



September 17, 2008

Via email: zoningdept@fairlawn.org
Attn: Cathy Boza, Zoning Board Clerk

Borough of Fair Lawn Zoning Board
8-01 Fair Lawn Avenue, P.O. Box 376
Fair Lawn, NJ 07410

Attn: Mrs. Ann Peck
Zoning Officer

Re: **Traffic Engineering Review No. 1**
Case No. 2008-036
18-35 River Road, LLC (The Oppper Group)
Block 5834, Lots 1, 3 & 4
Borough of Fair Lawn
Medina Project No. 08007-08-036

Dear Board Members:

Our office has reviewed the subject application for traffic engineering and traffic safety issues based on receipt of the following materials:

- Application and supporting materials prepared for the property in question
- Concept Site Plan, prepared by Weissman Engineering Co., P.C., dated Revision 2 – April 29, 2008, containing 1 sheet.
- Wetlands Delineation Plan, prepared by Weissman Engineering Co., P.C., dated Revision 2 – April 29, 2008, containing 1 sheet.
- Subdivision Plan, prepared by Weissman Engineering Co., P.C., dated November 14, 2007, containing 1 sheet.
- Conceptual Architectural Plans, prepared by Studio 5 Partnership, dated July 1, 2008, containing seven sheets.

I. General

The property in question is an irregular corner lot located at the southeast corner of Maple Avenue and River Road containing a total area of approximately 7 acres. The property is located in the I-2 General Industrial Zone and contains multiple one and two story industrial buildings of unspecified size.

- CIVIL ENGINEERING
- RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS
- ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES & PERMITS
- FLOOD STUDIES & STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
- RECREATIONAL & LANDSCAPE DESIGN
- BRIDGE STRUCTURAL DESIGN
- BUILDING STRUCTURAL DESIGN
- STRUCTURAL INSPECTION
- GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING
- TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC ENGINEERING
- HIGHWAY DESIGN
- RAILROAD DESIGN
- HIGHWAY & RAIL LAND SURVEYING
- BOUNDARY & TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEYS
- HIGH DEFINITION SURVEYS / 3D LASER SCANS
- RIGHT-OF-WAY DOCUMENTS
- CONSTRUCTION STAKEOUT
- CONTRACTOR DESIGN SUPPORT
- CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
- CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION

www.medinaconsultants.com

1100 Valley Brook Ave., Suite 201
Lyndhurst, NJ 07071
Tel: 201.372.1511
Fax: 201.372.1522

One Edgeview Drive
Hackettstown, NJ 07840
Tel: 908.850.3366
Fax: 908.850.3326

3379 Quakerbridge Road, Suite 200
Hamilton, NJ 08619
Tel: 609.838.6425
Fax: 609.838.6422

And Offices in New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut

The proposed development consists of a minor subdivision to create two separate lots. The front portion of the property abutting the roadway intersection, identified as Proposed Lot A, will contain approximately 3.2 acres and will be developed with retail uses. The rear portion of the lot, identified as Proposed Lot B, will contain approximately 3.8 acres and will be developed with residential uses. As depicted on the Concept Site Plan, the proposed development contains the following:

Proposed Lot A:

Retail Building 1	1-story	13,000 square feet
Retail Building 2	1 story	4,200 square feet
Retail Building 3	1-story	3,500± square feet

Proposed Lot B:

Residential Building 1	3-story	33 Units	Garden Apartments
Residential Building 2	3-story	31 Units	Garden Apartments

In addition, one existing building located just off Maple Avenue is designated as “to remain”. The size of the building and proposed use are not specified.

The proposed retail and residential uses are both expressly prohibited in the B-2 zone. The applicant is seeking approval for a preliminary and final minor subdivision as well as a use variance. The required approval requests for preliminary and final site plan approval have been bifurcated from the application. Variances are also sought for encroachment into the rear yard setback for Lot A, and for access to Lot B which will not front on a public street as required by Section 125-51(c) of the Ordinance.

