

MINUTES
VILLAGE OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 28, 2020
REGULAR MEETING (HELD VIA ZOOM)

PRESENT: Richard RAMSDELL, Chairman
Anthony LASPINA, Member
Vincent RAPPA, Co-Chairman
Robert JANKELUNAS, Member

NOT PRESENT: Gene WINTERS, Member

ALSO PRESENT: John ORR, Code Enforcement Officer
Mark EDSALL, Planning Board Engineer
Harold PRESSBERG, Planning Board Attorney

****** REGULAR MEETING (HELD VIA ZOOM) ******

Chairman Ramsdell opened the Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM.

MINUTES

Review Draft February 2020 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. ***MOTION** made by Member Jankelunas, second by Member LaSpina, to **ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS DRAFTED**. Motion passed 3-0 (Member Rappa abstained as he was not present at the February 2020 Planning Board meeting).

CORRESPONDENCE

Response received from Orange County Planning regarding the Donnelly Site Plan

CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER REPORT

No Code Enforcement report as there is no work being done in the Village at this time
As part of the West Central Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC) Study, Orange County Planning has identified a select set of corridors and intersections to conduct detailed transportation analyses. To keep the project moving forward during the COVID 19 situation, Julie Richmond, Deputy Commissioner Orange County Planning Department, reached out to the Village of Chester to inquire if we have any available traffic data that could be used for the TLC study. CEO John Orr was asked if the requested traffic studies were sent to the County. CEO Orr advised that he was reviewing the request, but, as the office is currently half staffed, it was taking some time to provide the documents to her.

WORK SESSION REVIEW

The applicants at the March 5, 2020 Work Session were:

- Jones Site Plan Amendment
- 717, LLC / VanDerMeulen Lot Line Change
- Rustic Wheelhouse Site Plan Amendment
- Donnelly Site Plan
- Chester Agricultural Center Site Plan Amendment

The April 2, 2020 Work Session was cancelled

PROJECTS FOR REVIEW

1. Project # PB-20-01	Project Name: Donnelly Site Plan
Applicant/Owner:	Lewis Donnelly
Location:	7-9 Greycourt Avenue (105-1-4 & 105-1-5 / B-1 Zone)
Re:	Proposed Commercial / Residential Building
Presented by	Ross Winglovitz, PE, Engineering & Surveying Properties, PC

Ross Winglovitz, Engineer, provided an overview of the project:

- They are presenting an updated concept plan.
- Public Hearing requested.

Mark Edsall reviewed McGoey, Hauser and Edsall's comments (copy attached). General discussion was held regarding:

- Update the notes to indicate it's a mixed-use building and indicated the primary and accessory uses.
- Landscaping.
- CEO John Orr noted his concern regarding paving, etc. right up to the property lines. Is it possible to make the building 100 square feet smaller to have a buffer between the paving and the next property?
 - Ross Winglovitz advised if they make the building smaller, they'll lose parking spaces, but suggested they could screen the adjacent properties with a fence. He also noted that the water runoff goes to the rear of the property.
- CEO John Orr also suggested the applicant utilize the existing 6/7 feet in front of the building by moving the building forward to create room in the back of the building.
 - Ross Winglovitz commented it would create a landscaping opportunity in the front of the building to improve the aesthetics.
 - CEO John Orr commented that the Code requires a green area for apartment buildings, but since the primary use of the building is commercial, there's no requirement in the Code for a green area.
- Chairman Ramsdell asked if the parking spaces along Greycourt could be increased from 22' to 24'.

***MOTION** was made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **DECLARE THIS AN UNLISTED ACTION UNDER SEQR**. Motion passed 4-0.

***MOTION** was made by Member LaSpina, second by Member Rappa, to **SET THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 26, 2020 AT 7:00 PM**. Motion passed 4-0.

2. Project # PB-20-02	Project Name: Steris Isomedix Temporary Site Plan
Applicant/Owner:	Chester Industrial Park Assoc, LLC / Steris Isomedix Operation Inc
Location:	9 Nucifora Boulevard (117-1-3 / M1 Zone)
Re:	Temporary concrete plant during expansion project @ 2 Nucifora Blvd
Presented by	Ben Ostrer, Attorney

Ben Ostrer, Attorney, provided an overview of the project:

- Applicant submitted 3 applications – 2 to the Planning Board for Temporary Site Plan and a Site Plan Amendment and 1 to the Zoning Board for an area variance.
- Applicant is looking for site plan approval for the temporary use of a lot in the Industrial Park for a concrete plant related to the construction of the Steris building addition.
- There would be approximately 12 trips per day across the road during construction.
- Concrete pouring would be scheduled for the morning – approximately 4 AM – 9 AM to avoid interfering with current traffic in the Industrial Park.

