



ATZL, NASHER & ZIGLER P.C.

ENGINEERS - SURVEYORS - PLANNERS

Web: www.anzny.com

April 10, 2023

Village of Chester
Planning Board
47 Main Street
Chester, NY 10918
Attn: Sandra Vanriper
PH: 845-469-2388, Ext 231
Email: planning@villageofchesterny.com

Re: Tax Lot 116-0-1.2
Summerville Industrial Park
Village of Chester

Dear Ms. Vanriper,

The following is our response John Queenan, P.E. of Lanc & Tully Engineering and Surveying, P.C. letter dated March 24, 2023:

1. Comment: The Project Site is located in the M-1 Zone where warehouse facilities are principal permitted uses in the zone. Based on the bulk table provided, a variance for building height has been requested from 40 ft to 53 ft. The bulk table should be revised to label proposed and not existing conditions.

Response: Revised accordingly.

2. Comment: The parking calculations table should include a calculation of the amount of parking required by zoning which is 2 parking spaces per 3 employees of the 2 largest successive shifts.

Response: Added to Parking Calculation Table.

3. Comment: Orange and Rockland Utilities easement runs through the north side of the property. The applicant should coordinate with this agency to determine if the proposed parking and related improvements are permitted in this area.

Response: Currently we are requesting the parking lot to be designated "Reserve Parking" and we will use the area for a temporary Subsurface Septic System. We will be contacting Orange and Rockland Utilities for utility mark out.

4. Comment: Proposed water and sewer lines should be shown on the plans with sizes and slopes and a plan note should be added confirming the project site's location in water and sewer districts. Our office will coordinate with the Village DPW and Water Department for their review of the proposed plan.

Response: The details will be provided on the site plan drawing 4 thru 6.

5. Comment: The applicant is advised that the Village is currently exceeding the sanitary sewer flow allotment with the sewer district and does not have the ability at this time to allocate additional sewage use for this project. The applicant will need to address sewer capacity.

Response: We currently await comments from the Orange County Sewer District from the GML circulation.

6. Comment: The site plan requires a secondary means of access for emergency vehicles based upon NYS Fire Code. Also, fire accessibility and an aerial apparatus access road shall be provided and location(s) shown on the site plan.

Response: The existing gravel access off Route 94 will be converted to a gated emergency access to the loop road.

7. Comment: Based on the wetlands report provided by the applicant, the site contains both NYS and Federal jurisdictional wetlands. The Existing Conditions plan should note that both agencies have jurisdiction and should either note that the boundaries of the wetlands are coterminous or should identify boundaries for each.

Response: We have a General Note Section on Drawing 1 which will have this addressed.

8. Comment: A limit of disturbance should be shown on the grading plan and total disturbance should be noted.

Response: See Drawing 4.

9. Comment: An erosion and sediment control plan should be provided in the plan set.

Response: We will develop during the Stormwater Water Pollution Prevention Plan for submission.

10. Comment: Landscaping and lighting plans should be provided.

Response: Will be provided in this submission.

11. Comment: All hydrant locations should be shown on the plans.

Response: See Drawing 5 thru 7.

12. Comment: Filing information for the easement should be noted on the plan and the easement documents should be provided to the Planning Board.

Response: Currently the easement is Final Approval. We will provide a draft of the proposed agreement.

13. Comment: A dumpster location should be shown on the plans or a plan note added confirming all refuse will be located inside the building.
- Response: Two dumpster locations are now depicted in the center of the truck docks.*
14. Comment: Several construction details refer to notes which are not provided on the plans.
- Response: Amended accordingly.*
15. Comment: The plan should note that the lots are to be combined.
- Response: Amended accordingly.*
16. Comment: A legend should be provided on the plans.
- Response: Amended accordingly.*
17. Comment: The plans should note that any user of the proposed building will be required to comply with the performance standards of Section 98-16 of the zoning code.
- Response: Amended accordingly.*
18. Comment: Specific entry way locations should be identified on the plan.
- Response: Not available at this time.*
19. Comment: The vicinity map should identify the access easement as part of the project site.
- Response: Amended accordingly.*

20. Comment: A pedestrian connection should be provided to the eastern parking area.

Response: Amended map for a crosswalk.

21. Comment: Further review of the SWPPP shall be completed once a full report has been submitted. Based upon the conceptual review, a significant amount of the required stormwater component is comprised of porous pavement/infiltration. Porous pavement is not ideal for a warehouse use as it is considered a hotspot. Also, significant soil testing will be required to prove out the design. The applicant's engineer should complete soil testing prior to submitting the SWPPP document.

Response: Proceeding forward at this time.

22. Comment: Traffic Improvements are proposed along Summerville Way. A traffic study and analysis of these improvements shall be forwarded to the Planning Board once completed.

Response: Details and Colliers Report will be forwarded to the Village.

The applicant has provided a full EAF on which we have the following comments:

23. Comment: It is unclear why the application requires a permit from the ACOE as the plan does not show any Federal wetland disturbance.

Response: This project will not require a permit and the EAF reflects that fact.

24. Comment: D.2.r should be 'Yes' as the project will produce solid waste (refuse) that will need to be disposed of.

Response: Revised D.2.r with details of solid waste facts.

25. Comment: The EAF identifies the site as have archaeological sensitivity. The applicant should coordinate with SHPO and provide any correspondence when available.
- Response: Application submitted, attached herewith.*
26. Comment: The EAF identifies the site as having the potential to provide habitat for endangered Long-Eared Bats. If the applicant plans to adhere to the recommended clearing limits to avoid impacts to this species, a note should be added to the site plan.
- Response: The construction limits contain no trees.*
27. Comment: This application is a Type 1 Action under SEQ RA based on the total amount of disturbance and building floor area. Based on the plans and EAF provided, we believe the board can declare their intent to be Lead Agency. Our office can prepare this notice for circulation.
- Response: Statement no response required.*
28. Comment: The application requires referral to the Orange County Planning Department based the proximity to NYS Route 17.
- Response: So noted on the EAF.*