Access to Proposed Lot A is shown as a full movement ingress/egress drive on Maple Avenue approximately 150 feet east of its intersection with River Road. An additional full movement driveway is shown on River Road approximately 290 feet south of its intersection with Maple Avenue.

Access to the residential buildings on Lot B is shown through an access aisle constructed on Lot A that intersects with Webber Place/Lake Street at the northeast corner of the site.

II. Traffic Operations

The application provided to the Board does not contain any data or analysis regarding traffic operations or analysis. Our office has estimated the peak hour site traffic for the proposed uses from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 7th Edition of the *Trip Generation Manual*, which is summarized in the following Table:

TABLE 1
Peak Hour Trip Generation – Proposed Development

Time Period	Retail Use – Lot A			Residential Use – Lot B		
	Enter	Exit	Total Trips	Enter	Exit	Total Trips
Weekday AM Peak Hour	37	24	61	7	28	35
Weekday PM Peak Hour	106	115	222	34	18	53
Saturday Midday Peak Hour	162	149	311	23	23	45

In general, trip generation for retail uses are significantly more intense than industrial uses for each 1,000 square feet of floor area. The applicant does not provide sufficient information on the existing industrial use at the site to determine if the proposed use for this particular site is more or less intense than the existing use or other uses that are permitted on the site. Relative to traffic operations on the site, the Applicant should provide the following:

1. Provide a comparison of the existing traffic activity using the site and compare it to the traffic activity estimated for the proposed development.
2. Provide a comparison of the traffic estimated for the proposed development relative to permitted uses on the site.
3. Provide a Traffic Impact Analysis of the existing roadways and intersections adjacent to the site. A scope of study should be prepared to determine the appropriate offsite intersections that should be evaluated for potential site related impacts. At a minimum, the report should address the proposed site access points, the River Road/Maple Avenue intersection and the Weber Place/Lake Street intersection.
4. Provide a comparative analysis of the site access points and offsite intersections for pre and post operational conditions in the anticipated build year.
5. Address appropriate and effective mitigation to offset impacts created by the increased traffic associated with the proposed development.

III. Site Access

1. The intersection of River Road and Maple Avenue is a signalized intersection under Bergen County jurisdiction. The southern leg (River Road) and eastern leg (Maple Avenue) of the intersection are designated as County Route 507, and Urban Principal Arterial under County jurisdiction with posted speeds ranging from 30 to 40 miles per hour across the site frontage. The northerly leg of the intersection Wagaraw Road is designated as County Route 69, an Urban Principal Arterial with an unposted speed limit.
2. All approaches to the River Road/Maple Avenue intersection contain one travel lane in each direction plus a dedicated left turn lane. The left turn lanes on the

southern and eastern legs of the intersection extend for a considerable portion of the subject site's frontage.

3. The Applicant should address vehicle queuing at the approaches to the signalized intersection of River Road and Maple Avenue as a part of the Traffic Impact Analyses. The stacking of vehicles in the dedicated left turn lanes could impact traffic movements and safety at the proposed site driveways. The Applicant should provide an analysis of the proposed driveway operations and the effect of their proximity to the signalized intersection.
4. The proposed access to the residential development (Lot B) is illustrated on the Concept Site Plan as an extension through proposed Lot A to intersect Webber Place at its intersection with Lake Street. The existing intersection is configured as a right angle turn where Webber Place intersects Lake Street. The proposed site access is shown intersecting the existing right angle bend in the road with no geometric improvements. The Applicant should detail how the proposed access will be constructed, and indicate what geometric changes are necessary at the existing intersection.
5. A connection to the retail development on Proposed Lot A is also shown extending from the Webber Avenue/Lake Street intersection. The Applicant should clarify if the intent is to permit traffic for the proposed commercial uses on the site to directly access the adjacent residential streets.

