



STONEFIELD

engineering & design

March 17, 2017

Land Use Board
Borough of Dumont
80 W. Madison Ave
Dumont, New Jersey 07628

RE: Washington Promenade
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Redevelopment
Block 212, Lot 20 & Block 215, Lot 1
546 Washington Avenue (CR 39)
Borough of Dumont, Bergen County, New Jersey

Stonefield Engineering & Design, LLC is pleased to submit updated Site Plans as part of the Board's continued review process for the above referenced Project. Please find the following items enclosed for review:

ITEM DESCRIPTION	DATED	COPIES	PREPARED BY
Preliminary & Final Site Plans	03/15/2017	20	Stonefield Engineering & Design

As per the recent Borough of Dumont Planning Board hearing on February 28, 2017, discussions with the Dumont Fire Official (Mr. Steve Cavadias), and project review meeting with the County of Bergen on March 8, 2017, please note the following key Site Plan revisions:

1. Zoning tables have been updated to reflect the appropriate Redevelopment Plan standards.
2. Relocation of the trash enclosure on Block 215, Lot 1.
3. Northbound and southbound bus lanes have been added along Washington Avenue.
4. Emergency ingress/egress connection has been added to Stafford Road.
5. The prior noted R.O.W dedication to the County along Block 212, Lot 20 has been revised to note Roadway Widening Easement, a second Roadway Widening Easement is also now noted along Block 215, Lot 1.
6. Patios and decks have been added on Block 212, Lot 20.

The following is an itemized response to the site/civil related comments contained within Boswell Engineering Review Letter, dated February 21, 2017:

Lighting Review

16. The Applicant shall provide the type of lighting element being provided in each lighting fixture on a revised table contained on Drawing C 16 and provide testimony regarding same. According to the aforementioned Redevelopment Plan, Section VII.F., "Low pressure sodium or mercury vapor lighting is prohibited.

Response: The table has been revised as requested. Low pressure sodium and/or mercury vapor lighting are not proposed.

17. The Applicant shall provide the uniformity ratio (avg/min.), intensity for the parking area of each lighting fixture on a revised table contained on Drawing C 16 and provide testimony regarding same. The ratio should not exceed four (4) and should never be equal to zero (0).

Response: Testimony will be provided regarding the uniformity ratio



18. Should the Land Use Board look favorably upon this application, Boswell suggests that there should be a six (6) month look-back review of any lighting installed pursuant to a condition of approval. If there is a problem, the Applicant will correct the matter at his/her sole expense.

Response: Noted.

Stormwater Management

19. Calculations demonstrating the ability of the offsite easement storm draining toward Essex Place to accommodate flow from the project to be submitted.

Response: Off-site survey is being performed to confirm the downstream invert, calculations will be provided.

20. Storm drain pipe sizing calculations for the project's on-site drainage system to be provided.

Response: Storm pipe sizing will be provided.

21. The grading along the east side of Building 'B' to be revised to redirect yard runoff from entering the building.

Response: A swale and yard inlet have been provided.

22. It appears that the first floor elevation of Building 'B' is set too low relative to the adjacent grading on the northern and eastern sides of the building. Inlets located in the center of the drive aisles of the parking lots should be relocated to the curb line and the parking lot grading revised accordingly.

Response: The first floor elevation was raised and inlets have been relocated adjacent to curbs.

23. Additional detail of the offsite drainage improvements on Stratford Road to be provided to confirm the viability of the design. It appears that the amount of cover on the proposed pipe is too shallow.

Response: A window on sheet C10 has been added to provide detail of the Stratford Road connection.

24. It also appears that the Stratford Road gas main is located along the east side of the roadway. The installation of the storm drain at close proximity and parallel to the gas main may affect the stability of the gas main. This should be evaluated/reviewed with PSE&G.

Response: The gas main will be located prior to construction, if necessary the storm pipe will be adjusted as needed.

25. A detail of the rain garden should be provided for review.

Response: A detail has been provided.

26. A detail of the outlet structure for the detention basin should be provided for review.

Response: A detail has been provided.



27. A stage-discharge-storage rating curve of the outlet structure should be provided for review.

Response: This information will be provided for review/approval along with the final Stormwater Management Report.

