Engineers • Surveyors • Environmental Specialists • Planners

Rami N. Nassar, PE, PP, CME David S. Scheidegg, PE, PP, CME Andrew F. Schaeffer, PE, PP Daniel F. Kwapinski, PE, PP Howard A. Transue, PLS

May 15, 2012

Mr. Michael Bylone, Chairman and Planning / Zoning Board Members Township of Buena Vista Box 605 Route 40 Buena, NJ 08310

RE:

IMAJE, LLC, Norman Estates / Hopkins Estates

Preliminary Major Subdivision-Completeness

Block 1904, Lots 5, 6 & 7 Block 2409, Lots 2, 3 & 4,

Block 2501, Lot 1 Block 2503, Lot 11,

Block 2504, Lots 1,9, 10 & 11,

Block 3302, Lots 3 & 7.08,

Block 3303, Lot 1,

Weymouth Road, Norman Road, Tenth Street

Buena Vista Township, Atlantic County, New Jersey

Our File #6006.221

Dear Chairman and Planning Board Members:

Since September 2010, the following items have been provided for our review.

- A. Norman Estates and Hopkins Estate Major Subdivision as prepared by Swiderski Associates, consisting of 44 sheets signed by William S. Swiderski, PE, dated March 8, 2010, last revised April 4, 2012.
- B. Geometry Plan, Hopkins Estates and Norman Estates as prepared by Robert J. Monson, PLS, dated August 13, 2010 signed by Robert J. Monson, Professional Land Surveyor, consisting of seven (7) sheets.
- C. Plan of Survey as prepared by Robert J. Monson, PLS dated March 20, 2010, unrevised, consisting of one (1) sheet.
- D. Buena Vista Township Comprehensive Application Form, completed in 2010, as prepared by the applicant.
- E. Stormwater Management Report and Computations as prepared by Swiderski Associates, dated May 19, 2008, last revised August 31, 2010 including stormwater calculations dated April 4-8, 2012...
- F. Modified Traffic Report as prepared by Litwornia Associates, Inc. dated June 28, 2010.

- G. Fiscal Impact Analysis, Norman and Hopkins Estates, Buena Vista Township, as prepared by William D. Crane Associates, Inc., dated July 2010.
- H. Pinelands Certificate of Filing, dated July 7, 2010, Application #1995-1662.002
- I. Letter from William Swiderski to Lois Yarrington dated May 2, 2012 transmitting the Major Subdivision checklist
- J. Buena Vista Township Major Subdivision Checklist as prepared by William Swiderski and dated April 23, 2012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project proposes the subdivision of the stated parcels which contain 260.57 to create a 97 lot (95 new residential lots and 2 existing dwellings) residential subdivision. The lots are to utilize the clustering ordinance and be situated on 1 acre each. There are 6 proposed lots for stormwater management. The remainder of the parcels are to be set aside as open space.

COMPLETENESS:

Based upon our initial review of the referenced documents, and the Township of Buena Vista Major Subdivision Preliminary Plat Checklist, we offer the following comments:

Checklist Item 2. - The plan shall be drawn or reproduced at a scale of not less than 1" = 50".

The plans as submitted vary in scale from 1" = 30' to 1' = 400'. Due to the size of this project, several of the plan sheets depicting the overall site cannot be prepared in conformance with the Township minimum scale of 1" = 50'. A checklist waiver is required.

Checklist Item 8. – A survey of the property prepared by a New Jersey Licensed Lane Surveyor with bearings and distances provided for all property lines. The survey shall also identify the location of existing and proposed property lines, streets, street names, buildings, watercourses, railroads, bridges, culverts easements, rights-of-way and any natural features, such as wooded areas, streams, or wetlands. All historically, cultural and/or archaeological significant structures or resources.

The location of wooded areas, existing conditions and easements has not been shown on the survey. The applicants engineer indicated in their submission transmittal letter that a revised or updated survey would be forwarded to us under separate cover. However, we have not received the survey as previously requested.

<u>Checklist Item 21.</u> On-site septic systems as proposed must be in accordance with Section 49-34 of the Township Code.

This section dictates that proposed septic systems shall be located in the front yard where feasible. The plans indicate that septic systems are proposed in the rear yards. A checklist waiver has been requested.