IV. Concept Site Plan

Although the Applicant is not currently seeking site plan approval, we have reviewed the Concept Site Plan for general compliance with accepted practices and layout and have provided the following general comments. Should the Applicant advance Site Plans following a favorable vote by the Board on the Use Variance aspect of the Application, more detailed review and comments will be provided.

A. Site Circulation

1. Access to the existing building designated to remain on the site does not integrate well into the other portions of the site. The ingress only aisle appears narrow and should extend off of a main drive aisle in the site as opposed to an extension of a parking field. The two way driveway is located very close to the residential and retail access driveway proposed just of the existing Webber Place/Lake Street intersection.
2. Several drive aisles to parking fields intersect the main drive aisles in close proximity to the site driveways leaving limited internal stacking for traffic exiting onto the adjacent roads. The driveway throat should be configured to account for anticipated queuing without impacting internal site circulation.
3. The proposed dumpster locations for Retail Buildings 2 & 3, as well as for Residential Buildings 1 & 2 do not appear accessible without service vehicles

impacting general site circulation. As a part of the site plan development, the applicant should provide truck turning simulations to demonstrate serviceability of the proposed dumpster areas.

4. A dumpster area for Proposed Retail Building 1 should be considered as one is not provided.
5. Loading Zones for the proposed retail buildings should comply with the Ordinance requirements for number and size.
6. A loading zone is not shown for Proposed Retail Building 3 and should be provided.
7. Loading and servicing at the existing building to remain should be addressed on the Site Plan.
8. The drive through lane on Proposed Retail Building 1 does not provide sufficient stacking without impacting opposing traffic on the main drive aisle.
9. Pedestrian connections should be incorporated into the site plan that provides connections between the residential uses and the several retail buildings.
10. Pedestrian access to the site from the adjacent residential developments should be considered to encourage reduction in vehicular traffic accessing the site.

B. Site Parking

1. The proposed development illustrates that parking for both the residential and retail components of the site will be provided in excess of the Ordinance requirements.
2. The Applicant should address possibilities for shared parking to reduce the overall impact on the site in terms of impervious surface and underutilized parking spaces.
3. As shown on the Concept Site Plan, parking for the residential uses does not appear separated from the retail uses other than by a drive aisle. The Applicant should address intended measures to reduce encroachment of the retail parking activity into the residential area.
4. The proposed parking shows a mix of angled parking (implying a one-way drive aisle) and right angle parking along two-way drive aisles. Mixing the two configurations tends to cause driver confusion, and the applicant should consider reconfiguring the site to eliminate the one portion shown with angled parking.
5. The parking area for the existing building that will remain should be detailed on the plan and the required/provided parking calculations for this use should be included in the total computations for the site.

V. Summary

1. The Board should require a Traffic Impact Analysis and Report from the Applicant addressing potential impacts on adjacent streets and intersections before acting on the requested Use Variance. The impact of traffic operations on the adjacent roadways should be considered in the balancing of the positive and negative aspects of the proposed nonconforming uses on the site.
2. The Board should require a more descriptive design concept of the proposed site access points, particularly at the proposed connection with Webber Place/Lake Street where the applicant is proposing a connection for both residential and retail uses.
3. The site driveways on River Road and Maple Avenue should be evaluated relative to the separation from the signalized intersection and the interaction with the dedicated left turn lanes to determine the adequacy of turning movements and available lines of sight.
4. Our office cannot provide the Board with an assessment of how traffic operations may affect the existing area based on the limited information provided to date. Upon receipt of the additional information recommended herein, we will provide the Board with additional comments.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (908) 763-5512.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark Kataryniak, P.E., PTOE
Director of Traffic Engineering

cc: W.C. Soukas, Esq, Board Attorney
P. Azzolina, P.E., Board Engineer
J. Beahm, AIPC, PP, Board Planner
S. Liebman, Esq., Applicant's Attorney