

March 21, 2018

John Wynn, Chair
Montclair Township Planning Board
205 Claremont Avenue, 2nd Floor
Montclair, NJ 07042

Subject: Application 2548 – One Bay Urban Renewal LLC
311 Bay Avenue, Block 4215, Lot 1
Montclair Township, Essex County, New Jersey

Dear Mr. Wynn:

In reference to the application cited above, NV5 has reviewed the following revised documentation:

- “Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for One Bay Urban Renewal LLC”, prepared by Bohler Engineering, revised March 15, 2018, 22 sheets
- “Traffic Impact Analysis for One Bay Urban Renewal LLC”, prepared by Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, LLC, revised March 15, 2018.
- “Traffic Signal Plan, Bay Avenue & Walnut Crescent, Junction of Montclair/Borough of Glen Ridge” prepared by Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, LLC, revised March 15, 2018, 1 sheet.

With regard to the aforementioned submission this office has the following comments. For ease of reference NV5’s original comments are provided in *italics* and NV5’s updated comments in regular text.

Traffic Impact Study

Existing Traffic Volumes

1. *Existing counts were completed in December of 2014, however the TIS references ATR counts conducted in 2017 as part of a traffic signal warrant analysis study. The 2017 study should be provided to this office to confirm that the 2014 volumes remain representative of current conditions.*

The requested information has been provided. No additional information necessary.

Other Area Developments

2. *The applicant has stated in their traffic study that both Montclair and Glen Ridge have been contacted regarding planned developments in the area and the resulting information considered in their analysis.*

No further comment.

Trip Generation

3. *The traffic study accurately estimates trip generation based on the 10th Edition ITE trip generation manual for land use code 720 – Medical/Dental office building.*

No further comment.

Trip Distribution

4. *The trip generation estimates for the site assume 35% of site traffic approach from the west via Claremont Avenue, 35% from the east via Bay Avenue, and 15% from both the north and south via Walnut Crescent. This office is in agreement with the proposed distribution.*

No further comment.

Full Build Traffic Volumes

5. *The traffic study includes the prohibition of the eastbound left turn movement on Claremont Avenue approaching Walnut Crescent. It appears from the traffic volume figures that this volume was removed from the network entirely. The applicant shall provide testimony regarding the anticipated route that these vehicles will take with the proposed prohibition and revise the traffic study to accommodate this diversion accordingly.*

The applicant has indicated that the proposed left turn prohibition has been eliminated from the project. Based on the revised analysis provided in updated traffic study, this office concurs that the left turn at the signal will not back up such that sight lines for the left turn movement will be impacted.

Capacity Analysis

6. *The traffic signal plan for the proposed traffic signal at Bay Avenue and Walnut Crescent indicates that left turn arrows will be present for three of the four approaches. The capacity analysis in the traffic study, however, indicates a simple two phase signal without any arrows. The plans and analysis shall be rectified and the documentation corrected accordingly.*

The documentation has been revised to indicate a fully actuated two phase traffic signal on both the plans and traffic study.

7. *The traffic analysis for the proposed signal at Bay Avenue & Walnut Crescent indicates that the signal will have 'MAX' recall on the north/south (Walnut Crescent / Site Driveway) approaches. The signal should be modeled as either fully actuated or soft recall to the east/west approaches.*

The analysis has been modified appropriately.

Queue Analysis

8. *Once the changes made in comments 7 & 8 above are addressed, a revised analysis of the queuing for the southbound (driveway) approach should be provided to ensure that adequate stacking is provided.*

Based on this office's review of the Synchro reports, it appears adequate storage is provided. The applicant, however, should provide appropriate testimony for the record.

9. *Based on the site plan, it appears that an automated ticket system will be placed along the throat of the entrance to the site. A queueing statement should be provided to ensure that adequate storage on site exists to store vehicles waiting to enter the site without impeding on the operations of the proposed traffic signal.*

It appears from the site plan that the proposed gate system has been removed.

Parking

While this office respectfully defers the parking review to my colleague Mr. Giosa, the following items were noted by this office regarding parking on site:

10. *The TIS states 227 parking spaces are required. Consistent with the parking requirements table on sheet 3 of the site plans, 229 spaces are required and provided.*

The TIS has been modified accordingly.