Mark Edsall reviewed McGoey, Hauser and Edsall's comments (copy attached). General discussion was held regarding:

- Temporary site plan would need approvals from the Street Superintendent and Water Commissioner.
- The site is approximately 4 acres with 1.5 +/- disturbed by this project.
- The project is subject to SWPPP.
- The project is subject to review by Orange County Planning Department.
 - It was suggested that the County be made aware of the essential services that Steris will provide.
- Applicant was asked to clarify North, South, West and East.
- Applicant was asked to put a vicinity map on the plans.
- Applicant was asked how much dust the project would generate.
 - Kip Kramer advised it would generate a little dust, and they are working on mitigating the dust and keeping it away from the Park and Ride located close to the project.
 - Street sweeping / cleaning would need to be approved by the Street Superintendent.

- 3. Project # PB-20-03** **Project Name: Steris Isomedix Site Plan Amendment**
 Applicant/Owner: Chester Industrial Park Assoc, LLC / Steris Isomedix Operation Inc
 Location: 2 Nucifora Boulevard (117-2-4.2 / M1 Zone)
 Re: Construction of a new warehouse addition with 2 new x-ray shields
 Presented by Ben Ostrer, Attorney

Ben Ostrer, Attorney, provided an overview of the project:

- The building is approximately 44.5' at its highest point.
- Site plan is conditioned on approval of the area variance.

Mark Edsall reviewed McGoey, Hauser and Edsall's comments (copy attached). General discussion was held regarding:

- The largest issue is the plans not being complete.
- Applicant was requested to show existing conditions versus the most recent approved site plan.
- SEQRA would be handled at the Public Hearing.
- Chairman Ramsdell requested the following:
 - The "North" arrow be moved and made prominent.
 - The proposed addition shaded to clarify what they're requesting.
- Chairman Ramsdell asked if the retaining wall between the building and the South East corner of the building is 20' tall?
 - Kip Kramer confirmed the retaining wall would be approximately 20' tall.
- Discussion was held regarding the shields around the x-rays.

***MOTION** was made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **SET THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MAY 26, 2020 AT 7:00 PM.** Motion passed 4-0.

***MOTION** was made by Member Jankelunas, second by Member LaSpina, to **REFER THE PROJECT TO ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING AS SOON AS UPDATED PLANS ARE RECEIVED.** Motion passed 4-0.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

***MOTION** was made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **SET A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD FOR MAY 12, 2020 AT 7:00 PM.** Motion passed 4-0.

Chairman Ramsdell asked if anyone had anything else to discuss and there were no other comments.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOTION** was made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **ADJOURN THE MEETING.** Motion passed 4-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Sandra VanRiper
Planning Board Secretary

**Village of Chester Planning Board
47 Main Street
Chester, New York 10918
845-469-2388**

Planning Board Meeting

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that the Planning Board of the Village of Chester will hold its monthly meeting on April 28, 2020, starting at 7:00 PM to consider any matters on the published agenda. Due to public health and safety concerns related to COVID-19, the Planning Board will **NOT** be meeting in person.

In accordance with the New York State Public Officers Law and Executive Order 202.1 issued on March 12, 2020, by New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, this meeting is being held via video/teleconferencing. Accordingly, **NO IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE IS PERMITTED FOR THE MEETING**. Public comment will be permitted. The Board Members as well as members of the public may participate in the meeting utilizing the access information listed below:

The Zoom app must first be downloaded and installed on smartphones, tablets or computers from www.zoom.us.

