

July 3, 2025

Marie Raffay, P.E.
Colliers Engineering & Design
400 Valley Road, Suite 304
Mt. Arlington, New Jersey 07856

**Re: 695 Springfield Avenue Review #2
Beacon Unitarian Universalist Congregation
Block 1702, Lot 47
Summit, Union County, New Jersey
Summit No.: ZB-24-2237
Langan Project No.: 101007201**

Dear Marie:

Included below please find our responses to your review memorandum dated May 30, 2025, regarding the Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for Beacon Unitarian Universalist Congregation project. See Applicant Responses to your review comments in bold below:

Comment 1:

1. The 75,958-square foot (1.74-acre) property is located on the northern side of Springfield Avenue.

**Response 1:
Acknowledged.**

Comment 2

2. The property is in the R-15 Residential Zone, with surrounding properties zoned as R-15 as well.

**Response 2:
Acknowledged.**

Comment 3

3. The Applicant has provided topographic information from a survey prepared by Langan Engineering dated December 8, 2022. The property slopes down from the northwest corner at elevation 361 to the southwest corner at elevation 343.

**Response 3:
Acknowledged.**

Comment 4

4. The property is mostly rectangular in shape with approximately 227-feet of frontage along Springfield Avenue, a rear yard width of approximately 235-feet, and an average depth of approximately 324-feet.

Response 1:
Acknowledged.

Comment 5

5. The property is improved with a two-story brick and vinyl building with concrete porches, brick patio, asphalt driveway, asphalt parking lot, two story wood frame detached garage, rock/masonry walls, and related site improvements.

Response 5:
Acknowledged.

Comment 6

6. The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structures on the property and replace them with a 300-seat sanctuary, church offices, classrooms for religious study, and other spaces dedicated to church use. The Applicant is also proposing to construct a 42-space parking area, solar panels in the parking area, and extensive landscaping. The Applicant should confirm the improvements in testimony. **The Applicant has revised the plans to include four tandem parking stalls at the northeast corner of the project. This increases the amount of available parking on-site to 46 spaces. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding the use of the tandem spaces for larger events.**

Response 6:
Acknowledged. Testimony has been provided.

Comment 7

7. The Applicant notes that the proposed Limit of Disturbance on the property is approximately 1.66 acres (72,310 square feet).

Response 7:
Acknowledged.

Comment 8

8. The Applicant is proposing an increase in Building Coverage of 8,811 square feet from 3,038 square feet (4%) to 11,849 square feet (15.6%), where the maximum permitted in the R-1 5 Zone is 15%. **The Applicant has revised the plans to reduce the originally proposed building footprint. The Applicant is now increasing the Building Coverage of 8,811 square feet from 3,038 square feet (4%) to 11,795 square feet as reflected in the revised stormwater management report. The Applicant should confirm that the zoning table, stormwater management report and the architectural plans have been coordinated.**

Response 8:
The building footprint has been reduced to 11,430 SF (18,007 Gross SF). The building coverage calculation has been updated to include the building overhangs and is 16.2%. Testimony was provided to address the building footprint and building coverage revisions. The zoning table, stormwater management report and the architectural plans have been coordinated.

Comment 9

9. The Applicant is proposing an increase of 12,533-square feet in lot coverage from 22,863-square feet (30.1 %) to 35,396-square feet (46.6%), where the maximum permitted in the R-15 Zone is 40%. **The Applicant has revised the plans to increase the originally proposed lot coverage. The Applicant is now increasing the lot coverage of 22,863-square feet (30.1%) to 37,143-square feet (48.9%) for an increase of 14,280-square feet. The Applicant should confirm that the zoning table, stormwater management report and the architectural plans have been coordinated.**

Response 9:

Acknowledged. The lot coverage has been revised to be 48.9%. Testimony was provided to address the site plan and lot coverage revisions. The zoning table, stormwater management report and the architectural plans have been coordinated.

Comment 10

10. The Applicant is seeking a number of 'c' and 'd' variances. We defer to the Board Planner for review and comment for zoning review.

Response 10:

Acknowledged.

Comment 11

11. Information should be provided regarding the capacity of the existing and proposed sewer and additional flow. The Applicant shall provide testimony regarding the need for TWA permit.

Response 11:

A projected sewer demand summary table is provided.

