

MINUTES

VILLAGE OF CHESTER PLANNING BOARD

MAY 26, 2020

REGULAR MEETING

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

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

****** PUBLIC HEARING ******

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

Public Hearing notice read into the record by Chairman Ramsdell and it was confirmed that the mailings were done and return receipts were turned into the Planning Board Secretary.

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

- The applicant owns 7 and 9 Greycourt Avenue.
- The applicant is proposing combining the two lots, removing the existing structures and constructing one, three story, mixed use building.
- The first floor of the proposed new building will be commercial and the second and third stories will be residential (efficiencies and one-bedroom apartments).
- Proposed parking will have one handicap space.
- Proposed parking will be in the back of the building and screened from the surrounding properties.
- Proposed walkway all around the building.
- Proposed dumpster in the back of the building with a masonry enclosure.
- Proposed pump station in the back of the building.
- Proposed new water main connection to the building.

Planning Board questioned / commented on the following:

- Member Jankelunas asked if the parking for the residences would be dedicated.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised it would not be dedicated, allowing the commercial tenants to use while the residents are at work or out.
- Chairman Ramsdell asked what the parking calculations are based on.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised they are based on the Code requirements and they could dedicate residential parking if the Village wants it.
- Member LaSpina asked about drainage.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised there is a high point at the face of the building. A small amount of water would drain onto Greycourt Avenue and they're proposing a small pond in the rear of the property to catch everyday rain. There's an existing swale in the rear of the property.
 - Member LaSpina commented Village Street Superintendent Bono is also concerned with drainage. He asked if it was possible for the water to drain to the left of the property instead of the right.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised the natural drainage is to the right, but he will look into alternatives.
 - Member LaSpina asked if the stormwater could drain to the ditch on the left side of the property.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised it could end up ponding there, but he will look into it.

- Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall advised when he spoke with Village Street Superintendent Bono, Superintendent Bono agreed to mark up the plans with his concerns and suggestions for discussion. As soon as Village Street Superintendent Bono responds, Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall will review the plans with the applicants engineer.

Public questioned / commented on the following:

- Donald and Jennifer Wittekind, 11 Greycourt Avenue:
 - They commented they live next door to the proposed project and are concerned with the height of the proposed building.
 - Where will the excess cars go?
 - How will the drainage in the back of the property effect their property?
 - How far back does the property go and how far back will the parking be? Will it go into the trail?
 - Ross Winglovitz advised the property goes up to the trail, but all improvements will be within the property lines.
 - Chairman Ramsdell asked the Wittekind's if they have a basement and they advised they have a crawl space with a sump pump installed.
- Leslie Smith, 117 Brookside Avenue:
 - Commented she remembers the applicant proposed a two-story building and now it's three-stories.
 - Is the elevation plan is required with the site plan?
 - It looks like 90% of the parcel will be covered in impervious surface. Is there any consideration to permeable parking to allow rainwater to run into the ground? What does the Code allow? The property is not in the floodplain, but is low, so drainage should be considered.
 - There is no sign proposed on the plan, but the sign is important to the aesthetics of the building, so the application should submit a draft plan for the Board to consider location, etc.
 - She appreciates that the applicant expressed concern about keeping the building's appearance in line with the existing community.
- Chris Battiato, 17 Kerner Drive:
 - Commented that he remembers the applicant originally proposing a two-story building.
 - Also expressed concern about the proposed on-street parking with the curves in the road.
- Cliff Patrick, 117 Brookside Avenue:
 - The applicant should show the building elevation as well as the building elevation in relation to the neighborhood as part of the site plan.
 - The applicant should show a draft of the sign.
 - Drainage is a concern.
- Lewis Donnelly, Applicant: Commented he is considering the options for signage. It might be a pole sign off the building or window sign or both; but will fit the contour of the Village.

As there were no other questions from the members of the Planning Board or the public in attendance, ***MOTION** made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **HOLD THE PUBLIC HEARING OPEN FOR THE NEXT 10 DAYS TO ACCEPT WRITTEN COMMENTS**. Motion passed 5-0.

- 2. 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

Public Hearing notice read into the record by Chairman Ramsdell and it was confirmed that the mailings were done and return receipts were turned into the Planning Board Secretary.

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

- Applicant is proposing a 64,909 square foot addition to the existing building to house additional sterilization facilities.
- The proposed addition will require a height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- The Planning Board approval can be contingent upon the Zoning Board approval.
- The existing business provides a direct service for medical supplies.
- The proposed addition is allied with the proposed temporary concrete plant.

