



January 13, 2017

Ms. Georgia Gray, Chairperson  
Village of Voorheesville Planning Commission  
29 Voorheesville Avenue  
Voorheesville, NY 12186

**RE: Proposed Stewart's Shops – 112 Maple Avenue  
Site Plan Resubmission  
CHA Project No.: 31753**

Dear Ms. Gray:

CHA is transmitting revised site plans for the above project bearing a revision date of January 11, 2017. These site plans supersede plans included in our December 30, 2016 submission, and they more fully address the site plan review comments dated December 22, 2016 from Lauren Sherman of C.T. Male Associates.

C.T. Male comments and CHA responses are provided below:

1. Original CTM Comment #1: Archeological Resources: No correspondence was provided from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). It is recommended that the Applicant consult with OPRHP.

*CHA 11/30/2016 Response: Please refer to the attached letter from Ruth Pierpont, NYSOPRHP Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation indicating that OPRHP has reviewed the project and determined it will have no impact on listed or eligible archaeological and/or historic resources.*

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: A "No Impact" letter from NYSOPRHP was provided. Please provide correspondence sent to the NYS OPHRP that resulted in their no impact determination. This information is being requested in order to have a complete record of the NYSOPRHP consultation process.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: We have attached a copy of our 11/1/2016 OPHRP submission and the 11/8/2016 "no-impact" response letter for the record.***

2. Original CTM Comment #3: Traffic Information: The Applicant has provided information related to the anticipated vehicular trips generated by the proposed project. In addition to providing the AM, PM and Saturday AM peak hourly trip information, the trips generated should

also be assessed during the peak associated with school bus traffic generated by Voorheesville Elementary School. According to the Trip Generation Assessment, the estimated peak hourly traffic generated by the proposed Stewart's ranges from 150 vehicles per hour (weekday AM peak) to 187 vehicles per hour (weekday PM peak). The Saturday peak hour is estimated at 169 vehicles per hour. Although up to 65% of this traffic can be attributed to pass-by trips (per the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual), this volume is significant. The potential impact of left-turning vehicles entering and exiting the site should be evaluated. Maple Avenue is a two-lane roadway in front of a site which, operationally, could be impacted by this level of traffic.

If available, actual peak hourly traffic data/rates should be provided for an existing Stewart's site which is similar to the proposed Stewart's site. This peak hour data can be used in comparison to the empirical trip rates found in the ITE Trip Generation tables. Please note that page 2 of the Trip Generation Assessment references the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook rather than the most recent edition.

Based upon a review of the above-requested information, the Planning Commission will be able to determine if a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is warranted.

*CHA 11/30/2016 Response: A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been prepared by CHA (attached). The TIS includes traffic counts, trip generation, and capacity analyses in accordance with standard engineering practice and methodologies.*

*The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual is the industry standard for determining trip generation for various land uses and is based on data collected at case study sites throughout the United States. The proposed Stewart's is consistent with the description of the land use for ITE Land Use Code 853 and is appropriate for use in preparing Traffic Impact Studies and assessing the operations of the intersections and the adjacent street network.*

*CHA's reference to the use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook is correct as this is the most current edition. The reviewer may be confusing the ITE Trip Generation Handbook with the ITE Trip Generation Manual or the ITE Traffic Engineering Manual.*

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared and submitted by CHA for the most recent submission. The study was conducted with the premise that the Stewart's Shop will have two (2) full service driveways at Maple Avenue. Although this layout may work well for the Applicant, it has the potential to create conflicts for exiting left and right turns from the site, as well as creating conflicts with left-turns into the site. With the traffic split between the two (2) driveways, the level of service only shows modest delays outbound and nearly no delay upon entering.

Additionally, the study does not suggest any queuing problems from the signal at Rt. 156 back to the site driveway with the traffic volumes present during either conventional



peak hours or school peak hours. Although the TIS output does not suggest any queuing issues, it seems likely that there could be additional queuing issues associated with the additional Stewart's traffic.

