

May 28, 2021

Ms. Geraldine Entrup  
Administrative Officer, Zoning Board  
Township of Mahwah  
475 Corporate Drive  
Mahwah, NJ 07430

Re: Review Letter Brew Land LLC, Block 132, Lot 3.01 Docket No. 625

Colliers Engineering & Design Project No. MWP-0099

Dear Ms. Entrup,

We are in receipt of the above-referenced Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan Application and associated documents. We have reviewed the following documents submitted by the Applicant in support of this application.

1. Application Checklist complete 6/12/2021;
2. Development Application dated 4/28/2021;
3. Summary of Amended Site Plan Application;
4. Owner's Affidavit of Consent, dated 4/23/21;
5. Ownership Disclosure Statement, dated 4/23/21;
6. Verification of Taxes Paid, dated 5/18/2021;
7. Historic Preservation Commission Application dated 4/23/2021;
8. Survey, prepared by Steven D. Rigg for Rigg Associates, PA, dated 12/3/2009 and revised through 2/19/2020;  
and
9. Site Plans, prepared by Eve Marie Mancuso for Brooker Engineering PLLC, dated 4/2/2021.

**A. Site Description**

The subject site is located at 219 Ramapo Valley Road, just southwest of State Highway Route 17. The property is designated as Block 132, Lot 3.10 on the Mahwah Tax Map. The 2.14-acre lot is zoned B-40 (Highway Business). The lot is developed with a restaurant, which is a permitted use in the zone. The site sits directly across from the Ramapo River, is generally surrounded by commercial uses with a restaurant to the north and a hotel to the south. A large wooded area buffers residential uses to the southeast.



*Figure 1 – Google Aerial showing approximate location of the property in red.*



*Figure 2 – Google StreetView of property from Ramapo Valley Rd.*



*Figure 3 – Google Axonometric of property indicating area of proposed development*

## **B. Proposed Project**

The Applicant proposes to add a 2,100-square foot outdoor pavilion to the existing restaurant, increasing dining space and adding space for entertainment. The pavilion is proposed in the existing parking lot, eliminating 12 parking spaces.

The proposed pavilion will seat 60 patrons.

## **C. General Comments**

1. Upon eliminating the row of parking closest to the building, how will truck deliveries be handled?
2. The Applicant indicates that 67 seats will be eliminated inside the restaurant. No revised floorplans have been provided to evidence this change. It is not possible to verify the compliance of the parking without architectural floorplans demonstrating a change in occupancy.
3. No plans have been provided showing the elevations or floorplans of the Pavilion. Is this an actual building, or is it a tent? If a tent, are there walls or is this open to the elements? Will a kitchen, restrooms, etc. be located in this structure?
4. Are any signs or illumination proposed for the pavilion structure?
5. The resolution of approval from the original site plan has not been provided to evaluate the current proposal against.
6. The zoning table shows a rear yard setback of 279.1 feet, unchanged from existing. With a new structure proposed in the rear yard, this is not correct. A rear yard string dimension of 227.6' is shown, but it incorrectly measures to a point offsite. This dimension must be re-measured, and the zoning table corrected.
7. It is noted that although the dining area has increased, the seating capacity change is negligible. This should be discussed.
8. An 18.5' aisle is shown between the pavilion and existing restaurant. What is the purpose of this aisle? With parking eliminated, no vehicles would be accessing this space. However, aerial photography

shows 18-wheeler trucks using this space. If vehicles are accessing this space, we defer to the municipal engineer for comment on the sufficiency of the access aisle width and turnaround.

9. No pedestrian connection between the existing restaurant and pavilion is provided. There is no sidewalk between the two, for example. Will customers enter the restaurant and then be escorted through the back to the pavilion, or will the two buildings operate separately?
10. Parking requirements for restaurants are based on the assumption that patrons will be seated (hence 1 space per 2.5 seats). The applicant proposes this pavilion to host live entertainment as well as dining area. Will all entertainment be enjoyed by seated customers, or will there be standing-room capacity for entertainment such as can be found at entertainment venues?

We reserve the right to make additional comments based upon further review or testimony presented before the Board. Should you have any questions on this correspondence please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Colliers Engineering & Design



Debbie Alaimo Lawlor, FAICP, PP  
Discipline Leader-Planning Services

DAL/kjr

cc: Mary Jo Wood, Recording Secretary ([mwood@mahwahtwp.org](mailto:mwood@mahwahtwp.org))  
Michael J. Kelly, Township Engineer ([mkelly@boswellengineering.com](mailto:mkelly@boswellengineering.com))  
Jennifer Knarich, Esq., Applicant's Attorney ([jknarich@pricemeese.com](mailto:jknarich@pricemeese.com) )  
Eve Marie Mancuso, PE, Applicant's Engineer ([emancuso@brookerengineering.com](mailto:emancuso@brookerengineering.com) )

R:\Projects\M-P\Mwp\MWP-0099\Correspondence\OUT\210528\_Brew Land\_dkt625\_COLLIERS\_review.docx