28. The grading along the south side of Building 'E' depicts approximately a five (5) foot embankment for the parking area which will drain onto the adjoining property. This should be reviewed to have the runoff redirected toward Washington Avenue.

Response: The site has been lowered and a small retaining wall is now proposed.

29. A yard inlet should be added at the southwest corner of Block 215, Lot 1 and connected to the rain garden to better control runoff from the yard area.

Response: The rain garden is now located in the southeast corner due to the Road Widening Easement now proposed.

30. A yard inlet should be located along the swale on the northeast corner of Building 'E' and connected to the catch basin on Delong Avenue.

Response: Yard inlets connecting to the underground basin have been added.

31. Swales should be added along the western and southern side of Building 'C' to direct runoff away from the building.

Response: Low points and yard inlets are provided.

32. The grading along the east side of Building 'C' and the adjacent parking lot appears to be too high relative to the first floor elevation.

Response: The first floor elevation of Building 'C' has been raised slightly.

33. The grading of the parking area over the detention basin and in front of Building 'C' appears to be too flat, especially with respect to the elevation 106 contour.

Response: The grading has been revised to improve pavement pitch.

34. The grading of the north side of the detention basin adjacent to the northern property line should be reviewed to determine if adequate cover is provided.

Response: Adequate cover is believed to be provided.

35. A copy of the geotechnical report should be provided for review.

Response: A copy of the Report will be provided to the Engineer's office.

36. The Applicant shall provide testimony with regard to the entity that will be providing maintenance in perpetuity to the stormwater management system.

Response: The operating entity will be responsible, testimony will be provided.

37. Runoff from this property shall not impact any adjacent properties either during or subsequent to construction. In the event adjacent property is impacted, the Applicant is required to correct this matter at his/her own expense.

Response: Noted.



Review of Landscape and Buffering Requirements

38. Boswell has reviewed the Landscape Plans for the above referenced project, prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design, LLC. We have also reviewed the excerpt from the Borough of Dumont Redevelopment Plan for Block 212, Lot 20 and Block 215, Lot 1 Section E Landscape and Buffer Requirements relative to this property. Based upon our review of these documents, we offer the following:

- FE 1** The plan needs to be clarified for proposed street trees along Washington Avenue. The plan indicates ACE-GRE which is not defined within the Plant Schedule. It appears it is either an October Glory Red Maple or a Village Green Zelkova. Please revisit and revise accordingly.

Response: ACE-RUB (October Glory Red Maple) trees are proposed.

- FE 1** The street trees of either the October Glory Red Maple or the Village Green Zelkova are required to be planted 40 foot on center. The plan as submitted provides 50 foot on center or greater. This is not compliant to Section E.1.a of the Redevelopment Plan. Please revise accordingly.

Response: Spacing has been revised to 40 foot on center.

- FE 1** Section E.2.a of the Redevelopment Plan requires a shade tree be provided at a rate of one (1) tree per every ten (10) parking spaces. This is not fully complied with within the parking areas. Please revise accordingly.

Response: It is believed that the proposed tree locations comply with the intent of the Redevelopment Plan.

- FE 1** Section E.3.a. of the Redevelopment Plan requires a perimeter buffer planting area for Lot 20, Block 212 of average 20 foot and minimum of 10 foot. The applicant indicates compliance to this requirement. However the plan's buffer planting layout provides primarily a 10 to 15 foot planting buffer. Please revise accordingly.

Response: It is believed that the planting areas combined with lawn areas comply with the intent of the Redevelopment Plan and meet/exceed 20 foot average and 10 foot minimum requirements.

- FE 1** Section E.3.b. of the Redevelopment Plan requires the buffer plantings to consist of a combination of plantings to provide a natural simulation and screening buffer. This is not complied with. The plantings proposed are of one specie plant in groupings. This does not comply with the intent to have a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs to create a natural setting and create a varied height of plantings. Please revisit and revise accordingly.

Response: The Applicant will comply. Our office will defer to and coordinate with your office to ensure compliance with all recommendations.

