

JOHN H. ALLGAIR, PE, PP, LS (1983-2001)
DAVID J. SAMUEL, PE, PP, CME
JOHN J. STEFANI, PE, LS, PP, CME
JAY B. CORNELL, PE, PP, CME
MICHAEL J. McCLELLAND, PE, PP, CME
GREGORY R. VALESI, PE, PP, CME

TIM W. GILLEN, PE, PP, CME (1991-2019)
BRUCE M. KOCH, PE, PP, CME
LOUIS J. PLOSKONKA, PE, CME
TREVOR J. TAYLOR, PE, PP, CME
BEHRAM TURAN, PE, LSRP
LAURA J. NEUMANN, PE, PP
DOUGLAS ROHMEYER, PE, CFM, CME
ROBERT J. RUSSO, PE, PP, CME
JOHN J. HESS, PE, PP, CME

ASSOCIATES ASSOCIATES

March 20, 2025

Howell Township Planning Board 4567 Route 9 North PO Box 580 Howell, NJ 07731

Re: Starcap Holdings, LLC (SP-1135)

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan - Engineering Review #1

Block 74, Lot 16.03 Location: 65 Kent Road

Zone: HD-1 (Highway Development Zone 1)

Our File: 115.HWP0075.H04

Dear Planning Board Members:

Our office received the following information in support of the above-referenced application for Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan approval:

- Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan (14 sheets) prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC, dated January 06, 2025, unrevised;
- Truck Circulation Plan (1 sheet) prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated January 06, 2025, unrevised;
- Outbound Survey (1 sheet) prepared by Clearpoint Services LLC dated November 03, 2021, unrevised;
- Topography Survey (1 Sheet) prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated November 20, 2024, unrevised;
- Architectural Floor Plan and Elevations (2 sheets) prepared by Perez & Radosti, dated October 4, 2024, unrevised;
- Prior Planning Board Resolution Case No. SD-2738, dated May 1, 1997;
- Prior Planning Board Resolution Case No. 97-11, dated July 16, 1998;
- Prior Zoning Board of Adjustment Resolution Case No. 97-11, dated January 27, 1998;
- Stormwater Management Report prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated January 6, 2025, unrevised;
- Stormwater Management Operations & Maintenance Manual prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated January 6, 2025, unrevised;

\howell-fs1\Shared\SEC\Howell\Planning Board Reports\75.04 - Prel. & Final Major Site Rvw. #1 3-20-25.docx



March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 2

- Geotech Report prepared by Ocean Development Services LLC dated August 26 2024, unrevised;
- Environmental Impact Statement & National Resource Inventory Report prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated November 18, 2024, unrevised;
- Response Action Outcome letter prepared by Slack Environmental Services, dated August 24, 2023;
- Natural Heritage Database Report, prepared by the NJDEP, dated December 11, 2024;
- Engineer's Report for Sanitary Sewer prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated January 6, 2025, unrevised;
- Engineer's Report for Water Service Connection prepared by MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC dated January 6, 2025, unrevised;
- Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by McDonough & Rea Associates, Inc. dated November 5, 2024, unrevised;
- Howell Township Planning Board submission letter prepared by Heilbrunn Pape, dated January 21, 2025;
- Monmouth County Planning Board submission letter, prepared by Heilbrunn Pape, dated January 21, 2025;
- Freehold SCD submission letter, prepared by MidAtlantic, dated January 21, 2025;
- Submission Letter to Howell Township Utilities Department for Sanitary Sewer service, prepared by MidAtlantic, dated January 14, 2025;
- Submission Letter to Howell Township Utilities Department for Water service, prepared by MidAtlantic, dated January 14, 2025;
- Persons who will testify at the public hearing, prepared by Heilbrunn Pape, dated January 21, 2025;
- List of outside agency approvals required, prepared by Heilbrunn Pape, dated January 21, 2025;
- Checklist Waiver Request Letter, prepared by Heilbrunn Pape, dated January 29, 2025;
- A development application and checklist.



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan - Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 3

In accordance with your authorization, we have reviewed this application for Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan approval and offer the following comments:

Project Description

The subject property contains 1.84 acres within an HD-1 Zone District and provides 385 feet of frontage along Kent Road. Currently, the property contains a 1-story daycare center with parking in the front yard, and one-way circulation from a one-way ingress driveway to a one-way egress driveway, both along Kent Road. There are outdoor playground areas on the north and south sides of the building, and the northern third of the site is densely wooded.