- The proposed temporary concrete plant will have limited hours of operation.
- The applicant received comments from Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall.

The Planning Board had no questions or comments at this time.

Public questioned / commented on the following:

- David Stevenson, 16 Elm Street:
 - Regarding the concrete plant temporary site plan, the plans indicate the cement trucks will turn and travel on Nucifora Boulevard to get to the proposed addition site. Is it possible to move the access so that the exit from the temporary concrete plan is a straight shot into the Steris site?
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall indicated he asked that the roads align in his comments
 - Commented that dust / debris mitigation is important as the park and ride is close to the site.
 - Asked how the pipes sticking out above the building would be integrated into the new building.
 - Noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals would appreciate a 3D rendering of the building from the street level to get a better idea of the proposed building from street level.
 - Ben Ostrer advised they can do a 3D rendering for the Zoning Board of Appeals.
 - Ben Ostrer advised the exits and entrances for the concrete plant and the Steris site will line up.
- Clif Patrick, 117 Brookside Avenue:
 - Commented he remembers a few years ago V Paulius was before the Board and there was an agreement regarding the intersection of Nucifora Boulevard and Summerville Way.
 - CEO John Orr advised that the agreement was to design
- Leslie Smith, 117 Brookside Avenue:
 - The site plan says Route 94 and West Avenue but should be Route 94 and Summerville Way.
 - Noted on the west side of the site with the existing structure and showing diagonal parking spaces, it appears the lane in between is 12 feet wide.
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall advised he is reviewing the accessibility issues.
 - Noted the tractor trailer access is shown as a two-way. Could it be made a one-way?
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall referred to Note 13 on the proposed site plan, which states the southerly Nucifora Boulevard curb cut may be restricted to entrance only, no exit, if the Village deems the restriction warranted, based on traffic conditions.
 - Noted following the traffic is confusing due to the coloring on the site plan.

As there were no other questions from the members of the Planning Board or the public in attendance, ***MOTION** made by Member Rappa, second by Member LaSpina, to **HOLD THE PUBLIC HEARING OPEN FOR THE NEXT 10 DAYS TO ACCEPT WRITTEN COMMENTS**. Motion passed 5-0.

****** REGULAR MEETING ******

Chairman Ramsdell opened the Regular Meeting at 7:55 PM.

MINUTES

Review Draft April 28, 2020 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. ***MOTION** made by Member LaSpina, second by Member Jankelunas, to **ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS DRAFTED**. Motion passed 5-0
The May 12, 2020 draft minutes were tabled to the June 9, 2020 meeting to allow adequate time for review

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER REPORT

Verbal report presented by John Orr:

- The Building Department is receiving several Building Permit Applications
- Construction is just starting to resume
- The next Planning Board Work Session is scheduled for June 4, 2020
- Would like to schedule a Special Meeting of the Planning Board on June 9, 2020 for the applications of Linda Jones, Rushing Duck and Beer World.

***MOTION** made by Member LaSpina, second by Member Jankelunas, to **SCHEDULE A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD ON JUNE 9, 2020 AT 7:00 PM.** Motion passed 5–0

WORK SESSION REVIEW

Work Session review was done at the May 12, 2020 Planning Board meeting.

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

As an overview was provided earlier during the Public Hearing, Mark Edsall reviewed McGoey, Hauser and Edsall's comments (copy attached). General discussion was held regarding:

- Chairman Ramsdell following up on the permeable parking / surfaces.
 - CEO John Orr suggested the 9 parking spaces in the rear be used for permeable parking spaces.
- Ross Winglovitz advised he will move the handicap parking as suggested in the review comments.
- Ross Winglovitz advised he will draft signage and coordinate with CEO John Orr.
- Chairman Ramsdell requested information on vehicle movement – both vehicles and fire apparatus.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised he will re-create the garbage truck movement and he believes the Fire Department can access the site from Greycourt Avenue.
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall commented that, depending on the residential layout, he would like the building to have egress out from both the front and rear of the building. Notes might have to be added to the site plan for this.
 - CEO John Orr advised the building will be fully equipped with a fire sprinkler system.
- CEO John Orr asked about the fencing between this building the residential neighbors.
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall advised the fence detail is shown on page C3 and the location is shown on page C1.
 - CEO John Orr asked for more detail as a 6-foot fence is not allowed to the front per Village Code.
- Member Jankelunas expressed concerns about:
 - The building being 3 stories.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised there would be a maximum of three one-bedroom apartments per floor.
 - Is there a limit on the garbage pick-up time?
 - Ross Winglovitz advised it is private property, so he's not sure they can restrict garbage pick-up.
 - Where will the snow be pushed to?
 - Ross Winglovitz advised snow would be piled at the rear of the property and will note on the plan.
 - Who will maintain the parking spaces along Greycourt Avenue?
 - CEO John Orr advised the Village would ask the property owner to maintain those parking spaces.
 - Ross Winglovitz will add a note to the plans to indicate they will maintain the parking spaces.
 - Drainage.
 - Ross Winglovitz advised he will look into drainage and set up a meeting with CEO John Orr, Street Superintendent Charlie Bono and Village Engineer Mark Edsall.
- As the proposed project is close to the Black Dirt, is the applicant required to do a soil test/study?
 - Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall advised his office can assist with the soil test/studies.