- FE 1** The planting sizes are compliant to the requirements for all plantings except for Section Ec.(4) of the Redevelopment Plan which requires shrubs to have a minimum mature height of 6 feet and a planted initial height of 30 inches. The design does not comply with this requirement for the proposed evergreen boxwood shrub in initial size and the overall mature height for both the boxwood and the inkberry. Please revise accordingly.

Response: The plant schedule has been revised to comply.

- FE 1** Testimony shall be provided addressing compliance to Section E.3.e. of the Redevelopment Plan which requires existing healthy trees within the buffer to be retained. According to the plan, not one existing tree is shown to exist or remain. This should be confirmed in testimony.

Response: Testimony will be provided, the Applicant's intent is to comply.



- 18 Section E3.f. of the Redevelopment Plan requires the buffer plantings to be naturally staggered and not lined up in rows. The proposed plan does not comply with this in the straight lined proposed plantings and also the uniformly, minimally, staggered buffer groupings of same specie plantings. Please revise accordingly.

Response: The Applicant will comply. Our office will defer to and coordinate with your office to ensure compliance with all recommendations.

- 19 Plant bed lines should be defined.

Response: Planting bed lines have been added.

- 20 A Performance Bond is recommended for this application.

Response: Noted.

- 21 A two (2) year guarantee for each planting is recommended.

Response: Noted.

- 22 Hardwood dark brown mulch is recommended. Red mulch is not recommended.

Response: Hardwood mulch is now specified.

- 23 Irrigation should be addressed.

Response: Irrigation will be provided and is noted on the Landscape Plan.

- 24 A maintenance schedule should be addressed.

Response: Noted.

Signage Review

51. It appears that the Applicant is proposing a Freestanding sign just south of the two (2) way access to the development from Washington Avenue across from its intersection with Poplar Street (refer to Drawing C8). There does not appear to be a detail on the drawings with regard to this sign. The Applicant shall therefore provide a detail of this sign on a revised set of drawings and provide testimony with regard to same. The Applicant shall also provide testimony with regard to all signage on this application and how said Applicant intends to satisfy paragraph H. of the Building Design Standards stated in the aforementioned Redevelopment Plan.

Response: Freestanding sign was presented by the project Architect at the last hearing.

Parking Review

52. Parking Table Requirement for Block 212, Lot 20 as per RSIS

Number of One (1) Bedroom Units: 69 units x 1.8 spaces/unit =	124.2 spaces
Number of Two (2) Bedroom Units: 55 units x 2 spaces/unit =	110.0 spaces
Number of Three (3) Bedroom Units: 0 units x 2.1 spaces/unit =	<u>0.0 spaces</u>
Subtotal Requires Parking Spaces =	234.2 spaces
SAY:	<u>235 spaces</u>

Response: Noted.



53. Parking Table Requirement for Block 215, Lot 1 as per RSS

Number of One (1) Bedroom Units: 4 units x 1.8 spaces/unit =	7.2 spaces
Number of Two (2) Bedroom Units: 13 units x 2 spaces/unit =	26.0 spaces
Number of Three (3) Bedroom Units: 5 units x 2.1 spaces/unit =	10.5 spaces

Subtotal Requires Parking Spaces = 43.7 spaces

SAY: 44 spaces

TOTAL REQUIRED PARKING SPACES = 279 spaces

Response: Noted.

54. The Applicant is proposing 289 parking spaces.

Response: 290 spaces are proposed.

55. The Board shall be made aware that there is a discrepancy between the Parking Table for the number of bedrooms specified and depicted on Drawing C3 of the engineering drawings, the number of bedrooms specified on the Architectural Plans and that depicted on page 3 of the "Impact Evaluation Report" regarding Block 212, Lot 20. Boswell took part in a conference call with the Applicant's Engineer and Architect. During this conference call it was determined that the information presented on the Architectural drawings with regard to bedroom type and quantity was correct (in total) and that the information depicted on the Engineering drawings (Drawing C3) and the information presented in the "Impact Evaluation Report" need to be corrected in a revised submittal for Block 212, Lot 20. Therefore, Boswell with the concurrence of the Applicant's Engineer and Architect formulated the above referenced information with regard to site parking requirements for Block 212, Lot 20. The Applicant's Engineer shall provide testimony with regard to this matter and correct the specified parking requirements on a revised submittal.

