



**Hackettstown Office**  
43A Newburgh Rd, Suite 100  
Hackettstown, NJ 07840  
**Regional Offices**  
Corporate Wall, NJ  
Camden, NJ  
New York, NY

March 17, 2021

Ms. Beth Foley  
Planning Board Secretary  
**MENDHAM TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**  
2 West Main Street  
Brookside, NJ 07926

Re: **Hillandale- Technical Review #1**  
Block 100, Lot 17.03  
22 St. John's Drive  
Township of Mendham, Morris County  
*FPA Job Number: 13311.082*

Dear Ms. Foley:

As requested, our office has completed a review of the documents related to the above listed application. The following documents were reviewed:

1. Mendham Township Application for Development dated 2/11/2021,
2. Application Checklist dated 2/11/2021,
3. Preliminary and Final Major Site Plans prepared by Gladstone Design, Inc., dated 2/12/2021, revised through 2/24/2021,
4. ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey for 22 St. John's Drive prepared by Apgar Associates, dated 10/15/2014, revised through 6/27/2018,
5. Architectural Plans for Hillandale at Mendham-A Residential Community prepared by CPL Partnership, dated 2/12/2021,
6. Stormwater Management Report prepared by Gladstone Design, Inc., dated 2/12/2021,
7. Hillandale Operations and Maintenance Manual for Stormwater Management Facilities prepared by Gladstone Design, Inc., dated 2/12/2021,
8. Traffic Report prepared by Dolan and Dean Consulting Engineers, dated 2/12/2021,
9. Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Ecolsciences, Inc., dated 2/12/2021,
10. Freshwater Wetlands L.O.I. Presence/Absence Determination Extension prepared by the NJDEP, dated 10/15/2020,
11. Applications to the Morris County Planning Board and Morris County Soil Conservation District, dated 2/11/2021,
12. Additional supporting documentation including: Owner Consent, Project Proposal, Corporation Ownership Disclosure, Fee Calculation Worksheet, Owner indication regarding demolition of existing structures, Prior Resolution of Approval dated 11/16/15,



Easements and Restrictions from the Title Commitment, Tax Certification from Mendham Township Tax Assessor, Certified Property Owners lists from Mendham Township and Borough of Peapack-Gladstone.

The subject application is for a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan located on Block 100, Lot 17.03 as shown on the current Taz Maps of Mendham Township and by street address of 22 St. John's Drive. The site is approximately 18.14 +/- acres in size and is currently occupied by eight vacant buildings of various sizes and related amenities. The application proposes to utilize the Mendham Township ordinance for Reuse of Existing Buildings Overlay District as the basis for the proposed multi-family townhouse development.

The applicant, Pinnacle Ventures, LLC is proposing to demolish all the existing structures and construct forty-four (44) luxury townhomes with attached garages and additional on grade parking. Other related site improvements include lighting, landscaping stormwater management facilities, and all utilities. Access to the site will be from Mosle Road via St. John's Drive. All roads appear to be privately owned and maintained by a homeowner's association.

One bulk variance for a minimum setback for accessory structures is being requested for the proposed development. A minimum of 80 feet is required, where the application is proposing 26 feet for a utility sewer structure and 39.3 feet for a water pump house.

It should be noted that this parcel was the subject of a Planning Board application for age restricted housing and approved by Resolution 15-03 dated November 16, 2015.

We have reviewed the submitted documents which results in the following comments for the boards consideration:

1. The applicant should provide testimony as to the existing and proposed configuration, use and shape of the subject property.

**Cover Sheet**

2. The parking summary provided does not match the project layout. There are 25 visitor spaces on the layout, but the summary only states 22 spaces. This should be clarified and corrected.
3. Note number 16 should be revised to indicated that the unit number layout should be approved by the Township and the Postmaster.

**Overall Existing Conditions Plan**

4. Note number 1 indicates the date of the survey as January 30, 2015. The survey provided with the application is dated June 27, 2018. It appears to have been updated. The existing conditions should be checked by the engineer to ensure that there have been no significant changes to the existing conditions.



### **Existing Conditions and Environmental Constraints Plan**

5. The total first floor area listed for the existing buildings is not the same as that provided on the survey as submitted. The Gym area needs to be checked and corrected, as necessary. This also effects the total square footage of the existing buildings.
6. The applicant has provided a calculation of impacted Steep Slopes. The calculations indicate that relief from the steep slopes ordinance will be required. The applicant should provide testimony as to the justification of these impacts.