The Applicant is proposing to construct a second-floor addition directly above the footprint of the existing first floor for the purposes of providing more classrooms, as well as two (2) stairwells with one at the front of the building and one at the rear of the building. This stairwells would increase the footprint of the building by 609 sf for a total floor area of 16,187 sf. Additional site improvements include an expanded parking lot on the south side of the building, mill & overlay portions of the existing parking lot, sidewalk along the frontage, lighting, landscaping and stormwater management. The existing daycare is currently serviced by existing water and sanitary sewer found within Kent Road. One trash enclosure will also be located in the rear of the site at the end of the new parking area.

We note that in accordance with the MLUL Section 40:55D-66.6, child care centers shall be a permitted use in all nonresidential districts of a municipality.

2. Zoning Compliance

The subject tract is situated within an HD-1 Zone District. The table below summarizes the bulk measures and zone requirements for the development.

DESCRIPTION	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Minimum Lot Area	80,000 sf	80,288 sf
Minimum Lot Frontage	200 feet	385.1 feet
Minimum Side Yard	25 feet or height of principal building (30.33 ft) whichever is greater	64 feet
Minimum Front Yard Setback	60 feet	83.3 feet



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan – Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 4

	-	
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	25 feet or height of principal building (30.33 ft) whichever is greater	23.6 feet (addition) (V) 32.0 feet (existing)
Maximum Impervious Coverage	70%	44%
Maximum Height	45 feet	30.33 feet
Location of Accessory Buildings	In side or rear yards only, accessory buildings shall be set back twice their height (Shed Height TBD)	2.4 feet (shed) (V)
Minimum Number of Parking Spaces	1 space per employee (24 employees) + 1 space per facility vehicle type (TBD) 3 spaces per classroom (16 classrooms)	67 spaces + 7 EV spaces count as 2 spaces (up to 10% of the requirement = 7 spaces) Therefore, 74 spaces
	Total = 72 spaces	provided.

(V) – Variance (E) – Existing Nonconformity

The Applicant has requested the following variance with this application:

a. **Section 188-Schedule II** – The minimum rear yard setback in the HD-1 zone is 25 feet or the height of the principal building, whichever is greater. The height of the principal building is 30.33 feet; whereas the proposed building addition is set back 23.6 feet from the rear property line.



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan – Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 5

Additionally, the following variances also appear to be required:

- b. Section 188-Schedule II The location of accessory buildings shall be set back twice their height; whereas the existing shed has been relocated to be 2.42 feet from the rear property line. The Applicant shall verify the height of the shed as it related to the setback requirement.
- c. **Section 188-12A** Fences and walls located in the required setback area shall have open space for light and air representing at least 50% of the fence area; whereas solid walls, 4 feet in height, are proposed within 27 feet of the front property line.

The following design waivers appear to be required with this application:

- a. **Section 188-106C** Curbing between vehicular and pedestrian ways shall be designed with periodic ramps from the street or parking grade to the sidewalk which shall be no less frequent than one every 65 feet and located in accordance with a pedestrian circulation plan; whereas the curb ramps are not provided every 65 feet.
- b. **Section 188-106I(6)** Parking shall be discouraged from being located in the yard space between any public street and any principal building, but when located within this yard area, shall be at least 100 feet from the street; whereas parking is proposed approximately 13 feet from the front property line.
- c. **Section 188-225G(1)** All lots shall have private walkway access to a public sidewalk in the right-of-way. Such access shall be designed for the safety, control, efficient movement, convenience and encouragement of pedestrian traffic into and out of the site and to promote pedestrian circulation generally within the Township. Whereas sidewalk access between Kent Road and the building is not provided.
- 3. The Applicant has requested a waiver from providing the following required checklist submission item:
 - a. **Checklist Item #17** All proposed written descriptions including metes and bounds for all easements, covenants and deed restrictions affecting the property in question.

Additionally, the following required checklist submission items should be provided or a waiver requested:

- b. Checklist Item #52 Use designation of all lots within 200 feet.
- c. **Checklist Item #60** All overland and underground drainage conveyances within 2,000 feet that are down flow of the point of discharge.



March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 6

- d. Checklist Items #88 Profiles of utility layouts.
- 4. Based on our review of the subject application, we estimate that the following fees are required:

a. Nonrefundable Application Fees:

Preliminary Major Site Plan: \$1,000 for building area over 10,000 sf + \$100 per each 1,000 sf or fraction over 10,000 sf. (16,187 sf) \$1,618.70

Final: 50% of Preliminary Fee \$809.35

Bulk Variance (Other than residential) \$500 + \$50 per variance

(3) \$650.00

Subtotal: \$3,078.05

b. Professional Services Escrow Fees:

Preliminary Major Site Plan: 10,001 to 50,000 sf \$10,000.00

Final Site Plan: 1/3 of original escrow \$3,333.33

Bulk Variance \$2,000.00 \$2,000.00

Subtotal: \$15,333.33

We recommend the Township collect \$3,078.05 in nonrefundable application fees and \$15,333.33 in professional services escrow fees from the Applicant prior to deeming the application complete. In addition, the Applicant will be required to pay all applicable revision fees as stipulated in the Township Ordinances.

