

Christopher J. Noll, PE, CME, PP
President & CEO

William H. Kirchner, PE, CME, N-2
Vice President

Rakesh R. Darji, PE, PP, CME, CFM
Vice President/Treasurer

Benjamin R. Weller, PE, CME, CPWM, S-3, C-3
Secretary



Joseph P. Orsino, Jr. CET, *Vice President*
Harry R. Fox, NICET III
G. Jeffrey Hanson, PE, CME
Joseph R. Hirsh, PE, CME, CPWM
C. Jeremy Noll, PE, CME, CPWM
Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

Memo To: Ms. Cheryl Chrusz, Planning Board Secretary
Montgomery Township Planning Board
100 Community Drive
Skillman, NJ 08558

Date: November 20, 2023
55031 03

From: Rakesh R. Darji, PE, PP, CME
Environmental Resolutions, Inc.
Planning Board Engineer

RE: Reynard Management, Inc. (Self Storage)
Preliminary and Final major Site Plan with (d) and (c)Variances
Application #BA-04-23
Engineering Review
Block 39002, Lots 49 and 50
1026 Route 518
Township of Montgomery, Somerset County

Our office has reviewed the plans and documents submitted by the applicant for a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with D(4) FAR, D(6) height variance and Bulk Variances application. The subject tract consists of Block 29002, Lots 49 and 50, comprising approximately 2.99 acres. The applicant proposes to construct two buildings, a 3-story, 123,295 SF and a one-story, 9,907 SF self-storage facility. The existing structure, a vacant office building, has been recently demolished.

The site is located on the Georgetown Franklin Turnpike (CR 518) just east of US Route 206. Its eastern property line is at the Borough of Rocky Hill. The zoning district is Highway Commercial.

The site is encumbered by 20 FT wide sanitary easement along the western property line as well as steep slopes. In addition, monitory wells, under federal jurisdiction, are located on the parcel.

The following information, submitted by the applicant in support of this application, has been reviewed by our office:

1. Response letter, to DRC comments, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated September 14, 2023.
2. Montgomery Township Land Development Application, dated July 13, 2023.
3. Checklist, Final Major Subdivision Plats and Final Major Site Plan, dated July 2022.
4. ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey, prepared by Dynamic Survey, LLC, dated August 11, 2022.
5. Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Use and Bulk Variances for Renard Management, Inc., proposed Self-storage Facility, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated June 8, 2023, revised to August 14, 2023, consisting of the following:
 - a. Cover Sheet, sheet 1 of 21.
 - b. Aerial Map, sheet 2 of 21.
 - c. Demolition and Tree Removal Plan, sheet 3 of 21.
 - d. Site Plan, sheet 4 of 21.
 - e. Grading Plan, sheet 5 of 21.

- f. Drainage Plan, sheet 6 of 21.
 - g. Utility Plan, sheet 7 of 21.
 - h. Utility Profiles, sheets 8/9 of 21.
 - i. Landscape Plan, sheet 10 of 21.
 - j. Lighting Plan, sheet 11 of 21.
 - k. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, sheet 12 of 21.
 - l. Soil Management and Restoration Plan, sheet 13 of 21.
 - m. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Details, sheet 14 of 21.
 - n. Construction Details, sheets 15-17, of 21.
 - o. County Construction Details, sheet 18 of 21.
 - p. Vehicle Circulation (Refuse), sheet 19 of 21.
 - q. Existing Steep Slopes Plan, sheet 20 of 21.
 - r. Proposed Steep Slopes Plan, sheet 21 of 21.
- 6. Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Dynamic Traffic, LLC, dated June 15, 2023.
 - 7. Stormwater Management Analysis, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated June 2023.
 - 8. Operation and Maintenance Manual, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated August 2023.
 - 9. Use and Operations Statement, dated September 14, 2023.
 - 10. Environmental Impact Assessment Report, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated June 2023.
 - 11. Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer Engineer's Report, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated June 2023.
 - 12. Steep Slope Analysis Exhibit, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated December 9, 2022.
 - 13. Architectural Plans, prepared by Louis W. Vandeloecht, Architect, dated June 29, 2023, consisting of 6 sheets.

