



Consulting Engineering
Site Planning
Construction Management

706 Tall Oaks Drive | Brick, New Jersey 08724
Phone: 732 539 9385 | Fax: 732 206 0701
jvengineering@aol.com

May 4, 2020

Nancy DeFalco – Administrative Officer
Planning Board
Township of Manalapan
120 Route 522
Manalapan, New Jersey 007726

Via Email & FedEx

Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision Application
45 Smithburg Road, Block 84.02, Lot 3.02
Township of Manalapan, Monmouth County, New Jersey
Project No. 18-0827A

Dear Ms. DeFalco:

We are in receipt of the review letters from the Board Engineer and Planner for the Galloping Hills @ Manalapan Major Subdivision Application. Please be advised that the applicant is prepared to address all items contained within these review letters.

To assist the Board in this matter, we have prepared the following detailed response to the specific items noted in the review letters. The original review item is listed, followed by the applicant's response noted in **bold** font.

March 12, 2020 CME Associates Engineering Review #1.

- 7) General
 - a) Testimony is required in support of the required variances and design waivers outlined above. We defer to the Board Planner and/or Board Attorney for further comment relative to the criteria necessary for the Board to grant the necessary relief.
Testimony in support of the requested Variances and Design Waivers will be presented and the Public Hearing.
 - b) The Applicant should address the possibility of subdividing the property in a manner which does not require the construction of a new public roadway and/or stormwater management facilities that will be owned and maintained by the Township.
A Subdivision creating five (5) new residential lots fronting Smithburg Road was evaluated. This proposal would result in multiple driveway accesses to the County Roadway, which was not preferred by Monmouth County, as opposed to the one new controlled intersection. Also, this alternate design would result in a land-locked detention basin, making access for maintenance purposes not practical.
 - c) The Applicant should provide testimony and/or exhibits to address the appearance of the proposed homes and confirm that the homes will comply with the applicable zoning requirements for maximum height and number of stories.



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 2 of 11

The applicant envisions the construction of homes ranging from 3,000 sf to 3,500 sf in size, containing basements, 4 bedrooms, 2 or 3 car attached garages, with paved driveways accommodating a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces.

8) Traffic & Circulation

a) The Applicant should address the anticipated traffic impact of the proposed development on the adjacent roadway network.

As per ITE trip generation estimates, 48 daily trips are anticipated from the development. 4 trips are estimated for the AM peak hour (1 in/3 out) and 5 trips are estimated for the PM peak hour (2 in/3 out). These are extremely low trip generation rates.

b) Smithburg Road is under Monmouth County jurisdiction as County Route 527. The Applicant should clarify whether there have been any discussions / meetings with and/or preliminary comments received from the County relative to the proposed subdivision and associated improvements.

The applicant has received Conditional Subdivision approval for the project, based on the 5 lot cul-de-sac layout shown on the plans.

c) The Applicant should confirm that the proposed homes will comply with the Township and RSIS parking requirements. General note #31 on the cover sheet indicates that each home will have a 2-car garage and an additional parking space in the driveway, for a total of three (3) spaces per property but no architectural plans have been provided, so our office cannot determine the parking space requirements for each dwelling (which is based on the number of bedrooms) nor can we confirm that the proposed garages will have sufficient dimensions to provide two (2) RSIS-compliant parking spaces.

The applicant envisions the construction of homes ranging from 3,000 sf to 3,500 sf in size, containing basements, 4 bedrooms, 2 or 3 car attached garages, with paved driveways accommodating a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces. Based on RSIS, this configuration equates to 3.5 parking spaces. The garage spaces will provide a minimum 10' x 20' space per vehicle.

d) The proposed cartway width of Galloping Hills Court is 24 feet, which does not appear to be consistent with any of the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) residential access or rural residential street type designations. It appears that design modifications may be required for compliance with RSIS.

At a prior meeting with the Board's professionals, the Board's Engineering staff recommended that the cul-de-sac roadway width be reduced the 24', based on the low number of homes (low traffic volumes) and in an effort to reduce impervious areas and long-term roadway maintenance. As such, the plans were revised to the 24' width. The Applicant is seeking appropriate relief from RSIS standards. Should the Board desire, the plans will be revised to increase the road width to 28'.

e) It does not appear that the proposed 24-foot wide cartway width will allow for vehicular parking along Galloping Hills Court. Notwithstanding the RSIS parking requirements and compliance therewith, the Applicant should address the possible need for parking within the roadway for overflow, gatherings, parties, holidays, etc.

