

June 22, 2026

Lisa Smith, Secretary
Mendham Borough Joint Land Use Board
2 West Main Street
Mendham, New Jersey 07945

Re: The Greens at Mendham Village
Block 1801, Lot 5
80-88 West Main Street
Project No. 26MDP103

Dear Ms. Smith:

The above referenced application requests amended site plan and subdivision approval for the previously approved inclusionary development project on Lot 5 in Block 1801 along West Main Street. The traffic-related comments are associated with the Traffic Engineering Evaluation and Preliminary and Final Site Plan provided by Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd., dated February 12, 2026.

Comments and observations include the following:

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.
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.
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.
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.
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).



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.
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.
8. The volumes in the Existing conditions figure matched the analysis printouts. This information is acceptable.
9. The level of service (LOS) results for the existing conditions were LOS D or better for the weekday AM and PM peak hour.
10. The build year of the proposed development is 2029.
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.
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.
13. To be conservative, the TEE utilized the NJDOT Annual Background Growth Rate Table over six (6) years. This information is acceptable.
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.
15. The TEE mentioned that there were no approved developments in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site.
16. The volumes provided in the No Build condition figure matched the analysis printouts.
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.



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.
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.
20. The Site Generated Traffic volume figure matched the trip generation projections. This information is acceptable.
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.
22. The volumes provided in the Build condition figure matched the analysis printouts.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
3. The site plan's total proposed parking (426 spaces) was consistent with what was presented in the TEE.
4. The site plan showed that the 15 percent EV requirement would equate to 53 total spaces (i.e., 351×0.15). The provision of an EV charging station in each garage (or 118 units) would comply with the EV requirement. This information is acceptable.
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.



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.
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.
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.
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).
10. Please confirm that the proposed sidewalks provided within the development are a minimum of five (5) feet.
11. Please confirm that the proposed curb ramps conform to ADA standards.
12. Please confirm that the proposed curb ramps contain detectable warning surfaces.
13. The Layout & Dimension Plan showed six (6) ADA spaces, in addition to at least one (1) van accessible space. This information is acceptable.
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.
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.
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.
17. Please clarify if a clubhouse-type social / entertainment area is proposed on the premises.
18. STOP signs and pedestrian crossings signs were provided at proposed stop bars and crosswalk locations. This information is acceptable.



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

I trust the above comments are useful to the Board in its review of the application. Should additional information or clarification be requested, please feel free to contact me or Paul Ferriero, P.E., CME.

Very truly yours,

Marco E. Navarro, PE, PTOE
Project Manager

cc: Board members
Thomas Germinario, Esq.
Jessica Caldwell, PP/AICP