### **Overall Proposed Site Plan**

7. The Existing Floor Area calculation should be revised as noted in the previous comment.
8. St. John's Drive should be added to the plan to provide a better understanding of ingress/egress for the proposed development from Mosle Drive. It will also clarify the emergency access connection shown on the layout that splits off St. John's Drive.
9. All the underground features related to the development appear to be depicted, but labeling should be added for clarity. As an example, the sanitary subsurface disposal area is not labeled.
10. If there is to be a temporary sales or construction trailer associated with this project, it should be shown on this overall plan and noted as such. Any temporary parking associated with these trailers should also be shown.
11. Any contemplated signs should also be shown on this plan along with appropriate size, details and lighting.

### **Site Dimension Plan**

12. The proposed road on the plan is labeled as Road "A". This is acceptable for review and general discussion purposes. The name of the road should either be included in the application or will be subject to approval by the Township Committee as a condition of Final Approval.
13. Note 4 allows the developer to substitute pavers or asphalt for the concrete sidewalk without prior approval. We have no objection to pavers, but do object to asphalt as a sidewalk material.
14. Note 5 states that St. John's Drive is to receive a 2" mill and overlay, which conflicts with the notes on the St. John's Drive improvement plan. The applicant should provide information as to the thickness of the existing pavement to verify it is suitable for a mill and overlay. Roadway cores should be provided as well as any indication as to subbase material.



15. The width of the northerly emergency access lane varies from 15' to 17.5' (by scale), and the southerly access lane is to be 16' in width. These widths should be reviewed and approved by the fire department to determine if they are adequate for emergency vehicles.
16. The northerly emergency access hammerhead turnaround should be reviewed and brought up the RSIS standards. The standards require an 18' x 60' hammerhead. There is no turnaround provided on the emergency access located south of units 1-7 and no emergency access behind units 8-12. This condition should require fire department approval.
17. The southerly emergency access lane is to be constructed with reinforced turf. This material should be discussed with the fire department.
18. The emergency access provided to the north of units 19-33 is as much as 160' from the rear of unit 29. This distance should be subject to fire department review and approval.
19. There is no emergency access provided south of units 37-44 and south of units 8-12. This condition subject to fire department review and approval.
20. There is approximately 2 feet between some of the driveways that are adjacent to each other. The applicant should provide testimony as to the ground cover and maintenance of this area.

### **Grading Plan**

21. There are two major retaining walls proposed for the project, one at the end of each cul-de-sac. The applicants engineer should review the top of wall (TW) and bottom of wall (BW) grades in detail along each of these walls. There appears to be a discrepancy between the TW and the proposed grading adjacent to the wall. As an example, there is a proposed grade west of unit 34 labeled as elevation 650 and the top of wall at this point is 643.9. It appears that this correction will require a 22' high wall.
22. Convention places the TW grade over the BW grade on the plan. In many instances these are reversed and intermingled with those TW/BW grades that are shown correctly. These grades should be corrected with the TW listed over the BW grade.
23. A note should be added to the plans indicated that detailed retaining wall designs signed by a licensed engineer shall be submitted to the Township Engineer for review and approval prior to construction.



24. The grades between the top of curb at the west cul-de-sac and the top of the retaining wall is steeper than 1:1. The guiderail and fence will be nonfunctional given their height and grade they would be constructed at. We recommend that the top of wall be raised to a point such that the grade is sloped at 2% max.
25. The grade behind the curb at the eastern cul-de-sac is too steep, similar to what is noted in the prior comment. The top of wall should be raised to create a 2% slope.
26. Contour lines should be adjust such that grades do not direct stormwater toward foundations or retaining walls. Note the wall behind Unit 28 which grades toward the wall.
27. The retaining wall adjacent to the sewer utility building should be checked. It appears it should be 640 not 638 as shown in the southwest corner. The remainder of the wall elevations should also be reviewed.
28. Additional walls may be required between unit entrance sidewalks and adjacent unit driveways where there is a 2-ft drop in grade. As an example, units 5 and 6 have grades of 662.2 and 660.2 between the sidewalk and garage, which will create a grade of over 13%. This condition should be reviewed.
29. There are many instances where the grades do not have surface water flowing away from the foundation, but towards, or along, the foundation. The building code requires a 5% grade away from the foundation for at least 10 feet perpendicular to the foundation wall.
30. Many of the 4' x 4" utility pads for the units are located in a swale and in some instances the swale is in excess of 20%. As an example, there is a swale along unit 18. We are concerned about constructability of the pads, and erosion under the pads and future maintenance issues.
31. There are areas where the grades are steeper than the preferred 3:1 grade. As an example, the grades east of unit 36 are 1.5:1. These should be adjusted to the 3:1 grade.
32. A high point should be added east of unit 30 to direct runoff around the unit.
33. The area directly behind units 25-29 appears flat. A minimum 2% slope should be used for drainage and spot grades added.



