 1 three-bedroom)
 6. **Fifth Floor:**
 - 25 residential units (11 one-bedroom, 13 two-bedroom, 1 three-bedroom)
 - Outdoor amenity deck (approx. 5,000 SF)
 7. **Roof:** HVAC equipment, generator, stairwells, and elevator bulkheads
 8. **Streetscape + Public Realm:**

- Pedestrian alleyway between South Orange Avenue and Taylor Place with a connection to Scotland Road with amenities including bicycle parking, trash receptacles, planters, bench type seating, and movable tables and chairs.
- 14 street trees
- Streetscape amenities including bench type seating, movable tables and chairs, planters, and trash receptacles.
- Decorative sidewalk pavers with tactile features denoting vehicular entrances
- A thermoplastic crosswalk across Taylor Place
- Lighted bollards at the South Orange Avenue and Taylor Place crosswalks

C. **Bulk Table:** Below is a bulk table of the proposed project:

Vose + Taylor Redevelopment Zone Requirements	Required	Proposed Consolidated Lot
Lot Area (Min.)	47,000 SF	61,147 SF
Lot Width (Min.)	230'	208.1' (V)
Lot Depth (Min.)	260'	284.4'
Front Yard Setback (to curb)	8' - 22'	9.1' - 21.1'
Building Coverage (Max.)	95%	84.1%
Impervious Coverage (Max.)	95%	100% (V)
Building Height (Max.)	66'	65.58'
Stories (Max.)	5 stories	5 stories
Floor-to-Floor Height (Retail – S.O. Ave)	13' - 20'	16'-8"
Floor-to-Floor Height (Retail – S.O. Ave)	13' - 20'	12'- 6" (V) to 13'- 3"
Floor-to-Floor Height (Residential)	10' - 16'	10'-8" and 11'-8"
Floor-to-Floor Height (Office)	13' - 20'	14'-6"
Density (Max.)	110 Units	110 Units ¹
Affordable Housing (Min.)	20% of all units = 22 units 50% units on-site	11 units on-site 11 units off-site
Commercial Space (Max.)	24,000 SF	12,105 SF ²
Vehicle Parking Requirements		
Multi-Family at 1 per unit (Min.)	110 spaces for 110 units	125 spaces ³
Office at 3 per 1,000 SF (Min.)	30 spaces for 9,940 SF	10 spaces(V)³
Commercial at 4 per 1,000 SF (Min.)	49 spaces for 12,105 SF	Applicant must confirm⁴
Public Parking at replacement rate of 1 for 1 (Min.)	59 ⁴	Applicant must confirm⁴
Total Parking Spaces	199 spaces	205 spaces
EV Charging Spaces (Min.)	10% of Public Spaces	8 spaces
Tandem Parking Spaces	For office spaces only	For office & residential uses (V)
Tandem Spaces – Quantity (Max.)	15 spaces	28 tandem spaces (V)
Parking Stall Size (Min.)	9' wide x 18' long	8.5' wide x 18' long (V)
Bicycle Parking Requirements		
Commercial at 4 per 1,000 SF (Min.)	49 spaces for 12,105 SF Public + unsheltered	Applicant must provide ⁵
Multi-Family at 0.18 per unit (Min.)	20 spaces for 110 units Private + sheltered	Applicant must provide ⁵
Office at 0.5 per 1,000 SF (Min.)	5 spaces for 9,940 SF Public + sheltered	Applicant must provide ⁵
Total Bicycle Parking Spaces	74 spaces	Applicant must provide⁵

(M) Variance Required

¹ 110 residential units plus one building superintendent apartment. Per Redevelopment Plan, "the one (1) unit reserved for building operations staff shall not be counted as part of overall residential density."

² Inconsistencies between the Engineer's bulk chart, which reports 19,915 SF, and the Architect's plans, which show 12,105 SF.

³ Inconsistencies between the plans regarding parking. The Applicant must confirm all parking counts for each use, confirm which parking spaces are for the public, and label the different parking spaces on the plans accordingly.

⁴ All public parking may be counted towards any onsite commercial parking requirement, per RDP.

⁵ Inconsistencies exist between the Engineer's bulk chart and the information shown on the other professionals' plans.

