



September 3, 2026

VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Lisa Smith
Land Use Coordinator, Joint Land Use Board
Borough of Mendham
Phoenix House, 2 W. Main Street
Mendham, New Jersey 07945

**RE: Site Plan Response #1
80-88 West Main, LLC ("Applicant")
The Greens at Mendham Village
Block 1801, Lot 5 (the "Property")
Borough of Mendham, Morris County
BCG File No. 081228-03-002**

Dear Ms. Smith:

We have received technical comment letters from the Borough Engineer, Borough Planner, the Borough's traffic consultant and environmental consultant related to the above referenced application. We also attended the Planning Board meeting on August 18, 2026 when we began our presentation on this application. We have revised the site plans to address a number of the comments which are submitted herewith. In discussion with the Borough Engineer, the stormwater comments will be addressed after our testimony continues at the September 15 hearing. We are providing the following copies of the site plans as well as providing a digital copy of this letter and the site plans:

1. Five (5) full-size copies of "Preliminary and Final Major Site Plans for The Greens at Mendham Village", prepared by Bowman Consulting Group Ltd, dated February 12, 2026 and revised to September 2, 2026; and
2. Thirteen (13) half-size copies of "Preliminary and Final Major Site Plans for The Greens at Mendham Village", prepared by Bowman Consulting Group Ltd, dated February 12, 2026 and revised to September 2, 2026.

We have also prepared a detailed response to the comment letters received from the Borough's professionals, which are presented below.

Boswell Engineering (Paul Ferriero), Site Plan Review, dated July 20, 2026

- I. Site Plans
 - A. Sheet 1 – Cover Sheet – No comments
Statement, no response required.
 - B. Sheet 2 – Key Map
 1. A list of any de minimus exceptions or waivers from the RSIS should be provided.
A list of de minimus exceptions from the RSIS have been provided on Sheet 2.

2. There is a typo at the bottom of the zoning table in the factor for the calculation of affordable units (2% vs. 20%).

The zoning table has been corrected to address this comment.

C. Sheet 3 through 4 – Site Preparation Plan A & B

1. The limit of disturbance must be staked out by a licensed surveyor prior to any site disturbance.

Acknowledged.

2. Several items are called out to be removed. The note indicates "All existing pavement and curbing to be removed", however, no limits are provided, and the pavement area extends onto Lot 5.01. Clear limits of pavement to be removed should be indicated.

The pavement to be removed is shaded; and limits of the pavement removal noted at three locations where it matches to existing pavement to remain. All disturbance is limited to Lot 5.

3. Is it proposed for the drywells, septic tanks, and septic fields to be removed? If so, this should be indicated. The existing disposal system shall be abandoned in accordance with NJDEP and Health Department requirements.

We have added notes that septic systems and drywells are to be removed.

4. For clarity, notes should be provided on the plans that indicate the full extent of the existing features to be removed such as buildings, existing underground utilities and drainage, electrical service, etc.

We have revised the plans to more clearly show the extent of site improvements and utilities to be removed.

5. The plan indicates an access easement to be vacated. The easement holder should be identified and the status of the vacation of the easement provided.

We would request that the modification and/or vacation of these easements be a condition of approval.

6. A phasing plan needs to be prepared prior to construction. The phasing needs to be established to create manageable areas of disturbance to ensure they get stabilized to minimize downstream impacts. Of particular concern is that the stormwater management facilities need to be in place as the project moves forward.

Acknowledged.

D. Sheets 5 through 6 – Layout & Dimensioning Plans A & B

1. There does not appear to be a distinction between the graphic in the legend for concrete vs. granite block curb.

No concrete curb is proposed; this has been removed from the legend.

2. Curb return radii need to be called out throughout the plans.

We have added curb return radii throughout the plans.

3. Proposed crosswalks should be called out. Some are showed with high visibility marking and others are not identified. All should be shown with high visibility striping. **The crosswalk along the boulevard is shown as high visibility as it is located mid-block along the main driveway. This crosswalk is also provided with warning signs. The remaining crosswalks are at intersections. These locations do not require nor are we proposing to provide high-visibility striping.**

4. Proposed street names should be submitted to the Borough Council for review and approval.

Acknowledged. We request that this be a condition of approval.