Zoom videoconference meeting link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88236687067>

Meeting ID: 882 3668 7067

Password: 264918

Telephone dial in only:

Dial by your location

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US

+1 253 215 8782 US

888 788 0099 US Toll-free

877 853 5247 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 882 3668 7067

Password: 264918

Online meeting materials:

Any meeting materials, including the Agenda, can be viewed at the Planning Board section of the Village of Chester website: <https://villageofchesterny.org/document-category/planning-board-key-documents/>

BY ORDER OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE VILLAGE OF CHESTER, NEW YORK
Sandra VanRiper, Planning Board Clerk
April 21, 2020



Steven M. Neuhaus
County Executive

Orange County Department of Planning

124 Main Street
Goshen, NY 10924-2124
Tel: (845) 615-3840
Fax: (845) 291-2533

Alan J. Sorensen, AICP
Commissioner

www.orangecountygov.com/planning
planning@orangecountygov.com

County Reply – Mandatory Review of Local Planning Action as per NYS General Municipal Law §239-1, m, &n

Local Referring Board: Village of Chester Planning Board

Applicant: Lewis Donnelly

Project Name: Donnelly Site Plan

Proposed Action: Site Plan for merger of two existing parcels, demolition of existing structures, and redevelopment of site with three-story mixed-use building containing first floor commercial and six residential apartments total on the second and third floors

Reason for County Review: Within 500 feet of parkland owned and operated by Orange County (Orange County Heritage Trail); within 500 feet of active farmland located within Orange County Agricultural District No. 1

Date of Full Statement: March 3, 2020

Referral ID #: CHV 03-20M

Tax Map #: 105-1-4 and 5

Local File #: PB-20-01

Comments:


The Department has received the above referenced minor subdivision and has found no evidence that significant intermunicipal or countywide impacts would result from its approval. We would like to offer the following advisory comments regarding this application:

Water and Sewer Capacity: The proposed development is located in an area that has the potential to connect to public water and possibly also public sewer. We advise the Town, when the full application is received, to ensure that either the private facilities onsite are sufficient for the needs of six residential units and a business, or that the development has the potential to connect to public water and sewer facilities.

County Recommendation: Local Determination

Date: March 26, 2020

Prepared by: Megan Tennermann, AICP, Planner


Alan J. Sorensen, AICP
Commissioner of Planning

As per NYS General Municipal Law 239-m & n, within 30 days of municipal final action on the above referred project, the referring board must file a report of the final action taken with the County Planning Department. For such filing, please use the final action report form attached to this review or available online at www.orangecountygov.com/planning.



McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS D.P.C.

MARK J. EDSALL, P.E., P.P. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL W. WEEKS, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL J. LAMOREAUX, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA, VT & VA)
PATRICK J. HINES
LYLE R. SHUTE, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA)

Main Office
33 Airport Center Drive
Suite 202
New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100
fax: (845) 567-3232

Writer's Email:
mje@mhepc.com

Principal Emeritus:
RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)

VILLAGE OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD
REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: DONNELLY SITE PLAN
PROJECT LOCATION: #7 & #9 GREYCOURT AVENUE
SECTION 105 – BLOCK 1 – LOT 4 & 5
PROJECT NUMBER: 20-01
DATE: 28 APRIL 2020 (Zoom Meeting)
CONSULTANT: ENGINEERING & SURVEYING PROPERTIES
PLAN DATE: 03/24/2020 (5-drawings)
DESCRIPTION: THE APPLICATION PROPOSES THE DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURES ON THE PROPERTIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 3-STORY BUILDING WITH FIRST FLOOR RETAIL, AND APARTMENTS ON THE SECOND AND THIRD FLOOR. THE PLAN WAS REVIEWED ON A CONCEPT BASIS ONLY.

1. The property is located in the B-1 Zoning District of the Village. The proposed retail use is Principal Permitted Use #2, with the apartments being accessory use #4 of the zone. The “required” bulk information indicated is correct for the zone and uses.
2. We have reviewed the plans submitted on a concept basis. We provide the following initial comments:

General

- The title block indentifies the site as a 6-Unit Building. Inasmuch as the primary use is retail, with the apartments being an accessory use, the title should be corrected on all sheets.
- The site (as proposed) requires 18 parking spaces. Only 16 are proposed on site, with 2 proposed as on-street parking. As per Local Law #3-2017 the Planning Board has authority to provide a waiver allowing these 2 on-street spaces. Any future approval resolution should reflect this waiver, if so acceptable.
- The plans do not include a vehicle movement plan depicting and verifying ability of relevant vehicles to pass thru the site (appropriate turning radii etc.). This should be added to future submittals.
- As per Section 98-30.2 of the Village Zoning Code, the Applicant should indicate a reasonable anticipated completion date for the project on the plan.

