

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: March 26, 2024
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 Pan with (d) and (c)Variances
Application #BA-04-23
Engineering Review #3
Block 39002, Lots 49 and 50
1026 Route 518
Township of Montgomery, Somerset County

Our office has reviewed the revised plans and documents submitted by the applicant for a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with D(4) FAR, and Bulk Variances application. Our office had previously issued Engineering review letters on November 20, 2023 and January 15, 2024. Many of our comments have been addressed, those remaining are provided below.

The subject tract consists of Block 29002, Lots 49 and 50, comprising approximately 2.99 acres. The applicant now proposes to construct two buildings, a 2-story, 84,904 SF and a 2-story, 22,846 SF self-storage facility for a total of 107,750 SF (a reduction of 25,416 SF from the original proposal). 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, monitoring 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, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated December 21, 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 *March 4, 2024*, consisting of the following:
 - a. Cover Sheet, sheet 1 of 23.

- b. Aerial Map, sheet 2 of 23.
 - c. Demolition and Tree Removal Plan, sheet 3 of 23.
 - d. Site Plan, sheet 4 of 23.
 - e. Grading Plan, sheet 5 of 23.
 - f. Drainage Plan, sheet 6 of 23.
 - g. Utility Plan, sheet 7 of 23.
 - h. Utility Profiles, sheets 8/9 of 23.
 - i. Landscape Plan, sheet 10 of 23.
 - j. Lighting Plan, sheet 11 of 23.
 - k. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, sheet 12 of 23.
 - l. Soil Management and Restoration Plan, sheet 13 of 23.
 - m. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Details, sheet 14 of 23.
 - n. Construction Details, sheets 15-17, of 23.
 - o. County Construction Details, sheet 18 of 23.
 - p. Vehicle Circulation (Refuse), sheet 19 of 23.
 - q. Vehicle Circulation (SU-30), sheet 20 of 23.
 - r. Vehicle Circulation (Fire), sheet 21 of 23.
 - s. Existing Steep Slopes Plan, sheet 22 of 23.
 - t. Proposed Steep Slopes Plan, sheet 23 of 23.
- 6. Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Dynamic Traffic, LLC, *dated March 12, 2024*.
 - 7. Stormwater Management Analysis, prepared by Dynamic Engineering, dated June 2023, *revised March 2024*.
 - 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 March 12, 2024* 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	53.9 FT	Conforms
Min Side Yard Setback	25 FT	25.2 FT	Conforms
Coverage and Height			
Maximum Building Height	30 FT/2.5 stories	29.67/2 stories	Conforms
Maximum Floor Area Ratio	0.2	0.83	Variance
Maximum Lot Cover	55%	58.3%	Variance

Variances

1. 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.
2. 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 0.83 with this application, a d(4) variance will be required.
3. Per §16-4.12.d, the maximum lot coverage within the zoning district is 55%. The project proposes lot coverage of 58.3%. A bulk variance will be required. We note the existing lot coverage is 65.3%.
4. 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 larger of the two (2) proposed buildings contains 84,904 SF. A variance will be required.
5. 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 41.7%. The Buffering and Landscaping notes (12D) should be updated to provide the calculation for the percentage of the site landscaped. A variance will be required.
6. 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 (15FTx160FT) along the smaller of the two buildings. A small interior area (approximately 30FTx38FT) is provided interior to the larger of the two buildings. A variance will be required.
7. 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 d-variance. The Applicant should provide testimony indicating that there are “special reasons” to grant the requested relief;

1. The site is particularly suited to the proposed use OR would be zoned into inutility without the variance;
2. The proposed will advance the purposes of the NJ Municipal Land Use Law (NJSA 40:55D-2) and the Township’s Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance;
3. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; and
4. The variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

The Applicant has the burden of proof to justify the variance, by testimony or other means, by using either the c(1) or c(2) proofs.

