

6 July 2023

Christopher J. Kok, PP, AICP
Township Planner
Township of Wayne
475 Valley Road
Wayne, NJ 07470

**Re: Planning Review #2
Planning Board Case PB-2022-013
1361 Alps Road, Block 2329, Lots 1 and 17
AG-RW Wayne Owner LLC
Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Subdivision
Langan Project No.: 100925301**

Dear Mr. Kok:

We are in receipt of your planning review letter dated February 28, 2023 regarding The Villas at Wayne Hills Preliminary & Final Site Plan and Subdivision application, assigned as Planning Board Case PB-2022-013.

Planning Comments & Requested Testimony

Comment 1

Environmental Concerns:

- a. Environmental Impact Statement
 - i. Given the size of the development, steep slopes involved, wetlands, on-site, and other various environmental issues, Applicant is requested to provide an Environmental Impact Statement.
- b. Site Contamination
 - i. General process: Applicant shall provide a summary of the remediation process from identification of a spill through a final outcome of remediation, including information regarding
 1. Types of contamination (ie. soil, groundwater, etc.)
 2. Process for determining geographic extent of contamination and placement of monitoring wells
 3. The different types of methods used to remediate a site
 4. Types of Response Action Outcomes from the most restrictive to the most permissive
 - ii. Case 11-05-19-1016-14 — Wastewater Treatment Plant
 1. What was the type of contamination and what was the extent of the contamination under this case?
 2. What method of remediation was utilized?
 3. What was the timeline of the remediation effort?

4. What was the final Response Action Outcome?
 5. Are there any remaining monitoring wells? If so, how long do they need to remain in place?
- iii. Case 15-04-06-1351-51 — Building #2
1. How long will the site be monitored for contamination related to this case?
 2. How long will the monitoring wells need to remain on-site?
 3. What have been the results of the annual monitoring since the issuance of the report and do the results require any changes to the conclusions of the Remedial Investigation Report and Remedial Action Report?
- iv. Impacts of Construction on Remediation Process
1. What is the timeline for disturbance within the Areas of Concern resulting from the two spill cases discussed above?
 2. Will any monitoring wells be impacted by the disturbance and will they need to be replaced?
 3. Will construction have the potential to disturb the contaminated areas in a way that would expand the areas in which contamination values exceed maximums permitted under Soil Remediation Standards and Ground Water Quality Standards?
 4. Who would have the jurisdiction to approve disturbance within the Areas of Concern? Have they reviewed these plans and issued any findings/decisions at this time?

Response 1

- a. **An Environmental Impact Statement has been submitted.**
- b. **The applicant has provided both an extensive environmental report from the LSRP of record for the site and testimony to address the site remediation related aspects of the project.**

Comment 2

Architecture

- a. Applicant shall provide proposed building heights in feet for all townhouse buildings per the Township's definition of building height as applicable to the MLR3D-2.
- b. Applicant shall submit a clarified set of drawings for the McPherson Grand showing only the options proposed as part of this application.

Response 2

- a. **A Townhouses Building Heights Calculations Summary Table, dated 7/7/2023, is included in this submission demonstrating the building heights for all townhouse buildings comply.**
- b. **Supplemental exhibit and testimony were provided at the 5/8/2023 Planning Board hearing to clarify the build-out options associated with the McPherson Grand building type.**

Comment 3

Provision of Garages:

- a. Applicant shall provide testimony as to why variance relief can be granted for the lack of garages for the affordable townhouse units.

Response 3

Testimony was provided by the architect regarding the design element reasons for the affordable townhouse units not having garages.

Comment 4

Vehicular Circulation

- a. Applicant shall provide testimony regarding any applications before the Passaic County Planning Board and whether a traffic signal will be required at Alps Road or whether the site will be subject to a right-in/right-out restriction.

Response 4

Testimony has been provided regarding the status of the application before the Passaic County Planning Board in addition to the Township's participation in a meeting with the County to assess the option of providing a signal at Alps Road. The applicant is in the process of pursuing permitting a proposed signal for the intersection and is preparing supplemental submission documents required to justify the warrants for the proposed signal. This work is being done with the understanding that the Township will acquire any easements or Right-of-Way required to permit the construction and operation of the signalized intersection.