• Regional Office • 111 Wheatfield Drive • Suite 1 • Milford, Pennsylvania 18337 • 570-296-2765 •

- No landscaping plan is provided at this time. The board should discuss expectations.

Drawing EX-1 (Existing Conditions)

- We suggest some additional information be added to Location Map, such as street names at minimum.
- It is noted that the two parcels are owned by different entities. The application and authorizations should be signed by both parties. The two lots must be combined as part of the application approval, and proper documentation should be submitted to this effect before the site plan is stamped, if approval is granted in the future.

Drawing C-1 (Sketch Plan)

- The bulk table (or related notes) should indicate that the apartments are limited to 1-bedroom and/or efficiencies.
- Existing structures are depicted to the east. Structures should be depicted to the west as well (or if “off the sheet”, a distance to nearest structure indicated).
- The westerly sight distance should be indicated from the east curb cut. With same in mind, there should be a discussion as to the best use of the directional movement can be confirmed.
- Comments from the Street Superintendent should be received with regard to the curb cuts and street-side parking proposed.
- Although understood from discussions and the project details, this sheet should be clear regarding proposed concrete curb and the limits thereof.
- Further review of the operation of the rear of the site is needed. An evaluation of the door locations, locations of access to the porch, sidewalk width, vehicle overhang, etc., to evaluate pedestrian movement from the vehicles into the rear of the building.
- On the east side of the site a short retaining wall is proposed. We have some concerns regarding this wall, as follows:
 - The wall appears virtually on the property line, with no room for installation or maintenance. A construction and maintenance easement may be needed from the adjoiner n/f Helt.
 - The type of wall proposed is an MSE (mechanically stabilized earth) retaining wall which are generally good for low heights as on this site, other than our concern regarding the walls proximity to vehicle loads (driveway is immediately adjacent). We suggest an alternate wall type retaining wall be considered (this may also lessen concerns with regard to installation and maintenance).
- Although screening may not be mandatory per Section 98-17, a short fence along the east property adjacent to the existing structure may be appropriate.
- Regarding site lighting, it appears that only one fixture is proposed, building-mounted at the rear of the building.
 - Under-porch lighting would appear to benefit both the front and rear of the building and would lessen potential impacts to the adjoining properties. If the applicant and board believe this is beneficial and sufficient, it should be indicated.
 - For the rear lighting, no isolux curve has been provided. This would be helpful.

- It is unclear where the “Do Not Enter” sign(s) are proposed.
- Regarding the gravity sewer line to the pump station, we recommend the pipe bend be moved to the rear, such that the line need not go under the dumpster enclosure.
- Regarding the sewer force main, we recommend an oversized sleeve under the area of the dumpster enclosure.
- No project sign is indicated.
- The stormwater aspect of the site development will be the subject of further reviews. Some supporting information should be provided regarding the design and sizing.

Drawing C-2 (Details)

- The site sewer pump station design and layout is good for the site. We provide the following observations/suggestions:
 - The detail includes a conflict that indicates the pump controls & dialer are pedestal mounted adjacent to the pump station, and a second identifies the “controls to be installed in the main building”. We can further discuss this.
 - We recommend automatic alternation of the pumps be included in the controls.
 - The manhole rungs don’t appear to align with any access.

Drawing C-3 (Details)

- For the one-way signs, we recommend the signs at both drives be double post, double-sided.
- For the handicapped parking space, where a standard space adjoins a handicapped space, a double line should be installed, one blue, one white.
- Normally, we recommend installation of a masonry type dumpster enclosure, with exterior finish (or coating) to match the proposed building, for a more durable long-term life installation. The Board should discuss if this is appropriate in this location.
- Whichever dumpster enclosure construction is determined, bollards should be provided to protect the installation.
- For the curb detail, please add total height and base width. Also, we recommend 4000 psi.

Drawing C-4 (Details)

- This sheet provides the detail for the lighting, although no lighting isolux plan is provided. As such, insufficient information has been provided for a review.
- With regard to the fixture detail, two critical fixture selection alternatives are not clarified, namely, fixture distribution (wide throw, forward throw or wall wash) and color temperature (4000k or 5000k). Both are relevant matters and need further discussion. The need for cutoff shields should be discussed.

