



MEMORANDUM

TO: Hardyston Township Planning Board

FROM: Susan Gruel, P.P. and Fred Heyer, P.P., AICP
Aditi Mantrawadi, Associate Planner

RE: PB-5-08-1a
Hardyston Park Plaza (previously known as Beaver Run Shopping Center, LLC)
Block 63, Lot 1.01
Preliminary Major Site Plan

Date: September 19, 2008

This report supplements our memo dated August 26, 2008 based upon the following materials:

- 26-sheet set of site plans for Hardyston Park Plaza, Block 63, Lot 1.01, by Dykstra Associates Inc., dated April 21, 2008 and last revised September 11, 2008.
- 2-sheet set of Line of Sight drawings for lower parking lot by Dykstra Associates Inc., dated July 24, 2008.
- Letter from Dykstra Associates, Inc. dated September 9, 2008 in response to our memo dated August 26, 2008
- Letter from Dykstra Associates, Inc. dated September 9, 2008 in response to the August 22, 2008 memo from Robert Guerin, Planning Board Engineer.

Revised Project Description:

The applicant has made the following revisions to the previously proposed site plan:

- Buffers and Landscaping: Percentage of green areas for lower level (17.5%) shown on Variance Request List on site plan drawings sheet 1.
- Circulation and Parking: a note has been added to cart return spaces in the parking in front of Building F "Final location of cart storage to be determined by Building F tenant",
- Signage: sign locations added to site plans, elevations of free-standing signs included in details sheet.

- Lighting: the height of proposed lighting in the rear and sides of Building A in the vicinity of residence of Lot 2 has been reduced to 16 feet.

Variations and Waivers Required:

1. Variance - Setback for parking and service aisles from right-of-way: 75' required, 45' proposed.
2. Variance - Setback for parking and service aisles from property line: 25' required, 20' proposed.
3. Variance - The applicant is requesting several variances including number, type, size, location and design of signs provided as a table of requested signage variances on sheet 1 of the revised plans. The applicant is proposing 6 freestanding signs whereas according to Section 185-74 Subsection D(3) of the ordinance, only one freestanding sign is permitted on any single property regardless of the number of establishments on the property. The Planning Board may authorize an additional freestanding sign if the property has access from more than one public street; however, any additional freestanding sign shall comply with all setback requirements of the zone. The sign variance table should be edited to request variances for sign setbacks for proposed additional signs.
4. The applicant is requesting several variances from Section 185-100(E)-
 - 2- 20% of parking visible from adjoining street to be green space
 - 5- Curb height above pavement in front of stores and width of curbed pedestrian walks
 - 6- No direct access from roads or lanes to off-street parking space stalls
 - 8- No off-street loading area proposed for the bank building
 - 9- 30 feet separation between building and parking areas required.
5. Waiver - 16 feet maximum height for lighting in parking areas, 22.5 feet proposed.
6. Waiver - Preliminary Floor Plans - Building F (retail) and Building A (grocery store). These drawings are required for a complete evaluation of the application by our office. However, the applicant has indicated that it is not possible to provide a floor plan until a tenant is known. The applicant should provide the Board with floor plans and other elevations for review once the tenant/s are determined.

Revised Planning Comments:

Buffers and Landscaping -

1. The applicant is requesting a variance from maintaining the required 20% of parking area visible from adjoining street to be maintained as green space with 17.4% proposed for the lower parking lots. It is our opinion that while adequate landscaping has been provided within the parking lot in form of landscaping islands, the intent of the requirement is to provide a visual buffer from the adjoining street. As a result, the applicant should submit a sight profile drawing/visual simulation of the parking area as viewed from Route 94, specifically in the vicinity of Block 64 Lot 4.03.

Lighting-

1. The revised lighting plan for the upper site on sheet 13 indicates "A2216" and "B16" near the proposed truck turnaround to the southeast of Building A; however, these types of lighting are not indicated on the lighting table. We assume that these represent A16 and D16 fixtures; the applicant should clarify and revise drawings to indicate the same.

Signage-

1. The revised site plan drawings indicate the location of the proposed signs. According to the response letter from Dykstra Associates, Inc., sign details have been added to the plan drawings. However, the signage details on sheet 24 do not include all the information required as per Section 185-74 Subsection A (1) through (8) as required by Subsection (B). The drawings should be revised to include all required information.
2. Based on the colored renderings presented at the time of sign testimony and the sign details on sheet 24, it appears that the proposed signs will be placed on a wide pedestal base on the ground/sidewalk, instead of a single or dual mounting pole more typical of a pylon sign. Additionally, the proposed rock face signs are single-sided which is more typical of a billboard-type sign. The applicant should discuss and clarify the proposed type of signage, since the ordinance specifies different requirements for billboard and pylon free-standing signs and, hence, would require different variances.
3. The applicant notes that the exact location and mounting height of the proposed rock face signs cannot be determined until the actual rock is exposed and variance is requested on Sheet 1 of the site plan drawings.
4. The applicant has indicated on Sheet 1 of the site plan drawings that "All proposed

building mounted signs shall conform to applicable ordinance requirements". It should be noted that, according to the ordinance Section 185-74 Subsection C, "The total area of all signs affixed to nonresidential structures shall not exceed 20% of the building facade of the structure". Additionally, Subsection B requires that all signage and its elements should be consistent with each other. Therefore, it is our opinion that any approval of the signage plan should be subject to review of the building mounted signage for consistency and conformance.

Architecture -

1. According to the response letter from Dykstra Associates, Inc., "the architectural theme of the buildings was provided during hearing testimony". However, this office has not received any revised architectural drawings for review at this time.
2. The applicant has submitted two sight profiles with the revised drawings. However, it appears that both profiles have been drawn from about 1200 feet east of the entrance on Route 94. It is our opinion that the view would be significantly different from Block 64 Lot 4.03, without the steep grade change of the proposed infiltration basin in the eastern portion of the property. The applicant should submit a sight profile of the parking area as viewed from Block 64 Lot 4.03 and/or testify as to the adequacy of the buffers/screening in this area.