Given the low number of homes in this development, we believe parking restrictions placed on one side of the road will permit the occasional visitor parking requirements. Given the length and overall design of the proposed driveways, as many as seven (7) cars can be parked in the 140' driveway length, accommodating significant visitor parking during social gatherings.



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 3 of 11

- f) The Final Plat indicates that the radius of the right-of-way at the proposed cul-de-sac bulb is 48 feet. However, the Grading & Utilities Plan in the Subdivision Plan set indicates that the curb radius within the cul-de-sac bulb is 48 feet, but same appears to scale to a radius of +/- 40 feet. Revisions appear to be required to reconcile this apparent discrepancy. We note that the RSIS requires a minimum cartway turning radius of 40 feet for cul-de-sac bulbs, with the right-of-way line a minimum of 8 feet beyond the edge of the cartway.
The labeling on the plan will be corrected. The cartway radius is 40 feet, the Cul-de-sac bulb radius is 48 feet as presently designed.
- g) In accordance with §95-9.2.A(6) of the Township Development Regulations, sidewalks shall be provided parallel to the street and within the right-of-way on both sides of all streets throughout site development. Sidewalks are proposed along one (1) side of Galloping Hills Court, which may be permitted by RSIS (depending on roadway designation), and no sidewalk is proposed along Smithburg Road / C.R. 527. We recommend that sidewalks be provided along Smithburg Road, where feasible and subject to Monmouth County approval. We note that §95-9.2.A(6)(g) requires a payment in lieu of sidewalks into the Sidewalk and Curbing Capital Contribution Fund in cases where the reviewing agency grants an exception from the requirement to provide sidewalks.
The County Planning Board did not require sidewalks along Smithburg Road. If the Board desires, additional sidewalks will be provided. However, the applicant has not proposed these sidewalks as they would not connect to existing off-site sidewalks, and this sidewalk construction would result in additional environmental impacts to existing wetland area to the north and south. The applicant seeks a waiver of this construction and would contribute to an appropriate Municipal Fund.
- 9) Stormwater Management, Grading & Utilities
- a) The proposed development constitutes a major development from a stormwater management standpoint, as greater than one (1) acre of disturbance and greater the 1/4 acre of new impervious coverage are proposed. Accordingly, the site must comply with the applicable NJDEP and Township requirements for a major stormwater development, including peak rate of runoff reduction, stormwater quality and groundwater recharge. The Applicant should provide an overview of the proposed stormwater management system for the benefit of the Board.
The stormwater management system has been designed to address the applicable NJDEP requirements. Additional discussion will be presented at the Public meeting.
- b) The Applicant should discuss why the stormwater management is proposed to be dedicated to the Township as an easement instead of a separately platted lot. We note that §95-9.3.F(13) of the Township Development Regulations (Dedication of Stormwater Management Facilities) indicates that a separately platted lot is the preferred option for the dedication of stormwater management facilities to the Township .
If the Board desires, the applicant will create a separate lot for the detention basin. However, creating such a lot would create irregular lot lines and less than desirable access for maintenance as noted in the exhibit attached to this letter.
- c) §201-18.A of the Township Code (Stormwater Management Regulations) requires that if a stormwater management basin is dedicated to the Township in the form of an easement, the easement line shall be located in a manner to contain an area of a minimum of 15 feet from the top of bank or toe of slope for facilities constructed in cut or fill, respectively . The proposed design does not appear to comply with this requirement, as the basin's top of bank appears to



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 4 of 11

be less than 1 foot from the easement line at the northerly end of the basin. Accordingly, if the Applicant intends to dedicate the stormwater management basin to the Township via easement, design modifications would be required.

We have prepared an exhibit demonstrating a complying detention basin design. Such a design introduces significant retaining walls and increases the working depth of the basin. We believe the proposed design would require less long term maintenance and are requesting the setback variances noted.