We would recommend that after consulting with the NYS DOT, the applicant consider consolidating site access to one full service ingress/egress along with one right turn exit lane.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: CHA stands by the conclusion presented in the TIS that the project will not have a significant effect on traffic operations.***

***Regarding CTM's recommendation to consolidate site access to one full-access driveway and one right-turn exit driveway, the Applicant wishes to work collaboratively with the Village and NYSDOT toward an access plan that is acceptable to all parties. As such, Stewart's would be amenable to an ingress-only west driveway (adjacent to the proposed building) and a full-access (ingress/egress) east driveway. We have made this modification to the site plan, and we are concurrently transmitting revised plans to NYSDOT. We have been in communication with NYSDOT regarding the driveway permit application, and we are awaiting their comments on the revision to the access plan.***

***We have also added a stop bar and stop sign at the egress side of the full-access driveway, as discussed at the Planning Commission meeting, to better enforce the pedestrian right-of-way at the sidewalk.***

***Also with regard to traffic, please see the attached letter dated 12/21/2016 from CHA traffic engineer Christine Lilholt addressing comments raised at the 12/13/2016 Planning Commission meeting.***

### **Part 1 Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF):**

Below are specific comments on the content of the Part 1 Short EAF.

3. Original CTM Comment #8: Question 8a: In response to the question of whether or not the proposed action will result in a substantial increase in traffic, the Applicant has checked the box "No"; however, additional traffic information has been requested to determine if this answer is appropriate. In addition, it is worth noting that the proposed action includes the construction of two (2) separate entrances, each having unrestricted ingress and egress, which has the potential to alter current traffic patterns.

***CHA 11/30/2016 Response: The TIS provides data and engineering analysis which indicate that no significant impacts to traffic will occur as a result of the project.***

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: Refer to CTM Response for Comment 2 (Original CTM Comment #3) above.



***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Comment previously addressed.***

4. Original CTM Comment #9: Question 13b: No documentation is provided to determine if the proposed action will not have any impact to a regulated wetland or other water of the U.S.

*CHA 11/30/2016 Response: See response #2, above.*

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: The proposed grading plan shows work in close proximity to the floodway and mapped wetlands. There appears to be potential for temporary impacts to these features to occur during construction, due to this close proximity. If no impacts (temporary or permanent) to the floodway or mapped wetlands are proposed, site plans should clearly demonstrate how work will be done in a manner that will have no impact on these features. Although temporary fencing is shown to protect wetlands during construction, proposed protection measures should be more clearly detailed.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Details for the retaining wall proposed adjacent to the wetlands have been modified to more clearly demonstrate how protection of the wetlands will be ensured during construction. Please refer to the retaining wall elevation, section and construction notes (Details 4 and 4A, Sheet C-604).***

5. Original CTM Comment #10: Question 15: It is stated that the site of the proposed action contains a listed State or Federal threatened or endangered species, however, no information is provided related to the particular species present, or how impacts can be avoided.

*CHA 11/30/2016 Response: A NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program Data Request was submitted by CHA on 10/26/16. We are awaiting a reply, and will provide additional information when it is received.*

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: There is an apparent inconsistency between the answer to Question 15 on the Part 1 Short EAF and the NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program correspondence. The Part 1 Short EAF states “yes” to the question of the presence of possible State or Federally listed threatened or endangered species on the project site. Please provide documentation from the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding Federally listed species that may be present on the project site.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: CHA utilized the EAF Mapper tool located on the NYSDEC’s website to auto-populate the Environmental Assessment Form. The tool relies on NYSDEC Environmental Resource Mapping (ERM), which provides a very broad, non-site specific indication of the potential for T&E species in a given area. NYSDEC guidance on the use of the EAF Mapper tool indicates that if a “hit” is registered for a general area, more investigation is necessary to determine whether or not it applies specifically to a site under consideration. Accordingly, and per NYSDEC protocol, CHA followed up with a written inquiry to the NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program. This inquiry initiated a more detailed and site-specific agency***



***review, which resulted in the finding that there are “no records of rare or state-listed animals or plants or significant natural communities at the project site or in its immediate vicinity.” The finding issued by NHP is the result of a site specific review, and it supersedes the more broad-based information obtained from the EAF Mapper tool. The fact that the NHP finding differs with the EAF mapper result is not at all indicative of an inconsistency, provided that the reader understands the various resources provided by NYSDEC and how they are properly used.***

***In addition to NHP’s finding, a CHA senior scientist conducted a detailed field evaluation of all existing site habitats. This evaluation is summarized in a 12/7/2016 letter which was included in a previous submission to the Planning Commission. Its findings are consistent with NHP’s.***

***Finally, there are no required federal permits for this project. Absent a pending federal permit application, there is no warrant under SEQRA and there is no jurisdiction available for USFWS to review.***

**Site Plans:**

6. Original CTM Comment #21: Retaining wall design information needs to be provided on future engineering plans as the site design is progressed to construction-level plans.