- The typical lighting note (as follows) must be added to the plans:

“Planning Board’s acceptance of the lighting design shown hereon is premised on the representation of the applicant that the lighting will not cause a glare or other deleterious effect on adjoining properties and/or roadway traffic. Should any such conditions result from the installation, in the sole opinion of the authorized representatives of the Village, the applicant agrees to modify and/or replace fixtures to cause the correction of the condition, to the satisfaction of the Village representatives.”

3. We have received a copy of the Orange County Planning response which recommends connection to public sewer and water. This is shown on the plans.
4. The Board should discuss the SEQRA and Public Hearing procedural items with the Attorney for the Planning Board.
5. We will continue our review as additional information is submitted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-01-28April2020.doc



McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS D.P.C.

MARK J. EDSALL, P.E., P.P. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL W. WEEKS, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL J. LAMOREAUX, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA, VT & VA)
PATRICK J. HINES
LYLE R. SHUTE, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA)

Main Office
33 Airport Center Drive
Suite 202
New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100
fax: (845) 567-3232

Writer's Email:
mje@mhepc.com

Principal Emeritus:
RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)

VILLAGE OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD
REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: CHESTER INDUSTRIAL PARK ASSOC. TEMPORARY SITE PLAN
(STERIS CONCRETE PLANT)
PROJECT LOCATION: NUCIFORA BLVD – CHESTER INDUSTRIAL PARK
SECTION 117 – BLOCK 1 – LOT 3
PROJECT NUMBER: 20-02
DATE: 28 APRIL 2020 (Zoom Meeting)
CONSULTANT: MJS ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING, PC
PLAN DATE: 04/16/20 (two drawings)
DESCRIPTION: THE APPLICATION PROPOSES THE TEMPORARY USE OF A LOT
WITHIN THE INDUSTRIAL PARK FOR A CONCRETE PLANT RELATED
TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STERIS BUILDING ADDITION. THE
PLAN WAS REVIEWED ON A CONCEPT BASIS**.

**an interim non-meeting review was performed on 24 March 2020

1. The property is located in the M-1 Zoning District of the Village. As noted in my informal comments issued on 24 March 2020, the Planning Board has adopted a general procedure for processing temporary site plans within the Village. Based on the information submitted, it is also noted that this site would also serve as employee parking for the construction activities on the nearby Steris construction site.
2. As part of the submission for this application, the applicant has provided all the elements of information on the “checklist” for temporary uses.
3. We have reviewed the submittal and have the following comments:
 - The Street Superintendent should review and accept the temporary curb cut (which appears to be oversized for the construction operations).
 - The applicant may wish to coordinate the site access to this site with any construction site access to the development site (must be appropriately identified on the Site Plan Amendment drawings).
 - The Water Superintendent should review and accept the details of connection for the temporary service to the site and equipment.

• Regional Office • 111 Wheatfield Drive • Suite 1 • Milford, Pennsylvania 18337 • 570-296-2765 •

- We understand the general concept of the site grading and erosion protection, however, the plans are difficult to read (contour numbers illegible, difficult to connect existing to proposed contours, etc.). Perhaps if the second sheet scale was improved and drafting adjusted, this can be resolved. Proposed contours must tie into existing contours.
 - The plans appear to indicate some type of retaining wall; however this is not clear, no wall heights or TOW/BOW elevations provided, nor any type of wall indicated. Clarify.
 - All stormwater management provisions should be identified on the plans and coordinated with the SWPPP.
4. The Board should discuss the procedural aspects and SEQRA with the Attorney for the Planning Board.
 5. It is our understanding that a NYSDEC Storm-Water Multi-Sector General Permit will be required for the proposed use.
 6. The Board should discuss the need for a referral to the Orange County Department of Planning.
 7. Once revised plans are received, we will continue our review. Any further comments regarding stormwater management will be provided at that time.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-02-28April2020.doc



McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS D.P.C.

