Town of Rotterdam
Planning Commission
January 21, 2020

Approval of the Summary of Minutes January 7, 2020

1. Stewart’s Shops – 2970 Guilderland Avenue. Final Site Plan/Special Use Permit Public Hearing for the construction of a ±3,847 square foot convenience store with a four island fueling station on a consolidated ±1.3 acre parcel. Design by: Stewart’s Shops.

2. Quality Petroleum 2, LLC - 330 Becker Drive & Duanesburg Road. Sketch Site Plan/Special Use Permit review to construct a ±8,000 square foot travel center with a drive-thru window and a five island motor vehicle fueling station on a consolidated ±3.37 acre parcel. Engineer: MJ Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.

Waiver(s)

1) Bernie’s Barber Shop - 2703 Hamburg Street. The applicant requests a Waiver of Site Plan review to operate a barbershop initially with two (2) chairs and the allowance for future expansion for up to four (4) chairs in a ±790 square foot tenant space on a ±12,048 square foot parcel.
1. Stewart's Shops – 2970 Guilderland Avenue. Final Site Plan/Special Use Permit Public Hearing for the construction of a ±3,847 square foot convenience store with a four island fueling station on a consolidated ±1.3 acre parcel. Design by: Stewart's Shops.

1. Approval is conditioned upon applicant addressing all Town Designated Engineer (TDE) and Rotterdam Department of Public Works (DPW) comments and full and final approval of the TDE and DPW.

2. Approval is conditioned upon the applicant receiving a highway work permit from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) for utility, sidewalk, and right-of-way work on Guilderland Avenue.

3. Approval is conditioned upon the applicant receiving Town sign permits for the proposed project including any proposed pylon, monument, and/or building mounted signage.

4. Approval is conditioned upon Town Water and Sewer Department review and approval of the proposed service laterals, methods of connection and proposed sanitary sewer extension.

5. Final approval is contingent upon the applicant receiving permits (site development and building) from the Department of Public Works Building Inspector.

6. One water meter shall be installed on the service connection. Final type and location to be approved by DPW (Add note to Sheet S-2).

7. All final fees are due prior to Chairman’s Signature.

8. Prior to the issuance of building permits for construction, the applicant shall combine the existing five parcels into a single parcel of land and file documents with Schenectady County (add note to Sheet S-1).

9. Prior to the issuance of building permits for construction, the applicant shall receive permits from NYSDOT (perm-33) for proposed work in the State ROW.

10. Prior to the issuance of building permits for construction, the applicant shall receive NYS DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity.

11. Prior to the issuance of Site Development and/or Building Permit(s) by the Town of Rotterdam, the applicant shall attend a pre-construction meeting with the Building Inspector and DPW staff to confirm the completion of the above stated conditions.

12. The applicant shall provide the Town of Rotterdam Department of Public Works paper and electronic AutoCAD file copies of the utility “As-Built Record Drawings” upon completion and testing of the utilities.

13. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, 5 foot concrete sidewalks and crosswalks as depicted on the site plan (Sheet S-2) shall be installed.
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14. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a 5 foot concrete off-site sidewalk along the eastern side of Guilderland Avenue from the project site north to the intersection of Willow Avenue shall be installed.

15. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall provide a copy of deed filed with Schenectady County that restricts access onto Floral Avenue as requested by the Town Board and agreed to by Stewart’s.

The following documents are attached for your review and consideration.

- Review letter from CHA dated October 7, 2019
- Response letter on DPW comments from Stewart’s dated November 22, 2019
- E-mail from DOT dated November 1, 2019 Guilderland Ave. sidewalks.
- Response letter on CHA comments from Stewart’s dated November 22, 2019
- Review letter from CHA dated December 4, 2019
- Response letter on CHA comments from Stewart’s dated December 20, 2019
- Site distance evaluation from Stewarts dated November 22, 2019
- Comment letter from NYS Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation dated December 16, 2019
- Review letter from CHA dated January 3, 2020
- Stewart’s letter to DPW dated January 9, 2020 summarizing meeting from January 8, 2020
- Response letter on CHA comments from Stewart’s dated January 9, 2020
- Response letter on CHA comments from Stewart’s dated January 10, 2020
- Schenectady County 239-m response dated January 17, 2020
DPW Comments from October 15, 2019

1. As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided along the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street to Willow Street. Additionally, a crosswalk with signage should be provided to the existing sidewalk located on the east side of Guilderland Avenue.

2. Commercial ornamental fencing and stone pillars should be provided along frontage to help with aesthetics and help guide pedestrians to internal and external sidewalks.

3. Detail dumpster enclosure.

4. Stone pillar treatment should be added to gas canopy poles.

5. Pavement should be concrete in fueling areas and parking spots along the building.

6. Additional deciduous trees should be considered and ground cover identified.

7. Planning Commission may wish to consider widening on-site pavement to better accommodate larger service vehicles that tend to frequent Stewart’s. It appears that room may exist. This could alleviate any concerns for off-site parking of these types of vehicles.

SEQR Requirement: 6 NYCRR 617 Unlisted Action. Rotterdam Town Board has completed SEQR and issued a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019. Planning Commission to make a determination regarding consistency with the Negative Declaration issued by the Town Board.

Involved/Interested Agencies
Schenectady County Economic Development and Planning
Schenectady County Department of Health
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation – Region #4
New York State Department of Transportation
Rotterdam Highway Department
Rotterdam Police Department
Fire District #2
Rotterdam Planning Commission
October 7, 2019

Mr. Peter Comenzo, Senior Planner
Town of Rotterdam
John F. Kirvin Government Center
1100 Sunrise Boulevard
Rotterdam, New York 12306

RE: Stewart’s Shops - Concept Site Plan Review
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY
CHA File: 12669.1030

Dear Mr. Comenzo:

On behalf of the Town of Rotterdam, acting as Town Designated Engineer (TDE), CHA Consulting, Inc. (CHA) has reviewed the following documents for the above referenced Site Plan Application:

- Town Special Use Permit/Site Plan Application dated September 27, 2019 prepared by Charles Marshall of Stewart’s Shops.
- Concept Site Plans dated December 2, 2018 with no revision date, consisting of (6) Plan Sheets, prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. for Stewart’s Shops.
- Rotterdam Town Board Resolution 220.19 dated July 31, 2019 adopting a Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQR.
- Rotterdam Town Board Resolution 221.19 dated July 31, 2019 enacting a Local Law No. 11 of the year 2019 regarding a change of zone from R-1 Single Family Residential to B-2 General Business.