General Information

Applicant: Renard Management, Inc.
23 Mandy Lane
Mahopac, NY 10541

Owner: Yonkers 300 LLC
1590 Troy Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11234

Engineer: Joshua A. Sewald, PE
Dynamic Engineering Consultants, PC
1904 Main Street
Lake Como, NJ 07719
jsewald@dynamiccec.com

Architect: Louis W. Vandeloecht, AIA
4849 Greenville Avenue, Suite 1460
Dallas, TX 75206
lvandloecht@arcomurray.com

Attorney: Chris Murphy, Esq.
34 Commerce Street, 12th Floor
Newark, NJ 07102

Zoning

- 1. This parcel is within the Highway Commercial (HC) zoning district.
- 2. The prior use, an office building, is a permitted use within this district (§16-4.12a3).

3. Area, yard, and coverage requirements are detailed in §16-4.12.d2.

	Required	Proposed	
Maximum Lot Area	1 Acre	2.99 Acres	Conforms
Minimum Lot Width	150 FT	432.67 FT	Conforms
Minimum Lot Frontage	150 FT	427.20 FT	Conforms
Minimum Lot Depth	150 FT	300.10 FT	Conforms
Setbacks			
Min Front Yard Setback	50 FT	50 FT	Conforms
Min Rear Yard Setback	50 FT	50.2 FT	Conforms
Min Side Yard Setback	25 FT	25 FT	Conforms
Coverage and Height			
Maximum Building Height	30 FT/2.5 stories	42.5 FT/3 stories	Variance
Maximum Floor Area Ratio	0.2	1.02	Variance
Maximum Lot Cover	55%	58.8%	Variance

Variances

- Per §16-4.12A, the proposed self-storage facility is not a permitted use within the Highway Commercial Zone. A d(1) Use Variance will be required.
- Per §16-4.12.c1, the maximum height of a principal building shall not exceed 30 FT. The applicant is proposing a height of 42.5 FT and 3 stories where 30 FT and 2.5 stories are permitted. A d(6) variance will be required as the proposed height exceeds the permitted height of 30 FT by more than 10%. It is recommended that calculations for the building height, in accordance with §16-2.1, definitions, be provided on the plan.
- Per §16-4.12.d, the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 0.20 within the zoning district. The floor area ratio is the gross floor area to the area of the lot or tract. The applicant is proposing an FAR of 1.02 with this application, a d(4) variance will be required.
- Per §16-4.12.d, the maximum lot coverage within the zoning district is 55%. The project proposes lot coverage of 58.8%. A bulk variance will be required. We note the existing lot coverage is 65.3%.
- Per §16-4.12.e2, no building within the HC zoning district, not part of a shopping center, shall exceed 50,000 SF of gross floor area. The proposed building contains 123,269 SF. A variance will be required.
- Per §16-4.12.f3, no less than 45% of the area of any lot or tract shall be landscaped, and the landscaped area may include approved detention and/or retention basins. Landscaping on-site is proposed to be 44.2%. A variance will be required.
- Per §16-4.12h.1, each principal building or group of buildings shall provide a minimum of one off-street loading spaces at the side or rear of the building. The plans only show a loading area (15FTx200FT) along the smaller of the two buildings. A variance will be required.
- Per §16-6.4.e1, no steep slope shall be disturbed or developed, except as follows in specific situations where it is determined by the Board that soil erosion, land disturbance and other environmental concerns have been adequately addressed by the developer. The applicant has provided a proposed steep slopes plan. Testimony should be provided to the Board addressing the performance standard requirements of §16-6.4.e3 to determine if a waiver for steep slope disturbance is warranted.

The Applicant has the burden of proof to present “positive” and “negative” criteria to justify the variance and should be prepared to provide testimony as such. The applicant must provide to the satisfaction of the Board that there are exceptional conditions of the property preventing the applicant from complying with the Zoning

Ordinance. Testimony should also demonstrate that the site is particularly suited to the proposed use and that the proposal will advance the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law and the Township's Master Plan and Zoning ordinances. Additionally, the applicant must show that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and that the variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinances. Testimony should be provided.

Waivers

9. It is unclear why curbing is not proposed along the rear parking lot (k-turn area). Per §16-5.8c3, all paved parking areas shall be curbed. Should curbing not be provided, a waiver will be required.