***CHA 11/30/2016 Response: A retaining wall section is included on Sheet C-604. Top and bottom of wall elevations are shown on the Grading Plan (Sheet C-201). Detailed engineering drawings for the wall will be included with the final building/structural drawings.***

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: We recommend that the final retaining wall plans and details be provided at site plan review given its proximity to the Vly Creek and the floodway for Vly Creek. It is critical that the wall be designed to not impact the Creek, the floodway or encroach into the wetlands. A slope stability analysis should be performed for the retaining wall prior to finalizing design. Additionally, geotechnical information should be provided as a basis for the retaining wall design and site grading.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: CHA agrees that final engineering of the retaining wall should be based upon a geotechnical analysis and recommendations. We have added additional details and notes pertaining to the retaining wall which establish reasonable and conservative parameters for the final design of the wall. Our preferred approach is always to obtain site plan approvals before executing a geotechnical exploration program, as this will result in more accurately located borings. Our understanding from CTM’s previous comment is that they agree it is appropriate that this information would not be required until future, construction level plans are prepared. Naturally, if the results of the geotechnical investigation were to require a change to the site plan, that change would be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.***



7. Original CTM Comment #25: The layout plan needs to provide a truck turning plan for the largest anticipated delivery truck (fuel or store goods) for the site. The truck turning plan will be used to verify that the truck can navigate the site, as designed.

*CHA 11/30/2016 Response: An Auto Turn template for a WB-40 delivery truck is included on Sheet C-102. The turning template demonstrates that there is adequate maneuvering space.*

CTM 12/22/2016 Response: As discussed at the December 13<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting, in addition to the WB-40 fuel delivery truck, the Applicant will also show the auto turn path of a goods delivery truck which will access the rear of the proposed Stewart's Shop.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: A turning template for the SU-30 delivery truck has been added to Sheet C-102.***

**Additional CTM Comments from 12/22/2016 review letter:**

1. Many of the existing conditions text callouts (i.e., asphalt, Smith's Tavern, etc.) are visible on the proposed plan sheets. Freeze existing call-outs/labels, as needed.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: CHA has specific standards pertaining to the importance of existing conditions information in the background of proposed plan sheets. This appears to be a matter of preference, and ours is to not change this.***

2. The existing hydrant is not clearly labeled on the survey basemap.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: The existing hydrant has been labeled on the basemap.***

3. Article XIX "Special Regulations", Section F "Landscaping Standards" of the Village Zoning Law states that the light level at the lot line must not exceed 0.2 foot candles. The Lighting Plan shows that there is low level light spillage onto the adjacent property (over 0.2 foot candles); however, we take no exception to leaving the light fixtures as they are. We recommend that the Planning Commission weigh in on this and determine whether the spill level would require a discretionary review by the ZBA.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: Cutoff shields have been added to the light fixtures in question, and a revised photometric plan has been provided demonstrating compliance with the Village Landscaping Standards.***

4. The existing conditions features appear grainy and are difficult to read on some of the plan sheets.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: The purpose of showing existing conditions on proposed plan sheets is to allow coordination between existing and proposed features. We screen this***



***information to provide clarity for the proposed plan features. While some of the existing conditions text may be harder to read than if we didn't screen it, our experience is it presents better this way, and the existing conditions information can be seen unscreened on the Existing Conditions Plan.***

5. Not all of the layers shown on the plans appear in the legend/match what's shown in the legend (G-002) (i.e., OU, wetland/marsh symbol).