Comment 5

Parking

- a. The parking summary included on page 6 of the Preliminary and Final Site Plan set is incorrect. In particular, the table specifies 2.3 parking spaces per market rate townhouse and 0.5 guest parking spaces per market rate townhouse. While 0.5 guest parking spaces are required per townhouse unit, this is included in the total parking obligation for the townhouse unit (ie. 2.3 spaces). As such, 1.8 spaces are required for the individual townhouse and 0.5 spaces for the guest parking for each townhouse unit. The guest parking requirement also applies to the affordable townhouse units. Correct values are as follows:

Use	Unit Ratio	Guest Ratio	Units	Unit Spaces	Guest Spaces
Single Family (unspecified bedrooms)	2.5	0	10	25	0
Townhouse (unspecified bedrooms)	1.8	0.5	349	628.2	174.5
Townhouse (1-bedroom)	1.3	0.5	18	23.4	9
Townhouse (2-bedrooms)	1.8	0.5	45	81	22.5

Townhouse (3-bedrooms)	1.9	0.5	27	57.3	13.5
Total	N/A		449	815	220

- b. The single family units and market rate townhouses are all provided with two stall garages and driveway parking, exceeding the parking requirement by 1.2 parking spaces per unit per RSIS calculations. The affordable townhouses are provided on-street and off-street parking. Guest spaces are required to be made available and thus be provided either on-street or in off-street parking lots. As a result of this, 382 parking spaces are required to be provided either on-street or in an off-street parking lot.
- c. Applicant proposes 403 on-street and off-street parking spaces, 21 spaces more than required.
- d. Plans show a concrete pad for the EV charging station, however, the individual spaces are not identified. Plans shall be revised accordingly.

Response 5

- a. **Based upon our understanding of the RSIS parking requirements, the affordable housing units residents and guest parking are accommodated in the parking ratios provide given the parking is provided in common area off-street parking lots. For townhouses, RSIS indicates in Note B in Table 4.4 in N.J.A.C. 5:21-4.14, guest parking must be provided in on-street or common parking areas and is therefore not included in the ratio required (in this case we have adjusted the ratio to 2.4 spaces per unit for the townhouses being 3/4 bedroom units). See Note 4 on the Proposed Parking Summary table on Drawing GI006.**
- b. **Based upon the response to a. above, please refer to Drawing GI006 for our proposed required and provided parking spaces.**
- c. **Based upon the response to a. above, please refer to Drawing GI006 for our proposed required and provided parking spaces.**
- d. **Plans have been revised to identify the EV Make Ready and Charging Station spaces provided (separate from the townhouse/single family unit provision).**

Comment 6

Pedestrian Circulation

- a. There are several areas of small 90 degree parking where the sidewalk is diverted around the parking area. This increases the distance that pedestrians are required to walk while providing limited benefit in terms of parking. Applicant should look for opportunities to consolidate these parking areas or to shift them into off-street areas where feasible. Potential options would include shifting these spaces into existing lines of on-street parking or into existing off-street parking lots, or removing these space altogether since excessive parking is provided (see comment 6.c). Spaces for analysis are on road B, C, D, E, G, H, and K.
- b. Applicant has revised sidewalks to create a more efficient pedestrian pathway. There is one remaining area identified by the Planning Department where additional efficiency could be gained as shown below.

- c. Planning Department requested that Applicant consider inclusion of mid-block pathways in several areas. Applicant reported back that due to the significant grade changes, the pathways would not be ADA accessible and would create other challenges and as such, these mid-block pathways will not be proposed.

Response 6

- a. **The intent of the layout of the guest parking is specifically to distribute guest parking throughout the site. This along with constraints of available space between each building and their respective driveways has dictated where guest parking can be provided.**
- b. **The sidewalk has been revised accordingly. Refer to Drawing CS101.**
- c. **Acknowledged.**

Comment 7

Site Amenities

- a. Applicant shall provide testimony regarding the types of amenities and programming that will be available to residents.

Response 7

Testimony has been provided in this regard.