Checklist Item 25. – An open space / recreation plan showing all areas designed for open space / recreation, their proposed use, the organization intended to maintain such spaces and the relation of the proposed facilities with existing Township facilities.

The plans shall depict each of the open space areas and their size. Additionally, the organization that will owning and maintaining these areas. The application indicates that Fees in lieu of recreational facilities are proposed.

<u>Checklist Item 26.</u> – A modification report, if applicable, showing the modifications of Township standards requested, along with supporting documentation.

A modification report (Attachment D) has been provided.

<u>Checklist Item 28.</u> – In the case of planned and/or clustered development, the application for preliminary approval shall contain, in addition to the items specified above, the following:

A. Common open space map at a scale as same as the site plan showing all areas of the site to be designated as common space and the designation of each area according to its proposed use, and the type, size, and general location of planting or other screening techniques to be used in designated buffer areas. The map shall also denote the size of each designated area in acres and the total common open space area in acres as a percentage of the site, in accordance with applicable ordinances.

An open space map has been provided, however, it should list the area of the proposed open space and the area of each of the proposed deed restricted parcels. We do not support this checklist waiver request.

<u>Checklist Item 29.</u> – A Polaroid or similar photograph of the premises in question from the opposite side of the street.

Photographs have not been provided. However, the applicants engineer has provided an aerial photo which satisfies the intent of this ordinance requirement. A checklist waiver is required.

<u>Checklist Item 34.</u> – Location of existing and proposed wells, septic systems, driveway aprons, and streetlights.

The location of existing wells and septic systems shall be depicted on the plans. We do not support this checklist waiver request.

<u>Checklist Item 35.</u> – Location of all monuments, corners and other survey points established in the field.

The applicant indicates that this is to be addressed at the time of final approval. A checklist waiver has been requested.

ZONING:

In accordance with Buena Vista Township Ordinance #14-2011, the project shall conform to the following criteria:

In the RDR1 Zone, clustering of single-family detached dwellings shall be required whenever two or more units are proposed as part of a residential development. The following standards shall apply:

- (1) Permitted density: RDR1, RDR1C and RDR1I Zones: one unit per 3.2 acres
- (2) The number of residential lots permitted within the cluster shall be calculated based on the size of the parcel of land and the density permitted in A(1) above, with a bonus applied in accordance with the following:

Parcel Size	RDR1, RDR1C and RDR1I Zones	RDR2 Zone	FA-3 Zone	FA-1 and FA- 2 Zones
<50 acres	0	0	0	0
50-99.99 acres	10%	15%	20%	25%
100-149.99 acres	15%	20%	25%	30%
≥150 acres	20%	25%	30%	40%

- (a) The Bonus Density in (a) above shall not apply to parcels in common ownership as of April 6, 2009. In order to be eligible for the Bonus Density provided in (a) above, an applicant must document the acquisition of additional vacant, contiguous land on or after April 6, 2009. Such land must be included in the application for cluster development and result in the preservation of a larger area of open space. Upon the acquisition of such lands, the Bonus Density set forth in (a) above shall apply to the entire contiguous parcel which is the subject of the cluster development application.
- (3) The residential cluster shall be located on the parcel such that the development area:
 - (a) Is located proximate to existing roads;
 - (b) Is located proximate to existing developed sites on adjacent or nearby parcels;
 - (c) Is or will be appropriately buffered from adjoining or nearby non-residential land uses; and
 - (d) Conforms with the minimum standards of Article VIII.
- (4) Development within the residential cluster shall be designed as follows:
 - (a) Residential lots shall be one acre in size but may be larger if dictated by unusual site conditions. In no case shall the average size of residential lots within a cluster exceed 1.1 acres;