The proposed project is located on a proposed 1.29-acre site consisting of 5 parcels of land at northeast corner of the intersection of Guilderland Avenue (Route 158) and Lilac Street within the B-2 General Business Zoning District. The existing uses include an automobile service garage, storage yard and two residential homes proposed to be demolished. Stewart’s Shops (contract vendee) is proposing to construct a 3,847 square foot convenience store and stand-alone gas canopy that will house four pumps (eight fueling positions). Two full access drives are proposed; one from Guilderland Avenue and one from Lilac Street. No access is proposed to Floral Avenue. Associated site improvements include grading, drainage, stormwater management, utilities, pavement and parking improvements.

Based upon the above and acting as Town Designated Engineer (TDE) for the project, CHA offers the following review comments:

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. The Negative Declaration identified the following potential mitigation measures as may be deemed necessary by the Planning Commission:
   a) Installation and maintenance of landscape buffers and privacy fencing.
   b) Construction of new sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian accommodations.
   c) Stormwater management measures to meet or exceed NYSDEC requirements.
   d) Mitigation measures to limit noise and visual impacts.
   e) Town Designated Engineer to review transportation elements.

As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application.
2) The Rotterdam Town Board enacted Local Law No. 11 of the year 2019 changing the zone for subject properties at 1174 Floral Avenue and 1180 Floral Avenue to B-2 General Business, on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 221.19.

3) The project site is located within the B-2 General Business Zoning District, where the proposed motor vehicle fuel filling station and convenience store uses may be permitted subject to special use review. The proposed project appears to conform to the area and bulk requirements, including maximum building height, minimum lot area, maximum lot coverage and the minimum yard depth for the front, side and rear yards. In order to demonstrate conformity, the building and canopy heights and square footage should be specified. In addition, although clearly in excess of the minimum required, the proposed setback dimensions should be verified (Floral Avenue Side Yard 49’ listed vs. 45’ measured and Guilderland Avenue Front Yard 155’ listed vs. 153’ measured).

4) A lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land will be required.

5) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section A:
   a) Structures and circulation: …structure dimensions and square footage.
   b) Cut and Fill: extent and amount of cut and fill for all disturbed areas, including before and after profiles of typical development areas, parking lot and roads (including limits of disturbance).
   c) Stormwater retention: provisions for on-site stormwater retention basins during and after construction, designed to handle any increased rate of runoff.
   d) Location of existing wetlands and floodplains (if none, then please add note to plan).
   e) Outdoor Storage: location of any outdoor storage and other accessory uses (if none, then please add note to plan).

6) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section B:
   a) Show location of snow storage area or indicate if it will be removed off site. In addition, provide a note on the site plan that reads “snowfall accumulations in excess of four (4) inches shall be removed from all parking areas/walkways within 48 hours.”
   b) Provide a signature space for the Planning Commission Chairman with the following wording below the signature line “Chairman, Rotterdam Planning Commission Date:________________.”
   c) Show location of all external vents, propane tanks, HVAC units and other accessory external structural features (provide screening, where appropriate).
   d) Provide documentation from the Town of Rotterdam Water Department that a consultation has occurred.
   e) Show location of all outdoor lighting fixtures and provide a note on the face of the plan that states: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”.
   f) Add note on the face of the site plan that reads “Development must meet all NYS Building and Fire Codes”.

7) Calculations should be provided to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-149 Off-street parking, D. Landscaping; Parking areas with more than 12 spaces shall be landscaped over not less than 10% of the total interior area of the parking lot. Landscaping and planting areas shall be dispersed through the parking lot.

8) In order to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-150 Off-street loading; Designated loading area (15’ wide x 40’ long by 14’ high) should be shown on the plan.
9) Screening and buffering of the proposed commercial use from adjacent and nearby residential properties is proposed by 6-foot-high white vinyl fence and arbor vitae trees spaced at 6 feet on center along Floral Avenue and the northeastern property line. In addition to that which is currently proposed, consideration be given to the following additional noise and visual impact mitigation measures:
   a) Extend the privacy fencing along the northern property line toward Guilderland Avenue.
   b) Increase the height of the vinyl privacy fencing from 6 feet to 8 feet.
   c) Increase the height of the proposed arbor vitae trees to between 6 and 8 feet.
   d) Consider limiting the time for trash and recyclable pick up.
   e) List the business hours of operation on the site plan.
   f) Minimize the potential for offsite light spillage by requiring back shields, sharp cutoff fixtures and/or shorter light pole heights.

10) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:
   a) The proposed access drive locations are consistent with access management best practice guidance. The specific design elements for the access to Guilderland Avenue will be subject to NYSDOT permit approval.
   b) The driveway access to Lilac Street is shown to permit full access for enter/exit from both directions. We agree with this concept as it will facilitate local access to/from the adjacent neighborhood and help support the functional priorities of the street network.
   c) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances.
   d) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site.
   e) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit, number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad.

11) We offer the following comments regarding the Title Sheet, Drawing T-1:
   a) Building height should be specified to demonstrate conformance with the maximum height requirement.
   b) If possible, mechanical and/or HVAC units should be mounted on the rooftop and screened by a parapet wall. Otherwise, these units should be effectively screened and include measures to mitigate potential noise.
   c) Applications for Sign Permits should be made with the Town Building Department.
   d) Future Site Plan submissions should include the date of latest plan revision along with a description.
   e) Final Site Plans will require the stamp and signature of a New York State licensed Professional Engineer.

12) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:
   a) The plan should be revised to reflect the revised zoning district boundaries and adjacent R-1 Single Family Residential zoning district.
   b) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided.
13) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:

a) A Truck Turning Plan should be provided showing how fueling, delivery and trash removal vehicles will maneuver through the parking lot and exit the site and back into the loading areas. Additionally, the location of where the fueling delivery truck would be stopped during re-fueling and the impact on the circulation of the site should be evaluated. Truck deliveries should be scheduled during off peak hours.

b) We recommend that the privately-owned onsite sidewalks be interconnected across the proposed parcel and crosswalks be added over the access drive in order to promote pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.

c) Consideration should be given to extending the proposed 4’ decorative black aluminum fencing at the corner along the project frontage to include stone pillars, shrubbery and street trees. In addition to aesthetic improvements to the Guilderland Avenue frontage, decorative fencing will create definition and separation of pedestrian and bicycle routes.

d) There is a potential for larger trucks to park on the side of Guilderland Ave and Lilac Street to access the facility. Consideration should be given to providing “No Parking” signage in areas where truck may attempt to park.

e) The “No Parking” sign adjacent to the accessible parking spaces appears to be located within the accessible route. It should be verified that adequate width for the accessible route is provided.

f) Concrete parking pads are currently proposed to be flush with sidewalk along the building face in order to minimize trip hazards. Protection of pedestrians on the sidewalk appears to be provided by a single bollard in front of each parking stall. We recommend that traditional sidewalk and curb be provided with ADA accessible ramps be provided instead.

g) Proposed curbing adjacent to parking spaces should include radii (instead of 90-degree corners as currently shown).

14) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:

a) The proposed privately-owned water services design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department.

b) The proposed sanitary sewer service design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.

c) Clarification is requested regarding the proposed sanitary sewer service design. It appears that a new private sanitary sewer service lateral connection at Lilac Street is proposed. Also shown is what looks to be a new public sanitary sewer main and manholes are proposed along Lilac Street and Floral Avenue, the purpose of which is unknown.

d) In addition, the Applicant should confirm that no food preparation is proposed and therefore an exterior grease trap is not required for the project.

15) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscape Plan, Drawing S-5:

a) Site landscaping should include street trees along the project’s road frontage along Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street.

b) A combination of low-level decorative fencing with stone pillars and shrubbery should also be considered between the public roadway and proposed parking lot.

c) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended.

d) A note should be provided on the Landscaping Plan stating that the landscaping will be maintained in perpetuity and dead or dying plants shall be replaced as equal.

e) The spacing of the row of arbor vitae trees along Floral Avenue and the northern property line should be specified.

f) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the site distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street.
16) We offer the following comments regarding the Photometric Plan, Drawing S-6:
   a) The foot-candle grid appears to depict light spillage onto to adjacent properties.
   b) Light pole heights should be specified.
   c) Catalog cut sheets for all site lighting should be submitted for review and comment.
   d) Provide a note on the plan that stating: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”.

17) The limit of land disturbance should be quantified on the site plan. The project appears to result in a decrease in impervious area and disturbance of greater than one acre of soil, requiring the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity. The stormwater practices for the project should follow the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual and include for safe overland conveyance of extreme storm events without impacting downstream or adjacent roadways and properties. The vehicle fueling station is considered a stormwater hotspot and should not rely on infiltration. Subsurface systems treating other portions of the site (such as roof runoff) should be conservatively designed to include a factor of safety for situations such as compaction of underlying soils and frozen conditions.

18) NYS DOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks and signage) in the NYS DOT right-of-way along Guilderland Avenue (NYS Route 158). Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town.

Should you have any questions or need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 453-2882 or pliholt@chacompanies.com

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter L. Liholt, Jr., PE, CPESC, CPSWQ
Vice President

cc: John Denny – Planning Commission Chairman
    Jonathon Tingley – Planning Commission Attorney
    Charles Marshall – Applicant
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RE: Stewart's Shops
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY

Thank you for your review of our proposal. In response to your comment letter dated 10/15/19 I offer the following responses in red:

DPW Comments:

2. **Stewart's Shops- 2970 Guilderland Avenue.** Sketch Site Plan/Special Use Permit review for the construction of a ±3,847 square foot convenience store with self-service fueling stations on a 1.3 acre parcel. Design by: Stewart's Shops.

   1. As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided along the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street to Willow Street. Additionally, a crosswalk with signage should be provided to the existing sidewalk located on the east side of Guilderland Avenue. **Detail added.**

   2. Commercial ornamental fencing and stone pillars should be provided along frontage to help with aesthetics and help guide pedestrians to internal and external sidewalks. **Detail added.**

   3. Detail dumpster enclosure. **Detail added.**

   4. Stone pillar treatment should be added to gas canopy poles. **Detail added.**

   5. Pavement should be concrete in fueling areas and parking spots along the building. **Detail noted.**

   6. Additional deciduous trees should be considered, and ground cover identified. **Detail added.**

   7. Planning Commission may wish to consider widening on-site pavement to better accommodate larger service vehicles that tend to frequent Stewart's. It appears that room may exist. This could alleviate any concerns for off-site parking of these types of vehicles. **Detail noted.**
SEQR Requirement: 6 NYCRR 617 Unlisted Action. Rotterdam Town Board has completed SEQR and issued a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 (see attached).

Involved/Interested Agencies
Schenectady County Economic Development and Planning
Schenectady County Department of Health
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation - Region #4
New York State Department of Transportation
Rotterdam Highway
Department Rotterdam Police
Department Fire District #2
Rotterdam Planning Commission

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Tyler G. Fronte
Stewart’s Shops Corp.
PO Box 435
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
518-581-1201x4440
Tfronte@stewartsshops.com
Hi Pete,

It was good to meet with you as well.

The next step, which Stewarts can proceed with independently of the Town, is a Stage 2, perm33-com submittal (permit application). I strongly encourage the Stage 2 submittal be provided to us well in advance (no less than 3 months) of when they plan to do the work.

Sidewalk along Guilderland Ave was mentioned by the Town as a possibility, which NYSDOT would be supportive of and if required by the Town to be done by Stewarts, would also be part of their permit from us.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,

Tina

Kristina (Tina) L. Crowley, P.E.
Regional Permit Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation, Region 1
50 Wolf Road – Suite 1s50, Albany, NY 12232
(518) 457-6645 | Kristina.Crowley@dot.ny.gov
https://www.dot.ny.gov/permits
11/22/19

RE: Stewart’s Shops - Concept Site Plan Review
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY
CHA File: 12669.1030

Thank you for your review of our proposal. In response to your comment letter dated 10/7/19 I offer the following responses in red:

Town Designated Engineer (TDE), CHA review comments:

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. The Negative Declaration identified the following potential mitigation measures as may be deemed necessary by the Planning Commission:
   a) Installation and maintenance of landscape buffers and privacy fencing. **Detail added.**
   b) Construction of new sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian accommodations. **Detail added.**
   c) Stormwater management measures to meet or exceed NYSDEC requirements. **Detail noted.**
   d) Mitigation measures to limit noise and visual impacts. **Detail added.**
   e) Town Designated Engineer to review transportation elements. **Detail noted.**

As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application.