- d) In accordance with §95-9.3.F(11)U) of the Township Development Regulations, an Applicant seeking approval for construction of a stormwater management facility shall provide the funds necessary to permanently maintain the facility, with the amount of the funds to be calculated by the Planning Board Engineer. The provision of the funds required for permanent maintenance of the facility shall be required as a condition of approval, if granted.
The applicant will comply with the Ordinance contribution requirements.
- e) Drywells are proposed to collect and infiltrate roof runoff, pursuant to Township requirements. The specifications, locations and other details of the proposed drywells will be required for review and approval at the time of Plot Plan submission for each of the new properties and dwellings. The Applicant's Engineer will need to ensure that the drywells comply with the NJBMP Manual requirements for minimum 2-foot separation from the estimated seasonal high water table (ESHWT), as it appears that several of the conceptual drywells depicted on the Grading & Utilities Plan will not meet this standard Updated sizing calculations for the drywells, based upon the actual building footprints, may also be required with the Plot Plan submissions.
The plans currently show details based on an assumed building footprint. Appropriate details will be provided at time of Plot Plan / Building Permit application.
- f) Because the drywells discussed above are located on private property, a deed restriction or other similar legal measure will be required to prevent their removal, neglect, or adverse alteration by the future homeowners.
The applicant will provide the appropriate deed restrictions as a condition of subdivision approval.
- g) The sump discharge for each lot should be directly connected to the proposed drainage system via subsurface piping, with vented cleanouts provided where required, including just inside the sidewalk or curbing, as applicable.
The plans will be revised to include the additional piping system as a condition of subdivision approval.
- h) §95-8.3.C(4) of the Township Development Regulations prohibits proposed grading activities from requiring foundations for any structure to be exposed by more than 4 feet on the front, rear and side elevations of the structure, except to permit the construction of walk-out basements, subject to specific conditions defined in this section of the code. The Applicant should verify that the proposed design will comply, particularly for the proposed dwelling on new Lot 3.07, or request a design waiver and provide supporting testimony.
Lot 3.07 has been designed with a walk-out basement on the westerly building face. Grading on this lot has been designed to follow the general sloping nature of the lot, and to minimize wall heights. A design Waiver is requested for this lot at the westerly portion of the front and rear of the building so as to minimize retaining wall heights, and limit them to 4' maximum heights.
- 10) Environmental



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 5 of 11

- a) The Applicant should outline the comments and recommendations received from the Township Environmental Commission for the benefit of the Board.
The Applicant received Conditional Approval from the Township Environmental Commission. The conditions related to maintaining appropriate 2' separation from groundwater elevations. The current plans were revised to address those concerns. Also, the Environmental Commission requested that the Applicant submit a Phase 1 Site assessment Report and a Historic Pesticides Assessment of the site. Those reports were submitted for review. It should be noted that the Limited Site Assessment Report for Historic Pesticide Use noted no Exceedances and recommended No Further Action.
- b) The Applicant must obtain an NJDEP Flood Hazard Area (FHA) verification to establish the limits of the FHA and NJDEP riparian zone on the property. The limits of the verified FHA will be used to establish the limits of the Township Stream Corridor Buffer and confirm that said limits are accurately depicted on the Subdivision Plans.
The Applicant will obtain the required NJDEP FHA Permits as a condition of subdivision approval.
- c) A 100-year flood limit is shown on the Subdivision Plans, with a reference to the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The Applicant's Engineer should clarify whether 1 foot has been added to the FEMA FHA elevation to approximate the NJFHA, as would be required to determine the NJFHA under Method 3, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:13-3.4.
The required additional foot of elevation has been provided for in plotting the 100 year flood limit line of the plan, and is subject to NJDEP Verification.
- d) It appears that the Applicant is proposing to average the Township Stream Corridor Buffer on new Lot 3.07, reducing the width of the buffer by 10 feet in areas and compensating it by 10 feet in other areas. In accordance with §95-8.12.C(2)(b) of the Township Development Regulations, the Planning Board may allow the stream corridor to be averaged to allow reasonable flexibility to accommodate site planning when necessitated by the size and shape of the tract and physical conditions thereon, as long as the minimum width of the stream corridor is 75 feet and all relevant permits are obtained. The Applicant must demonstrate that the criteria required to permit stream corridor averaging have been met.
A minor amount of averaging of the Township Stream Corridor Buffer is proposed on limited westerly portion of proposed Lot 3.07. The reduction is limited to 10' wide, with 10' a=wide compensation areas.
- e) The Subdivision Plans and Final Plat identify a "drainage and conservation easement" on proposed Lot 3.07. It appears that this easement will contain the proposed stormwater management basin as well as the environmentally constrained and regulated areas (freshwater wetlands, wetlands transition areas, flood hazard area, Township Stream Corridor Buffer, etc.) along the perimeter of the property. If the stormwater management system is to be dedicated to the Township via easement, the drainage easement and conservation easement should be separated, with the former containing only the stormwater management improvements and the latter containing the environmentally constrained areas that shall be left in their natural state and not disturbed.
The easement areas will be revised as required based on any approval granted by the Board.
- f) The Applicant has submitted an application to the NJDEP for a line verification type of Letter of Interpretation (LOI) to verify the limits of the freshwater wetlands on site and establish the resource value of the wetlands. In addition, it appears that NJDEP permits will be required for the proposed stormwater outfall into the freshwater wetlands and FHA A status update relative to the LOI and required NJDEP permits should be provided.



