

700 Grand Avenue, Unit 5A Hackettstown, New Jersey 07840 T: 908.850.0977 F: 732.312.9801 **fpa**engineers.com

October 17, 2023

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

Re: Mendham Golf & Tennis Club – Pickleball Court Project

Technical Review #1 – Preliminary and Final Site Plan

Block 144, Lot 24

Kennedy Road, Gold & Corey Lanes Township of Mendham, Morris County

FPA Job Number: 13311.134

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. Letter of transmittal prepared by Day Pitney, LLP dated September 1, 2022,
- 2. Application for Development and Project Description, dated September 1, 2022,
- 3. Proposal Letter
- 4. Certification of Taxes Paid, prepared by Mendham Township, dated August 10,2022.
- 5. Certified List of Property Owners (200'), prepared by Mendham Township, dated August 19, 2022.
- 6. Application Checklist, dated August 29, 2022,
- 7. Addendum to PB Application Checklist, dated August 29, 2022,
- 8. NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands LOI for B. 144, L.24, dated July 24, 2014,
- 9. Limited Environmental Impact statement prepared by Yannaccone Villa & Adrich, dated August 29, 2022,
- 10. Transmittal to Morris County SCD by Yannaccone Villa & Aldrich, dated August 30, 2022,
- 11. Resolution of a previous Planning Board approvals dated September 29, 2021 & June 18, 2014
- 12. Transmittal to Morris County Planning Board by Day Pitney, LLP dated May 12, 2021,
- 13. Preliminary and Final Site Plans prepared by Yannaccone Villa & Aldrich, dated August 29, 2022, **last revised August 1, 2023**, eight sheets,

The subject application is for a proposed Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan of Mendham Gold and Tennis Pickleball Court, and shown on the Tax Map, as Block 144, Lot 24, located at Kennedy Road, Golf & Corey Lanes. The project is in the "G" Zoning District. The applicant, Mendham Golf & Tennis Club, is proposing the installation of 4 pickleball courts, with ancillary sidewalk, and stormwater improvement.

## **Technical Review**

Comment 1. - In accordance with § 13-15 of the LDO, "the developer shall pay to the township fees equal to the expenses incurred by the township with respect to the inspection of improvements constructed and installed by the developer and subject to inspection." It is recommended that the board required that prior to any construction,



a pre-construction meeting be scheduled, and construction drawings submitted to the Township's Engineer's office, as well as the establishment of an inspection escrow account and performance guarantee deposited as required by the ordinance.

Comment 2. In accordance with § 21-5A.2 "Supplementary Regulations, the planning board may require screening from view from any road or adjacent residential property where any games other than golf are located 500 feet from any lot line." The applicant has proposed all four (4) pickleball courts within 500 feet from residential lots 40 and 41. The applicant shall provide testimony regarding whether the site has adequate screening of the proposed pickleball courts.

Comment 3. In accordance with § 21-5A.2.a "Clubs shall meet the setback requirements in §21-6.9 of this chapter." In accordance with § 21-6.9b, the ordinance specifies that "tennis courts designed for daytime operation only with no artificial lighting facilities shall be set back not less than 100 feet from any lot line". § 21-6.9c specifies "game areas (other than platform games) designed for daytime operation only with no artificial lighting shall be set back not less than 250 feet from any lot line." The applicant has identified the proposed court as requiring a 100-ft setback, consistent with the requirement for a tennis court. We defer to the planner as to whether it is appropriate for a pickleball court to be categorized as a tennis court.

Comment 4. In accordance with the 2014 NJ Soil Erosion Control Standards, "performed scour holes may be utilized where conditions dictate the impractical use of flat aprons". Applicant shall provide information as to why a flat apron may be impractical.

Comment 5. The sidewalk grade leading to Court B2 appears to be at a 10% slope. Engineer should clarify if this is acceptable.

Comment 6. The proposed sidewalk connection to Court B1 is only 8-ft long. It is unclear if the existing sidewalk is at elevation 556.1 or 556.9. The difference between these two elevations is a sidewalk which is at 10% or 45%. This condition should be verified to ensure the sidewalk is functional.

Comment 7. The proposed sidewalk connection to Court A1 and A2 is only 3-ft long from the existing sidewalk to the proposed courts. The elevations of the existing sidewalk should be verified to confirm slope of the sidewalk is acceptable.

Comment 8. The applicants engineer should verify grading of the proposed courts. It appears the courts will have a high point at the net line which will drain toward the ends. It appears this may create a low point at the junction between Courts A1 and A2. Engineer to verify grading and suitable drainage.

Comment 9. The engineer should clarify grading between the tennis courts and the 'A' Courts. It appears that this area will drain across the pickleball courts. Typically, courts are designed such that stormwater does not drain onto the courts. Engineer to confirm if this is the proposed design, and if this is acceptable.

Comment 10. A proposed 553 contour is shown across a portion of the existing sidewalk which is identified as to remain. It should be verified whether this sidewalk needs to be removed or if it will remain.



Comment 11. It appears that a handicapped parking stall is located in the existing parking lot which accesses the proposed courts. The access route from the handicapped parking stall to the courts appear to have stairs. The engineer should address ADA applicability and accessibility.

Comment 12. We defer the review of stormwater management measures to the Princeton Hydro report.

Comment 13. Any approval should be subject to any outside agency approvals.

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

Sincerely,

**FRENCH & PARRELLO ASSOCIATES** 

Denis F. Keenan, PE

Planning Board Engineer

Denis.Keenan@fpaengineers.com