

Memo

To: Ms. Ashley Neale
Verona Planning Board Secretary

From: Plan Review Committee of the Verona Environmental Commission

c: Verona Environmental Commission Chair

Date: January 10, 2020

Re: **Site Plan Application**
25 Prospect Avenue [Block 601, Lot 1]
Verona, New Jersey

Zone: R-100 (Very Low-Density Single Family)

The Plan Review Committee of the Verona Environmental Commission (VEC) reviewed the site plan application for 25 Prospect Avenue in Verona submitted by the Montclair Golf Club (Applicant), which we received on December 20, 2019. We understand that the Applicant has classified proposed type of construction as, "tennis court resurfacing." The comments below are provided for the Board's consideration:

- 1) We understand that the proposed project is to disturb approximately 2.60 acres of land, meets the criteria for a redevelopment major development, and includes the following:
 - Removal of the seven existing tennis courts and tennis practice area.
 - Construction of six new tennis courts.
 - Re-grading of the upper portion of the existing golf practice range.
 - Re-sodding and installing underdrains in the lower portion of the golf practice range.
 - The reconstruction of areas affected by the improvements listed above.
- 2) The existing conditions drawing submitted by the Applicant does not clearly identify the size, species, and location of all Mature or Extraordinary Trees located on their property, as required by Verona's Tree Ordinance. The Applicant is required to provide a tree removal plan (or a site plan providing such information) as well as a replanting scheme for each Mature Tree identified for removal. We recommend that the Applicant provides a summary table for the Mature Trees that they intend to remove and a corresponding replacement schedule, if applicable, in accordance with Verona's Tree Ordinance.
- 3) The Stormwater Calculation Package submitted by the Applicant does not include pre- and post-development hydrologic analyses for Watershed B, nor do the plans indicate where the point of analysis is located. We respectfully ask that the Applicant's engineer explain how Curve Number for the "Woods" land cover does not increase from the pre- to post-development conditions as existing Mature Trees (up to 36-inch DPM) are removed and replaced with smaller diameter trees. Can pre- and post-development wooded area be delineated on the plan drawings for the stormwater runoff calculations?
- 4) Dwg. No. LA-106 and LA-107 submitted by the Applicant depict that soil berms will be constructed along the property line along Prospect Avenue. However, the Stormwater Calculation Package submitted by the Applicant does not address any of the possible

sheet flow that will be directed off site to Prospect Avenue now that this area of the site will have up to 4-foot-high berms with slopes up to 30 percent. The pre-development grades in this area were relatively flat and we request that the Applicant properly address sheet flow runoff from the site.

- 5) The Applicant's Engineer assigned the entire site as "Urban Land" soils and associated a "D-Type" Hydrologic Soil Group designation, but then subsequently indicates that there is no annual recharge to groundwater in those soil types using the Annual Groundwater Recharge Analysis spreadsheet prepared by NJGS.

According to the NJGS report that the spreadsheet was based on, the Applicant's Engineer was to consult with the county SCS office for this type of soil for the site-specific details for the actual recharge properties and not just assign it a zero value. We find it unlikely that the golf course landscape has absolutely no recharge to groundwater properties.

We recommend that if HEPSCD does not have that info readily available the Applicant's Engineer should estimate an infiltration rate for the soil at the site through field or laboratory testing approaches. Otherwise, per Appendix E of the Stormwater SW BMP Manual, the Applicant's Engineer should default to a "B-Type" HSG designation and use "Nixon" as the soil type for the pre-development scenario.

- 6) Only those portions of a site that have been previously developed are possibly exempt from the groundwater recharge requirements, per Stormwater Management Rules FAQ No. 6.1. Those areas of the site with woody vegetation are not considered "previously developed", are no longer defined as an Urban Redevelopment Area, and must be maintained or transferred elsewhere on site.

The Applicant's Engineer has not sufficiently addressed the woody vegetation as areas (approximately 0.16 acres) that currently provide groundwater recharge (regardless of site being in the Metropolitan Planning Area and in an Urban Redevelopment Area). The Applicant's Engineer should demonstrate that at least 0.16 acres of land is maintained for groundwater recharge in the post-development condition.

Attachments

[STD/JP/FD]

VEC_2020-01-10 Comments 25 Prospect Ave MGC.docx