III. VARIANCE DISCUSSION

A. **Requested Variances:** The Applicant will require the following "c" variances from the Redevelopment and or the Land Development Ordinance:

1. **Section 6.2.1.D: Lot Width (Min.)** Where 30' is required, but 208.1' is proposed
2. **Section 6.2.1.F: Impervious Coverage (Max.)** Where 95% is required, but 100% is proposed
3. **Section 6.2.1.I: Floor-to-Floor Height (Retail – S.O. Ave)** Where between 13' and 20' is required but 12' 6" is proposed
4. **Section 6.2.2.A.3.b.: Office Parking Spaces (Min.)** Where 30 parking spaces are required but the Applicant proposes 10 "designated" spaces
5. **Section 6.2.2.A.3.b.1: Tandem Parking Spaces**, where only office spaces may be tandem, but other non-office spaces are tandem
6. **Section 6.2.2.A.3.b.1: Tandem Parking Spaces Quantity (Max.)** Where 15 office spaces may be tandem, but 28 tandem spaces are proposed
7. **Ordinance 185-113.B.1: Parking Stall Size (Min.)** Where 9' wide required, but 8.5' wide is proposed for 49 parking spaces
8. **Ordinance 185-142B(8): Temporary Signs:** to exceed size and duration, as discussed in Section IV.B.

Several items remain outstanding in the Applicant's bulk chart, therefore additional variances and waivers may be identified upon receipt of complete information. Relief from specific design standards are discussed in Section IV of this report.

B. **Proof of Standard:** The Applicant must prove, and the Board must find that the necessary criteria for "c(1)" and/or "c(2)" variances, identified by the Municipal Land Use Law at section 40:55D-70, have been satisfied.

For a c(1) variance, the Applicant must prove hardship:

1. By reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of a specific piece of property, or
2. By reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, or
3. By reason of an extraordinary situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structures lawfully existing thereon, the strict application of any regulation pursuant to article 8 of this act (40:55D-62 et seq.) would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the developer of such a property, grant, upon an application or an appeal relating to such a property, a variance from such strict application of such regulation so as to relieve such difficulties or hardship,
4. AND that such relief from the zoning ordinance will not be substantially detrimental to the public good, and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

For a c(2) variance, the Applicant must prove:

1. That the purposes of the MLUL would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirement; and
2. That the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

IV. PLANNING COMMENTS

A. General + Site Plan Comments:

1. The Applicant should provide an overview of the existing and proposed conditions, development timeline, and relationship to the community and public realm. A summary of the proposed uses, the relationship of uses to each other, and the alleyway and streetscape improvements should be discussed in context with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan.
2. Testimony should be provided on the operations of the proposed office and commercial spaces including permitted/anticipated uses, hours of operation, employees, and site traffic.
3. The Applicant should discuss the residential use including amenities, parking, building access, and moving procedures such internal routes and moving truck parking. Additionally, if the apartment will be pet-friendly, dedicated pet relief areas should be considered, as well as bag/bin systems for waste.
4. Applicant must discuss existing and proposed easements which per Completeness Item #49 must be shown on the plan.
5. The Traffic Study indicates that a 4,500 SF fitness center is proposed. The Applicant should confirm whether this is a proposed commercial use or a residential amenity.

B. Architecture + Signage Comments:

1. The Applicant should provide an overview of the proposed building design, massing, and materials. A primary goal of the Redevelopment Plan is high quality architecture that "encourages the development of iconic architecture that respects the existing neighborhood fabric and provides a visual gateway to downtown South Orange."

The Applicant should discuss the design requirements of the RDP at Section 6.2.3.1. Material samples and/or renderings should be presented to show each facade and the human-scale experience at along the ground floors. We recommend any finalization of design items be done in conjunction with the Design Review Board.

We acknowledge that different screens show different colors and that physical samples cannot be provided due to COVID, therefore we continue to recommend that building final materials and colors be provided to and coordinated with the DRB.

Applicant should provide clear renderings of the Taylor Place façade. The renderings presented had trees over critical areas and had showed white block floor on the roof. Particular attention should be given to the treatment of the change between two floors due to significant slope change, the vent systems required for utilities, and doors associated with maintenance/moving only.

Additionally, floor-to-floor heights should be shown on the plans.