34. A high point should be added to the swales between units 24 and 25. The slope between these units is more than 20%. The soils in this area will need to be stabilized to prohibit soil erosion. This situation also occurs between other units and should be reviewed by the engineer.
35. An additional tree removal area should be shown around the U.G.O.S.#2 to MH #2-20 area for construction around MH 31-22. Additional trees to be removed may need to be added into the Tree Replacement Chart located on sheet 17 of 28. Engineer to review and revise accordingly.
36. The plan includes two drainage structures labeled MH#2-20. All manholes should be identified with a unique structure number. Other structure should be checked for conflicts.
37. Detailed grading and spot grades should be provided at and around the level spreader areas. There are grade differences between the spreader ends that needs to be accounted for to keep the perforated pipe level.
38. The engineer should address design and maintenance of the structure, as it requires all discharge to flow through a stone outlet.
39. There are two inlets to be constructed on St. John's Drive near station 2+60. At this station, the centerline grade is over 8%. The applicant has requested a design waiver from Section 16-10.2(u)3 which requires the placing inlets at a 45 degree angle for streets over 6% grade. We take no exception to this waiver.

#### **Utility Plan**

40. We note several areas around the site where underground utilities or utility lines are to be constructed within the 25' Tree Conservation Area. Applicant should provide testimony as to whether construction is allowed within this tree conservation area.
41. It also appears as though the area on the eastern side of the site also contains construction within 10 feet of the property line. A waiver from section 16-10.2(r) is required to allow grading within 10-ft of the property line.
42. The design utilizes a proposed sanitary sewer treatment system which must be approved by NJDEP through a TWA application. Any approval of the project would be subject to NJDEP approval.
43. Underground stormwater pipe should be shown on a detail to better define the construction of the underground pipe network.



44. The utility plan includes AC condenser units on ends up buildings, which creates a grading concern in several areas. Applicant should address how they will connect the condenser units to the AC units in the buildings. Will the condenser lines run through the neighboring units, or through the rear yard?

#### **Soil Erosion and sediment Control Plan**

45. Morris County Soil Conservation District will review and certify the plan. A 5G3-Construction Activity Stormwater (GP) will also be required from the NJDEP.

#### **Lighting plan**

46. We note that the plans provide lighting at key spots such as parking areas, cul-de-sacs, and street intersection. Lighting is not provided throughout the roadway network. The Board may wish to consider if they would prefer a more minimalistic lighting plan as is submitted, or to request lighting on all drive aisles as is common on a development such as this.
47. The light placed at the parking area between units 36 and 37 should be centered on the parking spaces.
48. The light on the southerly side of the western cul-de-sac has been placed over the underground detention facility. It should be moved outside of the basin.

#### **Profiles**

49. The centerline intersection grade between Road "A" and St. John's Drive are not coordinated on the profiles. This should be checked, and the grades adjusted accordingly.

#### **Details**

50. The street sign detail should be replaced with the Mendham Township detail included in the ordinance.
51. The applicant should address whether NJDOT compliant guiderail is required at the end of the cul-de-sacs, or if a more decorative guiderail could be used in the site.

#### **St. John's Drive Plan**

52. The plans as presented should be combined into one set of construction plans. Sheets may be lost or misplaced if they drawings are left in four separate sections.
53. The applicant should address the construction of the existing roadway pavement. Have core samples been performed to verify the pavement thickness, and if the pavement is underlaid with a stone subbase.



