MINUTES

VILLAGE OF CHESTER PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 22, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Richard RAMSDELL, Chairman

Anthony LASPINA, Member John REILLY, Member Gene WINTERS, Member

John ORR, Code Enforcement Officer

Mark EDSALL, Engineer

Harold PRESSBERG, Attorney

NOT PRESENT: Robert JANKELUNAS, Member

REGULAR MEETING 7:00 PM

1. Minutes

Review Draft of December 2012 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

*MOTION was made by Member Winters, second by Member Reilly, to ACCEPT THE DECEMBER 2012 MEETING MINUTES AS DRAFTED. Motion passed 4-0.

2. Correspondence

3. Code Enforcement Officer Report

Presented by John Orr (copy attached).

- Member Winters asked about the proposed changes to Bodles.
 - CEO John Orr advised the Board on the status of the property and a brief overview of the proposed project.

4. Projects for Review

Project # 12-01 Project Name: Chester Mall Revised Site Plan / Dunkin Donuts

Applicant/Owner: Chester Mall Partners, LLC (Joshua Goldstein)
Location: 78 Brookside Avenue (SBL 107-3-3 / B1 Zone)

Re: Approval for proposed Dunkin Donuts

Presented By: John Loch, AFR / Chester Mall Partners, LLC (Joshua Goldstein)

Mark Edsall's comments were reviewed and general discussion held (copy attached).

John Loch, AFR reviewed the site plan and provided an overview of the proposed Dunkin Donuts project. Discussion was held regarding:

- Before the Board previously with a generic site plan to review and possibly resolve any major issues;
- Dunkin Donuts facility is smaller than the proposed generic pad, but would have slightly more traffic due to the drive thru and would also have less parking;
- Updated site plan shows the proposed Dunkin Donuts facility, the updated traffic pattern, improvements to pedestrian access and the building specs, features and architectural plans for the Dunkin Donuts facility;
- A landscaping plan will be provided they are currently working with a landscape architect to finalize the landscaping details;
- The signs will be internally illuminated, but there will be no moving parts to the signs.

Mark Edsall's comments were reviewed (copy attached) and general discussion was held regarding:

- Comment # 1 Parking:
 - Mark Edsall's comments indicate what they propose on the plans works;

- Dunkin Donuts does not plan on utilizing tractor trailers for deliveries they will most likely utilize box trucks and, therefore, they've moved the loading/unloading area away from the site. They have no issue putting the loading/unloading area back as previously presented.
- The drive thru was made larger to improve traffic circulation;
- Improved sidewalks were put in and they will be adding a crosswalk towards the bank;
- The parking calculation is on the first page and they believe they have more parking that what is needed and/or required;
- As there is only one Handicap space required, it was suggested that the applicant slide the handicap space as far left as he can to distance it from the entrance and make a landscaping island near the entrance;
- There is a considerable amount of parking surrounding the pad, that the facility will most likely never be short of spaces;
- Comment # 2 Loading Area:
 - John Loch advised it will be put back in with a walkway.
- The rest of the comments are procedural.

Member Winters expressed his concern regarding the traffic and the impact on the entrance to the mall from 17M which restricts turns. The concern is that Dunkin Donuts will add more traffic to the entrance/exit by Monro Muffler.

- John Loch advised that the proposed traffic patterns encourage traffic to come from the existing light. He's not sure changes would increase safety unless the Village wanted to explore the possibility of adding another light.
- Mark Edsall advised that the right hand turn is the best configuration. People will take short cuts and make the turn illegally if they want to and there's not much the Village can do to change that. If the Village wants to make changes to the curb cuts, they will have to study the activity at the intersection and keep in mind traffic generated by the other businesses in the vicinity.
- It was suggested that the first step to managing the turn area would be to ensure the signage is in place and the striping is visible and, if there's a future issue, maybe a study could be done.

John Loch advised they tried to incorporate the dumpster pad into the building, but it did not leave room to access for removal of the garbage/recyclables. They have proposed a separate pad for the dumpster to include space for recycling bins and addition of a sidewalk to access the dumpster enclosure.

Oliver Young, Architect, provided an overview of the Dunkin Donuts building. Discussion was held regarding:

- Building materials;
- Building colors it was noted that the colors and images being used are provided by Dunkin Donuts;
- The architect was advised that any signs on the site plan need to be placed on site not the exact detail, but the size must be noted on the site plan;

It was noted that the application was previously typed as a Type II Action under SEQRA and that the Orange County Response was received.

The proposed changes for Dunkin Donuts do not trigger a new SEQRA review.

The applicant was advised to include on the plans:

- Sidewalks:
- Signage The applicant was advised to look at the Village's sign code to ensure conformance and to include sign details with the site plan;
- Hours of operation;
- Landscaping;
- An index of the drawings on the first page;
- Include the building's architectural plans with the site plan.

The applicant was advised to update the plans and appear at the February Work Session scheduled for February 7, 2013. It was also noted that the applicant would be called the day before the Work Session to confirm the meeting and provide the time the applicant is to appear.

Project # 12-08 Project Name: Meadow Hill Apartments

Applicant/Owner: John Sorrentino

Location: NYS Route 94 / 44 High Street, Chester (SBL 102-1-1.2 / RS Zone)
Re: 108 Unit Apt Complex in 6 Buildings, incl. parking & ancillary facilities.