- ~~2. Building sustainability should be discussed. The Redevelopment Plan states recommends Energy Star appliances within residential and commercial units. The Applicant has testified that they will provide Energy Star appliances within units, use lightly colored materials on the roof, provide a centralized hot water system, and overall be low water consuming.~~
- ~~3. The Applicant should discuss typical bedroom layouts and discuss the affordable housing. Testimony was provided.~~

4. The Applicant shall provide testimony regarding of all storage rooms including whether used for commercial storage, residential storage, or building maintenance, etc. **Plans should be labeled accordingly.**
5. ~~The Applicant should discuss the proposed sign package. Testimony must be provided regarding the required variance relief.~~ **Testimony was provided.**

We note that the plans contain placeholders for future sign design. If the Board approves the sign package as is, we recommend that final materials and designs be done in coordination with the Design Review Board prior to building permits. **This should be a condition of approval.**

6. The Applicant should provide an overview of regarding the temporary signage package and testimony in support of the requested relief for both size and duration. **This item must be discussed. We recommend the final design to be in conjunction with Board Professionals and/or the Design Review Board.**

Compliance with the RDP as well as the 2020 sign ordinance is as follows in the table below. Some of this information was provided in a response letter or during TCCs, but all of this information must be added to the plans.

Signage Requirements	Required	Proposed
Vose Avenue Frontage		
Wall Sign Area (Max.) (1.5 SF of sign area for each 1' of the business width)	82' retail width =123 SF	3 signs at 24 SF each =72 SF
Wall Sign Letter Height (Max.)	24"	14"
Signage per Frontage Area (Max.)	200 SF	72 SF wall +32 SF canopy = 104 SF total
Projecting Sign Area (Max.)	9 SF	9 SF
Canopy/Projecting Sign Extension (Max.)	4' from building	2' from building
Projecting Sign Height (Min.)	8' from ground	8' above ground
Canopy Sign Letter Height (Max.)	24"	14"
South Orange Avenue Frontage		
Wall Sign Area (Max.) (1.5 SF of sign area for each 1' of the business width)	122 retail width = 183 SF	4 signs at 30 SF each + 1 sign at 44 SF = 164 SF
Wall Sign Letter Height (Max.)	24"	14"
Wall Signage per Frontage Area (Max.)	200 SF	164 SF
Projecting Sign Area (Max.)	9 SF	4 signs at 7 SF each
Projecting Sign Extension (Max.)	4' from building	2' from building
Projecting Sign Height (Min.)	8' from ground	8' above ground
Taylor Place Frontage		
Projecting Sign Area (Max.)	9 SF	9 SF
Canopy/Projecting Sign Extension (Max.)	4' from building	2' from building
Projecting Sign Height (Min.)	8' from ground	8' above ground
Canopy Sign Letter Height (Max.)	24"	14"
Temporary Signage		
Temporary Sign Quantity (Max.)	1 sign on building	3 signs (V)
Vose Avenue		
Temporary Sign Area (Max.)	25 SF	225 SF (V)
Temporary Sign Time Limit (Max.)	30 days	540 days (V)

South Orange Avenue		
Temporary Sign Area (Max.)	25 SF	400 SF (V)
Temporary Sign Time Limit (Max.)	30 days	540 days (V)
Scotland Road Frontage		
Temporary Sign Area (Max.)	25 SF	720 SF (V)
Temporary Sign Time Limit (Max.)	30 days	540 days (V)
(V) Variance Required		

C. Streetscape + Alleyway Comments:

~~1. Preliminary streetscape and alleyway concepts were presented to an ad hoc streetscape review committee in May and June. The recommendations by the committee and responses made by the Applicant should be discussed. Changes made since the committee's review should be highlighted.~~

2. The Applicant should discuss the use, operation, and design of the alleyway and streetscape, and compliance with the requirements in Section 6.3.6, as well as the RDP goal to *"Design public and open spaces in and around the property to provide the opportunity for social interaction and enjoyment. This includes areas for outdoor dining and passive outdoor recreation."*

Testimony was provided which explained that the movable tables on South Orange Avenue and along the alleyway entrance on South Orange Avenue were illustrative only. The Applicant should provide testimony to confirm what, if any, furnishings will be provided in this area and on how the design would achieve the RDP's goal of *"passive outdoor recreation"* and *"providing palate of furniture, fixtures, and finishes for seating that are modern, human-oriented, and imaginative."*