5. These sheets indicate two trash enclosures. Dimensions need to be provided. The means of trash collection for the remainder of the development should be discussed.
Dimensions have been added to the trash enclosures, each are 12 feet wide by 12 feet deep. These enclosures serve the affordable units. As for the townhouses, as testified to at the August 18, 2026 Land Use Board meeting, refuse and recycling will be stored in each garage. We have confirmed with the trash hauler that they will enter each alley way.
 6. Additional dimensions for the sidewalk width need to be added to plans.
Additional sidewalk dimensions have been added to the plans.
 7. Vehicle turning templates should be added for trash collection and fire vehicles. Passenger vehicle templates should be shown for the back to back garage layout.
We have added the Fire Truck Turning Plan as Sheet 29 and the SU30 Truck Turning Plan as Sheet 30. We have also prepared a turning plan for passenger vehicles accessing the rear-load townhouse garages, which is typical of Buildings 1 through 12. This is provided on Sheet 29.
 8. The plan shows a directional sign in the stormwater basin across the street from Building 22. The purpose of the sign needs to be identified. The detail needs to be shown with respect to mounting posts and height since the location of the base is several feet above the road elevation.
These 2 signs are to direct motorists to the Community of St. John Baptist. We have added the legend and size of each of these signs to Sheet 6. The one sign has been relocated opposite Building 16.
 9. There are a number of square box graphics around the site with no label or legend. These appear to be electrical transformers, however clarification is required.
These boxes are part of the fiberoptic system related to the cell tower. We are working with the provider (Crown Castle) to relocate these facilities. These efforts are being coordinated with the other site improvements.
 10. Based on the limited distances between the garage doors and the alleys, there is insufficient room to park in front of the garages. It is recommended that the HOA documents prohibit storage in the garages that obstruct the parking of vehicles.
The alleys are only intended to provide access to the garages of the rear-loaded townhomes. No parking is permitted in the alleys. The applicant has no objection to placing a restriction in the HOA documents stating that garages are not to be used entirely for storage and they must provide parking for two (2) vehicles.
- E. Sheets 7 through 8 – Grading Plan A & B
1. It does not appear that some of the grading is feasible to be contained within the subject parcel. This is most notable along adjoining lots 5.01, 6, 8 and 16. Additional detail or grading modifications are required.
We are reviewing this in conjunction with the stormwater comments, but all grading will be contained within the subject parcel. This will be addressed as part of a subsequent submission.
 2. Additional top and bottom of wall elevations need to be shown throughout the site.
We have provided additional top and bottom of wall elevations at key locations along the walls. We note that the walls in the courtyards are decorative landscape walls and are generally two foot (2') or less in height.

3. Spot elevations need to be provided around ADA stalls to demonstrate compliance. Curb elevations need to be provided around the parking area.

The Grading Plan has been revised to provide additional spot grades as requested.

4. There are dimension lines with an "X" at the emergency spillway in Basin J and through the berm in Basin H. Clarification is required.

These indicated high points on the berm, they have been removed.

5. There appear to be a number of walls within the site that are depicted with the graphic for a curb versus a retaining wall. Clarification is required.

We have revised the plans to be consistent with the retaining wall symbol.

6. Basin B, near the front of the development, indicates a top of wall elevation of 580.0, and top of berm elevations at 580.0. The grate on the outlet structure and the emergency overflow are noted as 578.30. A section of the retaining wall, at the emergency overflow should be noted as a different elevation to ensure the emergency overflow is properly directed.

We have clarified the top of wall elevations at the emergency spillway to be consistent with the design intent.

7. Basin N along the eastern property line, indicates a top of wall elevation of 601.0. Additional grades for the berm at the top of the wall should be added, or a section of the retaining wall, at the emergency overflow should be noted at a different elevation to ensure the emergency overflow is properly directed.

The wall elevations have been clarified at the emergency spillway.

8. Basin R, in the emergency overflow, an elevation is indicated, however, is occluded by the headwall. The callout should be moved to be legible.

The overlap has been rectified.

9. Basins A, C, H, G, I, M, N, P, and R all have access driveways indicated. Please indicate the access driveway for Basin B.

Basin B has been revised to illustrate a graded access which is provided from the boulevard.

F. Sheets 9 through 10 – Drainage Plan A & B

1. Verify pipe runs will not have vertical conflicts:

- a. OS72-STMMH74 run – crown of pipe vs. bottom of pavement boxout and curb **The inverts of this pipe run have been modified to provide sufficient cover.**
- b. OS140-IN143 run – crown of pipe vs. basin access driveway, near outlet structure **The pipe invert of the 18" pipe leaving OS 140 has been lowered and the downstream inverts adjusted accordingly.**
- c. IN44-IN47 run – pipe conflict to retaining wall footing **We have lowered the invert by 0.5 feet. We note that this is only a landscape wall and will be constructed around the storm pipe.**
- d. The above list is not comprehensive or complete and is provided merely to indicate particular cases noted by this review. **We will further review each pipe run as we address the stormwater comments.**

2. Provide a table indicating pipe elevations and vertical clearances at all utility pipe crossings. **We request that this be made a condition of approval after any other stormwater design changes are made.**