Comment 12

12. There are several utility crossings on site. The Applicant shall ensure there will be no pipe conflicts during installation.

Response 12:

Acknowledged.

Comment 13

13. The maximum height of the solar canopy array is unclear as depicted on the architectural plan details. There are conflicting elevations of the solar canopy elevation. Is the canopy on a tilt or is it level? What is the height of the highest and lowest points of the canopy? The Applicant should confirm that the solar array canopy will conform to City ordinances.

Response 13:

Solar Canopy detail is provided on the Architectural Drawings. The height is approximately 12 ft. Testimony was provided by the Architect related to canopy height.

Comment 14

14. How will snow and rain drain from the solar panels? The Applicant should provide information and testimony regarding any proposed drainage system for the solar array canopies. All drains should have a clean-out at the downspout.

Response 14:

Testimony was provided. The canopies will have a gutter based system.

Comment 15

15. The Applicant is providing four (4) electric vehicle charging stations and providing signage indicating that vehicles may park only when charging. The Applicant should confirm in testimony.

Response 15:

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 16

16. The Applicant should confirm the location of all mechanical equipment and generators and ensure that they are properly screened.

Response 16:

Testimony was provided. Screening is shown on the landscape plans.

Comment 17

17. It does not appear that a detail of the green roof has been provided. The Applicant should provide a detail and provide testimony.

Response 17:

Testimony was provided. Detail to be provided by Architect at time of building permit submission.

Stormwater:

Comment 18

18. The project disturbs more than one (1) acre of land; therefore, is considered a "major development" as defined by NJAC 7:8.

Response 18:

Acknowledged.

Comment 19

19. The Applicant is proposing to meet the Green Infrastructure (GI) Standards by utilizing GI BMPs from Table 5-1, consisting of porous pavement systems with under drains at 3 locations, small-scale (subsurface) infiltration systems at two locations, rain garden with underdrain at one location, and manufactured treatment devices (MTD) at three locations (WQ-301 & WQ-302).

Response 19:

Acknowledged. Stormwater requirements have been addressed; Refer to Stormwater Management Report.

Comment 20

20. The Applicant proposes to meet the groundwater recharge requirement per NJAC 7:8-5.4(b)1i by demonstrating through hydrologic and hydraulic analysis that the site and its stormwater management measures maintain 100 percent of the average annual pre-construction groundwater recharge volume for the site.

Response 20:

Acknowledged. Stormwater requirements have been addressed; Refer to Stormwater Management Report.

Comment 21

21. The project is exempt from the Stormwater Runoff Quality Standards since the proposed improvements will not result in the creation of one-quarter acre or more of "regulated motor vehicle surface." It is noted that the proposed GI Best Management Practices (BMP) will treat runoff generated by the proposed motor vehicle surface areas and reduce the post-construction load of total suspended solids (TSS) by 80 percent.

Response 21:

Acknowledged. Stormwater requirements have been addressed; Refer to Stormwater Management Report.

Comment 22

22. The Applicant is proposing to meet the stormwater quantity requirement per NJAC 7:8-5.6(b)3 by designing the stormwater management measures so that the post-construction peak runoff rates for the current and projected 2, 10, and 100-year storm events, as defined and determined pursuant to NJAC 7:8-5.7(c) and (d), respectively, are 50, 75, and 80 percent, respectively, of the pre-construction peak runoff rates. Please clarify how emergency overflow with respect to each location will be accommodated per NJAC 5:21 - 7.8.

Response 22:

Acknowledged. Stormwater requirements have been addressed; Refer to Stormwater Management Report. Emergency overflow of each system would occur at the internal weir within the outlet structure. Porous Pavement system outlet control structure OCS2-1, emergency outflow would be over the CB2-1 grate (OCS2-1); Small-scale underground infiltration basin 1-1 (UGD-INF1-1) emergency overflow internal 12" weir, the 100 year flow 0.78 cfs, the downstream pipe capacity is 7.00 cfs; and Small scale underground infiltration basin 1-2 (UGD-INF1-2) emergency overflow internal 18" weir, the 100 year flow is 0.52 cfs, the downstream pipe capacity is 13.99 cfs.