General

10. The signature block should be revised to reflect the Township Engineer rather than the Board Engineer.
11. The lot line between Lots 49 and 50 should be depicted on the plans.
12. It is recommended that the applicant consolidate Lots 49 and 50 as a condition of approval.
13. There is a 25 FT wide sanitary easement along the western property line. It is unclear what this easement is for as no utilities (including sanitary) are depicted within the easement. The proposed sanitary line crosses this easement to Lot 46.
14. Our office defers to the Fire Marshal for further comment regarding site safety and fire lane marking.
15. Testimony should be provided regarding emergency vehicle access at the drive thru and that sufficient clearance is provided for emergency vehicles to safely maneuver this area.
16. The site is encumbered by numerous monitoring wells. The applicant should provide testimony regarding protection for the wells from construction activities. It is noted that PGT-MW-01 is located where curbing is proposed.
17. Testimony shall be provided regarding the frequency of monitoring well sampling/observation. Testimony shall also be provided as to whether the site is currently under LSRP oversight. Copies of the environmental site assessment, RAW and RAO should be provided.
18. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the following:
 - a. Hours of operations.
 - b. Average number of employees per shift.
 - c. Days and time for trash and recycling pick-up.
19. Testimony regarding the operation of the buildings should be provided:
 - a. Vehicle access to the buildings.
 - b. Per the architectural plans, there are garage entrances along the eastern side of the smaller building. Access to this appears a small truck or car could possibly park perpendicular to the building to load or unload the vehicle. If vehicles are positioned in this manner, will it affect circulation?
 - c. Per the architectural plans, there are garage entrances along both sides of the drive through area of the building. Access to this drive thru maybe limited should vehicles park to load and/or unload their storage units.
 - d. Per the architectural plans, the opening at each end of the drive thru is 26 FT, the site plan shows this dimension is 30 FT. This should be consistent with both plans.
 - e. The architectural plans depict garage doors for access to the drive through portion of the building. The applicant should address access to this area, for both users of the storage units as well as emergency officials.

20. Truck turning templates for a fire truck/emergency vehicle and box truck should be provided. Show accessibility at the drive thru area of the building.

Site Plan

21. County Planning Board approval is required. The following should be noted:
 - a. A note should be added that the curbing and sidewalk along Georgetown-Franklin Turnpike will be repaired and/or replaced at the direction of Somerset County and/or Township.
 - b. There is a portion of the sidewalk fronting Georgetown-Franklin Turnpike identified to be removed. The extent of the new sidewalk along the roadway should be identified on the plan. Curing associated in that area should also be identified to its limits of new curbing.
 - c. County details for the sidewalk should be provided on the Construction Detail sheets.
22. The dimension of all sidewalks should be provided, including along the front of the larger building and the proposed sidewalk along Georgetown-Franklin Turnpike.
23. An existing chain link fence, guide rail, vault and electrical vault are to remain on-site. A note should be added to the plans stating that any damage to these improvements will be repaired and/or replaced at the expense of the owner/contractor.
24. The distance between the driveways should be provided.
25. The applicant is providing a 10FT x 10FT trash enclosure. Testimony should be provided regarding the size proposed and if it is sufficient for servicing the site. A “person” door should be provided on the enclosure.
26. It appears that a portion of the sight triangles at each driveway are on the parcel. A sight triangle easement will be required, and it should be provided as noted in §16-5.3c.
27. It is noted that while self-storage facilities are not a permitted use in the Highway Commercial zoning district, these facilities are permitted as a conditional use in the REO district. Per §16-6.1s.14, a minimum of one space for every employee plus one space for every 200 units shall be provided. Sixteen spaces, which does include one accessible space and one EV space, are proposed where 4 spaces are required for the 706 storage units plus a number of spaces per employee. Testimony on the number of employees should be provided.

Grading/Drainage/Utilities

28. Spot grades should be provided at the corners of the un-curbed parking areas.
29. Grading activities appear to be proposed at areas along both the north and east property lines. Testimony should be provided regarding the need for any temporary construction easements.
30. It is recommended that the existing A-Inlet (Inlet #15) and its associated pipes be cleaned and televised to determine the condition of the remaining pipes prior to discharging any stormwater from the project site into this system.
31. The existing A-Inlet (Inlet #15) is depicted on the 140 contour. Its grate elevation is depicted as 139. This should be reviewed and the plans updated accordingly.
32. Testimony should be provided regarding A-Inlet #15. This is an existing inlet that discharges to an Inlet on Lot 46. Discussion should include the ultimate discharge point; if an easement is existing or should be provided; maintenance responsibility of the line.
33. Grades should be provided for any proposed ramps and sidewalk along Georgetown-Franklin Turnpike.
34. The water service to the smaller of the two proposed buildings should be depicted.

