

MEMORANDUM

To: Bruce M. Flower, Chairman,
and the Town of Wappinger Planning Board

Date: April 13, 2022

Subject: **Jiffy Lube – Site Plan Review**
Tax Lots 6157-02-653974

As requested, we reviewed the applications of Jiffy Lube International, Inc. (the “Owner” and “Applicant”) for Site Development Plan Approvals.

The Properties

The subject property is known as Tax Lot 6157-02-607850 on the Town of Wappinger Tax Assessment Maps and is the Wappinger Plaza Shopping Center on US Route 9 within a Shopping Center (SC) zoning district (the “Subject Property” or “Site”).

The Proposal

The Applicant is proposing the demolition of an existing restaurant and the development of a 3,057 square foot retail automotive quick oil change facility (the “Project” or “Proposed Action”).

Submission

The Applicant has submitted for review an Application for Site Plan Approval dated 9/21/21; an Application for Special Permit Approval dated 9/21/21; a Short Environmental Assessment Form (Short EAF) dated 9/22/21; a single sheet drawing entitled “Partial Boundary and Topographic Survey” prepared by Control Point Associates dated 7/9/21; a narrative prepared by Timothy Kratz of Seven Mutli-Site Solutions dated 1/14/22; a comment response memo prepared by Tomothy Kratz dated 4/4/22; a geotechnical report produced by GeoStructures dated 1/4/22; and the following plans generally entitled “Jiffy Lube Multi-Care Services” prepared by Seven Engineering, dated 9/23/21 last revised 4/1/22:

1. Sheet G0.01, “Cover Sheet,”
2. Sheet G0.02, “General Notes,”
3. ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey
4. Sheet C1.01, “Existing Composite Site,”
5. Sheet C1.02, “Composite Site Plan,”
6. Sheet C1.10, “Demolition Site Plan,”
7. Sheet C1.11, “Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan,”

8. Sheet C1.20, "Dimension Control Site Plan,"
9. Sheet C1.30, "Grading Plan,"
10. Sheet C1.31, "Storm Water Management Plan,"
11. Sheet C1.40, "Utility Plan,"
12. Sheet C5.00, "Erosion Control Details,"
13. Sheet C5.01, "Site Details,"
14. Sheet C5.02, "Utility Details,"
15. Sheet L1.20, "Landscape Plan, Notes and Schedule,"
16. Sheet AG1.01, "Site Plan – Signs,"
17. Sheet AG2.01, "Sign Elevations,"
18. Sheet AG5.01, "Sign Details,"
19. Sheet ES-1, "Site Photometrics,"
20. Sheet A-1, "Floor Plan – Lower Bay,"
21. Sheet A-2, "Floor Plan – Upper Bay,"
22. Sheet A-4, "Exterior Elevations,"
23. Sheet A-5, "Dumpster Enclosure."

Additionally, the applicant has provided following sheets:

Sheet EC, "Existing Conditions," dated 1/14/22
Sheet PC, "Proposed Conditions," dated 1/14/22

We offer the following comments for your consideration.

REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Variance. The Applicant has stated that they have been granted their requested variances. From our understanding, the Applicant has been granted one variance for their front yard but has not yet applied for the other variances they would require as proposed. We defer to the Zoning Administrator as to whether the Applicant can proceed with their variances bundled as they have been labeled on their cover page or if they will have to separate and itemize their requested variances.
2. Lighting.
 - a. The lighting plan shows hot spots regularly in excess of 5 footcandles. The Applicant should revise their lighting plan to reduce the lighting hotspots to a level lower than 5 ft..

- b. The proposed luminaire cut sheets do not specify which color temperature is being proposed. The Applicant should revise the lighting plan to specify that they are proposing the models with a color temperature of 3000K.
 - c. We are curious if the pole lights labeled as S1 and S2 are existing light poles surrounding but outside of the building Site.
- 3. Parking. The bulk table identifies 17 required spaces and 19 proposed spaces. The Site Plan shows 11 spaces including the ADA space. The remaining 8 spaces are located within the building and behind it as cars queue to enter the building. We defer to the Zoning Administrator as to the adequacy of the service bays and queuing cars behind the service bays serving as parking spaces. We are also concerned that the geometry of the Site is such that queuing cars will conflict with the traffic circulation of the site. The Applicant should include a circulation plan that shows the area reserved for queuing cars and how the Site circulation will function around them. We would also remind the Board that under §240-97-A, if the proposed use is not specifically defined in the schedule of off-street parking requirements, that the Planning Board can modify the parking requirements as it sees fit.
- 4. SEQRA. The Proposed Action is considered an Unlisted action pursuant to SEQRA.

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

Sarah L. Brown, AICP
Principle Planner

Malcolm M. Simpson
Planner

cc: James Horan, Esq.
Barbara Roberti
Jon Bodendorf, PE
Michael Sheehan
Timothy Kratz, P.E. (tim.kratz@sevansolutions.com)