3. Verify that Class III Wall B RCP is appropriate for the related depths of cover/backfill. **In accordance with data provided by the American Concrete Pipe Association, maximum cover for most diameter storm pipes for this project is at least 20 feet.**

4. Verify shape or orientation of FES 17 in Basin G.
The FES has been revised.
 5. The proposed 4" PVC underdrains in basins should be perforated pipe and called out as such.
We have revised the notes for all underdrains to be perforated pipe.
 6. Basin M's Bioretention callout should be moved so all text is on the page.
This note has been realigned.
 7. Pipe indicated between MTD F-1 and STMMH 28 needs to be clarified, please add callout.
This is a 4" PVC pipe, which has been noted.
 8. Stone Apron at HW56, in Basin B, should be aligned with pipe.
The alignment of the entering pipe has been revised.
 9. Rip Rap Aprons should be provided for Headwalls 111, 139 and 147.
Scour holes have been added to each of these discharge points.
- G. Sheets 11 through 12 – Utility Plan A & B
1. Provide a table indicating pipe elevations and vertical clearances at all utility pipe crossings.
We request that this be made a condition of approval after any other stormwater design changes are made.
 2. The water valve between Bldg 8 and Bldg 9, indicated behind the stormwater inlet, should be relocated onto a water main.
The water valve has been revised.
 3. The applicant shall provide calculations to confirm the 8-inch sanitary sewer main is properly sized.
At a minimum slope of 0.5%, an 8-inch sanitary sewer can convey over 350,000 gallons per day, flowing half full. The project flow has an average flow of 42,375 GPD, therefore the sanitary sewer can more than accommodate a peak factor of two as required by the regulations.
 4. The applicant shall provide calculations to confirm the pump station and associated force main is properly sized.
We request that this be made a condition of approval.
 5. The applicant shall provide calculations to confirm the 8-inch water main is properly sized.
We are working with New Jersey American Water (NJAW) on the sizing of the water main. We request that this be made a condition of approval.
 6. The 8" DIP Water Main callout on page 12, between Bldg No. 25 and Bldg No. 26 should be revised so its leaders are pointing to the water main.
The leaders have been revised.
 7. The proposed fire hydrant locations should be reviewed by the Mendham Fire Department.
We will coordinate with the Mendham Fire Department.
 8. The applicant should confirm that all electric, telephone and cable lines will be underground.
A note to this effect has been placed on Sheet 11. We note that the existing overhead service that extends from the site to the adjacent Christmas tree farm will need to remain an overhead service. We will coordinate this existing overhead service with JCP&L.
- H. Sheets 13 through 14 – Landscape Plans A & B
1. The applicant should provide information whether the selected plants are native species.
A column has been added to the Overall Plant Schedule identifying each plant species as native or non-native. The Green Giant Arborvitae and Magnolia grandiflora are non-native species selected for their hardiness, adaptability, and specific landscape functions. Green Giant Arborvitae provides evergreen screening, while Magnolia grandiflora

provides evergreen foliage and seasonal flowering interest. Neither species is considered invasive in New Jersey. The use of these species is limited within the overall planting palette, which consists predominantly of native and regionally appropriate plant material.

2. Building numbers should be added to these sheets.

Building numbers have been added to these plans.

3. On sheet 13, four (4) heavy dashed line rectangles are drawn between buildings 2 & 3, 4 & 5, 8 & 9, and 10 & 11, respectively. Please explain these rectangles.

A note has been added to Sheet 13 that references the courtyard enlargement on Sheet 15 for these areas.

I. Sheet 15 – Typical Foundation Planting Plan

1. Planting quantities per typical plan should be provided.

Plant schedules have been added to the Typical Foundation Planting plan identifying the quantities for each plant species associated with the typical foundation planting plans.

J. Sheets 16 through 17 – Lighting Plans A & B

1. A night light test will be required before certificates of occupancy are issued.

Acknowledged, this can be addressed as a condition of approval.

2. The design engineer should confirm if the lighting is dark sky compliant.

The Universe light fixture manufactured by Architectural Area Lighting is Dark Sky compliant and has a BUG rating of B1-U0-G2. Notes have been added to the light fixture detail identifying the Dark Sky compliance and BUG rating.

K. Sheets 18 through 19 – Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plans A & B

1. No disturbance in NJDEP regulated areas should commence until all NJDEP permits are obtained. The status of all permit applications should be provided to the Board.

No improvements or disturbance are proposed for regulated riparian zone and wetland areas. Copies of the NJDEP permits have been submitted to the Borough.

2. Morris County Soil Conservation District approval will be required and silt fence installed prior to the start of construction.