11. *The parking plan indicates that valet operations will occur typically from 9 AM to 5 PM on weekdays and the valet spaces will be open to self-park patrons outside those times. Given that the valet parking field is six spaces deep, additional information / testimony should be provided as to how this will be accomplished.*

This comment remains outstanding and testimony should be provided as appropriate.

12. *Testimony on the proposed operation of the valet area should be provided, particularly if a staging area is needed to temporarily park vehicles to access other vehicles deeper in the valet field.*

This comment remains outstanding and testimony should be provided as appropriate.

Traffic Signal Plan Review

13. *The TIS states that the traffic signal will ultimately be under municipal jurisdiction. The applicant should clarify if the signal will be under Montclair Township jurisdiction, Glen Ridge Borough jurisdiction or if some sort of shared maintenance agreement is anticipated. This office recommends that complete construction / electrical plans be provided to the maintaining agency for review as a condition of approval of this application.*

This comment remains outstanding and testimony should be provided as appropriate.

14. *The pedestrian push button in the vicinity of head 14 should have a R10-3(MOD B) sign attached to it.*

The traffic signal plan has been modified accordingly.

15. *The striping / traffic control at the intersection of Walnut Crescent and Claremont Avenue, if it is to remain on the signal plan, should be consistent with the proposed striping as shown on the site plans.*

The traffic signal plan has been modified accordingly.

16. *While this office recognizes that underground design of the traffic signal is likely to be a condition of approval, the location of the controller should be identified for the benefit of the board.*

The controller location has been added to the signal plan as requested, however it appears that the controller is in conflict with the proposed emergency call box as indicated on the hospital parking lot plans. Also, it is unclear if the controller is proposed within the right of way. These discrepancies should be rectified.

17. *All proposed sidewalk should be shown on the traffic signal plan consistent with the site plans, particularly any sidewalk that connects adjacent traffic signal equipment.*

The traffic signal plan has been modified accordingly.

18. *Atlantic Traffic is encouraged to review Federal guidelines on overhead street name signs and revise the proposed street signs accordingly.*

The traffic signal plan has been modified accordingly.

Additional Traffic Signal Comments

24. Consideration should be given to reducing the 45' mast arm containing heads 8,9,& 10 to 40'.
 25. It appears the pole containing heads 8, 9, & 10 as well as the ped poles containing heads 14 and 18 are located outside the right of way. Either a property dedication or traffic signal easement will be required.

Site Plan Review

19. *Sheet C-2 of the site plan package indicates that the existing traffic signal and crosswalk on Bay Avenue will be removed as part of the project. The applicant should clarify what changes to the sidewalk on the south side of Bay Avenue are proposed as part of the project, including any revisions to the sidewalk ramps to discourage crossing mid-block.*

This comment remains outstanding.

20. *Large vehicle turning plans shall be provided for any anticipated large wheel base vehicles.*

The garbage truck circulation plan indicates that the left side tires of the garbage truck will ride on top of the proposed mountable median for almost its entire length. This office recommends the access driveway be modified to eliminate this condition.

21. *Turning radii for passenger vehicles should be reviewed internal to the site. Of particular concern are the 'u-turn' movement to enter the drop off area in front of the building and the northbound right turn movement to the west of the proposed building.*

Turning radii plans have been provided. Additional information / testimony is required regarding the ability of vehicles to access the bypass lane in front of the proposed building. This information was omitted from the turning radii plans.

22. *The applicant should consider the relocation of the lighting fixtures east of the proposed building into the proposed islands to minimize potential for impacts to the lighting poles.*

This comment remains outstanding.

23. *The R1-1 (stop) and R5-1 (do not enter) signs proposed on site must be mounted on separate posts per section 2B10, Line 8 of the MUTCD.*

This comment remains outstanding.

I trust that this information assists the Board in its review of this application. As additional information is provided, additional comments may be necessary. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me at 973-945-5670.

Sincerely,

NV5

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Fishinger, Jr.', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Joseph A. Fishinger, Jr., P.E., P.P., PTOE
Director, Traffic Engineering