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 6 of 11

The Applicant has received Wetland LOI approval of the wetland limits as noted on the plans. The Applicant will obtain the required NJDEP FHA and Wetland Permits as a condition of subdivision approval.

- g) Because the property has a historic use as a nursery, the Applicant must submit a site investigation in accordance with the NJDEP's Historically Applied Pesticide Technical Guidance document (December 2018) in order to address §95-12.3.C(19) of the Township Development Regulations.

A Limited Site Assessment Report for Historic Pesticide Use was submitted to the Board for review. The report noted no Exceedances and recommended No Further Action.

11) Landscaping, Lighting & Forestry

- a) The Applicant should schedule to attend an upcoming Shade Tree Committee meeting.
We will schedule a meeting with the Shade Tree Committee.

- b) In accordance with Section 95-8.5.F(2)(e), shade tree easements are to be 20 feet in width, whereas a 10 foot wide easement is currently proposed along Galloping Hills Court and no shade tree easement is provided along Smithburg Road / C.R. 527. The Subdivision Plan and Final Plat should be revised for compliance.

The shade tree easement noted on the plan will be increased to 20' wide.

- c) Street trees are currently proposed within the County sight triangle easement on both sides of the Galloping Hills Court / Smithburg Road intersection. While we defer to the County relative to the improvements permitted within its sight triangle easement, we do not recommend that street trees be planted in these areas, as they may inhibit sight distance, particularly over time as the trees mature.

The location of the street shade trees near the intersection will be adjusted to be outside of the site triangles.

- d) The Applicant should schedule a field meeting with our office to review existing nursery trees to remain, to ensure they are healthy and in good condition.

We will schedule a field meeting to review site conditions with CME Associates.

12) Miscellaneous

- a) General note #20 references a screened fenced area for refuse and recyclable totes provided adjacent to the recreation building. This note should be clarified, and if not applicable, revised or removed from the Subdivision Plans.

General Note #20 is not applicable to the subdivision and will be removed from the plan.

- b) A proposed 16.5-foot wide right-of-way dedication and an 8-foot wide roadway easement, both to the County of Monmouth, are depicted on the along Smithburg Road. The Applicant should clarify how the widths of these dedications were determined, particularly the 8-foot wide easement, as an existing 10-foot wide roadway easement is indicated along the frontage of Lot 22 north of the site.

The Conditional Approval obtained from the County Planning Board requires a 10' wide roadway easement, in lieu of the 8' easement. Plans will be revised.

- c) The Applicant should discuss the comments and recommendations received (if any) from the following:

- i) Township Police Department



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
 Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
 Page 7 of 11

ii) Bureau of Fire Prevention

No comments have been received form the Police Department or the Bureau of Fire Prevention at his time.

13) Outside Agencies

- a) The Applicant is responsible to obtain all required outside agency permits and/or approvals, including but not limited to:
- i. NJDEP
 - ii. Monmouth County Planning Board
 - iii. Freehold Soil Conservation District
 - iv. Manalapan Township Health Department
 - v. Manalapan Township Tax Assessor

The applicant will comply and obtain all necessary other agency permits and approvals.

Enclosed please find our Technical Engineering Review #1. The Applicant remains responsible to address the comments contained therein.

The applicant will comply and revise the plans to address the comments within Technical Engineering Review #1.

April 15, 2020 Leon S. Avakian Inc. Planning Review

B. Variances and Waivers

- a. The applicant should update the site plan to include a table of all relevant bulk conditions for each of the proposed five (5) lots.

The Final Plat will be revised to contain a Table listing all bulk conditions for the five (5) residential lots.

2. The bulk standards of the R-R Rural Residential Zone District as compared to the identified conditions of the proposed lots are as follows:

Standard	R-R Zone District	Proposed Lot 3.05	Proposed Lot 3.06	Proposed Lot 3.07	Proposed Lot 3.08	Proposed Lot 3.09
Min. Lot Area	80,000 s.f.	119,677.6 s.f.	92,254.4 s.f.	334,841.6 s.f.	113,453.3 s.f.	137,549 s.f.
Min. Lot Frontage	200 ft.	200 ft.	148.81 ft.*		148.81 ft.*	200 ft.
Min. Lot Frontage -Route 527	200 ft.	~ 510 ft.	NA	NA	NA	~570 ft.
Min. Lot Depth	250 ft.	~ 230 ft.*	>250 ft.		>250 ft.	~ 230 ft.*
Min. Front Yard	100 ft.					



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
 Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
 Page 8 of 11

Min. Interior Side Yard Setback	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.
Min. Street Side Yard Setback	90 ft.	90 ft.	NA	NA	NA	90 ft.
Min. Rear Yard Setback	50 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.			
Max. Building Coverage	7.5%					
Max. Building Height	35 ft.					
Max. Habitable Floor Area Ratio	0.75					
Min. Improvable Area	20,000 s.f.	21,689.8 s.f.	24,213.1 s.f.	30,208.9 s.f.	36,517.7 s.f.	25,725.3 s.f.
Min. Improvable Diameter	100 ft.			100 ft.		

3. Proposed Lots 3.06 and 3.08 have a proposed lot frontage of 148.81 ft., whereas 200 ft. is required in the zone district. **A variance is needed.**

Lots 3.06 and 3.08 both have frontage dimensions of 206.40 feet (148.81' + 57.59' along curves) as noted on the Final Plat and in the Curve Table noted on the plans. Frontage Variances are not required.

4. Proposed Lot 3.07 will **require a variance** for lot frontage.

Lots 3.07 has a frontage dimensions of 154.80 feet as noted on the Final Plat and in the Curve Table noted on the plans. A Frontage Variance is not required.

5. Proposed Lots 3.05 and 3.09 have lot depths of approximately 230 ft., whereas 250 ft. are required. **A variance is needed.**

The definition for Lot Depth states that for corner lots, one side lot shall be considered a rear lot line for purposes of determining Lot Depth. Corner Lots 3.05 and 3.09 have depths of 500' and 580' respectively (in the direction perpendicular to the Galloping Hill frontage). Therefore, Variances are not required.

6. As per §95-2.4, the definition of improvable area is: The area of a lot for the placement of principal buildings, off-street parking lots, and off-street loading areas which is located within the envelope delineated by the required yards, or buffers of the zone district and which is not encroached upon by any of the following features:

- a. An existing or proposed public right-of-way.
- b. An area classified as a floodway by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection or as an area of special flood hazard or floodway pursuant to § 113-4, Definitions, of Chapter 113, Flood Damage Prevention, of the Township Code.



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 9 of 11

- c. *Wetlands or any required wetlands transition area pursuant to the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (N.J.S.A. 13:9B-1 et seq.), except where construction, fill, or disturbance has been authorized pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Act. (emphasis added)*
- d. Slope areas where the inclination of the land's surface from the horizontal is 15% or greater for a ten-foot interval.
- e. Stream corridors.

The improvable areas of the proposed lots as depicted on the subdivision plan appear to include areas of wetlands. The calculated improvable area of each proposed lot should be updated as to remove any areas of wetlands. Variances may be required.

The Improvable areas calculated and noted on the Final Plat exclude wetlands, wetland buffers, stream corridors, and steep slopes. All lots have Improvable Areas exceeding 20,000 sf and no variances are required.

7. As per §95-7.44.A, the top of the excavation or the toe of the outside slope of a detention basin shall be set back at least 25 feet from adjoining residential or nonresidential properties, whereas the top of the basin excavation is set back less than 25 ft. from the lot line with proposed lot 3.08. **A variance is needed.**

The Applicant is seeking the Variance. We have prepared an exhibit (attached) demonstrating a complying detention basin design. Such a design introduces significant retaining walls and increases the working depth of the basin. We believe the proposed design would require less long term maintenance and are requesting the setback variances noted.

8. As per §95-7.44.B, the top of the excavation or the toe of the outside slope of a detention basin shall be setback at least 40 ft. from the adjoining right-of-way line, whereas the top of the basin excavation is set back less than 40 ft. from the proposed Galloping Court ROW. **A variance is needed.**

The Applicant is seeking the Variance. We have prepared an exhibit (attached) demonstrating a complying detention basin design. Such a design introduces significant retaining walls and increases the working depth of the basin. We believe the proposed design would require less long term maintenance and are requesting the setback variances noted.