Acknowledged, this is a standard condition of approval.

3. Super silt fence should be used on all steep slope areas and intermediate rows installed the break up the larger slopes.

The need for super silt fence shall be coordinated in consultation with the soil conservation district.

4. Contributing drainage area must be less than 1 acre and the length of the slope above the silt fence must be less than 150 feet.

We will comply with the applicable standards set forth in “The Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control in New Jersey, 7th Edition”.

5. Proposed soil stockpiles shall be maintained appropriately.

Acknowledged. This will be monitored by the soil conservation district during construction and also as part of the SWPPP monitoring.

L. Sheets 20 through 22 – Profiles Sheets A through C

1. Provide a table indicating pipe elevations and vertical clearances at all utility pipe crossings where clearance is less than 12".

We request that this be made a condition of approval after any other stormwater design changes are made.

2. Drop manholes should be called out.

Notations have been added to the profiles for drop manholes.

3. A number of the sanitary sewer lines are in excess of 10 feet deep. Testimony should be provided as to whether or not blasting is anticipated.

At this time, it is anticipated that rock removal will be via ripping and hammering. The need for blasting, if any, would be in accordance with applicable State regulations.

M. Sheets 23 through 28 – Construction Details

1. A detail for a Dog Waste Station is provided. The proposed location(s) for this item should be provided.

This detail has been removed as no dog run is proposed.

2. Details are provided for two types of fences. The location of each should be called out on the plans.

The fence types have been clarified.

3. All trench details should indicate backfill to the subgrade elevation with DGA or RCA in areas of pavement.

These are private roadways and the trench details are compliant with RSIS.

4. A detail for concrete cradles is provided. The proposed location(s) for this item should be provided.

The concrete cradles are provided where less than 12 inches of separation are provided between pipes. These notations can be added to the utility crossing tables.

5. A detail for pipe encasement is provided. The proposed location(s) for this item should be provided.

Pipe encasement is to be provided for any locations where the sanitary sewer is above the water main. These will be noted on the profiles.

6. Light pole details are provided, however do not align with the lights presented on Sheets 16 and 17. Clarity on the specific model proposed is required.

The fixture order numbers shown in the Luminaire Schedule (sheets 16 and 17) are correct. The light pole detail has been revised to identify the fixture model as Universe and reference the Luminaire Schedule for the specific fixture order number.

7. All hydrant details are to be approved by the Fire Official.

Acknowledged.

8. Trash rack details are provided. The proposed location(s) for this item should be provided. It appears a table with the specific dimensions for each control structure is required.

Trash racks are provided at each outlet structure within a surface bioretention basin.

II. Architectural Plans

- A. A number of the units show floor plans and lots and offices on the upper floors. These should be deed restricted from being used as bedrooms.

The applicant is agreeable to such a restriction being a condition of approval and to including such a restriction in the HOA documents.

Boswell Engineering (Marco Navarro), Traffic Review, dated June 22, 2026

Traffic Engineering Evaluation (TEE)

1. The existing site comprised an area of 29.95 acres. The site contained a school building (formerly Daytop NJ), a chapel, associated driveways, and a parking area. The existing driveway also provided access to the Community of St. John Baptist.

Statement, no response required.

2. The proposed development is a residential complex comprised of 147 units across 32 buildings. The units are all townhouses. The proposed driveway is a boulevard entrance approximately 15 feet west of the existing driveway.

Statement, no response required.

3. Proposed parking for the future residents will consist of individual garages, individual driveways, and surface parking areas in the form of parking lots and on-street parallel spaces.

Statement, no response required.

4. The original data collection obtained turning movement counts at the unsignalized intersection of West Main Street and Linden Lane. Data was collected on September 13, 2023 from 7:00 AM – 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM. The weekday peak hours were determined to be 7:45 AM – 8:45 AM and 4:45 PM – 5:45 PM.

Statement, no response required.

5. Additional clarification is requested regarding the turning movement counts. Please explain the lapse in time between the original data collection (September 2023) and the TEE submission (February 2026).

The zoning ordinance went through an amendment process that took time. We note that updated traffic counts are scheduled for September. Once this data is reviewed, we will assess any changes in traffic volumes that have occurred since the last counts were obtained.

6. In order to ensure that the data obtained in 2023 remained reasonable for analysis purposes, it is recommended that spot counts (such as 30-minute counts) be performed at the intersection during the AM and PM peak periods.

Updated traffic counts are scheduled for September. Once this data is reviewed, we will assess any changes in traffic volumes that have occurred since the last counts were obtained.

7. The TEE mentioned that West Main Street is a roadway with predominant directional travel for the area. The AM peak is predominantly eastbound, while the PM peak is predominantly westbound.