- (b) All residential lots shall meet the following minimum requirements:
 - [1] Minimum lot width: 130 feet;
 - [2] Minimum lot depth: 130 feet;
 - [3] Minimum side yards: 20 feet;
 - [4] Minimum front yard: 40 feet; and
 - [5] Minimum rear yard: 30 feet.
- (c) Individual on-site septic waste water treatment systems which are not intended to reduce the level of nitrate/nitrogen in the waste that comply with the standards of §49-51B(4) may serve the lots within the cluster development area. However, in the event that existing agricultural uses will continue on the parcel in accordance with (5)(c) below, individual on-site septic waste water treatment systems shall comply with the standards of §\$49-51B(5) or (7). Community on-site waste water treatment systems serving two or more residential dwelling units which meet the standards of §\$49-51B(5) or (7) shall also be permitted;
- (d) The residential cluster development area shall include such land and facilities as are necessary to support the development, including wastewater facilities, stormwater management facilities and recreation amenities; and
- (5) The balance of the parcel located outside of the residential cluster development shall be owned and managed by a duly constituted homeowners' association, a non-profit conservation organization, Buena Vista Township or incorporated as part of one of the lots within the cluster development area.
 - (a) All such land shall be permanently protected through recordation of a deed of conservation restriction. Such restriction shall be in favor of Buena Vista Township or another public agency or non-profit conservation organization. In all cases, such restriction shall be expressly enforceable by the Pinelands Commission. The deed restriction shall be in a form to be approved by the Township Attorney, the Zoning Officer and the Pinelands Commission.; and
 - (b) Such deed of conservation restriction shall permit the land to be managed for low intensity recreation, ecological management and forestry, provided that no more than five (5) percent of the land may be cleared, no more than one (1) percent of the land may be covered with impervious surfaces and any such uses or activities are approved and conducted in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 49.

Additional Completeness items:

In order to confirm compliance with project zoning and the listed cluster development regulations, the applicant shall provide copies of deeds or agreements of sale to indicate conformance with Section 2 (Density Bonus) of Ordinance 14-2011.

The application indicates that Block 1904, Lot 6 is part of the project and the owner is Peter Galleta. However, his certification and signature has not been included.

The application contains a certification and signature of J. Mark D'Onofrio with no reference as to the identification of the parcel (s).

The submitted application requests Density Variance relief and therefore would be subject to review by the Zoning Board. If this correct, the Variance Checklists shall be completed by the applicant and submitted for review.

A Modified Traffic Report as prepared by Litwornia Associates, Inc. dated June 28, 2010 was submitted with the original application. The Conclusions paragraph indicates that the reports and analyses conducted in July 2009 for the Norman Road development and the Hopkins Estates development are still valid in 2010. However, these initial reports were not submitted with the application and must be submitted in order to be able to review the submitted document. Consideration should also be given to the submission of a new report with current traffic data and as a single 97 unit subdivision. I believe that this submitted report may not have considered the paving of 10th Street connecting the 2 smaller subdivisions into one larger project.

The signed Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement has not been provided.

A tax payment certification has not been provided.

Based upon our review of the information as submitted, we recommend that this application be deemed incomplete until receipt and review of the requested documentation.

Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely

Schaeffer Nassar Scheideng Consulting Enginee

Dávid S. Scheidegg, PE, PP, CME Planning / Zoning Board Engineer

Lois Yarrington, Planning/Zoning Board Administrator CC:

Robert Laveson, Esquire, Planning / Zoning Board Solicitor IMAJE, LLC, Applicant, 8003 Lagoon Drive, Margate, NJ 08402

Steven D. Scherzer and Nick Talvacchia, Esquire, Applicant's Attorney, 1125 Atlantic Avenue, Atlantic City, NJ 08401

SWIDERSKI ASSOCIATES

ENGINEERS-PLANNERS-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

599 SHORE ROAD, UNIT 10 SOMERS POINT, NJ 08244

609-601-1330 609-601-1377 FAX BILLDBEHT@ADL.COM

September 12 2012

David Scheidegg Schaeffer Nassar Scheidegg 1425 Cantillon Blvd Mays Landing, NJ 08330

Re:

Norman & Hopkins Estates Major Subdivision

Block 1904, Lots 5, 6 & 7 Block 2409, Lots 2, 3 & 4

Block 2501, Lot 1

Block 2503, Lots 11

Block 2504, Lots 1, 9, 10 & 11

Block 3302, Lots 3 & 7.08

Block 3303, Lot 1

Buena Vista Township, Atlantic County

Dear Dave:

In response to your review letter of 05/21/12, we have revised several of the drawings and are submitting additional information. Presented below are responses to the Technical Review comment in your correspondence:

- 1. My drawing and that of Robert Monson have been correlated so that lot numbers and dimension, phasing lines, bulk requirements, setback lines are consistent between the two sets of drawings.
- 2. No response required (NRR).
- 3. NNR.
- 4. NRR.
- 5. An access easement to Lot 11.18 has been added along the southerly lot line of Lot 11.17.
- 6. The application and the Checklists have been revised to indicate no bulk variances and previously submitted to your office.
- 7. The required topographic survey for the entire project has been previously submitted to your office. The enclosed set of drawings by Robert Monson also includes this survey.
- 8. Concrete curbing has been added at all intersection radii.
- 9. Handicapped ramps with detectable warning devices has been added at all intersections.

