

www.hardestyhanover.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Bruce M. Flower, Chairman,

and the Town of Wappinger Planning Board

Date: March 2, 2022

Subject: Myers Corners Road Self-Storage – Amended Site Plan and Special Permit

Tax Lot 6258-03-278358

As requested, we reviewed the application of Chuck Genck (the "Applicant" and the "Owner") for Amended Site Plan Approval and Special Permit Approval.

The Property

The subject property is a 30.81-acre lot located at 169 Myers Corners Road, is designated as tax lot 6258-03-278358 on the Town of Wappinger tax maps and is located within the COP Conservation Office District (the "Subject Property" or "Site").

The Proposal

The Applicant seeks redevelop the existing 111,580 footprint two story building into a self-storage facility with 500 units. The proposal would include minor improvements to the surrounding driveway and loading area, with the majority of improvements within the existing building (the "Project" or "Proposed Action").

Submission

The Applicant has submitted for review an Application for Site Plan Approval form dated 10/28/21; an Application for Special Permit Approval form dated 11/17/21; a narrative prepared by Benjamin Burkhart with no date; A Full EAF form signed by Chuck Genck dated 10/28/21, revised 2/7/22; a comment response memo prepared Day and Stokosa dated 2/7/22; and a site plan (7 sheets) generally entitled "Amended Site Plan Building No. 169" prepared by Day Stokosa Engineering, PLLC and dated 2/7/22:

We offer the following comments for your consideration.

REVIEW COMMENTS

1. <u>SEQRA.</u> The Proposed Action is considered a Type I action pursuant to SEQRA as it involves activities associated with a facility with more than 100,000 square feet of gross floor area and a parking area of more than 500 parking spaces in a town of fewer than 150,000 persons.

The Planning Board has stated that they intend to proceed with an uncoordinated review. The next steps under SEQRA would be to consider a Negative Declaration

- 2. <u>Signage.</u> Additional information is required to verify the code compliance of the proposed signage. The location and size of the proposed signs should be made clear on the plans. Additionally, we are curious if the signs are proposed to be illuminated.
- 3. <u>Lighting.</u> The Applicant has included a lighting plan showing areas of the Site where additional lighting is proposed. The hotspots appear to be below 5 footcandles and the color temperature is proposed to be 3000K. The BUG rating of the proposed light fixtures is B1U5G1. Typically, we would recommend a lower Uplight rating than 5, but we defer to the Planning Board with regard to this.
- 4. Parking and Landscaping. The Applicant is proposing to create 7 landscaped islands in the existing parking area. Each of the seven would be the 18' by 36' or the size of 4 parking spaces. Each landscaped island would be composed of a mixture of low shrubs, perennial flowers, and grasses on a bed of river rocks. We defer to the Town Engineer as to the adequacy of the soil remediation depth of 30" for the landscaped islands. We are curious if what appears to be lighting poles in the center of the landscaped islands are existing and proposed to remain or if they are newly proposed as they are not included in the lighting plan.
- 5. <u>Development Phasing.</u> The Applicant mentions their intention to phase the development, but the narrative does not provide additional detail and the EAF states construction will take 6 months. The Applicant has clarified that the exterior work will be completed in 6 months and that the interior work will be phased. The previous narrative stated the intention of 500 storage units but the 2/7/22 response memo from Day and Stokosa states the end goal would be up to 1,425 storage units. The Applicant should clarify their intentions regarding the size of the final interior development.
- 6. <u>Environmental.</u> The EAF notes the presence of the endangered Indiana Bat which would require calendar restrictions on tree clearing as mitigation. Our review does not show any proposed tree clearing which the Applicant has confirmed.

We look forward to discussing our comments with you. If you have any questions with respect to the above, please let us know.

Sarah Brown, AICP Principle Planner

Malcolm Simpson Planner

cc: James Horan, Esq. Barbara Roberti Jon Bodendorf, PE Michael Sheehan Chuck Genck

 $Y: \label{thm:locslower} Y: \label{thm:locsl$