The Orange County Department of Planning response was reviewed again.
 A SEQR determination will be made at the next meeting.

- 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 Boulevard

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

- Brad Cleverly, PE, advised the temporary construction entrance is right across from the temporary concrete site. They will have flag people and safety measures in place for traffic. The plans will be updated to reflect this.

***MOTION** was made by Member Jankelunas, second by Member LaSpina, to **DECLARE THIS AN UNLISTED ACTION UNDER SEQR AS THE ACTION WILL NOT RESULT IN ANY POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.** Motion passed 5-0.

Planning Board questioned whether this project should be referred to the Town of Chester. CEO John Orr advised he would look into that referral and advise the Board.

The project will be added to the June 9, 2020 Planning Board agenda.

Ben Ostrer asked if the applicant could begin organizing the utilities (water and electric to start) for the site at their own risk, pending Planning Board approval.

- Planning Board Engineer Mark Edsall advised he approves from an engineering standpoint.
- CEO Mark Edsall advised he approves from a Code standpoint.
- The Board approved the applicant to organize the utilities at their own risk.

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

As an overview was provided earlier during the Public Hearing, Mark Edsall reviewed McGoey, Hauser and Edsall's comments (copy attached). General discussion was held regarding:

- Variance requested from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- The Board requested the applicant review parking and traffic patterns.
- Chairman Ramsdell requested the following on an updated site plan:
 - On page C1, the building should have a bolder blue line so they stand out.
 - The size of the existing building should be noted as well as the size of the proposed addition.
 - Test pits, soil borings and percolation tests are shown on page C3, but not in the legend. Chairman Ramsdell requested the connection be made between the legend and the tests.
 - Adjacent streets – Elizabeth Drive is in front of the building; Nucifora Boulevard is on the side of the property and State Route 17M is at the rear of the property.
 - A dash line on the plan to clearly mark the front, side and rear yards.
- The project engineer's comments are added to the minutes to note the comments and responses.

The project will be on the June 23, 2020 Planning Board agenda.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

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 8:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Sandra VanRiper
Planning Board Secretary



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: 26 MAY 2020 (Zoom Meeting)
CONSULTANT: ENGINEERING & SURVEYING PROPERTIES
PLAN DATE: Revision 1 – 05/13/20 (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 PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AT THE 28 APRIL 2020 PLANNING BOARD MEETING. THE APPLICATION IS BEFORE THE BOARD FOR A PUBLIC HEARING AT THIS MEETING.

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 revised plans and have the following comments:
 - The applicant’s engineer has addressed the great majority of issues previously raised in the prior review.

 - Since the side sidewalks will be used for access from the rear parking to the front first floor entrances, we suggest the handicapped parking space be moved to either end of the parking row, such that the access aisle can align with a handicapped ramp to such side sidewalks.

 - No project sign is shown, the engineer’s letter indicates signs will be proposed “once commercial tenants are identified”. We do not need sign text at this point, rather the location on the site and a sign detail.

 - 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.). The engineer’s letter indicates this would be submitted “under separate cover”.

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

- As previously noted, the two parcels are owned by different entities. The engineer notes that an “owner authorization is being sent under separate cover”, which is helpful as part of the application phase; however, the issue of merger of the parcels should be considered as a condition of any approval.
- Some revisions have been made to the on-site sanitary pump station, the engineer should consider the remaining items from the prior comments. In addition, the following note should also be added to the detail:

“The responsibility for maintenance of the individual private pump stations will be that of the individual property owner. Property owner shall contract for the maintenance of the pump station with a suitable contractor or plumber. Should a failure occur and the homeowner is unable to cause the correction of the condition within a timely fashion, and such condition results in a potential danger to the public health (in the sole opinion of the Village of Chester officials and/or the Orange County Department of Health), the Village reserves the right to enter onto the property and cause the repair of the pump station. The Village in such cases will bill the property owner for all direct and indirect costs of the repair, and such property owner hereby agrees that this is an obligation attached to the property.”

