

May 9, 2018

Mark J. Edsall  
Engineer for the Village  
Village of Chester  
33 Airport Center Drive Suite 202  
New Windsor, New York 12553

Re: *Response to Review Comments*  
*Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union*  
*87 Brookside Avenue (Route 17M)*  
*Chazen Project # 10512.25*

Dear Mr. Edsall:

Attached please find a copy of the revised Site Plans and additional supporting information for the Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union project in the Village of Chester. We have received the following comments from the Village Planning Board and the Orange County Department of Planning as part of our previous submission and we offer the following point-by-point responses.

As requested the site plans have been significantly advanced and additional details have been provided. The layout of the site is generally the same with the exception being the consideration of removing the northern most driveway connection and improving upon the other access to the site. We will continue working with NYSDOT on the driveways and if the northern most driveway was to remain in the project it would not be restricted to just a one way similar to your office's Comment #2 below.

**Comments from the Village of Chester Planning Board in a letter dated November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017:**

1. **Comment:** *The property is located in the B-2 zoning district of the village. The bank use is a Principal Permitted Use for the zone. The bulk information provided in the table on sheet C130 appears correct. The site as depicted appears to comply from a zoning standpoint.*

**Response:** We concur.

2. **Comment:** *From a conceptual standpoint, the layout seems to function well, although I question the single (ingress) configuration of the north curb but. This decision should be finalized following input from the NYSDOT.*

**Response:** Comment acknowledged. We have coordinated this with NYSDOT and consideration is being made to remove that access point and improve the southernmost access location. The site plans have been revised to reflect this alternative.

3. **Comment:** *We have reviewed the concept site plan and have the following initial comments:*

- *Depending on the outcome of the one-way or two-way nature of the north side of the site, additional one-way signs may be needed.*

**Response:** We have coordinated this with NYSDOT and consideration is being made to remove that access point and improve the southernmost access location. The site plans have been revised to reflect this alternative. The circulation has been revised.

- *The back out dimension of 20ft is inadequate and unacceptable for the north and west parking areas (16-spaces and 7-spaces)*

**Response:** The lane widths have been revised to 24-foot wide in the parking areas as requested.

- *A stop sign should be added on the east end of the stop bar exiting the drive thru lanes.*

**Response:** The plan set has been revised. A stop sign has been added on the east end of the stop bar existing the drive thru lanes.

- *Details and elevations (TW/BW) for the retaining wall should be provided. Depending on the height, the standard wall notes may be required.*

**Response:** The plan set has been revised. Sheet C140 has been added to the set as a grading plan and shows TW/BW elevations. Additional details have been added to the set.

- *The front sidewalk should be at least 6 ft., since vehicle overhang will “waste” at least 2 ft. of the sidewalk.*

**Response:** The plan set has been revised. The front sidewalk width has been revised to 6 ft.

- *Further evaluation of the detail for the emergency cross access can occur prior to final plans. This can be discussed at the work session.*

**Response:** As discussed at the workshop and based on feedback from the owner of the property the emergency cross access has been removed from the plan. We received the emergency vehicle turning template from the Village and we have confirmed that the vehicle can make the turning movements throughout the site.

- *Grading, utility, landscaping, lighting and detail sheets should be added to future submittals.*

**Response:** The plan set has been revised. Grading, utility, landscaping, lighting and detail sheets have been added to the set.

- *The project number can be added to the approval boxes (17-08)*

**Response:** The plan set has been revised. The project number has been added to the approval box on Sheet C130.

4. *The submittal includes a floor plan and elevation drawings from the project architect. Normally these are not added as part of the site plan drawing set, and are usually reviewed for “information only”. If the Board wants these drawings as part of the site plan package, they should be numbered and included into the application drawings and not submitted separately.*

**Response:** The floor plans and elevations were provided to the Village as part our initial submission for information only. If the Board desires these to be part of the site plan package we can include them in the set.

5. *The applicants' professional should determine the area of disturbance (in acres) related to the project, such that a determination can be made as to the submittal requirement of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention regulations.*

**Response:** We have prepared a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and have attached it to this submission.

6. *This project adjoins NYS Route 17M and, as such, must be referred to the Orange County Planning Department as per New York State General Municipal Law (GML 239).*

**Response:** Comment acknowledged and our previous submission was referred to Orange County Planning and their comments and our responses are included in this response letter.

**Comments from the Orange County Department of Planning in a letter dated December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017:**

1. **Comment:** *Additional Board Review: Although the proposed building development is located within the permitted building envelope, a short length of the retaining wall required for the proposed parking lot will be within the setback area. The Planning Board should consult with the Zoning Board of Appeals to determine whether an area variance is necessary for this project, and proceed according to that determination.*

**Response:** Comment acknowledged and it is not anticipated that a variance would be required for the walls.

2. **Comment:** *Potential Air Quality Impacts: The proposed building plan shows three drive-up ATM lanes. As standing vehicles have a known adverse impact to air quality through their exhaust, the Village should consider whether three drive-up lanes are truly necessary, and should work with the applicant to amend the site plan as necessary.*

**Response:** The project proposes three lanes. The additional lanes reduce the amount of idle time as the branch can complete the transactions quicker and serve more members. Less lanes would create longer lines at the drive thru resulting in longer idle times.

3. **Comment:** *Parking Lot: Due to the proposed use of the lot as a credit union, replacing its current restaurant use, the impervious surfacing will be significantly reduced onsite, which the County supports. The impervious surfacing could be further reduced by the installation of pervious pavement in the area to be striped for parking spots; if the Village wished to require that, the County would be happy to provide resources. Further, the applicant has shown arrows on the site plan indicating the direction of travel throughout the site, as well as several "no entry" signs for the one-way driveways. If possible, the applicant should have those arrows painted onto the drive aisles as well as installing the signage for an extra safety measure.*

**Response:** Comment acknowledged and the directional arrows will be painted onto the drive aisles. The storm water management systems proposed promote recharge and reduce the amount of off-site stormwater discharge.

4. **Comment:** *Stormwater Management: We commend the applicant for the reduction in pavement area, and for the addition of multiple trees to the project site. In an effort to retain stormwater onsite to the*

*greatest extent possible, however, the Village could require that the applicant include additional plantings suitable for bioretention areas, including shrubs and small trees as well as ground covers.*

**Response:** Additional plantings have been added to the site plan and the bio-retention area will be planted and seeded in accordance with the NYSDEC stormwater design manual.

5. **Comment:** *Emergency Access:* *The site plan shows a connection between the site and the Holiday Inn site to the south of the project site, labeled as a "possible emergency cross access with gate." The County would actually support a full connection between the two sites, if the applicants would be amenable. However, if the purpose of this connection is truly limited to emergency access only, then the gate provided between the two sites should be a crash gate or otherwise fully accessible by emergency personnel.*

**Response:** As discussed at the workshop and based on feedback from the owner of the property the emergency cross access has been removed from the plan. We received the emergency vehicle turning template from the Village and we have confirmed that the vehicle can make the turning movements throughout the site.

We feel that we have adequately addressed the comments and your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or require additional information please contact me at (518) 273-0055.

Sincerely,



Roger E. Keating, PE, LEED AP BD+C  
Director, Civil Engineering