TROY A. WOJCIEKOFSKY, P.E., LEED-AP CONSULTING ENGINEER 845 594-1529 woj12@optonline.net

October 16, 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 and two (2) copies of a revised 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 and comments from the September Planning Board Meeting. The comments are specifically addressed below.

CPL 9/27/2023

1. Comment: Provide correspondence with and approval from DCDPW when available.

Response: Correspondence and approval will be provided once received.

2. Comment: Provide correspondence with and approval from the Dutchess County Department of Behavioral and Community Health for the on site septic system and well when available.

Response: Correspondence and approval will be provided once received.

3. Comment: As stated previously the drainage design relies heavily on infiltration. The previous report indicated an infiltration rate of 10" per hour, while the revised report it is shown as 2" per hour. Actual infiltration rates should be determined at the proposed elevation of the bottom of the swale, dry detention and drywells. The calculations should be revised using the field determined infiltration rates. It appears that the capacity of the existing 12" design point discharge culvert is about 2.4 cfs. Additional calculations should be provided to show what the headwater elevation at the culvert would be during the 100 year storm peak discharge of 19.91 cfs.

Response: Soil testing was performed 10/6/2023. Groundwater was generally 4 ft. deep in the proposed infiltration trench and drywell areas. This is too shallow to implement infiltration practices. The plans have been revised to replace the drywells and infiltration trench with catch basins. Collected runoff will be directed to the dry detention basin. The Storm Report has been updated.

The conditions at the design point culvert were reviewed and are discussed within the Storm Report.

<u>H&H9/27/2023</u>

- 1. Comment: <u>Turning Templates</u>. The turning templates should be revised.
 - a. The truck turning templates show two different labels. The SU-30 and the SU-40.
 - b. The templates show entering trucks using the internal exit lane and the exiting trucks using the internal entrance lane.
 - c. The turning template plan shows the proposed curb cut curb 11 and 12 feet away from the existing curb along Middlebush. This should be addressed.

Response: A truck turning template plan has been provided for an SU-30 and SU-40 vehicle. The templates have been adjusted to maintain the proper lane entering and exiting the site. The curb return along Middlebush Road at the entrance are 11' and 12' to match the existing curb. Two existing catch basins adjacent to the curb make it likely that the County will maintain the existing conditions.

General Operation Narrative

The use of the building and site is anticipated to be of a low intensity. Although specific tenants have not been identified, example tenants could be a plumbing, electrician or other general contractor. A contractor may park a utility vehicle within the building. However, the doors are not designed to be loading bays and deliveries are expected to pull parallel with the building and be unloaded into the building by forklift. The building could also be used for storage of materials with no vehicle parking within the building.

Most vehicles are expected to be van-type or small utility trucks. A box truck or material delivery vehicle could occasionally visit the site (estimated frequency of 1/week) so an SU-40 turning plan has been included within the plan set to show that this largest expected vehicle can enter and exit the site without causing a hazard. A more common scenario might be an SU-30 vehicle entering and existing the site with a delivery truck parked at the first overhead door (worst case scenario). Entering and existing vehicles will not present a hazard within the entrance or on Middlebush Road. The entrance will be 36 ft. wide (3-lane width) to assure that there are no maneuvering issues at the entrance. Photos of the typical vehicles are attached. Three (3) parking spaces have been removed to provide additional maneuvering room for an SU-40 truck and to access the northern-most bay.

2. Comment: <u>Wetlands</u>. The National Wetlands Inventory identifies a Town and Federally-regulated wetland on the property. The Applicant should contact the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) to verify if the project requires approvals from that agency or other regulating agencies. All correspondence between the Applicant and the ACOE should be sent to the Planning Board for review. The Application will also require a wetland disturbance permit from the Town as a substantial portion of the Proposed Action includes disturbance to the wetland and development within the Town regulated wetland buffer. The Applicant should quantify what square footage of the wetland and the wetland buffer is proposed to be disturbed. Additionally, the comment response memo submitted by the Applicant references a wetland memo from Ecological Solutions, but this wetlands memo was not received by our office. This should be included in future submissions.

Response: A Wetland Disturbance Permit application was previously submitted and includes the disturbance areas. Ecological Solutions is preparing an application for submission to ACOE for coverage under their Nationwide Permit. A copy will be provided to the Town once submitted.

3. Comment: <u>Sight Distance</u>. We defer to the Town Superintendent of Highways and the Town Engineer with respect to sight distance measurements at the driveway.

Response: DCDPW has reviewed the project and will issue a permit.

Bea Ogunti, Planning Board Secretary October 16, 2023

4. Comment: <u>Signage</u>. The Applicant has represented in their comment response memo that, "No freestanding tenant signs are proposed at this time. Only tenant directional signs are proposed on the entry doors to each of the four tenant spaces. Sign locations and details are shown on S-3.0." From the plans, the sign schedule shows 4 types of signs, including stop signs, handicap parking signs, no parking signs, and one that reads "All Vehicles Must Be Pull Beyond This Sign". It is not clear which signs on the sheet correspond to which signs identified on the schedule, or which of those signs, if any, are the directional signs proposed on the entry doors. The Applicant should address this.

Response: The sign locations are identified on Sht. S-1.0. A callout has been added designating the location and size of the tenant signs. A note has also been added to S-3.0 pertaining to the tenant signs.

5. Comment: <u>Sidewalk.</u> The Applicant has included a 5-foot-wide easement along the lot frontage for the future construction of a sidewalk along Middlebush Road. We defer to the Town Attorney as to the adequacy of the easement shown.

Response: No response required.

- 6. Comment: Parking:
 - a. The Applicant is requesting a parking waiver for 21 parking spaces where only 7 are required.
 - b. The parking lot configuration shows a row of parking stalls an uncertain distance from the northern most bay doors. This distance should be shown as a call out and more information should be given on the largest vehicles that will be using the northern most bay.

Response: A 24' dimension has been added to the plans (Site Plan S-1.0). See the discussion for comment #1 pertaining to the northerly-most door.

7. <u>Comment: SEQR</u>: The Application had concluded SEQRA, however, the Application has changed substantially and now includes the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new 6,890 square foot building. The Planning Board should decide if they would like to pursue a coordinated or uncoordinated review of the new Application. If a coordinated review is preferred, the Planning Board should consider if they would like to serve as Lead Agency.

Response: No response required.

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

Sincerely,

Tray O. Win

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



Photo 1: Utility Vehicle Type 1



Photo 2: Utility Vehicle Type 2



Photo 3: Utility Vehicle Type 3



Photo 4: Delivery Vehicle



Photo 5: Material Delivery Vehicle