3. While not compliant with requirements in section 6.3.6.A which stipulates that no less than 8' of unobstructed sidewalk space be maintained for pedestrians, we believe the proposed placement of tables within the alleyway achieves the intent of the RDP to design spaces that create opportunities for social interaction and enjoyment. We recommend a minimum width of 6' remain unobstructed for pedestrians. **Testimony was provided that these tables would be movable and illustrative only. Details should be provided on the plans to confirm any plans for seating in this area, and what entity will be responsible for maintaining them.**

~~4. The Applicant currently proposes several types of sidewalk material along each frontage, where the original versions had a comprehensive and replicable look on the frontage, with a distinct treatment in the alley. This should be discussed.~~

5. The Applicant requires relief for sidewalks less than 12' in some locations. This should be discussed. **Testimony was provided which expressed the difficulties in achieving minimum sidewalk widths along Vose Avenue due to existing site conditions along Vose Avenue, where these deviations occur. The current plans show points along Vose Avenue of 8', which would allow for a minimum of 6' for pedestrian through traffic according to the Applicant's testimony. Additional testimony should be provided as to why the new building design can't accommodate the minimum 12' width required, as a part of the variance testimony. Sidewalk width should be increased where cars queue at the garage doors.**

6. The chart on engineering sheet SP-1 indicates that the roadway walkways will not be ADA compliant. This must be resolved. **The Applicant provided testimony which clarified that ADA compliance in the roadways would be difficult due to the existing grade of the streets surrounding the project site. We defer comment to the Board Engineer for compliance in this matter.**

7. RDP Section 6.3.5.D.1 requires pedestrian improvements such as new/improved crosswalks at specified locations as well extended curbs at intersections. Compliance or requested relief must be discussed. **Testimony was provided that the Applicant would only be improving crosswalks that are included within**

the project area and creating a bumpout at the intersection of Taylor Avenue and Vose Avenue. The Applicant explained that existing crosswalks of Scotland Road and Vose Avenue are sufficient for safe pedestrian travel and would not be improved as part of this project. We anticipate testimony in support of the variance to be provided by the Applicant's Planner.

8. It was requested at the Completeness Hearing that, prior to construction, a pedestrian safety plan showing details be prepared and approved by the Village Engineer and Police as applicable. **The Applicant should confirm agreement with this as a condition of approval.**
9. While the proposed street tree placement does not provide a shade tree every 25' as required in RDP section 6.3.7.A.3, we believe that the proposed plan provides an adequate tree canopy and meets the intent of the plan. The relief requested for tree pit design should be discussed. **Testimony has been provided and the Applicant agreed to coordinate with the Environmental Committee.**
10. The RDP contains goals related to green infrastructure elements to reduce runoff and improve local water quality, and recommends the use of passive non-structural stormwater management techniques. Such plan features should be discussed. **We defer to the Board and Board Engineer regarding this item.**
11. **Details should be provided for the use of the alleyway space between the entrance to the parking deck and the row of bollards perpendicular to the alleyway entrance on Scotland Road. We recommend bollards are located at the end of the driveway, before it turns into the garage, to cue the drivers to turn. Otherwise, drivers may think the bollards are the terminus of the drive lane and overshoot the garage entrance.**

D. Parking + Circulation:

1. Regarding the on-site spaces within the parking garage, some inconsistencies between the plans were identified and discussed amongst the professionals during the TCC. It is our understanding that revised plans will be provided to address these issues. Therefore, we'll withhold the majority of our parking, loading, circulation, and traffic comments until then. At this time, we offer the following notes:
 - a. Plans will provide labels for each space/row to indicate user. **This has not been indicated on the plans. The Applicant should discuss whether the spaces will be dedicated to each use or shared.**
 - b. and a compliance chart will show the required and proposed number of spaces per each use, and other parking requirements of the RDP and ordinance, such as stall size, tandem spaces, etc. **The plans do not specify compliance with the parking requirements of the ordinance per use.**
 - 1) The RDP requires a minimum of 110 spaces for the residential use, 30 spaces for the office use, 49 spaces for the commercial use, and a minimum replacement of 1 public space per each 1 public space that was removed. The engineering plans indicates that 59 public spaces will be removed. *(The traffic study repost 57 public spaces exist/are being removed; this should be clarified.)* The RDP permits the public parking to be counted towards the onsite commercial parking requirement. Therefore, the total parking requirement is 110 (residential)+30 (office)+59 (public replace/commercial) = 199 total spaces.
 - 2) The chart on sheet SP-1 of the engineering plans states a minimum of 180 spaces and a maximum of 198 spaces are required, and cites a variance for exceeding the maximum requirement by providing 205 spaces. This must be clarified.
 - 3) The note on sheet SP-1 of the engineering plans states that 125 residential spaces, 80 office/commercial/public spaces, and 10 designated office spaces are proposed.
 - a) 30 office spaces are required and 10 designated spaces are proposed. These 10 spaces are tandem spaces. The deviation required should be discussed.
 - b) The RDP has distinct requirements for commercial/public and office separately. Compliance should be discussed.