10. The missing tight triangle on Malaga Road has been added to the

11. A waiver has been requested for street trees.

12. A waiver has been requested for all basins. Typical lot landscaping has been added to the Typical Lot Detail.

13. At this time no Identification Signage is proposed.

- 15. NNR

16. No existing lot will require an alternative septic system.

17. The location of the existing well and septic for Lot 11 is shown. The location of the relocated driveway for this lot is shown on the drawings.

- 18. An exhibit depicting the existing and proposed cartways and right of ways within and adjacent to the project site will be presented in conjunction with our presentation to the full Board.
- 19. The amount of land to be deed restricted as open space in presented on
- 20. The Limit of Clearing is shown on the enclosed drawings.
- 21. The drawings have been revised to indicate the limit of improvement for
- 22. All utility and access easements have been revised to be twenty foot in
- 23. A note has been added to the cross sections of Ninth and Tenth Streets that if the existing subbase on these streets are to be reused they must satisfy the minimum requirement of 4" of DGA with a CBR in excess of
- 24. A note has been added that all roadside swales are to be topsoiled and seeded.:
- 25. A note has been added that all utilities within existing or proposed rights of way are to be located underground.
- 26. The additional street lights have been added to the locations noted in your letter.
- 27. Ninth Street is to be improved and reconstructed to the end of proposed Lot 9.01 and this noted on the drawings.
- 28. All sidewalks are to be constructed of concrete and this is noted on the drawings.
- 29. The existing and proposed realigned off the driveway for Lot .1107 is shown on the drawings.
- 30. A detail of the proposed realignment and all improvements, including proposed grading of the intersection of Ninth Street and Weymouth Road is shown on Drawing 13.
- 31. The proposed temporary cul de sac to be constructed in conjunction with the Phasing plan is shown on Drawing 44.
- 32. Drawing 43 presents all the open space areas within the project that are not contained on proposed individual residential lots. For the proposed individual residential lots, it is proposed to restrict clearing to a maximum of 0.52 acres. Individual site plans are proposed to be prepared for each individual lot prior to the issuance of a construction permits and this plan will delineate the 0.52 acres to be cleared.

- 33. The breakdown of deed restricted areas by lot and block is shown on 34. NRR.
- 35. Ownership and maintenance of the Open Space will be present to the Board at the time of the public hearing.
- 36. Lot 11.19 has been incorporated into Basin B
- 37. NRR.
- 38. Detention and retention basin details are included on Drawings 12, 13, 19 and 35. A waiver has been requested for landscaping and fencing of the
- 39. The method and location of basin access on shown on the drawings
- 40. The length, type and outlet protection for the driveway aprons is shown on
- 41. No conduit outlet protection for the proposed roadside swales is shown since none of the pipes outlet into a swale. All terminate into an inlet.
- 42. The proposed bottom elevation of Basin J has been revised to provide for the required separation of the bottom of the basin and seasonal high
- 43. Soil borings SB9 and SB11 are now shown on Drawing 40.
- 44. The proposed bottom elevation of Basin B has been revised to provide for the required separation of the bottom of the basin and seasonal high watertable.
- 45. The existing ground elevations in the area of Basin B is relatively flat and the existing boring are representative of the groundwater conditions. Addition boring will be conducted in conjunction with the Board review of the other borings on the site.
- 46. The boring and permeability test for Basin A is shown on Drawing 26.
- 47. All basins now maintain a freeboard of one foot.
- 48. The invert of FES No 2 has now been relocated to the bottom of the basin.
- 49. Basin D-1 has been redesigned as a retention basin.
- 50. The discharge elevation and the grades along the discharge flow path has been revised Drawing 12
- 51. The proposed elevations of the discharge swale for Basin J-1 is shown on Drawing 36.
- 52. The proposed low point at Station 17+00 on Norman Road has been revised to provide an inlet.
- 53. Time of evacuation calculations are included with the enclosed revised stormwater calculations.
- 54. The grading for the flow path of the discharge swale for Basin A-3 is shown on Drawing 12
- 55. The discharge weir for Basin A-3 has been shown correctly on Drawing 12.
- 56. The unlabeled discharge device for Basin A-3 has been labeled.
- 57. Basin B is now a retention basin and has no discharge.
- 58. Basin C-1 has been revised to provide one foot of freeboard above the peak stage level of a 100 year storm event.