2) The Rotterdam Town Board enacted Local Law No. 11 of the year 2019 changing the zone for subject properties at 1174 Floral Avenue and 1180 Floral Avenue to B-2 General Business, on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 221.19. **Detail noted.**

3) The project site is located within the B-2 General Business Zoning District, where the proposed motor vehicle fuel filling station and convenience store uses may be permitted subject to special use review. The proposed project appears to conform to the area and bulk requirements, including maximum building height, minimum lot area, maximum lot coverage and the minimum yard depth for the front, side and rear yards. In order to demonstrate conformity, the building and canopy heights and square footage should be specified. In addition, although clearly in excess of the minimum required, the proposed setback dimensions should be verified (Floral Avenue Side Yard 49’ listed vs. 45’ measured and Guilderland Avenue Front Yard 155’ listed vs. 153’ measured). **Detail noted.**

4) A lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land will be required. **Detail noted.**

5) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section A:
   a) Structures and circulation: …structure dimensions and square footage. **Detail added.**
b) Cut and Fill: extent and amount of cut and fill for all disturbed areas, including before and after profiles of typical development areas, parking lot and roads (including limits of disturbance). **Detail provided.**

c) Stormwater retention: provisions for on-site stormwater retention basins during and after construction, designed to handle any increased rate of runoff. **Detail added.**

d) Location of existing wetlands and floodplains (if none, then please add note to plan). **Detail added.**

e) Outdoor Storage: location of any outdoor storage and other accessory uses (if none, then please add note to plan). **Attached storage shed located on the northeast side of the building. Detail shown on plan.**

6) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section B:

a) Show location of snow storage area or indicate if it will be removed off site. In addition, provide a note on the site plan that reads “snowfall accumulations in excess of four (4) inches shall be removed from all parking areas/walkways within 48 hours.” **Detail added showing snow storage area. Snow will typically not be removed off site.**

b) Provide a signature space for the Planning Commission Chairman with the following wording below the signature line “Chairman, Rotterdam Planning Commission Date:________________”. **Detail added.**

c) Show location of all external vents, propane tanks, HVAC units and other accessory external structural features (provide screening, where appropriate). **Detail noted.**

d) Provide documentation from the Town of Rotterdam Water Department that a consultation has occurred. **Documentation will be provided.**

e) Show location of all outdoor lighting fixtures and provide a note on the face of the plan that states: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”. **Detail added. Lighting plan submitted. Lighting pole reduced in size from our standard 15-foot pole to a 10-foot pole above the trash enclosure. All lighting is back shielded contiguous to any residential property.**

f) Add note on the face of the site plan that reads “Development must meet all NYS Building and Fire Codes”. **Detail added.**

7) Calculations should be provided to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-149 Off-street parking. D. Landscaping; Parking areas with more than 12 spaces shall be landscaped over not less than 10% of the total interior area of the parking lot. Landscaping and planting areas shall be dispersed through the parking lot. **Detail noted.**

8) In order to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-150 Off-street loading; Designated loading area (15’ wide x 40’ long by 14’ high) should be shown on the plan. **Detail shown on sheet 7 (Truck Routing).**

9) Screening and buffering of the proposed commercial use from adjacent and nearby residential properties is proposed by 6-foot-high white vinyl fence and arbor vitae trees spaced at 6 feet on center along Floral Avenue and the northeastern property line. In addition to that which is currently proposed, consideration be given to the following additional noise and visual impact mitigation measures:

a) Extend the privacy fencing along the northern property line toward Guilderland Avenue. **Detail added.**

b) Increase the height of the vinyl privacy fencing from 6 feet to 8 feet. **Vinyl privacy fence height to remain 6 feet in height. Stewart’s has installed 8 feet vinyl fences in the past and have seen significant damage due to wind and the typical northeast weather conditions. 6 feet fencing will fit the character of the neighborhood better and less likely to deteriorate due to the**
northeast weather conditions. Also providing 8 feet arbor vitae trees will help aide with privacy.

c) Increase the height of the proposed arbor vitae trees to between 6 and 8 feet. Detail added. Agreed to increase arbor vitae trees to 8 feet in height.

d) Consider limiting the time for trash and recyclable pick up. Stewart’s Shops is willing to limit time for trash and recyclable pick up. Our Curvy Road shop located at 1841 Helderberg Ave in the Town of Rotterdam trash and recyclable pick up is every Tuesday around 9AM. Stewart’s Shops would be willing to mirror a similar pick up arrangement.

e) List the business hours of operation on the site plan. Detail added. 5:30AM-10:00PM Monday-Sunday.

f) Minimize the potential for offsite light spillage by requiring back shields, sharp cutoff fixtures and/or shorter light pole heights. Lighting plan submitted. Lighting pole located above dumpster enclosure was reduced in height from our standard 15-foot pole to a 10-foot pole. All lighting is back shielded contiguous to any residential property.

10) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:

a) The proposed access drive locations are consistent with access management best practice guidance. The specific design elements for the access to Guilderland Avenue will be subject to NYSDOT permit approval. Detail noted.

b) The driveway access to Lilac Street is shown to permit full access for enter/exit from both directions. We agree with this concept as it will facilitate local access to/from the adjacent neighborhood and help support the functional priorities of the street network. Detail noted.

c) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances. Detail provided.

d) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site. Detail added to include sidewalks.

e) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit, number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad. Detail added to include NYSDOT compliant crosswalk.