- 4) The traffic study states *"Under existing conditions, the Taylor Place municipal parking lot provides 57 two-hour spaces for patrons visiting Downtown South Orange Village. Under the proposed development program, 80 public parking spaces would be provided, a 23-space increase, with a portion of the spaces designated for on-site employees and a portion designated for patrons of local businesses."* The Applicant should clarify the designation of spaces.
 - c. All traffic signage, wayfinding signage, and pedestrian safety controls, etc., should be shown on the plan. **These are still not shown on the plans.**
 - d. We recommend end islands (ie. 3' wide striping) at the end of parking rows where adjacent to doors or narrow drive-aisle intersections. **The plans have not been revised with any end islands, and no dimensions are shown on the engineering plans.**
 - 1) Conflicts between parked cars should be addressed. **The Stonefield response letter states that curb stops will be added but none are shown on the plan.**
 - 2) Some spaces appear inaccessible. **No changes have been made to address lack of backout space, narrow turning areas, etc. Stonefield response letter states that this will be addressed via testimony. We defer further comment to the Board Engineer.**
 - e. Plans will confirm compliance with all ADA regulations and show space and aisle widths.
 - 1) **No dimensions are shown on the engineering plans.**
 - 2) **We expressed some concern regarding location and configuration of ADA spaces and routes and offered recommendations previously. No changes have been made. We defer compliance to the Board Engineer.**
 - 3) **The traffic study reports 6 ADA spaces are proposed, where engineering plans list 5. The actual requirement and proposal must be clarified.**
 - f. The Traffic Engineer should provide testimony regarding the findings of the traffic study. 110 residential spaces are required per the RDP, and 125 spaces are proposed, suggesting some desire for 1-2 cars per unit. However, the study anticipates only 30 morning peak trips departing the site, suggesting under a quarter of cars are making an AM commute in cars. Number of required/proposed spaces and anticipated trips should be discussed.
 - g. The Traffic Engineer should discuss the parking entry and garage door on Vose Avenue. Procedure for door opening/closing should be discussed. The amount of space for car queuing while waiting to enter should be discussed, and whether cars will queue on Vose or the sidewalk driveway. A bump out, widened sidewalk or inset garage door could be considered.
 - h. Testimony should be provided regarding the tandem spaces. 10 office spaces will be tandem spaces; these are the only dedicated office parking spaces. 18 residential spaces are tandem, where tandem spaces are not permitted for this use. The engineering plan note 14 tandem spaces are proposed. This should be discussed.
2. The reconfiguration of on-street parking and loading should be discussed.
 - a. An existing conditions plan should show the number of existing on-site and on-street spaces. Applicant should confirm public parking spaces are being replaced or increased.
 - b. The proposed on-street loading strategy must should be discussed. The treatment of the loading area (striping, signage, etc.) should be clarified on the plans.
 - c. Coordination with streetscape elements (trees, benches, etc.) should be designed to provide clear routes.
 - d. We recommend a ramp or depressed curb be provided in this area for moving carts/delivery dollies, etc.