MARK J. EDSALL, P.E., P.P. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL W. WEEKS, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)
MICHAEL J. LAMOREAUX, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA, VT & VA)
PATRICK J. HINES
LYLE R. SHUTE, P.E. (NY, NJ, PA)

Main Office
33 Airport Center Drive
Suite 202
New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100
fax: (845) 567-3232

Writer's Email:
mje@mhepc.com

Principal Emeritus:
RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA)
WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA)

VILLAGE OF CHESTER
PLANNING BOARD
REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: STERIS ISOMEDIX SERVICES SITE PLAN AMENDMENT
(64,909 SF ADDITION)
PROJECT LOCATION: 2 NUCIFORA BLVD – CHESTER INDUSTRIAL PARK
SECTION 117 – BLOCK 2 – LOT 4.2
PROJECT NUMBER: 20-03
DATE: 28 APRIL 2020 (Zoom Meeting)
CONSULTANT: MJS ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING PC
PLAN DATE: 04/16/20 (eight drawings plus two architectural drawings for reference)
DESCRIPTION: THE APPLICATION PROPOSES A 64,909 SF ADDITION TO THE
EXISTING ISOMEDIX STERILIZATION FACILITY WITH ASSOCIATED
SITE IMPROVEMENTS. THE PLAN WAS REVIEWED ON A CONCEPT
BASIS ONLY **. **an interim non-meeting review was performed on 24 March 2020

1. The project is located in the M-1 zoning district of the Village. The proposed use is Principal Permitted Use # 2 of the zone. This is a site plan amendment, as the applicant previously received approval for a 59,690 sf facility on the 10.8 Acre property during 2015. This site plan amendment will construct the addition on the northeast side of the existing building (side toward Route 94).
2. The plans have been reviewed on a concept basis. We have the following comments based on our initial review:

General:

- The drawings are difficult to “read” due to line weight, overlapping drafting (text and lines), and content on various sheets. The various drawings of the set may have unintended “layers” or information on certain drawings. There appears to be little or no difference between some drawings, with un-necessary information on some drawings making review of the pertinent information very difficult. A review should be made of the full set to insure that each drawing is legible and complete for the intended purpose.
- The applicant is reminded of our interim comments dated 24 March 2020. Please insure all these items are addressed.

• Regional Office • 111 Wheatfield Drive • Suite 1 • Milford, Pennsylvania 18337 • 570-296-2765 •

- The north arrow should be made more legible and usable on the drawings.
- Drawings must be coordinated from drawing to drawing such that any elements that are pertinent to more than one drawing, are consistent from sheet to sheet.
- The prior approval plans include vehicle movement drawings. Such information should be provided for this expanded (amended) site plan.
- No drawings for this application should include the proposed temporary concrete plant on the nearby lot (subject of a separate application). Such temporary use is not part of this application.

Drawing C-1 (Amended Site Plan)

- The “required” bulk information on the plan is correct for the use and zone. Further review must be made as to the classification of yards for the site since this is a corner lot, in conjunction with the Code Enforcement Officer.
- The Vicinity Map needs significant improvement to serve the intended purpose.
- The plan should clearly both depict and indicate proposed items on the plan vs. existing conditions. (also see comments regarding existing conditions below). As previously noted, the site plan amendment should use the prior approved plan as a based, with the any non-conforming current conditions identified. The amendment plan should identify all proposed revisions clearly.
- Remove generic notations on the plan “Existing Approved Site Plan” and “Amended Site Plan” which do not fully identify existing and proposed as requested above.
- The size and dimensions of the existing building as well as the proposed building should be indicated on the plan.
- Note 10 should be corrected to provide existing, proposed and total areas. The note reflects the old data from the prior plan and is incorrect.
- The plans appear to depict approximately sixty (60) passenger vehicle parking spaces which contradicts note 11 calculation (see next bullet comment).
- Note 11 indicates a total of 25 employees, which is identical to the prior application, which has less than half the processing area of the full amended site plan. Please confirm there is no increase in number of employees.
- Explain purpose of lone parking space at the northerly corner of the building.
- There appears to be a fence proposed along the rear perimeter; however, it is not identified by type or height, nor is symbol consistent with legend.
- The plan must clearly identify the improvement types and limits (sidewalks, curbing, pavement, etc.)
- The text “Retaining Wall” does not identify what it is “pointing to”, and upon comparative review to other sheets, the limits of what may be the retaining wall doesn’t match other sheets.
- This plan should have metes and bounds based on a survey from a licensed land surveyor. A copy of the property survey should be submitted to the Planning Board for file.

- There appears to be two note 6c. The second such note regarding topographic source should also be located on drawing C-3. Also it should clarify the accuracy of the aerial data.
- All adjoining property owners should be identified on this drawing.
- See “General” comments above for additional concerns.