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: We have corrected the legend to align with the basemap.***

6. The sanitary sewer connection to the existing Village system appears to be lacking detail. Additional information on the existing system (including the force main path to the west and pump station location) and proposed connection to the existing sanitary MH should be provided.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: We have contacted the Village, and they do not have record mapping for the existing low-pressure forcemain. However, they provided verbal information, and we have adjusted the sanitary sewer design accordingly. The ability to connect to the existing forcemain is evident in that Smith's Tavern has an existing connection. In the absence of record drawings, the location of the actual connection will be determined in the field during demolition of the Smith's Tavern sewer.***

7. The water main location shown on the plans is assumed, but should be confirmed by reviewing the Village's record mapping.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: We have contacted the Village, and they agreed to provide record mapping for the existing waterline. We will add this information to the plan as soon as it is provided; however, we believe based on the location of existing valves identified on the survey, the location of the existing waterline will not vary much from the location shown, and the design of the new water service will not be substantially affected.***

8. It is recommended that the rock outlet protection shown at the end section of the storm piping is extended to a location where the slope flattens to minimize the potential for erosion.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: The rock apron was shown symbolically on the grading plan. We have corrected this. When drawn to actual scale, the 12-foot long rock apron extends to the flatter section of the channel. Erosion is not anticipated to be a concern, as the 10-year velocity is 4.4 FPS.***

9. Two (2) similar rock outlet protection details are included on the plans (3/C-601 and 7/C-603).

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: We have deleted the detail on Sheet C-603 and revised the call out on the grading plan to reference 3/C-601.***



10. It is recommended that the applicant consult with NYSDOT Region 1 at this point in the review process to discuss the location of the driveway entrances and potential queuing impacts. The applicant shall provide copies of correspondence with NYSDOT.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: CHA submitted a NYSDOT Highway Work Permit Application to the NYSDOT Region 1 Permit Coordinator on 12/12/2016. A copy of the transmittal is attached.***

11. The proposed sign should be a monument sign rather than a freestanding sign, as shown on Sheet C-604 and as discussed previously. The Village ZBA should be contacted to ensure that this type of sign is permitted.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: A revised monument sign detail has been provided on Sheet C-604.***

12. The existing conditions plan and ESC plan should more clearly label the identified wetlands using a shading or hatching, consistent with a map legend. Also, the southern property line is labeled as the centerline of creek; however the ordinary high water mark of the northern bank of the creek is not identified. The boundaries of this water of the U.S. should be accurately portrayed on the existing conditions plan. Additionally, the name of the creek should be denoted as well.

***CHA 1/13/2017 Response: We have made the wetland labeling and hatching clarifications to the ESC Plan and added the ordinary high water line and creek name to the basemap.***

13. Provide the depth to the seasonally high groundwater table.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Comment noted. Groundwater depth will be recorded during the geotechnical engineering investigation. See previous discussion (site plan comment #6).***

14. The close proximity of the toe of the retaining wall to the floodway for Vly Creek is a concern; the retaining wall shall be designed to account for potential erosion of the toe of the wall during flood events.

***CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Comment noted. See previous discussion (site plan comment #6).***

15. The Applicant shall provide a quantitative analysis of any potential impacts the proposed fill in the floodplain (outside of the floodway) could have on adjacent properties.

***CHA 1/13/17 Response: A flood study demonstrating that the project will not have a significant impact on the floodplain measured across the creek and upstream has been prepared and submitted under separate cover.***



16. The project has the potential for petroleum spills in close proximity to Vly Creek. Spill prevention measures should be discussed and incorporated into the design of this facility. Additionally, operational protocols associated with fuel tank filling operations that will serve to mitigate spills should also be described.

**CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Please see the attached Stewart's Shops Petroleum Storage Equipment Design, Installation and Maintenance narrative, attached.**

17. Please provide the proposed hours of operation for this new shop, as well as when the outdoor lights will be turned off and if any outdoor lighting will remain turned on outside of regular business hours.

**CHA 12/30/2016 Response: The proposed hours of operation are 5 AM – midnight. The lights are on both photocells and timers to maintain visibility throughout the hours of operation. When the store is closed the yard lights and signage will be turned off and the internal illumination will be reduced to safety lighting. One half hour before opening and one half hour after closing the delivery door light will be active for the safety of the opening and closing partner.**

18. At the NW corner of the proposed Stewart's building, add tree(s)/planting(s) to the north of the northernmost parking stall to screen parking area.

**CHA 12/30/2016 Response: Please see the revised landscape plan and revised building elevations. The patio has been relocated from the front (east side) to the north side of the proposed building, and an ornamental fence has been added around the patio. Landscaping, including the tree at the NW building corner has been moved to the north, and additional landscaping is shown along the front of the building.**

Thank you, and if you have any questions, please call me at 518-453-3927.

Sincerely,



Anthony P. Stellato, Jr. PE  
Vice President

cc: Lauren Sherman, CT Male  
Chuck Marshall, Stewart's Shops