Statement, no response required.

8. The volumes in the Existing conditions figure matched the analysis printouts. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

9. The level of service (LOS) results for the existing conditions were LOS D or better for the weekday AM and PM peak hour.
Statement, no response required.
10. The build year of the proposed development is 2029.
Statement, no response required.
11. The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) Annual Background Growth Rate Table was utilized to determine the future projected annual growth rate. Based on West Main Street's classification as an Urban Minor Arterial within Morris County, the associated annual growth rate is 1.25 percent. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
12. The TEE stated that the New Jersey Transportation Authority Plan 2050 Demographic data projects population, household, and employment growth, among others. Based on this information, the growth rate projections were between 0.2 to 0.3 percent for Mendham Borough in Morris County.
Statement, no response required.
13. To be conservative, the TEE utilized the NJDOT Annual Background Growth Rate Table over six (6) years. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
14. An alternative analysis computation to project background growth could have been utilizing the NJDOT Annual Background Growth Rate Table for the first three (3) years, and utilize the 0.3 percent growth from the demographic data for the final three (3) years, in order to reach the build year of 2029.
Statement, no response required.
15. The TEE mentioned that there were no approved developments in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site.
We have reviewed the Traffic Impact Statement prepared for the V-Fee development and it is our position that the traffic generated by that development at the studied intersections is covered by the background traffic growth.
16. The volumes provided in the No Build condition figure matched the analysis printouts.
Statement, no response required.
17. The LOS results for the No Build conditions were LOS D or better for the weekday AM and PM peak hour. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
18. The TEE utilized the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition* to generate the projected vehicle trips for the site. The Land Use Code (LUC) 220 "Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)." This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
19. The TEE mentioned that per ITE, the proposed development would generate 64 trips in the AM peak hour and 78 trips in the PM peak hour. This information has been confirmed, and is deemed acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
20. The Site Generated Traffic volume figure matched the trip generation projections. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.

21. Based on industry references such as the ITE *Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development* and the NJDOT State Highway Access Code, a site that would generate under 100 vehicle trips during the peak hour would not adversely affect future traffic operations.

Statement, no response required.

22. The volumes provided in the Build condition figure matched the analysis printouts.

Statement, no response required.

23. The LOS results for the Build conditions at the intersection of West Main Street and Linden Lane were LOS D or better for the weekday AM and PM peak hour. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

24. The LOS results for the Build conditions at the intersection of the Site Access Boulevard and West Main Street were LOS C or better. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

25. The TEE mentioned that per RSIS, 351 spaces are required. The development is proposed to contain 426 spaces. These spaces were broken down in the following:

- 236 spaces in garages;
- 45 spaces in driveways; and
- 145 spaces in surface lots and on-street parallel parking.

Statement, no response required.

26. Three types of buildings are proposed:

- a. Three-bedroom townhouses, with two-car rear load garages with alley access (no driveways);
- b. Three-bedroom townhouses with two-car front-load garages and driveways; and
- c. Two- and three-bedroom townhouses (affordable units) with no garages and driveways.

Statement, no response required.

27. The TEE mentioned that the Residential Site Improvement Standards were utilized in determining the parking provisions for the proposed residential unit. This included:

- a. 2.3 parking spaces for two-bedroom units; and
- b. 2.4 parking spaces for three-bedroom units.

The Mendham Borough Ordinance requirement is two (2) parking spaces for each residential dwelling. As a result, the number of parking spaces proposed is greater (and more conservative) than the Borough Ordinance. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

28. The TEE mentioned that the required parking may be reduced by 10 percent based on New Jersey's electrical vehicle (EV) requirements. The proposed development will provide electrical vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) in each individual garage. Additionally, six (6) surface parking spaces will be equipped for electrical charging.

Statement, no response required.

29. The TEE stated that the internal roadways for the development were proposed to be 24 feet wide. The Mendham Borough Ordinance stated that the parking aisle width for 90-degrees is 24 feet. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

30. The TEE did not mention the provision of ADA spaces. The number of ADA spaces will be verified upon review of the preliminary and final site plan. Based on the number of spaces in surface lots and on-street parallel parking (145), five (5) ADA spaces are required, including one van accessible space.

Acknowledged. The number of ADA spaces is compliant.

31. The TEE stated that the site plan will provide sidewalks and that link the residential buildings and with the internal passive recreation and courtyard areas. This will be verified among the preliminary and final site plan.

Statement, no response required.

Preliminary and Final Site Plan

1. The site plan's Unit Summary Table showed that 147 units were proposed for the residential development. There were 32 buildings shown on the Layout & Dimensions Plans. This information consistent with what was presented in the TEE.