- For the one-way signs, we recommend only one sign at each curb cut, on the “outside” side of the site. Also, as previously suggested, these signs should also be double post, in addition to double-sided.
 - As previously noted, even with masonry dumpsters, bollards should be provided to protect the installation.
 - As previously requested, for the curb detail, please add total height and base width.
 - Please confirm that the intent is that the gravity wall has an integral 6” curb. That is our understanding from a review of the detail.
3. We have discussed the application with the Village Street Superintendent, who noted some initial concerns regarding the application. We have not yet received any follow-up input. Based on our understanding of his concerns, I do not believe it would significantly impact the site plan layout, but rather, some detail as to the improvements within the Village Road right-of-way.
 4. Some “action” items should be considered by the Board as follows:
 - As previously noted, a waiver is needed from the Board in connection with the parking, per Local Law #3-2017. Since the site requires 18 parking spaces, and 16 are proposed on site and 2 proposed on-street, the Board should consider granting the requested waiver.
 - The Board should discuss any appropriate SEQRA actions with the Attorney for the Planning Board.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-01-26May2020.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: 26 MAY 2020 (Zoom Meeting)
CONSULTANT: MJS ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING, PC
PLAN DATE: Revision B – dated 05/12/20 (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 PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AT THE 28 APRIL 2020 PLANNING
BOARD MEETING.

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 received the updated plans and have the following issues to bring to the attention of the Board:
 - Status of a review and response from the Street Superintendent should be discussed.
 - The Water Superintendent should review and accept the details of connection for the temporary service to the site and equipment. This can be a condition of an approval.

- Although some additional clarification has been made regarding site grading, the requested contours are not fully identified, nor do they “close” with the existing contours. We believe it is adequate for a temporary site plan.
- It is anticipated that upon termination of the temporary site plan, the equipment will be removed and the site regarded and seeded/stabilized. A note to that effect should be on the plan.
- With regard to stormwater management, note the following:
 - We believe the applicant will require a SWPPP for construction given the area of disturbance.
 - The applicant should confirm that a SWPPP and coverage under GP-0-20-001.
 - We believe a NYSDEC Storm-Water Multi-Sector General Permit is an obligation
 - Our office strongly suggests against the use of straw bale dikes since water cannot easily pass through them.
 - The applicant has not proposed any Erosion and Sediment Control Best Management Practices on the E&SC plan.

The Village is not an MS4 community, as such these comments are advisory; the applicant must address this matter directly with the NYSDEC. Copies of all permits should be provided to the Code Enforcement Officer.

4. The Board should discuss the SEQRA status and GML 239 Planning Department status.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-02-26May2020.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: 26 MAY 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 PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AT
THE 28 APRIL 2020 PLANNING BOARD MEETING. THE APPLICATION IS
BEFORE THE BOARD FOR A PUBLIC HEARING AT THIS MEETING.

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. We have received the revised plan set. There is improvement in the clarity of the drawings; however, some additional effort would be beneficial. Please note the following comments:
 - The applicant is reminded of our interim comments dated 24 March 2020. Please insure all these items are addressed (we note several open issues).
 - We believe the improvement to the clarity of the north arrow is not as requested by the Chairman.
 - Some additional effort to limit extraneous information on drawings where information is not relevant to the purpose of that specific drawing would be beneficial.