35. The proposed sanitary connection is at a cleanout to remain. It is this office's recommendation that the connection point and existing line be cleaned and televised to determine the condition of the existing pipes.

Stormwater Management

36. The proposed project site currently contains approximately 1.95 acres of impervious coverage and 1.31 acres of motor vehicle surface. The proposed improvements will result in 1.76 acres of impervious surface and 0.49 acres of motor vehicle surface. However, as the project proposes to disturb more than 0.5 acres of land it is thus classified as a "major development" for the purposes of stormwater management and must comply with the requirements of NJAC 7:8 and the Township of Montgomery Ordinance §16-5.2. The project must, therefore, meet the following requirements:

- a. Address the rate and volume of runoff from the project site. This may be done in one of three ways as outlined in NJAC 7:8:
 - Reduce the peak rate of runoff from the project area by 50%, 25%, and 20% for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year storms, respectively; or
 - Demonstrate that the rate of runoff for the project is not increased from the pre-developed condition at any point along the post-developed condition hydrograph; or
 - Demonstrate that the peak rate of runoff is not increased and that the increase in volume and variation in timing will not have an adverse downstream impact.
- *As the project provides a net decrease in impervious coverage, it therefore reduces overall runoff and does not exceed at any time the runoff volume and peak rate from the 2-, 10- and 100-year storm events. Post development runoff rates do not exceed at any time the pre-development rates. The stormwater report calculations demonstrate that the quantity and volume have been reduce and meet the Ordinance requirements.*
- b. Reduce the Total Suspended Solids (TSS) loading in stormwater by 80% for new impervious.
 - *Impervious and motor vehicle surfaces have been reduced in the proposed condition. The water quality standards are not applicable to this application.*
- c. Demonstrate that the amount of groundwater recharge in the post-developed condition is equal to or greater than the pre-developed.
 - *Overall impervious coverage has been reduced. The applicant has provided the ground water recharge spreadsheet to show that the recharge is equal to or greater than the pre-developed conditions.*

37. The summary report of the stormwater management report states that the resulting motor vehicle surface has been reduced to 0.49 acres from 1.31 acres in one location and 0.56 acres in a 2nd location (water quality).

Landscaping/Lighting

38. In accordance with §16-2.1 the sight triangle easement area states that no grading, planting or structure shall be erected or maintained more than 12 inches above the street center lane except for street signs, fire hydrants or light standards. The landscaping plan should be reviewed to ensure that trees are not proposed within the easement or along the line of the easement.
39. In accordance with §16-4.12f3 states that trash enclosures shall be suitably landscaped with grass, shrubs and trees. The applicant should provide testimony regarding how the trash enclosure area meets this requirement as no landscaping is proposed at the trash enclosure area.

40. The applicant should provide testimony regarding proposed lighting under the drive thru area of the building.

Details

41. The ADA stall markings detail should be updated to reflect what is shown on the site plan. The width is not consistent nor is the location of the sign and the concrete wheel stop.
42. It is recommended that all paint notes should state that the paint material should be either long-life epoxy or thermoplastic.
43. A detail for striping for the loading area should be provided.
44. There is a “wall” or high curb shown at the trash enclosure. A detail should be provided.
45. Improvements within the county ROW also include a sidewalk. A county sidewalk detail should be provided.

Approvals and Permits

46. The following is the list of outside agency approvals which may be required for this application.
 - a. Montgomery Township Planning Board
 - b. Montgomery Township Engineering Department
 - c. Montgomery Township Shade Tree Commission
 - d. Somerset County Planning Board, application filed June 26, 2023.
 - e. Somerset Union County Conservation District, application filed July 18, 2023
 - f. Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission, application filed June 26, 2023

Administrative

47. The applicant shall pay all taxes, fees and required escrow due and owing.
48. This office reserves the opportunity to make further comment if additional information is presented.
49. All future resubmissions of the plans shall clearly indicate a revision date and be accompanied by a point-by-point response letter to the comments of the Board’s professional staff.

Should you or the applicant have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

RRD/mbs

Cc: Yonkers, LLC, LP, owner
Renard Management, Inc., applicant
Josh Sewald, PE, Applicant’s Engineer (jsewald@dynamicccc.com)
Chris Murphy, Esq., Applicant’s Attorney
Louis W. Vandeloecht, Applicant’s Architect (lvandloecht@arcomurray.com)
Mark Herrmann, Township Engineer (mherrmann@montgomerynj.gov)