



January 8, 2024

Autumn Sylvester, P.P., Director, Sussex County Division of Planning and Economic Development
Sussex County Administrative Center
One Spring Street, 3rd Floor
Newton, NJ 07860

**Re: Response to Engineering review letter dated December 11, 2023
SCP# 37(PSP)23: Seegull, LLC
Block 108, Lot 4.01 on CR Rte 669 (MM 5)
1023 Limecrest Rd, Andover Township, Sussex County**

Dear Ms. Sylvester:

I am in receipt of the Preliminary Technical Review letter from the Division of Engineering dated December 11, 2023. Following are responses to the items in the letter:

Documents Reviewed:

No comment/action required.

Related County Requirements:

No comment/action required at this time.

Brief History and Status:

No comment/ no action required.

Review Comments of Above Documents

Agree

Comments:

Agree with Summary

Apparent Waiver:

4. Agree- waiver for sight distance will be requested.



Design Standards:

- 5. Agree
- 6. Agree

Stormwater:

- 7. a. Agree
- 7. b. Agree
- 7. c. Agree
- 7. d. Agree to provide sheet flow easement
- 7. e. Pipe and Structure labels have been added to the plan
- 7. f. Soil log data has been added to the plan.

Site Traffic:

- 8. a. See enclosed Traffic Statement.
- 8. b. See enclosed Traffic Statement.

Access:

- 9. a. See enclosed Traffic Statement.
- 9. b. Agree
- 9. c. These items have been added to the 20 scale plan on sheet 7, waiver for pavement taper will be requested
- 9. d. Sight distance summary table is now shown on the plan, waiver for insufficient sight distance will be requested.
- 10. Concrete drop curb has been added to the plan.

Right of Way & Easement:

- 11. a. Note has been changed on the plan.
- 11. b. Dedication area has been identified on the plan.
- 12. a. Items pertaining to the sight triangle easement now shown on plan.
- 12. b. Applicant will provide a drainage sheet flow easement.

Site Plan:

- 13. a. 200' line has been added to the plan.
- 13. b. Note to this effect has been added to the plan.
- 14. a. No existing drainage along this segment of CR 669.
- 14. b. MUTCD sign ID's have been added to the plan.
- 14. c. Existing edge of pavements are shown on the plan.
- 14. d. Existing paved areas and existing access are shown on the plan.



- 14. e. Pavement and lane widths have been added to the plan.
- 14. f. Note regarding elevation datum has been added to the plan.
- 15. a. MUTCD sign ID's have been added to the plan.
- 15. b. Proposed double yellow line at entrance has been identified on the plan.
- 15. c. Pavement and lane widths have been added to the plan.
- 16. a. Sheet number has been changed to 4.
- 16. b. All items mentioned have been added to the plan.
- 16. c. Soil log data has been added to the plan.
- 17. a. Plant labels have been added to the plan.
- 17. b. Proposed sight easement has been added to the plan.
- 17. c. Professional testimony to be provided.
- 18. a. Detail has been added to the plan.
- 18. b. Detail has been added to the plan.
- 19. a. All items mentioned have been added to the plan.
- 19. b. Change to the note has been made.
- 19. c. Change to the note has been made.
- 19. d. Double yellow line within proposed access has been identified on the plan.
- 19. e. Access widths have been added to the plan.
- 19. f. The owner of Lot 4.02 Block 108 was contacted. A sight easement could not be granted as the property is currently under contract.
- 19. g. Agree. The owner of Lot 4.02 is required to dedicate Right-of-Way per site plan dated 4/10/18. Construction has already begun on Lot 4.02, so we suggest following up with the owner.



Waivers requested:

LDS Section V.E.1c. - Minimum sight distance requirement is not met for P, SU and WB type vehicles looking left and right out of the proposed access drive. 761 feet is required while 439 feet and 632 feet exists looking left and right, respectively.

Reason: The driveway location was selected by the design engineer to be the optimal location based on the existing conditions of the roadway geometry.

Justification: No other practical access point along the frontage will improve sight distance.

Evaluation Criteria:

Sight Distance Waiver evaluation and denial criteria: Sight Distance Waivers will generally be evaluated using the following:

i. Does the requested location optimize the available sight distances available along the property frontage?

RESPONSE: Yes. A sight verification meeting was held in the field with the County Planning and Engineering staff at which time it was determined that the proposed location optimized the available sight distances.

ii. Is access possible from a lower classification roadway?

RESPONSE: No.

iii. Can the proposed access meet minimum AASHTO Sight Distance for the legally posted speed?

RESPONSE: No, sight distance required for 40 MPH posted speed is 761 feet. Sight distance provided is 439 feet.

iv. Can the location provide AASHTO minimum Stopping Sight Distances for the project design speed?

Yes, minimum stopping sight distance required for 45 MPH design speed is provided in both directions.

v. Are there more than one accesses proposed per existing land parcel or existing lot?

RESPONSE: No.

vi. Does the proposal include sight distance improvements for adjacent existing substandard access points?

RESPONSE: No.

vii. Does the proposal eliminate existing substandard access points?

RESPONSE: Yes.



viii. *Does the proposal incorporate on or off tract improvements that will facilitate conformance with the legally posted speed?*

RESPONSE: No, but a sight distance triangle easement is proposed at the driveway.

LDS Section V.Q.3d.- Be transitioned from the curb offset width to the existing edge road using a minimum 50 foot asphalt tapered shoulder to transition from the curb line offset to the existing edge of asphalt.

Reason: The end of the proposed transition curb is too close to the westerly property line to provide for a 50 foot taper.

Justification: The driveway location was chosen to maximize sight distance. Requiring a 50-foot taper would require moving the driveway thereby decreasing sight distance and causing unnecessary danger to the users of the roadway.

Please contact me with any questions.

Regards,

Owen D. Dykstra, P.E.