

Memo

To: Ms. Ashley Neale
Verona Planning Board Secretary

From: Plan Review Committee of the Verona Environmental Commission

c: Verona Environmental Commission Chair
Ms. Jennifer Kiernan, Municipal Clerk

Date: August 10, 2020

Re: **Site Plan Application**
Bloomfield Avenue [Block 2301, Lots 11, 12, 14 through 19]
Verona, New Jersey

Zone: R-60 (Medium Density Single Family)

The Plan Review Committee of the Verona Environmental Commission (VEC) reviewed the application for the properties associated with the Cameco Redevelopment (lots listed in subject line) submitted by Day Pitney LLP on behalf of PIRHL Developers, LLC (Applicant) dated July 15, 2020, which we received on July 30, 2020. The comments below are provided for the Board's consideration along with the attached letter provided to the Town Council by the VEC dated December 29, 2019.

- 1) We understand that the proposed project is to disturb approximately 4.37 acres of land, meets the criteria for a redevelopment major development, and includes the following:
 - Demolition and removal of the all buildings within the property.
 - Removal of about 281 trees as large as 40 inches DPM as identified on Dwg No. SD03.01. It is unclear whether six trees along the property boundary with Block 2301, Lot 7 are to remain.
 - Construction of three multi-story residential buildings, interior paved access driveway and parking, underground utilities, several stormwater management facilities, and ancillary landscaping and amenities.
- 2) According to the Applicant's landscape plan, they intend to plant 148 new trees including deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental types. The listed Tree Zelkova Serrata, identified on the Plant schedule on Dwg. No. L-1, appears on a Do Not Plant list compiled by the New Jersey Invasive Species Strike Team's 2020 List as an emerging invasive species.
- 3) Although the Applicant is exempt from Verona's Tree Ordinance, the VEC had hoped that more of the site's existing trees could be preserved where site improvement is not planned.
- 4) The Applicant's Engineer should provide testimony indicating whether the stormwater design has been prepared in accordance with the March 2, 2020 amendments to the Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8).
- 5) There appears to be a separation of land use into pervious versus impervious surface areas to accommodate the possible shortcomings of the NRCS methodology in the

Stormwater report. We would respectfully request that a summary of the pre- and post-development conditions be presented to the Board for their consideration during the Applicant's Engineer's presentation to further explain their approach to the Board and the public.

- 6) It would be beneficial for the understanding of the Board and the public on how the Applicant's Engineer approached the stormwater management design of the site by choosing to use both the Rational Method (runoff coefficients) and the SCS Method (Curve Numbers) in preparing their stormwater management report.
- 7) Will the site grading result in a net soil import or export?
 - In case of import, all imported soils must meet the NJ Department of Environmental Protection's (NJDEP) Residential Direct Contact Soil Remediation Standards (RDCSRs) and the Impact to Groundwater Standards (IGWSs) for soil. The recommended sampling frequency for the imported soils is in accordance with the Table 1 of the "Fill Material Guidance for SRP Sites" (April 2015, Version 3.0). (https://www.state.nj.us/dep//srp/guidance/srra/fill_protocol.pdf).
 - In case of soil export, all the soils must be disposed of in accordance with the NJDEP and other applicable regulations.
 - We understand that Phase I & Phase II Environmental Assessments have been performed at the Cameco site and respectfully request that a summary of these findings be presented to the Board for their consideration.
- 8) During the import/export of materials to the site, what is the Applicant's protocols for the idling of delivery trucks in the residential areas adjacent to the site during construction. Verona's Anti-idling resolution should be strictly upheld.
- 9) There are landscaped parking islands planned for the project and we understand that two bioretention areas have been included in the design. However, there appears to still be an opportunity to convert the parking islands and some of the adjacent landscaped areas on the edges of the parking area to linear bioswales or rain gardens to further promote the management of stormwater runoff close to its source. There appears to be opportunities in this design to allow for more curb cuts and smaller scale green infrastructure best management practices.
- 10) We understand that there is sheet flow in the Inlet 400 area on Pine Street (Dwg. No. DR40.03) that may need an additional inlet or feature to increase the time of concentration before it leaves the sloped area onto Pine Street. Also, the area drains for Inlets 302 through 305 convey stormwater to the most downgradient end of the infiltration basin so flow from this subcatchment area has limited time within the infiltration basin before it is further conveyed out to the municipal storm sewer on Pine Street. Is there a way to add something around El. 462 on that slope to convey it back into the drain line between Inlet 304 and 303?