54. The pavement section detail should be updated to identify what improvements are proposed to the existing pavement. Note 1 on sheet 1 of 3 indicates that the road will be milled 4" and replaced. The detail should reflect this condition.
55. Some portions of the existing road have potholes which may require a more extensive repair than mill and overlay.
56. Note 1 on Sheet 1 of 3 mentions the repair of existing portions of the mansion. This note should be amended to reflect the modification of the site plan to demolish the building.
57. Now that the application has been modified to include the demolition of the mansion, which will account for additional stress on the roadway. Consideration should be set as to the timing of the roadway repair.
58. A note should be added to the plans indicating that any damage to the roadway during construction should be immediately repaired to not adversely impact the residences along the road.
59. The plan includes the replacement and installation of guiderail, however, no detail is included with the St. John's Roadway plans. A detail should be added. It would be recommended to utilize brown power coated guiderail.
60. The portion of the roadway near station 20+00 appears to be very narrow with little room to widen. We would like the opportunity to review this area in the field with the engineer.
61. At multiple locations, the plan indicates to repair existing culvert as needed. The engineer should address the condition of the existing culvert, and the extent of repairs anticipated.
62. The roadway has multiple small stone walls along the side of the roadway near station 21+00. In some instances, the proposed guiderail conflicts with these walls. The applicant should address if it is their intention to remove these walls and replace with guiderail.
63. A culvert currently existing under the driveway at station 28+00. The existing swale will be paved over once the roadway is widened. The engineer should address how this will impact drainage along the road.
64. We would request the opportunity to review the roadway design with the engineer to review these specific conditions and areas of concern.





65. The sight line profile shows a poor geometry of the roadway and marginal sight lines across a residential front yard. Upon an inspection of the intersection, it appears to indicate that the removal of a large existing tree could improve this condition. The applicant should address if this is on their property. If not, they should approach the neighbor about removing the tree.
66. It is noted that the improvements along St. John's Drive are located in Peapack Gladstone. It is noted that the applicant is responsible for obtaining any permits and approvals that may be required by the Borough.

#### **TRAFFIC REPORT**

67. The applicant should provide detailed calculations which verify the information contained within the Trip Generation Comparison Table on Page 4 of the report.
68. Page 3 of the report makes reference to age restricted housing. It is our understanding that the project will not include age restricted housing. If so, the report should be revised accordingly.
69. Page 3 and Page 4 of the report both include a Table I, it appears that one of the tables is mislabeled. The report should be updated.
70. We reserve the right to provide additional comments on the traffic report following further review of the submitted documents.

#### **GENERAL**

71. The site is designed with a proposed sewer treatment system that is subject to NJDEP approval. A copy of the proposed design should be submitted to the Board for our record.
72. The site is separated from the Mosle Fields with a lockable gate. A note should be added to the plans indicating that this access should only be utilized for emergency vehicles.
73. The applicant should provide testimony as to the intended garbage pickup.
74. Review and approval for the access should be provided from the police, fire, and emergency response departments.
75. The plans should indicate the estimate of import or export of soil. Any soil to be exported shall be deposited in a location outside of Mendham Township unless a grading permit is approved for the receiving site prior to movement. All soil shall be transported and disposed in accordance with all state and federal requirements.



76. The plans shall indicate that there will be no burying of stumps, construction debris, or garbage. All waste material shall be disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws.
77. A note must be added to the plan indicating the following:
  - Deviations from the plan must be approved by the Township Engineer in writing prior to the change. Any deviations without prior approval will render the permit null and void.
  - Any damage to the public road shall be repaired by the contractor at the direction of the Township Engineer prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
78. Any approval should be conditioned upon the applicant obtaining all necessary permits for the project. Including but not limited to:
  - a. Morris County Planning Board
  - b. Morris County Soil Conservation District
  - c. NJDEP 5G3 Construction Activities Permit
  - d. NJDEP Treatment Works Approval
  - e. New Jersey American Water and/or NJDEP Bureau of Water System Engineering
79. Any approval should be subject to the review and approval of an engineers estimate, and the posting of inspection escrow.
80. We reserve the right to provide comments on the stormwater management report, as well as the stormwater operation and maintenance manual.
81. The Operation and Maintenance manual refers to Bedminster Township. This should be corrected.
82. Should the application be approved, the O&M manual will be reviewed for compliance with the final approved plans. The manual must then be recorded and filed with the deed of the property.
83. We reserve the right to provide further comments subject to testimony and as we complete our review of the application package.



Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,  
***FRENCH & PARRELLO ASSOCIATES***

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Keenan', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Denis F. Keenan, PE  
Planning Board Engineer  
Denis.Keenan@fpaengineers.com

cc: Thomas J. Malman, ESQ  
Brian Stolar, Applicant Representative  
Robert Moschello, P.E. Gladstone Design, LLC