For c(1) variances the Applicant must demonstrate that strict application of the zoning requirement would have “peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the Applicant arising out of:

- a. The exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property, or
- b. By reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, or
- c. By reason of an extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structures lawfully existing thereon.”

For c(2) variances the Applicant must demonstrate that:

- a. The purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) would be advanced by a deviation from strict application of the zoning requirement;
- b. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
- c. The benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh the detriment; and
- d. The variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

Waivers

8. 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

9. It is recommended that the applicant consolidate Lots 49 and 50 as a condition of approval.
10. Per §16-5.6c, no soil shall be removed from or be imported to any site in excess of 20 CY per year without prior approval of the Planning Board. The applicant should discuss the anticipated CYs of soil proposed to be exported/imported for this project. A plan should be provided as described in §16-5.6c.
11. There is a 25 FT wide sanitary easement along the western property line. The proposed sanitary line crosses this easement to Lot 46. *The applicant will provide testimony.*
12. Our office defers to the Fire Marshal for further comment regarding site safety and fire lane marking.
13. Testimony should be provided regarding emergency vehicle access that sufficient clearance is provided for emergency vehicles to safely maneuver this area.
14. 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.
15. 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.

16. 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.
17. The applicant should discuss how trash and recycling will be handled on-site. A single dumpster is provided for the entire site. Will this dumpster be used by customers of the self-storage or for its business office only.
18. 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. The applicant should address access to the interior loading area and if this is for vehicles and small trucks.
19. The applicant should discuss if any pedestrian access has been considered between the site and the surrounding parcels.
20. Our office recommends that the Applicant request Title 39.

Site Plan

21. The transformer pad proposed within the front yard setback should be dimensioned to the property line.
22. A sight triangle easement will be required at the driveway. Easement language should be provided to the Board Professionals for review and approval.
23. A 5 FT sidewalk is proposed from the sidewalk on Georgetown Franklin Turnpike into the smaller 2-story building. The applicant should discuss the rationale for this sidewalk location and who would have access to the building.
24. It is recommended that “no parking” signs be provided along the drive aisle at the rear of the building.
25. Inlet #15 is referenced in Note #3. This inlet should be identified on the site plan.
26. There is a single directional arrow to the north of the larger building. It does not appear as this is a one-way drive aisle. The arrow should be removed or a 2nd arrow provided depicting travel in the opposite direction.
27. The crosswalk should be dimensioned.
28. There is an unknown line type in the sidewalk, south of the larger building. This should be identified.
29. A length for the trash enclosure pavement should be provided.
30. The length of the flush curb at the accessible parking area should be provided.
31. One of the existing monitoring wells (PGT-MW-01) is shown within the proposed curb line. Testimony should be provided to discuss construction of the curb at this location and any effect it may have on the monitoring well.
32. Per §16-5.21f4(c), concrete-filled steel bollards shall be used for publicly accessible EVSE for protection. Or, curbing and the EVSE set back a minimum of 2 FT from the face of the curb. The proposed location should be reviewed to see if these requirements be met as the EV space is located in the vicinity of a door.

33. 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 738 storage units plus a number of spaces per employee. Testimony on the number of employees should be provided.