Presented By: Mark Siemers, PE, Pietrzak & Pfau, PLLC

Discussion was held regarding:

- It was noted that no new documents were submitted to the Board for this meeting;
- The applicant appeared before the Village Board and was referred back to the Planning Board, so the applicant was attending the meeting to address any questions the Board might have;
- Chairman Ramsdell advised the applicant that the Planning Board composes the report and sends it directly to the Village Board;
 - It was noted that the Planning Board was only making a recommendation to the Village Board as to whether or not the zone should be changed and then, if the Village Board approves the zone change, the applicant would come back to the Planning Board for site plan approval;
 - The Planning Board members were provided a copy of the Report of the Planning Board for the previous application and advised they are expected to review the report and provide any comments at the next meeting. A final draft could be voted on at the February Planning Board meeting.
 - It was noted that the previous report was written with Senior Housing in mind and the new report will be written with the unrestricted apartments in mind and they will not be focusing on the other RM uses.
 - The applicant noted that Seniors and those with physical limitations would be given the option of a first floor apartment, but there are no restrictions.
 - The Planning Board requested the applicant provide a project narrative to help them with the draft report.
 - Chairman Ramsdell requested specific information on the impact the project would have on the school system;

The applicant was advised they are on the February agenda to review the draft report from the Planning Board to the Village Board.

5. General Discussion

CEO John Orr was asked about the LED lighting / digital signs proposed in the Village. He advised he is researching municipal codes to see who has a code in place and what, if any, restrictions they have.

Member Winters asked if there was a sound ordinance in place for sirens. He was advised there is no sound ordinance in place and if an emergency vehicle does not respond with its sirens, it's not considered a responding vehicle.

Chairman Ramsdell asked if anyone had anything else to discuss and as there were no other comments, *MOTION was made by Member Winters, second by Member LaSpina, to ADJOURN THE MEETING. Motion passed 4-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sangra VanRiper Planning Board Secretary

Alternate Planning Board Member: Norm Cottrill 845-649-2685; e-mail normcottrill@gmail.com

Village of Chester Building and Codes Department Monthly Report to the Planning Board

January 22, 2013

Current projects that were inspected during the last month:

Tartaglione – 69 Brookside Ave.

1- Requested final inspection, will be back to do another inspection.

Marco – 118 Main Street

1 - No work has started.

Chester Collision – 63 Brookside Ave

1 – Project almost complete.

Smith – 229 Lehigh Ave.

1- Work is complete.

Houston – 51 Meadow Ave

1- Foundation in waiting for house to be delivered.

C&S-1 Elizabeth Dr.

1 –Issued Building Permit for a new dock door

Regards,

John S. Orr

Code Enforcement Officer



RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY & NJ)
MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)
JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE
33 AIRPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 202
NEW WINDSOR, NEW YORK
12553
(845) 567-3100
FAX: (845) 567-3232
E-MAIL: MHENY@MHEPC.COM

WRITERS EMAIL: MJE@MHEPC.COM

VILLAGE OF CHESTER PLANNING BOARD REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME:

CHESTER MALL PARTNERS SITE PLAN AMENDMENT

(FAST-FOOD RESTAURANT PAD)

PROJECT LOCATION:

NYS ROUTE 17M

SECTION 107 - BLOCK 3 - LOT 3

PROJECT NUMBER:

12-01

DATE:

22 JANUARY 2013

CONSULTANT:

AFR ENGINEERING (JOHN LOCH, P.E.)

REV. 3 DATED 1-10-13 (SHEETS 2 AND 3 OF 3)

DESCRIPTION:

THE PLANS PROPOSE A 3900 SF RESTAURANT ON THE EXISTING

SITE. THE PLANS WERE PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AT THE 27 MARCH 2012, 24 APRIL 2012 AND 26 JUNE 2012 PLANNING

BOARD MEETINGS.

1. This project previously received Conditional Site Plan approval at the June 2012 Planning Board Meeting. We have received revised plans for the project, which have been revised based on a specific site tenant, Dunkin Donuts. The plans are noted as being revised "for Dunkin' Donuts Pad"; however, it is recommended that the Board ask the design engineer to include in their presentation clarification on what exactly has changed from the prior submitted plans.

We have reviewed the plans and note the following revisions:

- Parking spaces in southwest area revised and "Loading and Unloading Area" deleted. Notwithstanding the varied angular layout of the parking due to the unique shape of the site "pad", all spaces appear to be accessible with available backout dimensions.
- Outside circulation loop (outboard of the drive thru lane) has increased in dimension on both sides. This should improve circulation.
- A sidewalk has been added for the entire front (easterly) frontage. The crosswalks on each drive curb cut are maintained and integrated into the new sidewalk layout. This will improve pedestrian access to the site.

REGIONAL OFFICES

111 Wheatfield Drive
 Suite 1
 Milford, Pennsylvania
 18337
 570-296-2765
 540 Broadway
 Monticello, New York
 12701
 845-794-3399

- 2. As noted above, the loading / unloading area is deleted from this site. The Planning Board should discuss, with the applicant, the intent for deliveries to the site.
- 3. The Board previously determined this application is Type II under SEQRA.
- 4. The Planning Board previously referred this application to the Orange County Planning Department, with it being returned "Local Determination". It is my opinion that this plan is substantially similar to the prior referral, and a new referral would not be required.
- 5. It may be appropriate for the Board to review the scope of the changes and determine if the prior Conditional Site Plan approval can be affirmed and the conditions revised / updated.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall, P.E., P.P. Engineer for the Village

MJE/st

Ches12-01-22Jan2013.doc