Comment 8

Signage

- a. Planning Department does not object to the size of the proposed signage.

Response 8

a. Acknowledged.

Comment 9

Lighting

- a. Proposed lighting does not appear to be evenly distributed throughout the proposed streets. Lighting shown on Road A between Road B and Road C is a good example of consistent coverage, whereas, lighting on Road H between Road D and the beginning of the townhouses is a good example of poor spacing of lighting. Applicant shall provide testimony as to means to install more even and sufficient lighting. During a technical review meeting, the Applicant's engineer identified the K.Hovnanian development on Fairview Avenue in Cedar Grove as having similar lighting. Township Planner has conducted a site visit at night and is satisfied with the lighting at the K.Hovnanian development. Applicant shall provide copy of the lighting plan from this development for review by the Planning Department to determine extent to which lighting values are similar.

Response 9

Lighting Plans for the K.Hovnanian site have been provided and the lighting provided by the applicant's design provides similar type of lighting levels with improvements to the lighting at intersections and parking facilities.

Comment 10

Landscaping

- a. Applicant is proposing substantial landscaping and has increased the number of trees along the internal streets as well as the general number of plantings throughout the site based upon comments in preliminary reviews.

Response 10**Acknowledged.****Comment 11**

Stormwater Management

- a. Applicant proposes substantial development on a large, sloped piece of land. The Planning Department has heard concerns from several nearby residents regarding the impact this project will have on stormwater runoff. Given the importance of stormwater management, Applicant is requested to provide thorough and clear testimony on stormwater in regards to the following:
 - i. General Overview
 1. Conceptual basis for stormwater management
 2. Analysis of site
 3. Choice of points of analysis
 4. Why the different drainage systems were routed to each of the points of analysis
 - ii. Scope of Impact
 1. Impacts on the subject property
 2. Impacts on adjacent properties
 3. Impacts on drainage infrastructure between the subject property and Packanack Lake
 4. Impacts on Packanack Lake
 - iii. Topics
 1. Impact of runoff, including total runoff, peak hour runoff, and sufficiency of existing and proposed infrastructure to handle runoff.
 2. Water quality, including:
 - a. The amount of erosion or sedimentation likely to result from the project
 - b. The usage of fertilizer on-site and amount of fertilizer that will drain off-site. Of particular concern is any accumulations that could result in algal blooms in Packanack Lake.
 3. Infiltration, including amount of water currently and proposed to be infiltrated on-site.

Response 11**Testimony has been provided in this regard.****Comment 12**

Waste Management

- a. Applicant shall provide testimony as to how waste will be managed on site, including for the single-family dwellings, the market rate townhouses, and the

affordable townhouses. Applicant shall provide testimony as to whether recycling will be provided with the on-site dumpsters.

Response 12

Testimony has been provided in this regard.

Comment 13

R-30 Single Family Dwellings

- a. Applicant shall revise plans to note the minimum front yard setback of 38.9 feet. In particular, it's recommended that the dwellings be built closer to the minimum setback in order to reflect the existing character of the Olga Street. Furthermore, shifting the buildings forward will create larger back yards for the use by the future residents and create a larger distance between the new dwellings on Olga Street and existing dwellings on Stone Hill Road.

Response 13

The plans have been revised accordingly. Refer to Drawing CS105.

We trust that these revisions meet your approval and we look forward to your expedited review. Please feel free to contact me directly at 973-560-4987 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc.



John Coté, PE, LEED AP
Associate Principal/VP

JCC/kk

Enclosure(s): Preliminary & Final Site Plans, dated last revised 7/6/2023
Major Subdivision Plans, dated last revised 7/6/2023
Stormwater Management Report, dated last revised 7/6/2023
Stormwater Operation & Maintenance Manual, dated last revised 7/6/2023
Building Height Calculations, dated 7/7/2023
Exhibit EX10 – Temporary Model Unit Parking Site & Grading Plans, dated 7/6/2023

cc: Meryl Gonchar, Sills Cummis & Gross P.C.
Corey Klein, Sills Cummis & Gross P.C.
Jonathan Grebow, AG-RW Wayne Owner, LLC
Brett Owings, AG-RW Wayne Owner, LLC