Response: The site plans have been updated to match the unit counts on the Architectural Plans.

56. Dolan and Dean shall also revise their Traffic Impact Assessment Report to accommodate the above referenced discrepancies.

Response: Noted.

Site Plan Review

57. The Applicant shall provide this office and the Borough with an original survey signed and sealed by a licensed land surveyor in the State of New Jersey that the Site Plan is based on and reference same on the Site Plan.

Response: The Engineer's office will be provided with an original copy of the Survey.

58. The total number of ADA parking spaces shall only be based upon the total number of surface parking spaces being provided (175 parking spaces) and not those contained where there is a garage and driveway. The Applicant is proposing a total of nine (9) Barrier Free Parking Spaces; seven (7) on Block 212, Lot 20 (five (5) accessible spaces and two (2) van accessible spaces) and two (2) on Block 215, Lot 1 (one (1) accessible space and one (1) van accessible space). According to the ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG), the number of Barrier Free Parking spaces required for parking lots between 151 and 200 total parking spaces is six (6) Accessible parking spaces of which five (5) are to be accessible and one (1) is to be a Van Accessible Parking Space. Therefore, Boswell takes no exception to this matter. The Applicant shall coordinate with the Construction Code Official as to the location of the Accessible and Van accessible ADA parking spaces.

Response: Noted.



The Borough's Fire Department shall review/comment with regard to this application especially in pertaining to fire lanes, emergency vehicle access, firefighting availability, site circulation, site access, second means of egress and the like. The Borough's Police Department shall review comment with regard to this application pertaining to site circulation and emergency access.

Response: All comments received by the Fire Official have been incorporated into the updated Site Plans.

59. The Applicant shall provide roadway profiles for this office to review.

Response: Road widening plans with profiles for Washington Ave will be reviewed/approved by the County. Our office will provide copies of said plans to the Board Engineer as well.

60. The Applicant proposes a 39.4 ft. wide right of way easement (7,776 sf) to the County of Bergen parallel to the western side of Washington Avenue. The drawing depicts a "Dedication.". The Applicant's Engineer clarified this matter and shall provide testimony regarding same. If it was a dedication, all setback lines would then be taken from the new property line.

Response: The County is requesting this area be a Road Widening Easement

61. The Applicant is proposing to install concrete sidewalk and curbing to meeting existing along the entire frontage of the site along the western side of Washington Avenue. The Applicant shall provide testimony with regard to the width of the sidewalk and provide said dimension on a revised set of drawings (refer to Drawing C8).

Response: Testimony will be provided.

62. The Applicant is proposing to install concrete curbing along the entire frontage of the site along the eastern side of Washington Avenue and the southern side of Delong Avenue (refer to Drawing C9).

Response: Noted.

63. Grading to the north of Buildings B shall be regraded or swales provided so as not to exacerbate and convey runoff to the adjacent residential properties.

Response: Grading has been adjusted and yard inlets have been added.

64. The Applicant shall prepare and submit a sanitary sewer sizing and capacity report for this office to review in accordance with the requirements specified in RSIS and N.J.A.C. 7:14A- 23.

Response: Detailed analysis was performed and reviewed by the Sewer Authority's Engineer as part of the Redevelopment Plan Process. A copy will be provided to the Board's Engineer.

65. The Applicant shall provide sanitary sewer and storm sewer profiles for this office to review.

Response: It is requested that profiles be made a condition of site plan approval.

66. The Applicant should provide the Board with a status update on their application to the Bergen County Planning Board.

Response: The Application was submitted and our office attended a design review meeting with the County. County review/approval is pending.

67. Construction details should be provided for the proposed trash enclosure.

Response: A detail has been added.



68. The Applicant shall provide testimony with regard to the adequacy of the size of the trash enclosure area being of sufficient size for the intended use.

Response: Testimony will be provided.

69. Soil Movement shall be performed in strict accordance with Chapter 362 of the Dumont Code.

Response: Noted.

70. The Applicant shall provide testimony noting that the fence surrounding the proposed pool shall be in accordance with the requirements stated in the building code with regard to pools.

Response: Testimony will be provided.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Best regards,

Jeffrey Martell, PE, PP, CME, LEED AP
Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC