



Paul W. Ferriero, PE, PP, CME, LEED AP, CFM
Robert C. Brightly, PE, PP, CME

Steven B. Bolio, PE, CME
Mark S. Denisiuk, PE, CME, LEED AP
Joseph S. Kosinski, PG, CFM, LEED AP
C. Richard Quamme, PE, CME
Jess H. Symonds, PE

December 21, 2020

Debra Coonce
Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Township of Long Hill
915 Valley Road
Gillette, New Jersey 07933

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

Dear Ms. Coonce:

The above referenced application requests preliminary and final major site plan approval for the construction of 62 residential apartments, including 9 affordable apartments, on lot 3 in block 10801 along Valley Road. The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:

1. Application for Development, dated August 13, 2020.
2. Application for Development Checklist A, dated August 7, 2020, prepared by Marla Roller.
3. Cover letter dated August 24, 2020 prepared by Derek W. Orth, Esq.
4. Environmental Impact Statement, dated August 2020, prepared by Joseph G. Jaworski, PE.
5. Site Plans, consisting of 21 sheets dated August 7, 2020, prepared by Joseph Jaworski, PE.
6. Stormwater Management Report, dated August 2020, prepared by Joseph Jaworski, PE.
7. Architectural Plans, consisting of seven sheets dated August 6, 2020, prepared by John Saracco, RA.

A review of the above documents results in the following comments for Board's consideration.

I. Site Plans:

A. Sheet 1 – Cover Sheet

1. Prior to the signing of plans for construction, the plans should be noted that they have been issued for construction.

B. Sheet 2 – Aerial Map – No comments

C. Sheet 3 – General Notes

1. A copy of the survey referenced within General Note 1 needs to be provided.
2. A copy of the NJDEP Letter of Interpretation referenced within General Note 1, and the mapping used for the interpretation, needs to be provided.

• • •

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

3. The zoning table indicates a 10' buffer is being provided. It is noted that a 5' buffer appears to have been provided between the front wall of the detention basin and Passaic Valley Road. Testimony should be provided on whether a variance is required.
4. General Note 9 indicates 93 parking spaces are required per the ordinance and 105 spaces have been provided. RSIS standards require 122 parking spaces, using the parking requirement for garden apartments, which requires a waiver for the amount of parking being proposed.
5. General Note 9 indicates the minimum parking space size (19 feet long; 18 feet long where curb overhang is available) is being met. The parking space stalls on the ground floor of the building need to be dimensioned. Some of the spaces that abut the building walls scale 18 feet long and a waiver from Section LU-151.1.b appears to be required.
6. General Note 10A specifies "There shall be adequate provision for ingress and egress to all parking spaces. The width of access drives or driveways shall be 24 feet for two-way traffic and 15 feet for one-way traffic. (Complies)". The width of the ingress and egress that provides access to the parking area on the ground floor of the building need to be dimensioned. The total width appears to be less than the 24 feet required. (Section LU-151.2.a).
7. General Note 10C specifies the applicant is requesting a design waiver from Section LU-151.2.c for "Except in the case of single-family residences (including those with accessory apartments), no off-street parking or loading area shall be located in any front yard." Testimony in support of the waiver needs to be provided.
8. General Note 10G indicates that hairpin striping will be utilized for all parking stalls in accordance with ordinance requirements. The plans and parking stall striping details do not depict hairpin striping. The plans and details should be revised to depict hairpin striping, or a waiver with supporting testimony needs to be requested.
9. General Note 11A specifies "All parking areas, driveways, walkways, building entrances, loading areas and similar locations serving multifamily residential and all nonresidential uses shall be adequately illuminated for safety and security purposes. The lighting of intersections, driveways and similar locations shall provide an average illumination of 0.6 footcandle, while all parking areas shall provide an average illumination of 0.4 footcandle. Illumination levels of other areas to be lighted shall be determined by the approving authority after due consideration of the subject application. Complies". The statistical area summary on the lighting plan indicates average illuminance of 1.86 (parking north), pavement (2.62), and driveway & walk access (0.83). It appears waivers are required.
10. General Note 12 indicates walls within the front yard will comply with the maximum four foot height requirement. The walls being constructed along the entrance driveway will be greater than four feet in height and therefore the design does not comply.
11. General Note 16 indicates the project will comply with the sight triangle requirements (Section 157.5). However, the plans depict existing wooded areas within the sight

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

- triangle. The applicant shall confirm whether there will need to be tree removal and or tree trimming within the sight triangle area in order to comply.
12. Correct the date referenced within General Note 17 for the architectural plans (July 2020 listed while architectural plans on we have on file are dated 8/6/20).
 13. General Note 36 indicates that the setbacks identified on the plans are to the outside surface of the wall. The Township ordinance defines the setback as the distance to the building which is most likely the roof overhang. Any site plan dimensions that are impacted should be modified as required.
 14. Utility note 11 indicates the roof leader collection piping are conceptual in nature and are not for construction. Actual roof leader collection piping is to be coordinated with the architectural plans. The roof leaders need to be installed as per the stormwater management analysis. Any deviation from the analysis will require a revision to the stormwater management design.
 15. Grading Note 1 references a soil report which needs to be provided for review.
 16. Grading Note 9 indicates that a geotechnical consultant will be retained to inspect the infiltration/retention basin soils and permeability testing. Copies of all reports should be provided to the Township Engineer prior to any certificates of occupancy.
 17. The detention basin maintenance notes and the underground detention basin maintenance notes need to refer to the fact that the maintenance is to be performed in accordance with the approved operations and maintenance manual for the stormwater system.

D. Sheet 4 – Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan

1. The limit of disturbance must be staked out prior to site disturbance.
2. The plan does not indicate any disturbance within the wooded area along the sight triangle. The Engineer shall confirm whether any tree removal will be needed to provide the line of sight from the proposed driveway.
3. This plan should be signed by a licensed surveyor if any of the existing information depicted varies from the survey.
4. The table indicates the total critical area as 65,385 square feet. The definition of critical area includes areas of special flood hazard and/or any wetlands area. A breakdown of the critical area calculation should be provided. The Engineer should confirm whether the area of the special flood hazard area is congruous with the flood hazard area shown on the plan (the rear portion of the property inundated by the flood hazard area scales approximately 65,400 sf, which does not include the flood hazard area that runs along the easterly side of the property, not does it include the wetland area on the westerly side of the property).

E. Sheet 5 – Site Plan

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

1. Consideration to designation the four parking stalls under the building located adjacent to the stairwells and or the mechanical room as compact spaces should be given. While the parking spaces meet the minimum width, the spaces abut walls which may make maneuverability in and out of the spaces/vehicles more difficult.
2. The width of the ingress and egress that provides access to the parking area on the ground floor of the building need to be dimensioned. The aisles each scale approximately 9.5 feet wide and it appears a design waiver will be required (Section LU-151.2.a).
3. Control and access to the parking under the building should be discussed by the applicant. There are no turn around areas and if a vehicle enters and the stalls are full, drivers will have to back out of the parking aisles and buildings.
4. The parking space stalls on the ground floor of the building need to be dimensioned. Some of the spaces that abut the building walls scale 18 feet long and a waiver from Section LU-151.1.b appears to be required (19 feet required unless overhang is provided).
5. The sections of retaining walls with fences need to be more clearly shown on the plans.
6. Two of the proposed parking lot light fixtures by the parking lot near Passaic Valley Road appear to be within the wetland compensation area.
7. It appears the R6-1L sign located along the circular courtyard would need to be a R6-1R sign.
8. The two proposed handicap signs at the front of the building are located within the parking spaces. They should be relocated out of the parking spaces.
9. Handicap parking signage needs to be provided for the two spaces located on the ground floor of the building. The locations should be provided on the architectural plans as well as the site plan. It appears one of the signs may be able to be mounted on the building wall.
10. Approval from the Morris County Planning Board is required.
11. Approval from NJDEP is required for the disturbance and compensation to the wetlands buffers.
12. Approval from NJDEP is required for the proposed improvements within the flood hazard area.
13. As-Built Plans need to be provided for review and approval prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued. This should be a condition of any favorable resolution.

F. Sheet 6 – Grading Plan

1. Final construction details will need to be prepared for all retaining wall prior to construction.
2. The modular block wall detail depicts each upper course being stepped back from the course below it. It does not appear there will be enough room to construct the improvements behind the wall (guiderail/sidewalk/driveway to the widths specified

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

- etc.) as depicted on the plan without expanding the disturbance into the regulated areas. Driveway cross sections should be providing showing where the actual limit of disturbance would be in relation to the wall/proposed improvements.
3. The plans depict grading through existing trees that are proposed to remain along the westerly side of the building. It is not clear how the grading can be accomplished while preserving the trees. The grading is also outside the limit of disturbance and extends beyond the tree protection fencing in this area.
 4. The plan depicts the easterly retaining wall be constructed within a few feet of a tree that is shown as remaining (the limit of disturbance and tree protection fencing is depicted as running through the middle of the tree). The Engineer should confirm whether the tree will be able to be saved.
 5. Two benchmarks appear to be shown on the grading plan, however a reference to the benchmarks has not been provided. A reference to the benchmarks should be provided.
 6. Additional spot grades used in the building height calculation should be taken at the front of the building. The spacing of the spot grades around the building perimeter are generally between 45 to 60 feet apart along the sides and rear of the building, while the spot grades along the front courtyard area are generally 70 to 90 feet apart.

G. Sheet 7 – ADA Grading & Access Drive Section

1. The typical access drive section depicts a handrail on top of the proposed wall at the high side of the section and a retaining wall with fall protection on the low side of the section. Sheet 4 depicts fall protection on top of the proposed wall at the high side of the driveway and split rail/wire fence along the top of the wall on the low side of the driveway. Clarification is required. The location limits for the handrail and fencing should be more clearly identified on the site plan.
2. The Engineer should confirm whether a sidewalk landing is required on the far side of the entrance driveway. Since this area is located within the County right-of-way, if required this would be subject to County review and approval.
3. The spot grades for the crosswalk that crosses the entrance to the proposed parking lot located at the front of the property near Passaic Valley Road should be revised. The spot grades indicate one of the ramps exceeding the maximum allowable slope for curb ramps, while the landing on the other ramp is in excess of 2% maximum grade.
4. The cross walk/curb ramps at the beginning of the driveway within Passaic Valley Road is subject to review and approval from Morris County. It is noted the cross slope of the sidewalk, and the curb ramp exceed maximum slopes as required under PROWAG.

H. Sheet 8 – Drainage & Utility Plan

1. The locations of the hydrants should be approved by the Fire Official. The water meter vault and any building connections should also be reviewed and approved.
2. A detail for the water meter vault should be provided on the plans.

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

3. It is noted the proposed sanitary sewer is located within 10 feet of the 4" DIP and 6" DIP water services. The vertical separation was not identified. (7:14A-22.3(a)4.) specifies "Sewers conveying sanitary flow, combined sanitary and stormwater flow, or industrial flow shall be separated from water mains by a distance of at least 10 feet horizontally. If such lateral separation is not possible, the pipes shall be in separate trenches with the sewer at least 18 inches below the bottom of the water main, or such other separation as approved by the Department." Concrete encasement would be required if the vertical separation is not met. Concrete encasement has been depicted on the utility crossing detail, but it is not known if it will be required for the water service lines. The limits of any encasement that may be required should be provided on the plans.
 4. The projected increase in sewer flow pursuant to NJAC 7:14A-23.3 is 13,425 gallons per day (gpd); (14 one bedroom units at 150 gpd; 41 two bedroom apartments at 225 gpd; 7 three bedroom units at 300 gpd). Since the project increase the projected sewer flow by more than 8,000 gpd, an NJDEP Treatment Works approval is required (7:14A-22.3(a)2.).
 5. NJAC 7:14A-23.6 Sanitary sewer design specifies "The minimum diameter of sewer extensions shall be eight inches, however, consideration will be given to the use of smaller diameter sewers for lateral connections." It is noted that 6" diameter sanitary SDR35 sewer at 0.3% slope is proposed for the sanitary sewer line and the plans indicate the existing sewer main located in the street is also 6" diameter. The size of the existing main in the street should be confirmed.
 6. The underground detention basin outfall is within the flood hazard area of the Passaic River. A Tideflex backflow prevention valve is proposed on the outlet pipe. Approval from NJDEP for the discharge within the flood hazard area will be required.
- I. Sheet 9 – Landscape Plan
1. The plan depicts mature trees to remain within a few feet of the westerly side of the building. The applicant should confirm whether it is reasonable to expect these trees to be able to survive. There are balconies located along this side of the building. Will there be any impact to the use of the balconies if the trees were to remain?
 2. The surface treatment below the first floor balconies should be labeled.
 3. The proposed landscaping along the perimeter of the front surface basin will effectively close off the basin for access by maintenance personnel. It is recommended that a gap be provided for open space to allow for maintenance personnel to access the basin.
 4. The Landscape architect should confirm whether all of the proposed plantings within the center island are suitable for inundation from stormwater.
- J. Sheets 10 – Lighting Plan

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

1. The pole mounted parking lot lights proposed by the front parking lot are located within the proposed wetland compensation area. It appears the fixtures will need to be relocated or the compensation area adjusted so the fixtures are not located within the compensation area.

K. Sheets 11 – Lighting & Landscape Notes & Details

1. A 14' mounting height is identified for the building mounted light fixtures. The distance to the top of the light fixtures needs to be provided to confirm whether a design waiver will be required. Section LU-153.2.e. specifies "No light fixture shall provide a mounting height in excess of 15 feet, as measured from the ground to top of the light fixture, or the height of the principal building, whichever is less."
2. Section LU-153.2.g stipulates "All lighting plans shall be subject to a post-development lighting inspection by the Township Planner and/or Engineer." This should be a condition of any favorable resolution.
3. Based on the lighting specification, it appears the fixtures have a 4000K color. A maximum color temperature of 3500K is recommended.

L. Sheet 12 – Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan

1. This plan will need to be certified by the Morris County Soil Conservation District.
2. The limit of disturbance should be staked by a licensed surveyor prior to any disturbance. A note should be added to the plan.

M. Sheet 13 – Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes & Details

1. This plan will need to be certified by the Morris County Soil Conservation District.

N. Sheets 14 thru 19 – Construction Details

1. Details for the proposed ID sign should include sign materials, color etc. and sign lighting (if applicable).
2. Revise the parking stall striping detail to depict hairpin striping (unless a waiver is granted).
3. The Type A inlet detail should be specified as pre-cast only and include the typical notes that were included with the Type E inlet detail.
4. The sanitary sewer trench detail should specify the backfill in all paved areas as DGA or RCA.
5. The storm manhole detail should have the municipality removed since the drainage system will be privately owned.
6. The storm sewer trench detail should specify 12" lifts (vs. 18") and the backfill in all paved areas should be specified as DGA or RCA.
7. The Contech stormfilter detail is labeled as structure #112 while the plans label the unit as #113. They should be consistent.

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

8. The Basin A outlet control structure detail has the dimensions for the Basin B outlet structure. The detail should be revised to Basin B accordingly.
9. The text within the material quantities table within the Concrete Topping Plan is not legible. Revise accordingly.
10. The Concrete Basin Section detail indicates depth and type of cover to be specified. The depth and cover should be labeled on the detail. The depth and cover should be as per manufacturer specifications for the Cupolex system and the Engineer shall confirm the system will be able to support traffic loading.
11. The trash rack details should be revised to be consistent with the requirements within the NJDEP BMP Manual.
12. The inspection ports should be depicted on the rain garden section detail. The depth to seasonal high groundwater should also be depicted. The depth of runoff generated by the maximum design storm must be marked on all inspection ports and these levels included in the design report and maintenance plan.
13. The fire hydrant detail should be approved by the Fire Official.
14. Final retaining wall details will be required before construction.
15. The utility service trench detail should specify DGA or RCA in pavement areas.
16. One inch chamfers should be specified on the precast concrete headwall details.
17. The plans depict a flush granite block curb detail. It is recommended that flush concrete curbing be provided at all curb ramps. A detail should be provided.
18. The paving detail references a geotechnical report for the final pavement description. The geotechnical report was not provided. It is recommended the pavement detail include 3.5 inches of HMA 19M64 base (vs. 3”).

O. Sheet 20 – Morris County Construction Details

1. These details will need to be approved by Morris County

P. Sheet 21 – Vehicle Circulation Plan (Fire Truck)

1. The path for a fire truck should also be provide for a fire truck entering the site from the opposite direction.

II. Architectural Plans:

- A. Correct the apartment count within the table on sheet 1. The one bedroom apartment count, and the total apartment count, on the second and third floors are not consistent with the floor plans.
- B. According to the architectural plans, nine affordable units are proposed. Ordinance 460-20 specifies “not less than 9 units or fifteen (15%) percent of the total units shall be affordable ...for rental units and not less than 12 units or twenty (20%) of any for sale units shall be affordable...”. The applicant shall confirm the units will be rental units verses for sale units.

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

- C. The floor plans depict trash rooms on each floor of the building. The timing, frequency and location of where trash pickup will occur should be provided. If pickup will be via a garbage truck in the circular driveway, then some of the parking spaces, access may be temporarily blocked while trash collection is performed.

III. Environmental Impact Statement:

- A. Section I on page 6 indicates there are no significant unique, historic or scenic features being affected by this application. The next paragraph on Page 7 indicates the presence of an identified historic archaeological site in the northernmost tip of the property. It is not clear whether the archaeological site is being disturbed by the proposed project or not.
- B. The report should include an assessment of groundwater levels and depth to bedrock.
- C. The report should include an assessment of the flood hazard area from the Passaic River.
- D. The report should include a section on required permits that will be required for the project.

IV. Stormwater Management Report:

- A. DA-3 identified in the report is included within DA-4B on the proposed drainage area map. The report and drainage area map should be consistent.
- B. The water quantity description on Page 6 references three points of analysis while the calculations utilize two points of analysis. Clarification is required.
- C. At scale drainage area maps need to be provided in order to confirm drainage areas. The soil boundaries should be depicted on the drainage area maps.
- D. Tc flow paths need to be provided for each drainage area on scaled drainage area maps in order to confirm time of concentration calculations.
- E. Tc calculations should be provided for EX-DA-1A (EX-DA1-UNDIST).
- F. The Tc for PDA-1 is longer than the TC for EDA-1, which does not seem reasonable, since a portion of the wooded sheet flow in existing conditions is being replaced by a graded slope.
- G. A minimum Tc of 6 minutes needs to be used for NRCS methodology. Any Tc longer than 6 minutes need to be supported with calculations.
- H. PDA-3 includes area that will bypass basin B. A portion of the area along the top of the basin walls, and a portion of the front entrance that bypasses inlet #212 should be treated as bypass areas.
- I. The CN calculations indicate PDA-4 includes 1.74 acres of area while the routings include 1.45 acres. It appears the portion of the drainage area that is open space was not included in the routing. Clarification is required.
- J. The analysis needs to analyze the existing wetland/low area located in the northeasterly corner of the property. It appears this area would act as a detention area. Additional spot grades should be provided within the bottom of the depression (bounded by 214 contour)

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

- and along the adjacent offsite driveway to better define the area. Any offsite areas that are tributary to the low area should be accounted for in the analysis.
- K. The inlet drainage area map should include the drainage area, average coefficient, and Tc information with it. It appears subarea area 212 was identified as 211 in the routing analysis (hydrograph No. 35). Clarification is required.
 - L. The inlet analysis is based on a 25 year storm event. A 100 year storm event should be analyzed to ensure runoff will reach the detention basins without bypassing the basins. The rain garden should also be checked to confirm runoff will be contained within the garden without overflowing onto the driveway.
 - M. Sizing calculations for the proposed roof conveyance system needs to be provided in the report. The conveyance analysis should confirm the system has capacity for the 100 year storm event to ensure runoff will reach underground basin A without overtopping and bypassing the basin.
 - N. The water quality section of the report needs to include the full routing analysis for both basins (Basin A and B), the Contech stormfilter water quality unit, and the rain garden.
 - O. Sizing calculations for the Contech stormfilter water quality unit need to be provided in the report. The routing analysis indicates the storm filter will be inundated from the 2 year storm event routing within Basin A. The Engineer shall confirm whether the stormfilter can be surcharged.
 - P. It appears Basin B will act as an under drained sand filter and therefore needs to meet the requirements for Sand Filters within Chapter 9.9 of the NJDEP BMP. Additional information and detailing need to be provided to demonstrate compliance with the BMP Manual.
 - Q. A larger scale detail for Basin B should be provided, and the contour areas used in the basin volume calculations confirmed (scaling indicated approximately 20% less contour area than was depicted in the stage storage table).
 - R. Drain time calculations need to be provided for all the basins. The calculations should include the underdrains to confirm they will drain the basins within 72 hours.
 - S. Manufacturer information on the sizing of the Cupolex drainage system (Basin A) should be provided in the report. The routing used 760 lf of 5' diameter storage volume. The basin section details depict shorter rectangular openings. The clear width and height of the openings should be labeled on the details.
 - T. The outlet pipes for each of the detention basins have been analyzed assuming free flow conditions. Inlet/outlet control analysis needs to be provided for each pipe to ensure there is no impact on the functionality of the outlet structure.
 - U. The elevation of Basin A (and the outlet pipe) is below the elevation of the flood hazard area. The engineer is proposing a Tideflex Checkmate valve on the outlet pipe. Approval from NJDEP for the proposed basin and outlet pipe below the flood hazard elevation should be a condition of any favorable resolution.

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application
Completeness Review
Block 10801, Lot 3
621 Valley Road
Our Project No. 20LH201

- V. Water quality treatment is not being provided for the portion of the proposed driveway that bypasses basin B (approximately 1300 square feet). Water quality treatment for other portions of the site should compensate for this untreated area so the project meets 80% TSS treatment.
- W. Information relative to the depth of groundwater/bedrock should be provided for the underground detention basin and surface to confirm minimum separation in accordance with the NJDEP BMP Manual is being provided.
- X. A low impact development checklist needs to be provided in the report.
- Y. The groundwater recharge narrative indicates meeting groundwater recharge is not feasible due to the presence of rock throughout the site that presents unsuitable conditions for groundwater recharge. The narrative further states that a waiver on the developed site is warranted and justified. The field testing that this is based upon needs to be provided. The Engineer shall confirm whether the testing is in conformance with Chapter 12 of the NJDEP BMP Manual. Project redesign to incorporate dispersed runoff instead of a structure for recharge may be necessary to ensure compliance with the rules in this area. Mitigation for not providing groundwater recharge may also be required.
- Z. Soil testing confirming the depth to bedrock and the seasonal high groundwater table needs to be provided. Minimum separation distances as specified within the NJDEP BMP Manual from the lowest elevation of the proposed stormwater management basins needs to be demonstrated.
- AA. Attachment D – Major Development Stormwater Summary of the Tier A Municipal Stormwater General Permit needs to be completed by the Applicant.
- BB. An Operations and Maintenance Manual needs to be provided. It is recommended that the Manual be submitted once the stormwater management system had been approved. The Manual will need to be recorded with the property deed as a condition of any favorable resolution.

I trust the above comments are useful to the Board in its consideration of the application.

Very truly yours,



Paul W. Ferriero, PE, CME
Township Engineer

cc: Board Members
Jolanta Maziarz, Esq.
Elizabeth Leheny, PP/AICP
Derek W. Orth, Esq.

Ferriero Engineering, Inc.

December 21, 2020

Page 12

Re: Elite Properties Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Application

Completeness Review

Block 10801, Lot 3

621 Valley Road

Our Project No. 20LH201

Joseph Jaworski, PE