Statement, no response required.

2. The site plan's Parking Requirements for Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) showed 351 spaces for the residential development. This was consistent with what was presented in the TEE.

Statement, no response required.

3. The site plan's total proposed parking (426 spaces) was consistent with what was presented in the TEE.

Statement, no response required.

4. The site plan showed that the 15 percent EV requirement would equate to 53 total spaces (i.e., 351 x 0.15). The provision of an EV charging station in each garage (or 118 units) would comply with the EV requirement. This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

5. Six (6) EV spaces were proposed among three (3) surface lots (i.e., two (2) EV spaces in each lot). This information is acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

6. The site plan provided on-street parking dimensions of 8' X 18'. The parking dimensions in the surface lots were typically 9' X 18', with the exception of ADA and/or ADA van-accessible spaces. The RSIS standard parking dimension is 9' X 18' for typical parking spaces. The Mendham Borough Ordinance requires that off-street parking dimensions be 10' X 18', with ADA spaces being 12' X 20'. This is inconsistent with the Layout & Dimension Plan. The parking layout for surface spaces (on-street parallel parking and surface lots) should be revisited.

Parking space size is governed solely by the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) and all spaces are consistent with those regulations. Further, ADA requirements specify that ADA spaces be 8 feet in width, with either a 5 foot or an 8 foot access aisle. One in 6 of the ADA spaces must have an 8 foot access aisle. The ADA spaces conform with federal regulations.

7. The 90-degree parking aisle width in surface lots provided on the Layout & Dimension Plan was 24 feet. This is in accordance with the Mendham Borough Ordinance, and deemed acceptable.

Statement, no response required.

8. The parallel parking aisle width provided on the site Layout & Dimension Plan was 12 feet. This is in accordance with the Mendham Borough Ordinance, and deemed acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
9. Please confirm that the access driveway to West Main Street conform to the intersection sight distance requirements set for by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).
As West Main Street is a county road, the sight distance must conform with County standards.
10. Please confirm that the proposed sidewalks provided within the development are a minimum of five (5) feet.
Yes, sidewalks along internal roadways are a minimum of 5 feet in width. Where they abut perpendicular parking spaces they are a minimum of 6 feet in width. Sidewalks to individual units in some locations are 4 feet in width.
11. Please confirm that the proposed curb ramps conform to ADA standards.
All curb ramps are compliant with ADA standards.
12. Please confirm that the proposed curb ramps contain detectable warning surfaces.
Curb ramps along private roadways are not required to have detectable warning surfaces; and therefore, none are proposed.
13. The Layout & Dimension Plan showed six (6) ADA spaces, in addition to at least one (1) van accessible space. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.
14. Please provide vehicle turning templates for Emergency Medical Services, Garbage Truck, Fire Truck, and Delivery Truck design vehicles to ensure adequate circulation entering, exiting, and within the proposed development.
We have provided vehicle turning movement plans for an aerial fire truck (Sheet 29) and a single unit truck (SU-30, Sheet 30) which represent the various vehicles requested.
15. Please clarify whether school buses will be circulating within the proposed development. If so, please provide a vehicle turning template for a School Bus design vehicle among the other design vehicles.
We will confirm with the Mendham BOE if school buses will enter the development. The SU-30 vehicle is representative of a school bus, which illustrates sufficient maneuverability.
16. Please clarify the location of proposed fire hydrants in the vicinity of the 32 buildings. They were not readily apparent on the Layout & Dimensions Plans.
Hydrants are shown and identified on the Utility Plans. They are located in accordance with RSIS requirements.
17. Please clarify if a clubhouse-type social / entertainment area is proposed on the premises.
There is no clubhouse or other amenity building proposed.
18. STOP signs and pedestrian crossings signs were provided at proposed stop bars and crosswalk locations. This information is acceptable.
Statement, no response required.

19. Additional clarification is requested regarding crosswalks nearest Building Numbers 28 and 29. Please explain why the crosswalks in the relative north-south direction were proposed with skewed alignment rather than orthogonal to the roadway.

These are slightly skewed so as not to enter a driveway apron. Curb ramps must be separate from a driveway apron.

20. Please clarify whether there will be external refuse facilities within the development.

There are two (2) refuse and recycling enclosures for the affordable units, one located by Building 14 and the other by Building 26. The market townhouses all have garages and refuse and recycling containers will be stored in the individual garages.

We also received an environmental review letter from Boswell Engineering (Frank Rossi) dated June 18, 2026. There were no comments contained therein which require a response.

J Caldwell & Associates (Jessica Caldwell) Planning Review, dated August 13, 2026

1-11: These items are informational and do not require a response.