11) We offer the following comments regarding the Title Sheet, Drawing T-1:

a) Building height should be specified to demonstrate conformance with the maximum height requirement. Detail added.

b) If possible, mechanical and/or HVAC units should be mounted on the rooftop and screened by a parapet wall. Otherwise, these units should be effectively screened and include measures to mitigate potential noise. Mechanical / HVAC units are mounted to the rear of the building. Screened by the fencing provided as well as the 8-foot arbor vitae trees. Mounting the mechanical or HVAC units on the rooftop will make it more difficult to screen the potential noise generated.

c) Applications for Sign Permits should be made with the Town Building Department. Detail noted.

d) Future Site Plan submissions should include the date of latest plan revision along with a description. Detail added.
e) Final Site Plans will require the stamp and signature of a New York State licensed Professional Engineer. **Detail noted.**

12) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:

a) The plan should be revised to reflect the revised zoning district boundaries and adjacent R-1 Single Family Residential zoning district. **Detail added.**
b) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided. **Detail added.**

13) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:

a) A Truck Turning Plan should be provided showing how fueling, delivery and trash removal vehicles will maneuver through the parking lot and exit the site and back into the loading areas. Additionally, the location of where the fueling delivery truck would be stopped during re-fueling and the impact on the circulation of the site should be evaluated. Truck deliveries should be scheduled during off peak hours. **Truck routing plan provided.**
b) We recommend that the privately-owned onsite sidewalks be inter-connected across the proposed parcel and crosswalks be added over the access drives in order to promote pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. **Detail added.**
c) Consideration should be given to extending the proposed 4’ decorative black aluminum fencing at the corner along the project frontage to include stone pillars, shrubbery and street trees. In addition to aesthetic improvements to the Guilderland Avenue frontage, decorative fencing will create definition and separation of pedestrian and bicycle routes. **Detail added.**
d) There is a potential for larger trucks to park on the side of Guilderland Ave and Lilac Street to access the facility. Consideration should be given to providing “No Parking” signage in areas where truck may attempt to park. **Detail added.**
e) The “No Parking” sign adjacent to the accessible parking spaces appears to be located within the accessible route. It should be verified that adequate width for the accessible route is provided. **Detail noted. Adequate width for the accessible route is verified.**
f) Concrete parking pads are currently proposed to be flush with sidewalk along the building face in order to minimize trip hazards. Protection of pedestrians on the sidewalk appears to be provided by a single bollard in front of each parking stall. We recommend that traditional sidewalk and curb be provided with ADA accessible ramps be provided instead. **Stewart’s concrete parking pads to remain flush with sidewalk along the building face in order to minimize trip hazards. The plan shows a single bollard in front of each parking stall to protect pedestrians on the sidewalk.**
g) Proposed curbing adjacent to parking spaces should include radii (instead of 90-degree corners as currently shown). **Detail noted.**

14) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:

a) The proposed privately-owned water services design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. **Detail noted.**
b) The proposed sanitary sewer service design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. **Detail noted.**
c) Clarification is requested regarding the proposed sanitary sewer service design. It appears that a new private sanitary sewer service lateral connection at Lilac Street is proposed. Also shown is what looks to be a new public sanitary sewer main and manholes are proposed along Lilac Street and Floral Avenue, the purpose of which is unknown. **Additional detail will be provided**
regarding the proposed sanitary sewer service design. Town of Rotterdam requested the installment of the new private sanitary service lateral connection on Lilac Street. This is for public benefit as Stewart's could tie into the existing connections.

d) In addition, the Applicant should confirm that no food preparation is proposed and therefore an exterior grease trap is not required for the project. **Detail added to include an exterior grease trap as light food preparation will occur.**

15) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscape Plan, Drawing S-5:

a) Site landscaping should include street trees along the project’s road frontage along Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street. **No street trees provided as Stewart’s does not want to obstruct the site distances.**

b) A combination of low-level decorative fencing with stone pillars and shrubbery should also be considered between the public roadway and proposed parking lot. **Detail added.**

c) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended. **Detail added to include irrigation for the lawn and landscaping.**

d) A note should be provided on the Landscaping Plan stating that the landscaping will be maintained in perpetuity and dead or dying plants shall be replaced as equal. **Detail added.**

e) The spacing of the row of arbor vitae trees along Floral Avenue and the northern property line should be specified. **Detail added.**

f) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the site distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street. **Islands will not be installed on the site because it will disrupt internal circulation.**

16) We offer the following comments regarding the Photometric Plan, Drawing S-6:

a) The foot-candle grid appears to depict light spillage onto to adjacent properties. **Detail added to include fence which eliminated light spillage.**

b) Light pole heights should be specified. **Detail added.**

c) Catalog cut sheets for all site lighting should be submitted for review and comment. **Detail added.**

d) Provide a note on the plan that stating: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”. **Detail added.**

17) The limit of land disturbance should be quantified on the site plan. The project appears to result in a decrease in impervious area and disturbance of greater than one acre of soil, requiring the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity. The stormwater practices for the project should follow the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual and include for safe overland conveyance of extreme storm events without impacting downstream or adjacent roadways and properties. The vehicle fueling station is considered a stormwater hotspot and should not rely on infiltration. **Subsurface systems treating other portions of the site (such as roof runoff) should be conservatively designed to include a factor of safety for situations such as compaction of underlying soils and frozen conditions. SWPPP will be designed to meet the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual requirements.**

18) NYS DOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks and signage) in the NYS DOT right-of-way along Guilderland Avenue (NYS Route 158). Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town. **Detail noted.**
Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Tyler G. Fronte
Stewart’s Shops Corp.
PO Box 435
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
518-581-1201 x4440
Tfronte@stewartsshops.com
December 4, 2019

Mr. Peter Comenzo, Senior Planner
Town of Rotterdam
John F. Kirvin Government Center
1100 Sunrise Boulevard
Rotterdam, New York 12306

RE: Stewart’s Shops – 1st Preliminary Site Plan Review
2970 Guelderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY
CHA File: 12669.1030

Dear Mr. Comenzo:

On behalf of the Town of Rotterdam, acting as Town Designated Engineer (TDE), CHA Consulting, Inc. (CHA) has reviewed the following documents for the above referenced Site Plan Application:

- Item by item response to the Town Designated Engineer review comments of October 7, 2019 in a letter dated November 22, 2019 prepared by Tyler Fronte of Stewart’s Shops.
- Item by item response to the Town DPW review comments of October 15, 2019 in a letter dated November 22, 2019 prepared by Tyler Fronte of Stewart’s Shops.
- Preliminary Site Plan Set dated December 2, 2018 and last revised November 20, 2019, consisting of thirteen (13) Plan Sheets, prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. of Stewart’s Shops.
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated November 5, 2019 prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. of Stewart’s Shops.
- Sketch showing Sight Distance Evaluation & Stopping Site Distance Evaluation dated November 22, 2019 prepared by Bardin Land Surveying, P.C.