Comment 23

23. Please revise the plans and/or Stormwater Management Report (SWM) to address the following minor inconsistencies.

- a. Proposed UND-INF1-1: The one (1) foot rectangular weir crest elevation differs between the Outlet Control Structure Detail on Sheet CG502 and the Pond report stage-discharge. Please revise for consistency. **Comment Not Addressed. The table in the "Underground Infiltration Basin Outlet Control Structures" detail indicates a crest elevation of 350.60' whereas the stormwater routing calculations and the drainage plan indicate that a crest elevation of 350.80'. Please revise for consistency.**
- b. Proposed Rain Garden: The Outlet Control Structure Detail on CG503 indicates a four(4) inch orifice at elevation 351.75 however the pond report stage-discharge does not include an orifice. Please revise for consistency. **Comment Not Addressed. The table in the "Rain Garden Outlet Control Structure" detail and the drainage plan indicates the 4" underdrain with an invert of 351.75'. This is not included in the pond report for the rain garden. Please revise the routing calculations to include this orifice.**

Response 23

- a. **The Outlet control structure detail has been revised to match the Stormwater Management report with crest elevation of EL 350.80; Refer to CG502.**
- b. **The outlet control structure in the pond report has been revised to include the 4" drain; Refer to the Stormwater Management report.**

Comment 24

24. The Applicant is proposing an outfall and Conduit Outlet Protection (C.O.P) at HW 2-1. We defer further review and approval to the Somerset-Union Soil Conservation District.
Continuing Comment.

Response 24

Acknowledged.

Comment 25

25. The Applicant proposes an on-site stormwater conveyance system consisting of High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipe. The following shall apply:
- a. Per section 5:21-7.3 (c) of the RSIS, velocities in closed conduits flow shall be at least two feet per second to promote self-cleansing. The pipe calculations indicate average velocities that are significantly below the minimum requirement. Please revise for compliance. **Comment Not Addressed. The following pipe runs do not satisfy this requirement: Lines 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 in the first set of pipe calculations and lines 1, 2, 6, 8, and 9. The pipe layout must be revised accordingly.**
 - b. Drainage plan CG102. **Comment Not Addressed. The following inconsistencies between the plans and the pipe calculation s must be addressed:**
 - i. **The pipe slope and inverts for line 7 are not consistent.**
 - ii. **The grate elevations for WQ-1-3, NMH1-1, OCS1 -3, and WQ1 -2.**
 - iii. **The leader for line 17 is missing from the site plans**

Response 25

- a. **RSIS standards are not applicable for this use. The noted pipes are connected to the roof drain pipe which will have a velocity pressure head not accounted for in the conveyance calculations.**
- b. **The conveyance calculations have been revised to match the plans accordingly;**
 - a. **The pipe lengths and slopes are associated with the roof drains, the bends are not labeled on the plans but the pipe lengths between bends are labeled and consistent with the conveyance calculations.**
 - b. **Grate elevations in the conveyance calculations have been revised to match the plans.**
 - c. **The pipe label has been added to the Drainage Plan.**

Comment 26

26. Based on the geotechnical report, groundwater was encountered at TP-7, within the vicinity of proposed Porous Pavement System-1 , at approximate elevation 347. The bottom of the storage bed is proposed at elevation ?48, therefore the minimum one (1) foot clearance required for infiltration systems with underdrains is provided. Please revise the section detail and O&M Manual to indicate the SHWT elevation at proposed Porous Pavement System-1 . **Comment Not Addressed. Please provide an updated stormwater maintenance plan and revised the "Underground Infiltration Basin 1 -1 Section" detail.**

Response 26

Typical porous pavement detail shows the dimensional information for depth to SHWT. Same note has been added to the Underground Infiltration Basin 1-1 section detail. The Stormwater Maintenance manual has been revised with the updated Drainage Plans and Details. The SHWT observed in TP-7 is EL 346.0 which is two feet below bottom of stone bed of the Porous Pavement system.

Comment 27

27. Per NjAC 7:8-5.2(m), the proposed BMPs (porous pavement systems, small scale infiltration basins, rain garden and MTDs) must be reflected in a deed notice recorded in the Office of the County Clerk. A form of deed notice should be submitted to the City for approval prior to filing. **Continuing comment.**

Response 27

Acknowledged.