Site Plan Review

- 12. Use:** According to § 215-64, townhouse dwelling units for the provision of inclusionary affordable housing pursuant to "low- and moderate-income housing requirements" are permitted uses in the AHO Zone. The Applicant is proposing 147 townhouse dwelling units and 29 affordable housing units.

Statement, no response required.

13. Affordable Housing:

- A.** According to § 215-66A, not less than 20% of the total number of units shall be affordable to low- and moderate-income households. Any computation resulting in a fraction of less than 0.5 shall be rounded down; any computation resulting in a fraction of more than 0.5 shall be rounded up. Said low- and moderate-income housing units shall be constructed on site. As previously stated, 147 dwelling units are proposed, with 29 of those units being affordable housing units (20% set-aside).

Statement, no response required.

- B.** According to § 215-66B, any affordable housing units within the AHO Zone must meet State standards for affordable housing administration found in the Uniform Housing Affordability Controls, N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.1 et seq., and the Borough's Affordable Housing Ordinance. This should be a condition of any approval considered by the Board.

The applicant takes no exception to this as a condition of approval.

14. Parking:

- A.** According to §215-67 of Ordinance #08-2025, the parking standards for the AHO Zone shall use Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) and applicable Federal and State accessibility standards. The following table denotes the parking requirements per RSIS.

Statement, no response required.

- i. Per RSIS, a maximum of 350 parking spaces is required for the proposed residential development. Of the 350 total spaces required, a minimum of 73 visitor spaces is required. The Applicant is proposing a total of 426 parking spaces, consisting of 145 surface parking spaces and 281 private garages with driveways.

Statement, no response required.

- ii. While the proposed number of parking spaces complies, testimony should be provided describing the location of parking for the various units and correlating guest parking for units.

Testimony was provided at the August 18, 2026 Land Use Board meeting on parking.

B. EVSE Parking Requirements

- i. Per N.J.A.C. 40:55D-66.20, for dwellings with five (5) or more units, at least 15% of the required off-street parking spaces shall be prepared as EVSE spaces. As noted above, 350 parking spaces are required; therefore, a minimum of 53 EVSE spaces is needed. The Applicant is proposing EVSE charging in all townhouse units with garages which results in 118 garages with 220V EVSE charging access. In addition, six (6) EVSE surface parking spaces are also proposed. Overall, a total of 124 EVSE spaces are provided.

Statement, no response required.

15. Sidewalks:

- A. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the street internal to the development, along Road A, and are generally provided on both sides of the street, except along Roads B, C, and D in locations where units are not facing the roadway. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding the location and provision of sidewalks. RSIS generally requires sidewalks on both sides of the street for 24' wide roadways with one-sided parking.

Testimony was provided at the August 18, 2026 Land Use Board meeting on sidewalks.

- B. A sidewalk connection to West Main Street is not provided, nor are sidewalks along West Main Street. While no sidewalks exist on the subject property's frontage of West Main Street, they start at Linden Lane, approximately 500 feet east of the site driveway. The Applicant should discuss the ability to provide sidewalks in these locations.

Due to topography and other constraints, it is neither appropriate nor feasible to provide sidewalks along the boulevard to West Main Street.

16. Buffers:

- A. According to § 215-68A, the perimeter buffer shall be a minimum width of 30 feet.

A minimum 30 foot buffer is provided.

- B. According to § 215-68B, the minimum landscaped width shall be 20 feet and suitable for its function of site enhancement, screening, and control of climatic effects.

We have appropriately landscaped the perimeter of the site per ordinance requirements.

- C. According to § 215-68C, the landscape buffer design should retain existing vegetation which is of high quality and appropriate density. A variety of landscape planting materials (Appendix A), such as deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental trees, shrubs, and grasses, as well as ground covers, are proposed within the buffer areas. Testimony should be provided describing the proposed landscaping and any proposed retention of existing trees and vegetation.

Testimony will be provided.

17. Landscaping:

- A.** According to § 215-69A, all landscaping must have a two-year maintenance guarantee. If any planting material dies within two (2) years of planting, it must be replaced the following planting season. Landscape Note 4 on Sheet 13 of the Preliminary and Final Site Plan states, "all plant materials that do not survive the first 24 months after installation shall be replaced."
Statement, no response required.
- B.** According to § 215-69B, a limit of disturbance line shall be established during the review of an application for development taking into account grading, utility placement, and anticipated construction activities. Within the area encompassed by the limit of disturbance, there shall be no requirement for the replacement of trees. Within the area to be disturbed by construction activities, the redeveloper shall liberally install trees, shrubs, and groundcover in accordance with a landscape plan submitted to and approved by the Planning Board. The limit of disturbance is approximately 84.43% (21.91 acres) of the subject property's lot area. A variety of deciduous, evergreen, and ornamental trees, shrubs, and ground cover plantings are provided within the front yard area and stormwater basins, as well as throughout the proposed development, specifically within the proposed townhome courtyard and around the perimeter of the proposed townhome buildings.
Statement, no response required.
- C.** According to § 215-69C, native plants are encouraged. In the design of the landscaping plan, no non-native or invasive species of plants shall be used. The majority of the landscaping proposed is native species.
Statement, no response required.
- D.** According to § 215-69D Ordinance #08-2025, landscaping should be used to accept and complement buildings and provide for climate control in appropriate visual buffering from residentially developed adjacent properties. Testimony shall be provided describing proposed foundation plantings.
Testimony will be provided.