The following comments from CHA’s October 7, 2019 Town Designated Engineer (TDE) review letter have not been adequately addressed (additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application. Prior to Site Plan approval, the Planning Commission should either document consistency with the previously issued Negative Declaration OR issue their own Determination of Environmental Significance.

2) A lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land will be required. Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation should be a condition of Site Plan approval.

3) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section A:
   a) Cut and Fill: extent and amount of cut and fill for all disturbed areas, including before and after profiles of typical development areas, parking lot and roads (including limits of disturbance). Limits of disturbance and area of disturbance should be clearly shown on the Grading Plan and the Erosion Control Plan.
4) Calculations should be provided to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-149 Off-street parking. D. Landscaping: Parking areas with more than 12 spaces shall be landscaped over not less than 10% of the total interior area of the parking lot. Landscaping and planting areas shall be dispersed through the parking lot. The calculation should be provided on the Site Plan. Please note that required screening and side yards may be included in the calculation.

5) Screening and buffering of the proposed commercial use from adjacent and nearby residential properties is proposed by 6-foot-high white vinyl fence and arbor vitae trees spaced at 6 feet on center along Floral Avenue and the northeastern property line. In addition to that which is currently proposed, consideration be given to the following additional noise and visual impact mitigation measures:
   a) Consider limiting the time for trash and recyclable pick up. The Applicant responded indicating a willingness to limit time for trash and recyclable pick up around 9 AM, similar to the Curry Road Stewart’s Shop. However, a note stating the restriction should be added to the Site Plan.

6) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:
   a) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances. A plan has been provided, however, measured intersection and sight distances and stopping sight distances should be compared to the AASHTO recommended distances. The evaluations should consider the effect of the proposed landscaping plan on sight lines.
   b) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site. Sidewalk curb ramps and detectable warning surfaces should be specified at each driveway, at the end of the sidewalk on Lilac Street at Floral Avenue, and at the proposed crosswalk per the NYSDOT Standard Sheet 698.01. The plans should provide grading information for the proposed ramp connection from the crosswalk to the existing sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue.
   c) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit, number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad. Crosswalk details should conform to NYSDOT Standard Sheet 685.01. Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning signs should be specified and located per the distance specified by NYSDOT requirements. Back to back Pedestrian Warning Signs with Arrow Panel should be provided at the crosswalk. Refer to CHA’s 11/04/2019 Sketch of Pedestrian Improvements.

7) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:
   a) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided. It appears that a Demolitions Plan should be provided or combined with the Existing Site Plan. Additional detail is required to identify proposed demolitions and removals.

8) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:
   a) We recommend that the privately-owned onsite sidewalks be interconnected across the proposed parcel and crosswalks be added over the access drives in order to promote pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. Concrete sidewalks or pedestrian crosswalks should extend across both proposed site driveways.
9) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:
   a) The proposed privately-owned water services design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. **Document documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided.**
   b) The proposed sanitary sewer service design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. **Document documentation of Town Sewer Department review and approval should be provided.**
   c) Clarification is requested regarding the proposed sanitary sewer service design. It appears that a new private sanitary sewer service lateral connection at Lilac Street is proposed. Also shown is what looks to be a new public sanitary sewer main and manholes are proposed along Lilac Street and Floral Avenue, the purpose of which is unknown. **Documentation of Town Sewer Department review and approval should be provided.**

10) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscape Plan, Drawing S-5:
   a) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended. **An irrigation note should be added to the Landscape Plan.**
   b) The spacing of the row of arbor vitae trees along Floral Avenue and the northern property line should be specified. **Spacing of the arbor vitae trees should be dimensioned on the Landscape Plan.**
   c) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the site distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street. **Confirm that the proposed landscaping beds at the Guilderland Driveway and at the corner of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street will not adversely impact the sight distance at the driveway or at the intersection.**

11) We offer the following comments regarding the Photometric Plan, Drawing S-6:
   a) Provide a note on the plan that stating: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”. **This note should be added to the Photometric Plan.**

The following TDE comments from a Peter Lilholt of CHA email dated October 16, 2019 have not been adequately addressed **(additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):**

12) As discussed last night, please look into the following:
   a) Adding a Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue. **We recommend this be a condition of Site Plan Approval.**
   b) Mitigation measures for vehicle headlights from vehicles exiting the site onto Lilac Street from shining into the residential home across the street. Perhaps the Lilac Street driveway could be shifted a bit toward Guilderland Avenue OR supplemental plantings could be installed on the homeowner’s land for screening, if agreeable to the owner. **Mitigation measures or documentation of acceptance by the owner should be provided.**

The following Town DPW comments dated October 15, 2019 have not been adequately addressed **(additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):**

13) As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided long the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac to Willow Street. Additionally, a crosswalk with signage should be provided to the existing sidewalk located on the east side of Guilderland Avenue. **We continue to recommend that the Applicant provided an aerial map showing planimetric features, tax map property line data and approximate location of utility poles and other obstructions be provided in order to demonstrate hardship or property constraints associated with construction of the sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street northerly to Willow Street.**
We offer the following additional TDE review comments based upon the November 22, 2019 First Preliminary Site Plan Submission:

14) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:
   a) Adjacent public roadway ownership should be clarified (i.e. Guilderland Avenue is a NYS DOT ROW and Lilac Street is a Town ROW).
   b) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided.
   c) Pavement sawcut lines should be shown for offsite utility improvements and service laterals connections.
   d) Total area of disturbance should be clearly labeled on the Demolition Plan.
   e) Add a note stating that no soil disturbance should occur until an MS4 Acceptance Form is completed and coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity is obtained.
   f) Dig Safe NY/Underground Facilities Protection Organization notes and call in number should be provided.
   g) Notes should be added regarding coordination with utility providers.
   h) Conditions of permits and approvals should be specified (e.g. NYSDOT).

15) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:
   a) The limits of asphalt pavement (assume to be the drive aisles and circulation routes) and concrete pavement (parking stalls adjacent to the convenience store) should be clarified.
   b) Additional layout dimensions, radii and control data should be provided.
   c) Pavement markings and traffic control signage should be provided conforming to the MUTCD.
   d) Bike racks should be considered to promote bicycle patrons.
   e) Additional bollards may be required to protect building corners, curb lines, mechanical equipment, doors, dumpster enclosures, etc.
   f) Site Material detail call outs should be provided.

16) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:
   a) The location, size and material of existing public watermain along Guilderland Avenue, Lilac Street and Floral Avenue should be shown. In addition, locations of nearby fire hydrant assemblies should be shown.
   b) The proposed privately-owned water service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. The proposed water service consists of a 1” Type K copper to an unknown connection point along Lilac Street. The potential need for building sprinklers should be verified and sizing of the water service (and/or fire protection main) should be confirmed.
   c) The proposed privately-owned sanitary sewer service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. Please confirm that a 4” service lateral is acceptable, as commercial service laterals are typically 6”.
   d) The proposed public sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.
   e) Sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue ROW should be reviewed and approved by the NYS DOT. Sanitary sewer improvements with the Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed and approved by the Town Highway Superintendent.
   f) Limits of pavement sawcut for utility work should be shown. In addition, NYS DOT and Town roadway restoration specifications should be provided.
   g) Utility detail call outs should be provided.
17) We offer the following comments regarding the Grading Plan, Drawing S-4:
   a) Benchmark locations, elevations, description and datum should be shown.
   b) Additional spot elevations should be provided at the Lilac Street driveway to ensure that stormwater runoff from the site parking lot drains to the onsite catch basins along radii, instead of potentially bypassing by sheet flow onto Lilac Street.
   c) Clarification is requested regarding the intention of the “Grade to Drain” note listed in the grassed area between the Guilderland Avenue driveway and northern property boundary. The drainage flow arrow appears to be inconsistent with the proposed contours.
   d) The proposed project results in a decrease in impervious area over existing conditions. As such, according to the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual, peak flow mitigation is not required. Nonetheless, the applicant is proposing peak flow mitigation by underground detention in 36” HDPE pipes parallel to Lilac Street and Floral Avenue.
   e) Please confirm that potential ponding depths are generally less than 6”.
   f) Please confirm that safe overland conveyance from extreme storm events is provided that would result in exceeding the design capacity of the closed storm system.

18) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscaping Plan, Drawing S-5:
   a) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the sight distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street.
   b) Proposed street trees should be located to not adversely impact the proposed sidewalks in the public ROW (e.g. long-term root growth buckling the sidewalk).
   c) Detailed specifications on topsoil and necessary amendments should be provided. Seed mixture should be detailed to include breakdown of species content.
   d) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended.

19) We offer the following comments regarding the Erosion Control Plan, Drawing S-10:
   a) Silt fence should always be installed parallel to contours to providing filtering of sheet flow (never install silt fence crossing contours or perpendicular to the slope).
   b) Orange construction fencing should be installed to delineate the limits of disturbance, especially to protect the any existing trees and or vegetation to be protected for screening.
   c) A temporary topsoil stockpile area should be shown on the plan with perimeter controls such as silt fence and temporary seeding.
   d) Location of temporary facilities such as job trailer, parking, equipment parking and/or storage container, etc. should be shown.
   e) Temporary seeding specifications should be provided.
   f) Project phasing and sequencing plans and notes should be provided.
   g) Erosion and Sediment Control detail call outs should be provided.

20) We offer the following comments regarding the Miscellaneous Details, Drawing S-12:
   a) The Water Service Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department.
   b) The Copper Water Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department.
   c) The PVC Sewer Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.
   d) The Double Cleanout Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.

21) The following additional Construction Details appear to be required:
   a) Traffic Control Signage Details.
   b) Pavement Markings (stop bar, traffic arrows, driveway crosswalks, hatching, etc.).
   c) Sewer and Watermain Separation Detail.
22) A NYSDOT Detail Sheet should be provided and subject to NYSDOT review and approval, including the following:
   a) Maintenance and Protection of Traffic.
   b) NYSDOT curb ramp detail.
   c) NYSDOT crosswalk detail.
   d) NYSDOT Pedestrian Warning Sign.
   e) NYSDOT Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning Sign.
   f) NYSDOT sign post detail.

23) We offer the following comments on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated November 5, 2019:
   a) The applicant has prepared a SWPPP and met the requirements of the SPDES General Permit and the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual. Although that stormwater peak flow mitigation is not required for redevelopment projects with a decrease of impervious area, the applicant has proposed additional underground detention storage volume via installation of ±300 LF of 36" HDPE pipes. The proposed conditions 10-year and 100-year peak flows have decreased from existing conditions based on the HydroCAD analyses.
   b) However, the available storage volume listed for “Pond D1” in the HydroCAD model appears to be double (2 times) the volume of ±300 LF of 36” HDPDE pipes. Please make revisions accordingly.
   c) A copy of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (SHPO) sign-off letter should be provided in the SWPPP.
   d) Question #4 on the Notice of Intent indicated the “Total Site Area” to be 1.3 acres and the “Total Area to Be Disturbed” to be 1.5 acres. We recommend changing the total site area to be 1.5 acre and clarify in the SWPPP narrative where the extra 0.2 acres of land disturbance is outside of the project property boundaries.
   e) Weekly SWPPP inspection forms should be included in the appendix of the SWPPP for the qualified inspector to fill out during construction of the project.

24) We recommend the following conditions of Special Use Permit and/or Site Plan Approval:
   a) Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land.
   b) Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue.
   c) NYSDOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks) in the NYSDOT right-of-way along Guilderland Avenue. Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town.
   d) NYS DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity.
   e) Town sign permits should be obtained for the proposed project identification signage including any proposed pylon, monument and/or building mounted signage.
Should you have any questions or need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 453-2882 or plilholt@chacompanies.com

Sincerely,

[signature]

Peter L. Lilholt, Jr., PE, CPESC, CPSWQ
Vice President

cc: John Denny – Planning Commission Chairman
Jonathon Tingley – Planning Commission Attorney
Tyler Fronte – Stewart’s Shops
12/20/19

RE: Stewart’s Shops - Concept Site Plan Review
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY
CHA File: 12669.1030

Thank you for your review of our proposal. In response to your comment letter dated 12/4/19 I offer the following responses in red:

The following comments from CHA’s October 7, 2019 Town Designated Engineer (TDE) review letter have not been adequately addressed (additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application. Prior to Site Plan approval, the Planning Commission should either document consistency with the previously issued Negative Declaration OR issue their own Determination of Environmental Significance.