Site Circulation:

Comment 28

28. The Applicant is requesting a variance for minimum number of parking spaces. 100 spaces are required where 42 are proposed. The Applicant is proposing to use 58 off site parking spaces on the north side of Springfield Avenue but provides no further information or documentation to support this. The Applicant should provide testimony.

Response 28

The plans have been revised to include four tandem parking spaces for a total of 46 proposed parking spaces. Based upon the reduction of seats in the design, the new total parking required is 79 spaces. The Applicant is now proposing 33 off-site parking spaces. The Applicant should provide testimony on the use of the tandem spaces.

Comment 29

29. The Applicant is requesting a variance for minimum parking lot landscaping. One shade tree per ten parking spaces is required where no parking lot landscaping is provided. The Applicant should provide testimony.

Response 29

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 30

30. Fire Truck Circulation plan has been provided. A gap in the solar array canopy has been provided to allow for truck maneuvering. It is unclear how a truck will maneuver when the parking spaces are full. We defer further comment to the City Fire Official.

Response 30

Acknowledged.

Comment 31

31. The Applicant should provide testimony on the site circulation including pickup and drop-off for all programs and events on site.

Response 31

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 32

32. The Applicant is proposing a trash storage area at the northwest corner of the building. A nine (9) foot high wood screen fence is proposed to screen the collection. The Applicant should provide testimony on the amount of trash and recycling anticipated to be collected and how the trash and recycling will be collected.

Response 32

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 33

33. The Applicant should provide testimony on ADA site circulation from the parking lot to the building.

Response 30

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 34

34. The Applicant should provide testimony on the pedestrian access for the parking lot to the building and the outdoor facilities.

Response 34

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided.

Comment 35

35. Dimensions should be added to parking spaces around the curve north of the ADA spaces to ensure that the narrowest point of width still complies with City ordinance. The Applicant should provide testimony on the dimensioning of the spaces.

Response 35

Acknowledged. Testimony was provided. Narrowest part of the curved parking spaces is 9 ft and is dimensioned on the Site Plan; Refer to Drawing CS101.

Comment 36

36. The solar canopies as shown on the architectural plans show supporting columns however the location of the columns is lacking on the site plan. It is unclear where the supporting columns are to be located. The location of columns should be shown in the site plan. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding the columns and any potential interference with vehicles parking.

Response 35

Acknowledged, this will be coordinated on the final site plans. Testimony was provided.

Miscellaneous:

Comment 36

36. The Applicant appears to propose removal of 30 trees from the property. We defer to the City Forester for review and approval of the proposed improvements.

Response 36

Acknowledged.

Comment 37

37. The Applicant shall be aware of their responsibility to repair any damage to improvements within the City right-of-way including, but not limited to, curb and asphalt caused by construction activities associated with the installation of the improvements on the subject lot.

Response 37

Acknowledged.

Comment 38

38. The Applicant has noted that they will maintain a silt fence for the entire duration of construction

Response 38

Acknowledged. All soil erosion measures will remain in place during entirety of construction.

Comment 39

39. The Applicant shall remove all excavated and excess soil from the site and shall not use excess soils elsewhere on site.

Response 39

Acknowledged.

Comment 40

40. The Applicant shall be aware that if stormwater runoff drainage problems occur on their property and/or neighboring properties because of the construction of the proposed improvements, it is the Applicant's responsibility to remedy that drainage issue.

Response 40

Acknowledged.

Comment 41

41. As a condition of approval, signed digital plans shall be transferred to the City of Summit for use in updating the GIS database for the property. Coordination with the City's Engineering Department shall be the responsibility of the Applicant after the application is approved by the City and prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Response 41

Acknowledged.

We trust that these revisions meet your approval and we look forward to your expedited review. Please feel free to contact me directly at 973-560-4987 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, LLC


John Coté, PE, LEED AP
Associate Principal

JCC/th

Enclosure(s): Preliminary/Final Site Plan set
Stormwater Management Report
Stormwater O&M Manual
Sewer Demand Calculation
Architectural Exhibits (Glare Studies; Views from Adjacent Properties)
Landscape Architectural Plans (L-100; L-300; LP101; LP102; LP103)

cc: Robin Tanner, Beacon
Roger Mehner, Lindabury
Louis Cherry / Alison Croop, Louis Cherry Architecture
Tavis Dockwiller, Viridian