18. Solid Waste:

- A.** According to § 195-51A, provision shall be made for the proper storage and collection of refuse. All such storage shall be maintained within the confines of an enclosed building or structure and shall be reasonably accessible for vehicular collection on the site or shall be appropriately screened and landscaped where outdoor storage is necessary. Two (2) trash enclosures are proposed in the proposed parking lots depicted on Sheet 6 of the site plan. Testimony should be provided confirming whether other trash enclosures are provided throughout the proposed development or if there are other means for the storage and collection of refuse.
See response to Boswell Engineering Site Plan Comment D.5.
- i.** The proposed enclosures consist of a masonry wall with a height of six (6) feet and two (2) swinging solid gates.
Statement, no response required.

19. Fences & Walls:

- A.** According to § 215-29B(2), a fence equal to or in excess of 2 ½ feet in height, but not to exceed four (4) feet in height, may be constructed in any front yard or any yard that abuts either a public or private street, provided that it is not solid and that at least 20% of the overall area of

the entire fence, uniformly distributed, both horizontally and vertically throughout the fence area, is open.

The only fencing in the front yard is PVC three-rail post and rail fencing with black mesh along the tops of the retaining walls. By code, this fence is four feet in height and meets the openness requirement.

- B.** According to § 215-29B(3), no fence more than six (6) feet in height shall be erected within any rear or side yard setback.

No fencing greater than six feet (6') in height is proposed.

- C.** The following fencing is proposed as follows:

- i.** A decorative aluminum fence with a height of 3'-6".
- ii.** A black chain-link vinyl-coated fence with a height of four (4) feet.
- iii.** A bollard and chain gate with a height of four (4) feet.

We have added a PVC three-rail post and rail fencing with black mesh along the bio-retention basins north of Buildings 1 and 7.

20. Retaining Walls:

- A.** According to § 195-52, retaining walls shall be designed to be safe and adequate for the purpose intended. Said walls shall not detract from the aesthetic beauty of the site when constructed and, to this end, shall be fenced or landscaped in accordance with the plans to be approved by the approving authority. Various retaining walls are proposed throughout the proposed developments specifically in and around Basins 'A', 'B', 'C', 'G', 'H', 'I', 'J', 'K', 'M', 'N', 'P', and 'R'. Retaining walls are also provided throughout the site along the internal roadways and within the courtyards. Testimony should be provided regarding design and any proposed or required fencing and landscaping.

Testimony has been provided regarding the wall heights. Fencing is proposed where required by code.

21. Signs:

- A.** Testimony should be provided confirming if any signage, such as a monument sign identifying the residential development name, is proposed. If so, then the sign regulations of §215-8, as well as sign lighting standards (if applicable) of §195-47A(6) shall be followed.

A project sign is not proposed. The existing Community of St. John Baptist signs will remain but be relocated.

22. Architectural Plans:

- A.** According to New Jersey's Uniform Housing Affordability Controls (UHAC), specifically outlined in N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.5, affordable housing units within an inclusionary development must be designed and built to be comparable and integrated with market-rate units. Testimony should be provided confirming compliance with UHAC regulations.

Testimony will be provided.

Ms. Lisa Smith, Land Use Coordinator
Site Plan Response #1, The Greens at Mendham Village
Block 1801, Lot 5, Borough of Mendham, Morris County
September 3, 2026
BCG File No. 081228-03-002
Page 17 of 17

We trust that the plan revisions and other provided documents are adequate to address the comments contained in the professionals' review letters. We look forward to continuing our presentation at the Land Use Board meeting on September 15, 2026. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,
BOWMAN CONSULTING GROUP, LTD.



Eric L. Keller, PE, PP, LEED AP
Vice President
ekeller@bowman.com

cc: Paul Ferriero, PE, CME
Jessica Caldwell, PP, AICP, LEED-GA
80-88 West Main, LLC
Craig Gianetti, Esq.
Robert Cogan, AIA