

February 10, 2023

Bea Ogunti, Planning Board Secretary
20 Middlebush Rd
Wappingers Falls, NY 12590

RE: Re-submission for Site Plan for Contractor Storage Building
33 Middlebush, LLC
33 Middlebush Road (Tax Parcels 6157-01-396837 and 414840)
Town of Wappinger, NY

Dear Ms. Ogunti:

Attached are five (5) sets of full-scale and ten (10) sets of 11" x 17" revised plans, two (2) copies of an Engineer's Report for Drainage Design for the project. These documents have been updated by TW Engineering to address comments from the Town's consultants related to the Site Plans previously submitted by the Project Architect. The comments are specifically addressed below.

CPL 2/23/2022

1. Comment: Include locational sketch of the project parcel, at a scale of not less than 1 inch to 800 feet.
Response: A Location Map has been added to the Cover Sheet and Site Plan.
2. Comment: Show all existing buildings, structures, wells, septic systems, and other man-made features within 200 feet of the property boundary.
Response: Existing features have been shown. We are awaiting information from DCBCH regarding the location of the septic system on the property to the west.
3. Comment: Names of all owners of record of adjacent properties must be included in the plan set.
Response: Adjoiner information has been added to the plans.
4. Comment: Please expand on the proposed usage of the contractor storage units (i.e. is vehicle maintenance and/or storage proposed, will there be storage of chemicals, etc.).
Response: Contractor dry goods will be stored within the building. Vehicle maintenance/storage or the storage of chemicals is not anticipated.
5. Comment: Wetland and wetland buffer should be shown on the Site Plan on Sheet S-1.0.
Response: The wetlands have been flagged and are awaiting survey. Wetland flags and buffers will be shown on the next submission.
6. Comment: Include information of the individual(s) that delineated the wetland on Existing Lot #2.
Response: See Response #5.
7. Comment: Proposed construction in the adjacent wetlands and/or wetland buffer will be subject to a

wetland disturbance permit. The following proposed items appear to be in the wetland buffer: Bio-Retention Area #2, Reconstructed 2-story building, 5' wide concrete sidewalk at the rear of the proposed building, removal of existing pavement on southwest corner of project parcel, new concrete curbing on the southeast side of the proposed building.

Response: A Wetland Disturbance Permit Application Form will be provided once the wetland disturbances are quantified.

8. Comment: Bio-Retention Area #1 should be labeled as such on Sheet S-1.0. Please clarify.

Response: The Bio-Retention Area has been eliminated.

9. Comment: Is there a separate plan that contains the detail of sewage disposal and water system approval? If so, please include in the set for reference.

Response: The SSDS and proposed well are shown on Sht. S-5.0.

10. Comment: Regardless of the minor changes to the existing entrance, Dutchess County DPW must approve any changes to entrances onto a County Highway.

Response: So noted. DCDPW confirmed by email on 1/18/2023 that they reviewed the property in July 2019 and indicated that they had no comment and stated that a permit will be required for the improvements to the curb and any work within the ROW.

11. Comment: Page 3 of the SEAF states that the existing well will be reused, but the proposed paving on Sheet S-1.0 depicts paving surrounding the existing well. Please clarify and show how well is to be protected from traffic and contamination.

Response: A new well is proposed and the existing well will be abandoned. This work will be approved by DCBCH.

12. Comment: Dutchess County Behavioral and Community Health approval will be needed for the proposed reuse of the existing well and septic system.

Response: So noted.

13. Comment: Provide a truck-turning plan for the largest vehicle to service the facility.

Response: A Truck Turning Plan has been added for the largest anticipated vehicle on the site.

14. Comment: Provide inlet protection for all existing catch basins on the site. Sheet S-5 proposes only silt fence around the parcel line. A comprehensive erosion control plan should be developed.

Response: An Erosion Control Plan has been added to the plans. There are no existing catch basins on the site that are to remain.

15. Comment: Show location of construction entrance with necessary detail.

Response: Stabilized construction entrance is shown on the Erosion Control Plan and a detail has been added.

16. Comment: Show a concrete washout area with necessary detail.

Response: A concrete washout area is shown on the Erosion Control Plan and a detail has been added.

17. Comment: Are any building-mounted or free-standing signs proposed for the facility? If so, please show locations on plans and provide appropriate details.

Response: No free-standing signs are proposed at this time. Only tenant directional signs are proposed on the entry doors to each of the four tenant spaces.

18. Comment: Provide proposed first floor elevation and lowest sewerable elevation of the proposed building, as the Architect's Report states that the existing structure must be rebuilt.

Response: This information has been added to the plans.

19. Comment: The applicant should consider changing the site layout, with the proposed storage facility on the east side of the parcel.