Grading/Drainage/Utilities

34. 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 as grading is to the property line.
35. The applicant has noted that Inlet #15 and its associated pipes will be cleaned and televised prior to discharging stormwater from the project site into the system. Should these be damaged, it is recommended that the Applicant repair and/or replace at the direction of the Township Engineer.
36. Testimony should be provided regarding A-Inlet #15. This is an existing inlet that discharges to an Inlet on Lot 46. Discussion should include:
- a. The ultimate discharge point.
 - b. If an easement is existing or should be provided.
 - c. Maintenance responsibility of the line.
37. Grading is shown in close proximity to some of the existing monitoring wells. Details should be provided should the monitoring well cap need to be raised or lowered.
38. Grading should be provided for the sidewalk along Georgetown Franklin Turnpike. The sidewalk should meet ADA requirements for running and cross slopes.
39. A note has been added regarding cleaning and televising the existing sanitary pipes. The note should be updated indicating that the applicant will repair and/or replace the cleanout and/or pipes should these be damaged, at the owner's expense and the direction of the Township Engineer.
40. Inverts should be provided for all cleanouts. Additionally, a cleanout should be provided at all locations where a change of direction occurs.
41. Numerous pipes are connecting to an inlet at its corner. Ensure this connection will not impact any other pipes within the structure (proposed and existing).
42. The callout for Existing Inlet #15 should be reviewed. The labeling does not seem to match what is shown (label IDs, such as (A), (B), (C), should be clarified).
43. Any changes to sewer capacity will be evaluated by the Township Engineer.
44. The applicant is proposing steep slopes along the eastern property line, with drainage directed to the proposed yard inlets. Provide testimony that the proposed grading should not impact the neighboring parcel to the east.

Stormwater Management

45. 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 1.74 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 reduced 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 BA or greater than the pre-developed.
 - *Overall impervious coverage has been reduced. The applicant has provided the groundwater recharge spreadsheet to show that the recharge is equal to or greater than the pre-developed conditions.*
46. Regular and effective maintenance is crucial to ensure effected performance of the stormwater management measures. The applicant has submitted a stormwater maintenance report for review and approval. Our office offers the following general comments:
- a. The stormwater management maintenance plan and any future revisions should be recorded upon the deed of record for the property. This deed restriction should be prepared and forwarded to the Township Engineer for review and approval and should require the owner to maintain stormwater facilities in a manner satisfactory to the Township. A note indicating this should be placed on the plan. Further information on the deed records and dedications are found at §16-5.2u. The following restrictions should be incorporated.
 - i. The lot shall be "deed restricted" to require the perpetual maintenance of the stormwater management system in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Maintenance Plan. The restriction shall reference the maintenance manual by title, preparer, and most recent revision date.
 - ii. The deed restriction should provide that in the event that the responsible party fails in its maintenance obligation, the Township has the right, but not the obligation, to enter upon the property to perform the necessary maintenance at the responsible party's expense.

- iii. The deed restriction should provide that maintenance is required and must be documented. Completed checklists must be sent to the Township by December 31 annually, but if an item or items is/are identified as “urgent”, the checklist must be shared with the Township immediately.

Details

- 47. A note on the sanitary and storm sewer cleanouts should be provided indicating the following: Sanitary sewer cleanouts shall have round castings labeled “sewer” and storm sewer cleanouts are square castings.
- 48. A note to the manhole detail should be provided stating that stormwater manholes should be labeled “storm sewer” to differentiate from sanitary sewer.
- 49. Ladder rungs should be depicted for the full depth of the structure.
- 50. The EV charging signage appears to be within a bollard, similar to the Accessible parking signs. The sign detail should be provided showing this installation.
- 51. All details referencing pavement markings should provide (if applicable) the type of paint, color, thickness of line, angle, etc.
- 52. Per §16-5.8c2(a), areas of ingress/egress, parking stalls, loading and unloading areas, access aisle shall be paved with not less than 4” of compacted base court and 2” surface course. The detail should be revised to reflect this requirement.

Approvals and Permits

- 53. 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, July 18, 2023.
 - f. Delaware and Raritan Canal Commission, October 16, 2023 (awaiting Municipal and County approval).

Administrative

- 54. The applicant shall pay all taxes, fees and required escrow due and owing.
- 55. This office reserves the opportunity to make further comment if additional information is presented.
- 56. 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@dynamiccec.com)
Chris Murphy, Esq., Applicant’s Attorney
Louis W. Vandeloecht, Applicant’s Architect (lvandloecht@arcomurray.com)
Mark Herrmann, Township Engineer (mherrmann@montgomerynj.gov)