

April 22, 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 additional documentation:

- “Sign Inventory – Hackensack Meridian Health,” prepared by Philadelphia Sign, dated April 9, 2018, 23 sheets

With regard to the aforementioned submission and further review of the project documents, this office has the following additional comments. Items outstanding from my earlier March 21st review letter remain. For ease of reference, I’ve started the numbering in this letter sequential to comments in previous letters.

Proposed Sign Package

26. Sign N01 (MOB Identification Sign) – The proposed sign is not shown on the 3/15/18 site plan prepared by Bohler. The proposed sign should be added to the site plan and any conflicts with the proposed landscaping reconciled. It appears from the information provided that the proposed sign may be blocked by the proposed holly bushes to be located along the entrance drive.
27. Sign N02 (WB Directional Sign on Bay Avenue) – The proposed sign is not shown on the 3/15/18 site plan prepared by Bohler. The proposed sign should be added to the site plan and any conflicts with the proposed landscaping reconciled. It appears from the information provided that the proposed sign will encroach on the proposed buffer between the medical office building and the adjacent residence.
28. Sign N03 (EB Directional Sign on Roswell Terrace) – The proposed sign is not shown on the 3/15/18 site plan prepared by Bohler. The proposed sign should be added to the site plan and any conflicts with the proposed landscaping reconciled. It appears that the proposed sign is in conflict with the existing masonry wall on the site as well as a proposed street tree. Also, the sign appears to have limited utility in the location proposed as it will not be readily visible for vehicles traveling on Roswell Terrace.
29. Sign N04 – The proposed sign location should be reconciled with the site plan and clarification provided if the proposed sign is intended for pedestrian traffic or vehicles. If it is intended for view by vehicles, testimony regarding the visibility of the sign with the proposed letter heights should be provided.
30. Sign N05 – The location of the proposed sign should be clarified and adjusted if in conflict with the adjacent sidewalk. Consideration should also be given to relocating the proposed sign to the far side of the entrance driveway where it is more visible and vehicles are stopped while viewing it.
31. Sign N06 – The proposed sign should be added to the site plans and the location of the sign relative to the proposed lighting fixture clarified.

32. Sign N07 – The proposed sign appears to be in conflict with the proposed R1-1 (stop) sign indicated on the site plan. Also, the applicant should consider revising the copy on the proposed sign to better clarify the message provided. One potential option is “Valet & Handicap Parking Only”. Information regarding pushing a button for access should be located on the proposed ticket box, not on the referenced sign.
33. Sign N08 – Additional information on the necessity to advertise the location of the Emergency Room Valet Lot should be provided to the board. This office recommends this copy be removed from the sign as general patrons of the hospital may be confused with signage for the “Emergency Valet Lot.”
34. Sign N09 & N10 – The applicant should confirm that the proposed signs will be mounted consistent with MUTCD mounting height requirements.
35. Sign N12 – Consideration should be given to adding directional arrows on the compact car only signs to permit a single sign to accommodate multiple spaces. As proposed a sign is required for each compact space. Also, Sheet 14 indicates a ‘hidden drive ahead’ sign. Please clarify the location and purpose of this sign.
36. Sign N13, N14, N15 & N16 – The applicant should confirm that the proposed signs will be mounted consistent with MUTCD mounting height requirements.
37. Sign N17 & N18 – The sign plan should be reconciled with the proposed site plan. It appears that two R5-1 (Do Not Enter) signs shown on the site plan are omitted from the sign plan.
38. Sign N19 & N20 – Similar to comment 35 above, directional arrows should be added to the proposed signs to better indicate the parking spaces to which they refer.
39. Sign N22 – Testimony should be provided regarding the locations chosen for the identified sign including why no signs are proposed along Bay Avenue.
40. This office defers to the Board Engineer/Planner regarding the adequacy of the building mounted signage.
41. N26, N27 & N28 – The applicant should agree as a condition of approval to obtain the necessary approvals from the appropriate jurisdiction to locate the proposed signage. Consideration should also be given to providing/updating similar signage at the intersection of Grove Street & Bloomfield Avenue subject to County concurrence and approval.
42. At the last planning board hearing, suggestions were made regarding including road identification on the proposed directional signs. This office concurs with that suggestion and recommends the street directions be provided where appropriate. The applicant should provide testimony if this suggestion will be incorporated into the plans or provide justification as to why they believe this suggestion is inappropriate.

Traffic and Circulation Comments

43. This office has had conversations with both the applicant’s traffic engineer and Essex County staff regarding the ultimate jurisdiction of the proposed traffic signal at Bay Avenue & Walnut Crescent. The County is currently researching the exact limits of the County’s jurisdiction on Bay Street. While the decision of jurisdiction is ultimately between the Township and County, this office recommends the signal be designed consistent with Essex County requirements. This will minimize any issues with jurisdiction of the signal should it ultimately fall under Essex County jurisdiction. This will include use of Essex County standard signal foundations instead of NJDOT signal foundations.
44. Comments from the public received by this office included a request for additional pedestrian accommodations at the intersection of Claremont Avenue and Walnut Crescent. This office concurs with this request and recommends the applicant provide a crosswalk, ADA ramps, and appropriate signage on the west side of Walnut Crescent at Claremont Avenue.
45. Comments from the public received by this office included concerns over truck traffic in the area during both construction and under normal operations. While this office understands that the ability to restrict truck traffic on public streets is beyond the authority of the planning board, the applicant should provide testimony on the anticipated route for trucks to/and from the hospital site.

46. Comments from the public received by this office included a request for a four-way stop at the intersection of Walnut Street & Walnut Crescent. Based on the information contained in the traffic impact study for the project, a four-way stop at this intersection may be warranted. This office recommends, as a condition of approval, that the applicant provide a four-way stop warrant analysis to Montclair Township for the township committee's review and consideration.

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 dark ink, appearing to read "Joseph A. Fishinger, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

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

NIVIS

OFFICES NATIONWIDE