- 5. The Applicant should be prepared to discuss the following issues with the Board:
 - a. Continued compliance, or any specific deviations from prior conditions of approval, specifically related to the number of children and the days/hours of operation.
 - b. All changes to existing operations.
 - c. Function of the relocated shed and compliance with accessory structure setback requirements.



March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 7

- d. All existing and proposed signage should be discussed. It appears the only change may be to install a new wall sign on the front façade of the building. Details for all new signs shall be provided so that compliance with the ordinance may be verified.
- e. The traffic impacts associated with the development including any impacts on adjacent roads, site circulation, and whether sufficient parking is provided.
- f. Whether a K-turn can be provided near the trash enclosure for both passenger vehicles, but also so that garbage trucks do not need to reverse for approximately 180 feet into the entrance driveway from Kent Road.
- g. The adequacy of one trash enclosure as well as the path employees would take between the building and the trash enclosure. The hours of trash pickup shall also be discussed as it relates to the hours of the business.
- h. Whether any other larger vehicles are anticipated to visit the site including busses.
- i. Provide an overview of the existing and proposed stormwater management as well as compliance with NJAC 7:8. We note that the Stormwater report indicates that the application is not a Major Development.
- j. Whether any improvements are required to the existing utility services.
- k. Compliance with Ordinance Section Article IV, Standards of Performance, regarding but not limited to: noise; glare; pollutants; solid/liquid waste; flammable/hazardous material; etc.
- I. The need for any improvements (curb, sidewalk, widening, right-of-way dedication; etc.) along the roadway frontage should be discussed with the Board.
- 6. This application may be subject to the following outside agency approvals:
 - a. Monmouth County Planning Board
 - b. Freehold Soil Conservation District
 - c. Howell Township Municipal Utilities Department
 - d. Howell Township Shade Tree Commission
 - e. Howell Township Environmental Commission



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan - Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 8

- f. Howell Township Police Department
- Howell Township Bureau of Fire Prevention
- h. All other outside agency approvals as may be required. The Applicant shall address the Board regarding the status of all outside agency approvals for the project. In addition, copies of all outside agency approvals shall be forwarded to our office.

Prior to the application being deemed complete, the Board must act on the Applicant's request for the submission waivers as outlined in Item #3 of our report. We recommend the Applicant comply with all applicable notification requirements as set forth in the Howell Township Land Use Ordinance and the Municipal Land Use Law.

The right is reserved to present additional comments pending the receipt of revised plans and/or the testimony of the Applicant before the Board.

If you have any questions with regard to the above matter, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

Launf

CME ASSOCIATES

Laura J. Neumann PE, PP, CME, CFM

Planning Board Engineer

LJN/JAR/TJB

Howell Township Environmental Commission Cc:

Ronald Cucchiaro, Esq. – Board Attorney

Jennifer Beahm – Board Planner

Starcap Holdings, LLC – Applicant/Owner (stbrudny@gmail.com)

MidAtlantic Engineering Partners, LLC – Applicant's Engineer (IIz@midatlanticeng.com)

Kenneth L. Pape, Esq. – Applicant's Attorney (KPape@hpnilaw.com)



JOHN H. ALLGAIR, PE, PP, LS (1983-2001)

DAVID J. SAMUEL, PE, PP, CME

JOHN J. STEFANI, PE, LS, PP, CME

JAY B. CORNELL, PE, PP, CME

MICHAEL J. McCLELLAND, PE, PP, CME

GREGORY R. VALESI, PE, PP, CME

TIM W. GILLEN, PE, PP, CME (1991-2019)
BRUCE M. KOCH, PE, PP, CME
LOUIS J. PLOSKONKA, PE, CME
TREVOR J. TAYLOR, PE, PP, CME
BEHRAM TURAN, PE, LSRP
LAURA J. NEUMANN, PE, PP
DOUGLAS ROHMEYER, PE, CFM, CME
ROBERT J. RUSSO, PE, PP, CME
JOHN J. HESS, PE, PP, CME