3. Per RDP, 10% of all public parking spaces shall accommodate electric vehicle charging. The Applicant's response indicates 8 spaces will be provided. Details showing including location, utilities, signage, etc. must be shown on the plans. **No details/locations have been added to the plans.**
4. Testimony must be provided to regarding the requirements of the Redevelopment Plan, specifically the goal to establish a permanent pedestrian connection between South Orange Avenue and Taylor Place that is accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. The Board and the Applicant should discuss the use of the alleyway, and relationship between pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles entering the garage, and loading areas. To minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles within the alleyway, we recommend the following:
 - a. Establish an easement with the property owner of Block 1006, Lot 4 to provide a safe pathway for exclusive pedestrian use within the alleyway.
 - b. Install mirrors at the entrances to the parking deck to provide sightlines of the alleyway for vehicles exiting the parking deck.
 - c. Install a pedestrian warning system with audio and visual signals to provide advance notice of approaching vehicles.
5. Details must be provided for the sheltered/protected bicycle parking facilities, per RDP requirement 6.2.2.B.2. Each room/area should provide the number of spaces. Inconsistencies exist between the Engineer's bulk chart, which reports 66 totally bicycle parking spaces, and the Architect's plans, which shows one room with 44 spaces, one room without a quantity specified and one public sheltered area within the garage without a quantity specified, and the Landscape Architect's plans show unsheltered sidewalk spaces on the plan, but without a quantity specified. A compliance chart showing each required and proposed number of spaces per each use and shelter type should be provided to demonstrate compliance or request relief. **Arterial's response letter states that 25 racks for 50 bicycles will be provided in the public right-of-way. The remaining of these comments remains outstanding.**

E. Lighting Comments:

1. Lighting information is currently spread between all three professional plans. All information including fixture details, footcandle levels, compliance charts, and notes should be one plan. **The lighting compliance chart on the engineering plans should be included on Arterial's lighting plan for consistency.**
2. Per the RDP requirement 6.3.4.A, lighting should be dimmable and controlled by timer. A note should be added that states which fixtures comply with this items, min./max. light levels, and hours of illumination. A note states that the streetlights and bollards will tie into village meter and be maintained by township. **Applicant's response letter states "Arterial will submit revised lighting plan with additional detail", however, such notes have not been added. Details were provided for building mounted architectural lights that cast light both up and down. Applicant should confirm that building elements (i.e. cornices) will shield the light from directing to the sky.**
3. To comply RDP requirement 6.3.4.D, lights should be added to the portion of the alleyway closest to Scotland Road, which shows an illumination level of 0 footcandles. **Applicant's response letter states "Arterial will submit revised lighting plan with additional detail", however, 0 footcandles are still shown in this area.**
- ~~4. The relief required from RDP 6.3.4.J, which requires lighting at crosswalks, should be discussed. Testimony was provided that such crosswalks will be provided, therefore no such lighting is proposed.~~
- ~~5. The mounting height for proposed string lighting should be provided to ensure adequate clearance for vehicles entering the Taylor Place alleyway. A note was added regarding string height which will be 14' over vehicle areas and 10'-12' over pedestrian areas.~~

F. **Utility Comments:**


1. Per the TCC, the Applicant agreed that all rooftop utilities will be enclosed by a screen wall at least as tall as the mechanical equipment. **This must be reflected on revised plans.**
2. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding the ground floor utilities, with particular attention to the architectural treatment of walls, doors, vents, etc. on the Taylor Place facade. **This should be addressed as full renderings of this façade was not provided, as discussed in Section B above.**
3. The Applicant shall provide testimony regarding waste management and removal, the frequency of waste removal, and the method of waste removal (i.e. truck type).
4. We defer to the Board Engineer for all other comments regarding demolition, utilities, safety, noise generation, environmental conditions, drainage, soil erosion and sediment control, and outside agency permits to the Board Engineer.

G. **The plans should be revised to provide/clarify the following items:**

- ~~A survey showing all individual lots, block and lot numbers, lot areas/dimensions must be provided for all lots, per Completeness Items #32 and 34.~~
- Zone specified in the chart on Sheet SP-1 should state Vose + Taylor Redevelopment Zone instead of CBD zone (the heading title for the requirements column says "Code: CBD")
- ~~Light type B-2 will have a detail and it will be included in the luminaire schedule.~~
- Turning radius plan will provide original and revision dates.
- The bulk chart contains requirements that are not related to this project and should be removed.
- Revised architecture plans were not provided; therefore, we are unable to confirm consistency discussed in items below:
 - Proposed grading should be consistent between all plans.
 - Existing and proposed property lines and building footprint should be consistent/clear.
 - Labels should be provided for all storage and mechanical rooms, shafts, icons, etc.

If you have any questions regarding this application, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,



Greer Patras, AICP, PP
Board Planner