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

- Traffic control signs and some truck movement is depicted on these plans. It would be helpful for the applicant to clarify the intended operation of the site curb cuts and intended movements. As well, the plan does not affirmatively note the loading area on the west side of the existing building (nor the route to get there). This should be further discussed.
- On Sheet C-1, it would be helpful (on the plan) to identify the existing building with floor area and the proposed addition with floor area, rather than just by note. It is noted that dimensions have been added.
- On Sheet C-1, first row of passenger vehicle parking along Elizabeth Drive, the most northerly spot seems inaccessible.
- On Sheet C-1, sidewalks are not clearly identified, nor their width.
- On Sheet C-1, there are some “random” lines that should either be identified or removed.
- There is no utility drawing provided, and it appears that the only utility connection indicated on Sheet C-1 is the service to the temporary site (which should not be on these plans).
- As previously noted,, on sheet C-1, the text “Retaining Wall” does not identify what it is “pointing to”.
- The engineer’s letter indicates that the off-site striping (from the prior approval) will be re-striped. This should be added as a note on Sheet C-1.
- Drawing C-2 still does not reference the Licensed Land Surveyor as the source of the metes and bounds. As previously requested, a copy of the property survey should be submitted to the Planning Board for file.
- As previously noted, supporting information regarding the 20’ Utility Easement for the discharge of drainage from this project on the lot opposite the site should be referenced on Sheet C-2 and documentation provided to the Village for record. As well, the limits of the easement are not depicted.
- On Sheet C-3, elevation values have not been added to existing contours, as previously requested. Some additional cleanup of this drawing is requested.
- As previously noted, Drawing C-3 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. The detail must include a fence and the standard Village retaining wall notes.
- As previously noted,, it is unclear why spot grade elevations are shown within the area of the proposed building on Drawing C-3.
- Drawing C-4 is identified as the Landscaping Plan, but actually does not depict landscaping (only provides notes). Another Lighting and Landscaping drawing is provided (e1.2). We suggest Sheet C-4 be eliminated and any needed notes or details be merged with e1.2 or an additional “e series” drawing be provided.
- The Board should note that the fence is called out as 6 ft. on the plan, and is detailed as 6 ft. plus a 12’ barbed wire section.

3. A review of the Stormwater / Erosion Control plans and details, as well as the SWPPP, are the subject of a separate memo, attached hereto.
4. The Board should discuss any follow-up operational issues with regard to the southerly Nucifora Boulevard curb cut. As part of the prior approval, it was agreed 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 (see Note #13 on Drawing C-1). This would be an appropriate time to revisit this matter, and, at minimum, acknowledge continuation of this provision.
5. The Board should discuss SEQRA and the GML 239 Orange County Department of Planning referral.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark J. Edsall

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

MJE/st
Ches20-03-26May2020.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 & CT)
PATRICK J. HINES
LYLE R. SHUTE, P.E., LEED-AP (NY, NJ, 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

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

VILLAGE OF CHESTER
SWPPP REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT NAME: STERIS ISOMEDIX SERVICES EXPANSION SITE PLAN AMENDMENT
PROJECT NUMBER: 20-3
TAX LOT/LOCATION: 117-2-4.2
PLAN DATE: 26 MAY 2020
REPRESENTATIVE: MJS ENGINEERING

The undersigned reviewed the Preliminary Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and plans for the above mentioned project last revised 12 May 2020. The following observations are noted:

1. The applicant based the Runoff Quantity mitigation through the use of Downstream Analysis. Please see the following regarding the Downstream Analysis:
 - Please note that only the overbank and extreme flood events can be waived through the use of Downstream Analysis. Channel Protection Volume must be attenuated.
 - The applicant uses a different Curve Number (CN) for the 100 year storm peak discharge rate as compared to the 1 and 10 year storms. How can the drainage area differ for different year storm events?
 - It appears that some of the data used for this study was from a referenced study from 1993. It's conceivable that the drainage area has changed significantly over 27 years. How has the SWPPP accounted for this change?
 - The applicant should confirm that the downstream conveyance can accept the peak discharge rate of the 100 year storm event.
2. Section VII.A. states that the site has an infiltration of less than 0.5 inches per hour, however the infiltration testing provided states that the infiltration rate is ≥ 1.0 inches per hour. According to the test results, the WQv should be provided.
3. The SWPPP identifies the use of underground infiltrators; however the plans indicate underground infiltrators on some sheets and storm water planters on other. Please review for consistency.
4. The plans identify the total disturbance of 5.3 Acres. Due to the amount of disturbance, a phasing plan may be required.

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

26 May 2020

5. The SWPPP identifies the total disturbance as 4.4 acres. As stated above, the plans identify the total disturbance as 5.3 acres. Please review and revise as necessary.
6. The applicant proposes the use of NYSDOT Item 304.05 for use for the stabilized construction entrance in the SWPPP. Our office suggests that 2" stone for use within the stabilized construction entrance. We do note that the Stabilized Construction Entrance Detail specifies 2" stone for use within the SCE.
7. Our office strongly suggests against the use of straw bale dikes since water cannot easily pass through them.
8. All required SWPPP documents should be included in the document (General Permit, NOT, etc.)
9. This office will continue the review of the SWPPP upon the revisions based on the comments hereinabove.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCGOEY, HAUSER & EDSALL
CONSULTING ENGINEERS, D.P.C.**



Shawn Arnott, P.E.
Project Engineer