HOWELL TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD

Starcap Holdings, LLC

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

March 20, 2025

TECHNICAL ENGINEERING REVIEW #1

A. General

- 1. The Planning Board signature block can be revised to remove the Clerk.
- The parking calculation chart on the Site Layout Plan appears to take credit for both a 7 parking space reduction to the requirement plus a 7 parking space addition to the proposed number of spaces. This EV credit does not apply to both. However, the chart identifies that 60 parking spaces are proposed, whereas it appears that 67 spaces are proposed.
- 3. The tax map diagram appears to be scaled at 1" = 300' whereas the graphic scale states 1" = 500'.
- 4. Revise the bulk chart to include accessory structures.
- 5. The bulk chart states the existing lot area is 80,150 sf whereas the existing condition & demolition plan notes 80,288 sf. This should be verified and corrected.
- 6. A safety railing is required on retaining walls where the wall height exceeds 30". Also verify whether a guide rail is required between the parking spaces and the retaining wall at the basin.
- 7. Provide the dimension for the width of both driveways.
- 8. Provide a callout and dimension for the proposed crosswalk.
- 9. Clarify if the existing "do not enter" sign near the ingress driveway is to be relocated or if a second "do not enter" sign is being installed.
- 10. Bollards shall continue along the row of 20 parking spaces to protect the spaces in front of the playground in addition to the building.
- 11. Revise all concrete details to state a minimum compressive strength of 4,500 psi.

\howell-fs1\Shared\SEC\Howell\Planning Board Reports\75.04 - Prel. & Final Major Site Rvw. #1 3-20-25.docx



March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 10

- 12. Labels for depressed curbs at curb ramps shall be revised to flush curb to ensure there is no lip. Provide a detail as well.
- 13. Provide a callout and detail for the painted directional arrows in the parking lot.
- 14. Provide a detail for the vinyl fence.
- 15. The existing trees along Kent Road should be shown on the Site Layout Plan to verify that there will be adequate space to install the sidewalk.

B. **Grading**

- 1. Provide TW/BW shots at each end of the wall as well as at the beginning and end of the curve.
- 2. Provide additional spot shots at the vertices of the mill & overlay boundary to make it clear the contractor meets existing grade.
- 3. A section of the sidewalk near the northwest corner of the building exceeds 14% slope. Revise the grading in this area, between the 116 and 117 contours.
- 4. The northern edge of the trash enclosure contains less than 1% slope. Revise the grading to provide a minimum of 1% slope in this area.
- 5. Provide proposed contours and spot grade elevations throughout the full length of the proposed sidewalk in the Kent Road right-of-way. The proposed sidewalk is located within an existing slope, so the design shall ensure that the sidewalk will have ADA compliant cross slopes while still maintaining appropriate slopes on each side of the sidewalk.
- 6. Retaining wall design plans and calculations shall be provided for all walls over 30" prior to obtaining resolution compliance.
- 7. If the project will require the import or export of soil, calculations shall be provided to determine the volume. Alternatively, if the site is planned to be balanced, a note indicating same shall be provided on the plans.

C. Stormwater Management

1. The Stormwater report indicates that the project is not a Major Development, however, the combined increase in both motor vehicles surfaces and impervious coverage appears to be close to ¼ acre. Provide a separate sheet or exhibit to compare the



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan – Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 11

existing and proposed conditions and calculate the total increase to demonstrate if it is greater than or less than ¼ acre.

- 2. Basins collecting and detaining stormwater from this development shall tie into downstream stormwater infrastructure instead of bubbling or spilling over into the Kent Road right-of-way across sidewalks and into the street. Investigate any existing stormwater infrastructure in the area that this site could tie into.
- 3. The drainage area maps shall be included in the electronic version of the future resubmission of the stormwater management report.
- 4. Provide a groundwater mounding analysis for the basins on the site.
- 5. Provide drain time calculations for the infiltration basins.
- 6. Provide invert elevations of the roof drains leaving the building.
- 7. A headwall should be used instead of a flared end section if stormwater is to discharge through a retaining wall.
- 8. Provide size, slopes, and the material of all existing and proposed stormwater pipes and underground pipe beds on the site.
- 9. A detail for all stormwater basins should be provided. The details should also include the water surface elevation within the basin for the WQ, 2-, 10-, and 100-year storm events, top of berm, spillway, OCS grate, top of sand and bottom of sand and SHWT.
- 10. Revise the OCS label on the Drainage Plan to include the size and elevation of the invert.
- 11. It appears that the water surface elevation in Basin 5 will be higher than the up stream inlet grate elevation.
- 12. The water surface elevation in Basin 5 will be higher than the emergency spillway. The basin shall be revised so that the 100-year surface elevation is lower than the OCS grate which is lower than the emergency spillway which is lower than the basin berm.
- 13. Revise the detail for OCS-102 to show a 3" orifice with a stopcock valve set at the basin bottom elevation for dewatering purposes only. The valve should be noted "To remain closed during normal operation". This orifice does not need to be modeled for hydrology design purposes. The invert out of the OCS shall be at or below the basin bottom but not above it.