Drawing C-2 (Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan)

- Based on available information, there is question as to the accuracy of the “existing conditions” as depicted. The applicant’s engineer/surveyor should perform an actual field review/survey to verify and provide an actual existing conditions plan. Some typical issues:
 - Truck/Trailer parking along Elizabeth Drive not identified.
 - Parking along the northwest side of the building does not appear accurate. Verify.
 - Directional signs and pavement markings should be depicted.
- It appears that the two proposed shield are depicted. Why?
- The plan indicates a 20’ Utility Easement for the discharge of drainage from this project. The limits of the easement are not depicted. Also, the plan should reference the filed document reference for such easement on the plan, with a copy provided to the Village.
- What appears to be a silt fence location (based on plan legend on Sheet C-1) is depicted along Nucifora Blvd. Existing ? Explain.
- This plan should have metes and bounds based on a survey from a licensed land surveyor. A copy of the property survey should be submitted to the Planning Board for file.
- All adjoining property owners should be identified on this drawing.

Drawing C-3 (Grading & Drainage Plan)

- The drawing appears to have extraneous information not necessary for the intended drawing purpose. Please evaluate and modify as needed.
- Existing contour elevation information should be added to the plans.
- See comment above regarding note 6c on Drawing C-1. As requested, provide this note on this drawing and clarify the accuracy of the aerial data.
- The plan identifies a “Redi-Rock Retaining Wall”; however, no specific type or detail is provided. Given the height and location,, we are concerned about a MSE type wall being utilized and suggest the applicant consider a gravity type wall.
- A construction and/or maintenance easement may be needed from the adjoining property owner for the construction of the wall.
- Only the perimeter of the proposed addition is needed on this plan. Interior elements including the shields are unnecessarily shown.
- It is unclear why spot grade elevations are shown within the area of the proposed building.

- There appears to be a grass-lined swale depicted within the proposed building addition.
- Once the plans include more information regarding the retaining walls, the plans must include the standard retaining wall notes used by the Village.
- See “General” comments above for additional concerns.

Drawing C-4 (Lighting & Landscaping Plan)

- Other than the notes regarding Seeding, I see no information regarding lighting or landscaping. This drawing is deficient.
- Only the perimeter of the proposed addition is needed on this plan. Interior elements including the shields are unnecessarily shown.
- It is unclear why spot grade elevations are shown within the area of the proposed building.
- See “General” comments above for additional concerns.

Drawing C-5 (Erosion & Sediment Control Plan)

- This drawing has not been reviewed at this time, pending receipt of a SWPPP for the project.
- See “General” comments above for additional concerns.

Drawing C-6 (Details)

- A note should be added to the Fence Detail (4) that indicates that all components of the fence must be black vinyl coated.
- Regarding the handicapped parking detail:
 - The detail must clearly indicate that all striping associated with the handicapped space must be blue.
 - The detail must note that when a standard space adjoins a handicapped space, a double line should be installed, one blue, one white.
- These details must be coordinated with the other drawings of the submittal set and additional details will likely be needed as the drawings progress.
- Further reviews will be made of the detail sheets as the drawings progress.

Drawing C-7 (Details)

- These details must be coordinated with the other drawings of the submittal set and additional details will likely be needed as the drawings progress.
- Further reviews will be made of the detail sheets as the drawings progress.

Drawing C-8 (Erosion & Sediment Control Details)

- This drawing has not been reviewed at this time, pending receipt of a SWPPP for the project.
3. Based on our review of the prior review and approval, we note the following:
- At a field meeting held on March 5, 2015, it was agreed that the southerly Nucifora Boulevard curb cut would be restricted with a note that would agree that the use of this curb cut could be restricted to entrance only (ie no exit) at any time in the future if the Village deems the restriction warranted based on traffic conditions. Note #13 on Drawing C-1 reflects this restriction.
 - Based on a condition of approval striping improvements on both Nucifora Boulevard and Elizabeth Drive were to be installed. It should be verified that this work remains complete.
4. The Board should discuss the appropriate actions regarding SEQRA with the Attorney for the Planning Board.
5. The application / plans will need to be referred to the Orange County Department of Planning. We hesitate to suggest these plans be submitted at this time due to the numerous comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-03-28April2020.doc