- 59. The issue of the runoff from proposed Lots 11.05. and Lot 11.06 was discussed at length with Andrew Schaffer of your office and it was concluded that any runoff from these lots was not necessary to be routed thru Basin cf. The existing ground surface does not slope to the site of the proposed basin and therefore need not be routed thru this basin. The bubble-up system that was presented on the original drawings was intended to direct the runoff from these two lots into the basin. It has now been eliminated. The runoff from these two lots will contain the same onsite swales as the other lots in the subdivision but the discharge will be directed toward Weymouth Road which is the natural flow path.
- 60. After consideration it was decided that Basin D-3 was to be converted into a retention basin. The bottom of the basin was lowered and this will prevent the flooding of any of the pavement areas around the intersection of Ninth and Ave "A"
- 61. We have reviewed the routing procedure for Basin G-3 and feel that it is correct. As a check a manual computation was performed itilizing the design data inputted into the HydroCadd program. The maximum pond elevation for a 100 year storm event is Elevation 96.63 and the discharge along Tenth Street is thru an inlet grate with an elevation of 95.50. This results in both a submerged inlet and outlet with a maximum head of 1.19 feet (see enclosed computations). Considering inlet and outlet losses, pipe friction in the thirty-six inch discharge pipe and the afore mention head. The maximum discharge thru the thirty six inch pipe is 15.6 CFS. Based upon the flood routing calculations the maximum discharge from Basin G-3 is 4.56 CFS which is considerably less than the computed maximum capacity of the pipe. Additional topography illustrates the continued slope of the ground in this area. Additional details for this discharge structure is provided.
- 62. The drawings have been revised to match the design calculations.
- 63. The additional information requested has been added to the drawings, see Item 51.
- 64. The necessary notations have been added to the drawings.
- 65. Upon approval of the preliminary design and drawings a cost estimate for the on-site improvements will be proved to the Township Engineer for review and approval and the required bonds posted.
- 66. NRR
- 67. NRR

The revised drawings and attachments have been forwarded directly to Mrs. Yarrington's

If you have any questions please contact my office at 609-601-1330.

I Mendolshon N. Telvacchia

L. Yarrington

R. Laveson

SWIDERSKI ASSOCIATES

ENGINEERS-PLANNERS-ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

599 SHORE ROAD, UNIT 10 SOMERS POINT, NJ 08244 609-601-1330 609-601-1377 FAX BILLDBEHT@AOL.COM

May 2, 2012

Lois Yarrington
Secretary/Administrator
Buena Vista Township
Zoning & Planning Board of Adjustment
P.O. 605 Rte 40
Buena, NJ 08310

Re: Norman & Hopkins Estates Major Subdivision

Block 1904, Lots 5, 6 & 7 Block 2409, Lots 2, 3 & 4

Block 2501, Lot 1 Block 2503, Lots 11

Block 2504, Lots 1, 9, 10 & 11

Block 3302, Lots 3 & 7.08

Block 3303, Lot 1

Buena Vista Township, Atlantic County Pinelands Application # 1995-1662.002

Dear Mrs. Yarrington:

In support of our application for a major subdivision for the above referenced properties please find enclosed one copy of the Township's "Major Subdivision Preliminary Checklist".

Please consider this as the applicant's request to amend the existing application to remove the request for a use variance. In light of the Buena Vista Township's adoption of the Pinelands Commission's rule allowing bonus density for projects of this size a use/density variance is not required.

Please find enclosed an additional copy of the checklist and would request that it be forward to Mr. Levenson. If you have any questions please contact my office at 609-601-1330.

William S. Swiderski. P

cc I. Mendelsohn w/enclosure

N Talvacchia w/ enclosure

D. Scheidegg w/ enclosure

DEGEIVED MAY 03,2012 By Agmings