March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 12

14. In accordance with NJAC 7:8-5.2(m) a deed notice for the stormwater management systems shall be submitted for review prior to recording with Monmouth County.

D. ADA (Americans with Disabilities Association)

We defer compliance with ADA requirements to the Construction Code Official. At a minimum, our office offers the following comments:

- 1. All cross hatched ADA spaces should be squared off at the corners instead of rounded. Revise the handicap parking stall striping detail accordingly.
- 2. A minimum of one of the proposed EV spaces shall be made ADA accessible. Provide the proper signage and ensure compliant slopes.
- 3. Provide a callout for the detectable warning pads.
- 4. We recommend the ADA parking signs be installed within the bollards directly in front of the ADA spaces.

E. Landscaping

- 1. In accordance with Section 188-106G, provide additional landscaping to obscure the parking stalls. The plans indicate the existing landscape material will remain; however, the row of parking has been extended, and additional plant materials should be added to comply.
- Revise the plans to provide an alternative species for proposed APS (Norway Maple) as this is an invasive species and is not recommended to be utilized. Also, our office does not recommend BN (River Birch) in close proximity to the parking lot, due to its mature size.
- 3. Revise the plans to provide landscaping between the proposed parking stalls and the fence for the play area north of the building. Currently, landscaping exists in this space, but it is unclear if it will remain.
- 4. Where space exists, shift proposed trees further from the curb line, to reduce potential root damage.
- 5. Revise the 'Planting Notes', sheet 6 of 14, Note #22, to indicate that no mulch shall come into contact with the root flare. Also, clarify if the proposed lawn areas are to be sodded, as lawn seed mixtures are also noted.



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan – Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 13

6. Revise the plans to indicate the proposed disposition for all open areas, such as lawn, mulch, stone, etc., to prevent confusion during construction.

F. Lighting

- 1. The Applicant has indicated all light fixtures are to be re-used and relocated as needed; however, catalog cuts provided on sheet 9 of 14 depict fixtures that are not reflected on the lighting sheet. This should be reviewed and revised to prevent confusion.
- 2. Our office does not find the wall mounted light fixtures proposed to be re-used as acceptable due to the exposed housing unit and its light color temperature of 5,000 Kelvins. Revise the plans to provide full cut off wall mounted light fixtures no greater than 4,000 Kelvins.
- 3. It appears light levels are much greater than necessary. Currently, wall mounted light fixtures have a maximum footcandle of 16.5 and spill beyond the property line to the east. Similarly high light levels within the play area north of the building are also indicated. This should be reviewed and revised.
- 4. Revise the plans to depict isolux patterns on the plans and provide details, for further review.
- 5. Revise the plans to indicate the hours of operation for the site. Light fixtures should be turned off, except for security lighting, after the building is closed to reduce light pollution. Currently, the plans indicate light fixtures to be operated from dusk to dawn.

G. Woodlands Management

- Our office has concerns regarding the proposed construction in close proximity to the existing oak street trees currently indicated to remain. Also, the trees have been severely damaged from utility clearance pruning. This should be reviewed in the field with our office to determine if trees should remain or be replaced.
- 2. All trees proposed to be removed should not be depicted on the landscape sheet to prevent confusion during layout and construction.
- 3. Revise the plans to graphically depict and specifically label tree protection fencing at the limit of disturbance.



Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan - Engineering Review #1

March 20, 2024 115.HWP0075.H04 Page 14

H. Traffic

- Provide a sight triangle at the egress driveway. A sight triangle easement should be prepared to ensure that no obstructions are installed within the sight triangle easement. Additionally, we have concerns regarding the stop bar being approximately 19 feet behind the edge of pavement at the Kent Road egress driveway.
- 2. Provide a "no right turn" sign on the right side of the egress driveway facing the northbound side of Kent Road.

I. Environmental

1. Based on the information presented in the Environmental Impact Statement, the Applicant is going to apply for a NJDEP letter of interpretation (LOI). Based on the Soil Survey and the freshwater wetlands layer within the NJDEP's GEOWEB online GIS resource, there does not appear to be wetlands or wetland transition areas onsite. With this, it is assumed that the Applicant is going to apply for a presence/absence LOI to confirm that no NJDEP regulated features exist onsite. Note #6 on the Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan should be revised to state that there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas onsite, to be confirmed by the NJDEP through an application for an LOI.