9. As per §95-8.3.C(2), proposed grades shall not alter the natural contour of the land by more than 3 ft., whereas the grading alterations proposed on lots 3.07, 3.08, and 3.09 are greater than 3 ft. **A waiver is needed.**

The Applicant is seeking the Waiver for grading these lots. The front yards of these lots need to be raised to accommodate septic systems and maintain the appropriate separation between estimated seasonal high groundwater and the bottom of the septic disposal fields.

10. As per §95-9.2.A(6), sidewalks shall be provided parallel to the street and within the right-of-way on both sides of all streets throughout site development. Sidewalks are proposed along one (1) sidewalk of Galloping Hills Court and no sidewalk is proposed along Smithburg Road. **A waiver is required.**



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 10 of 11

If the Board desires, additional sidewalks will be provided. However, the applicant has not proposed these sidewalks based on feedback provided by staff at a review meeting (regarding on-site sidewalks) and as the sidewalk along Smithburg Road would not connect to existing off-site sidewalks, and this sidewalk construction would result in additional environmental impacts to existing wetland area to the north and south. The applicant seeks a waiver of this construction and would contribute to an appropriate Municipal Fund.

C. Variance Proofs

A number of “c” variances are required. There are two types of c variances with different required proofs.

1. Boards may grant a **c(1) variance** upon proof that a particular property faces hardship due to the shape, topography, or extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting the specific property.
2. Boards may grant a **c(2) variance** based upon findings that the purposes of zoning enumerated in the MLUL are advanced by the deviation from the ordinance, with the benefits of departing from the standards in the ordinance substantially outweighing any detriment to the public good. The Supreme Court’s ruling in Kaufmann v. Planning Board for Warren Township provides additional guidance on c(2) variances, stating that “the grant of approval must actually benefit the community in that it represents a better zoning alternative for the property. The focus of the c(2) case, then, will be...the characteristics of the land that present an opportunity for improved zoning and planning that will benefit the community.”
3. C variances must also show consistency with the negative criteria as well.

The Applicant will provide testimony in support of the requested Variances and Waivers at the Public Meeting.

D. Other Comments

1. We recommend the applicant install fencing along the perimeter of the conservation easement to ensure future property owners maintain the area in its natural state.

Fencing is shown on the plan along the perimeter of the conservation easement.

2. The plans indicate areas of the existing nursery vegetation to remain. Will these areas include a restrictive covenant, or will future property owners have the ability to remove them?

Areas of the existing nursery vegetation outside of the designated Conservation Easements noted on the plans will not be subjected to any restrictive covenants, allowing homeowners the ability to remove these areas in accordance with other Municipal Ordinances.

3. The applicant should provide testimony as to the appearance of the proposed new homes and compliance with all relevant sections of the Township’s ordinance.

The Applicant will provide testimony.

4. The proposed drainage basin is proposed to be located on Lot 3.07 and to be dedicated to the Township.



To: Ms. Nancy DeFalco
Re: Galloping Hills @ Manalapan
JV Project No. 18-0827A

May 4, 2020
Page 11 of 11

We recommend that the stormwater management basin be located on a separately platted lot.

If the Board desires, the applicant will create a separate lot for the detention basin. However, creating such a lot would create a Lot Frontage Variance for Lot 3.07 based on the current basin configuration, or irregular lot lines and less than desirable access for maintenance for a basin with retaining walls as noted in the exhibit attached to this letter.

5. The lighting plan should be revised to provide a data summary chart and to illustrate compliance with all relevant sections of the Township's ordinance.

The Lighting plan will be revised as requested.

6. The applicant should provide testimony as to the proposed new roadway. Will it be privately owned and maintained? If it is intended to be dedicated to the Township, is the Township interested in accepting it? The proposed roadway does not appear to comply with the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) for residential access or rural residential street type designations.

The Roadway is intended to be dedicated to the Township. The reduced cartway width is proposed as noted based on suggestions from the Board Engineer's staff as discussed at a prior meeting, for reasonable concerns as noted previously. If the Board does not desire the reduced 24' wide cartway width, the applicant will revise plans to indicate a 28' wide cartway width.

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

Very truly yours,

JV ENGINEERING

John P. Vincenti, P.E., P.P., C.M.E.

Cc: Peter Wersinger, Esq.