Response: The Applicant intends to re-build the building in the same footprint of the existing building and use the current septic field area for the upgraded septic system. The current layout provides the best access and vehicle maneuvering on the site.

20. Comment: The Board should discuss the comments received from the Dutchess County Dept. of Planning and Development.

Response: These comments are addressed below.

21. Comment: It is recommended that the existing timber wall encroachment along the west property line be addressed as a part of this application.

Response: The Applicant does not require this encroachment to be removed by the neighbor and it does not impact the project.

22. Comment: The limit of disturbance must be shown on the plans and a SWPPP must be prepared if disturbance is greater than 1 acre.

Response: An Engineer's Storm Report was previously prepared and submitted for the project. The report has been updated and has been re-submitted with this submission. The Limit of Disturbance is shown on the Erosion Control Plan and is 0.9 acres.

23. Comment: Regardless of whether a SWPPP is required, provide sizing calculations and details for the proposed seepage pits and bioretention areas, and provide a pre/post development drainage analysis. Include a detail for the proposed infiltration trench.

Response: The Engineer's Report includes all calculations. A detail has been added for the infiltration trench.

24. Comment: Confirm adequate separation is provided between the "upgraded" SDS and proposed drainage features.

Response: Additional dimensions have been added to the Utility Plan. DCDOH will confirm minimum setbacks are met as part of their review.

25. Comment: Applicant should explain reasoning for providing several sections of fence integrated with the proposed landscaping around the perimeter of the paved parking area/travel-ways.

Response: The sections of fence have been eliminated from the project.

26. Comment: Additional spot elevations should be provided on the grading plan to ensure positive drainage away from the building and towards the stormwater management features.

Response: Additional spot elevations have been added to the Grading Plan.

27. Comment: Roof leaders are depicted on sheet A-12.0, but are not depicted on Sheet S-4. Please clarify.

Response: Roof leaders have been added to the Grading & Storm Plan.

28. Comment: The answer to question 18 on page 3 of the SEAF should be amended as bioretention areas are proposed. Please revise.

Response: The bioretention area has been eliminated from the project.

29. Comment: The submitted Architect's Report references exploratory test pits excavated around the perimeter of the existing building. The applicant should be advised that any excavation in a wetland buffer is subject to a Wetlands Disturbance Permit.

Response: So noted.

30. Comment: It appears that tree-felling will be necessary for the proposed site work and expanded parking area. Please include notes for the protection of Indiana Bats.

Response: A note has been added to the Cover Sheet regarding protection of the Indiana Bat.

Dutchess County Planning 2/14/2022

1. Comment: *Sidewalk* - We suggest that the applicant include a sidewalk along the parcel frontage. For many years our department has heard from the Town that sidewalks along CR 93 are desired. The road is home to several schools and the Town Hall, along with residences, and it connects to Route 9 commercial. A sidewalk along the north side of the road is a recommendation of the 2011 [CR 93 Corridor Management Plan](#) and the County's Walk-Bike Dutchess plan. We understand that the plans before us are an amendment to an already-approved site plan, and if a sidewalk is not feasible at this stage of this project, we suggest that the Town obtain a sidewalk easement from the applicant to facilitate future construction.

Response: There are currently no sidewalks along this area of Middlebush Road, so it does not make sense to build one along the property. The Applicant is not opposed to reserving an easement for a potential future sidewalk if the Town believes sidewalks along Middlebush Road in the future is a possibility.

2. Comment: *Lighting* - The plans do not include a photometric map, but given the number of fixtures the parking lot is likely overlit. Parking lot average lighting levels should be between 0.1-1.0 footcandles, with no hot spots greater than 5.0. Fixtures should be full cut-off and Dark Sky compliant, with a color temperature no higher than 3,000K (the currently proposed pole lights are 4,000K and the proposed wall lights are 5,000K).

Response: A Lighting Plan is included with a lighting summary table.

3. Comment: *Parking* - We understand that the planning board requested additional parking during the initial site plan approval process. To limit impermeable surface area, we suggest land-banking this parking instead, with the applicant agreeing to construct it only if it is determined to be necessary at an agreed-upon future date.

Response: A portion of the parking area will be gravel to reduce impervious surfaces. The area is needed for truck turning on-site.

Bea Ogunti, Planning Board Secretary
February 10, 2023

DCDOH 3/10/2021

1. Comment: Backflow preventer and well abandonment require approval by DCDOH.

Response: Noted.

Please place this project on the May 17th Planning Board meeting for consideration. If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Troy A. Wojcikofsky". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Troy" being more prominent.

Troy A. Wojcikofsky, P. E.; LEED-AP; ENV-SP
Engineer