2) A lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land will be required. Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation should be a condition of Site Plan approval.

3) Future Site Plan submissions should include the following items from the Town’s Site Plan Checklist, Section A:
   a) Cut and Fill: extent and amount of cut and fill for all disturbed areas, including before and after profiles of typical development areas, parking lot and roads (including limits of disturbance). Limits of disturbance and area of disturbance should be clearly shown on the Grading Plan and the Erosion Control Plan.
   Area of disturbance has been added to sheet S-1 per comment 14.d.

4) Calculations should be provided to demonstrate conformity to Rotterdam Town Code 270-149 Off-street parking, D. Landscaping; Parking areas with more than 12 spaces shall be landscaped over not less than 10% of the total interior area of the parking lot. Landscaping and planting areas shall be dispersed through the parking lot. The calculation should be provided on the Site Plan. Please note that required screening and side yards may be included in the calculation.
   The calculation has been added to the general notes section on sheet S-2.

5) Screening and buffering of the proposed commercial use from adjacent and nearby residential properties is proposed by 6-foot-high white vinyl fence and arbor vitae trees spaced at 6 feet on center along Floral Avenue and the northeastern property line. In addition to that which is currently proposed, consideration be given to the following additional noise and visual impact mitigation measures:
   a) Consider limiting the time for trash and recyclable pick up. The Applicant responded indicating a willingness to limit time for trash and recyclable pick up around 9 AM, similar to the Curry Road Stewart’s Shop. However, a note stating the restriction should be added to the Site Plan. Note added to the general notes to limit trash pickup to 9 am – 5 pm.
6) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:
   
a) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances. **A plan has been provided, however, measured intersection and sight distances and stopping sight distances should be compared to the AASHTO recommended distances. The evaluations should consider the effect of the proposed landscaping plan on sight lines. Surveyor is updating sight distance evaluation.**

b) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site. **Sidewalk curb ramps and detectable warning surfaces should be specified at each driveway, at the end of the sidewalk on Lilac Street at Floral Avenue, and at the proposed crosswalk per the NYSDOT Standard Sheet 608.01. The plans should provide grading information for the proposed ramp connection from the crosswalk to the existing sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue. Sidewalks added through entrances and detectable warnings added at each entrance and road crossing. Spot grades have been added for new sidewalk tie-in on West side of Guilderland Ave. All applicable DOT details have been added to the plan set.**

c) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit, number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad. **Crosswalk details should conform to NYSDOT Standard Sheet 685.01. Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning signs should be specified and located per the distance specified by NYSDOT requirements. Back to back Pedestrian Warning Signs with Arrow Panel should be provided at the crosswalk. Refer to CHA’s 11/04/2019 Sketch of Pedestrian Improvements. NYSDOT detail sheets have been added to the plan set. All signs have been added to site plan sheet S-2.**

7) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:
   
a) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided. **It appears that a Demolitions Plan should be provided or combined with the Existing Site Plan. Additional detail is required to identify proposed demolitions and removals. Additional notes have been added to sheet S-1 regarding demolition.**

8) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:
   
a) We recommend that the privately-owned onsite sidewalks be interconnected across the proposed parcel and crosswalks be added over the access drives in order to promote pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. **Concrete sidewalks or pedestrian crosswalks should extend across both proposed site driveways. Detail added to extend across both proposed site driveways.**

9) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:
   
a) The proposed privately-owned water services design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. **Documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided. Plans have been sent to Mr. Maher at the DPW for comment request. At this point there has been no return contact. A Condition of Site Plan approval.**

b) The proposed sanitary sewer service design, location and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. **Documentation of Town Sewer Department review and approval should be provided. Plans have been sent to Mr. Maher at the DPW for comment request. At this point there has been no return contact. A Condition of Site Plan approval.**

c) Clarification is requested regarding the proposed sanitary sewer service design. It appears that a new private sanitary sewer service lateral connection at Lilac Street is proposed. Also shown is what looks to be a new public sanitary sewer main and manholes are proposed along Lilac Street and Floral Avenue, the purpose of which is unknown. **Documentation of Town Sewer Department review and approval should be**
provided. Plans have been sent to Mr. Maher at the DPW for comment request. At this point there has been no return contact. A Condition of Site Plan approval.

10) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscape Plan, Drawing S-5:
   a) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended. **An irrigation note should be added to the Landscape Plan. A note has been added to the Landscape plan general notes.**
   b) The spacing of the row of arbor vitae trees along Floral Avenue and the northern property line should be specified. **Spacing of the arbor vitae trees should be dimensioned on the Landscape Plan. Detail provided in the Plant List table. The spacing of the arbor vitae is 6 feet on center.**
   c) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the site distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street. **Confirm that the proposed landscaping beds at the Guilderland Driveway and at the corner of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street will not adversely impact the sight distance at the driveway or at the intersection. Placement has been confirmed to have no negative impact on sight distances.**

11) We offer the following comments regarding the Photometric Plan, Drawing S-6:
   a) Provide a note on the plan that stating: “All lighting shall be shielded and/or placed in such a manner as to prevent off-site illumination”. **This note should be added to the Photometric Plan. The note has been moved to the Photometric plan.**

The following TDE comments from a Peter Lilholt of CHA email dated October 16, 2019 have not been adequately addressed (additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):

12) As discussed last night, please look into the following:
   a) Adding a Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue. **We recommend this be a condition of Site Plan Approval. Stewart's will add Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue.**
   b) Mitigation measures for vehicle headlights from vehicles exiting the site onto Lilac Street from shining into the residential home across the street. Perhaps the Lilac Street driveway could be shifted a bit toward Guilderland Avenue OR supplemental plantings could be installed on the homeowner's land for screening, if agreeable to the owner. **Mitigation measures or documentation of acceptance by the owner should be provided. Driveway on Lilac Street to remain where it is shown on the Site Plan. Stewart's met with the owner at**

The following Town DPW comments dated October 15, 2019 have not been adequately addressed (additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):

13) As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided along the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac to Willow Street. Additionally, a crosswalk with signage should be provided to the existing sidewalk located on the east side of Guilderland Avenue. **We continue to recommend that the Applicant provided an aerial map showing planimetric features, tax map property line data and approximate location of utility poles and other obstructions be provided in order to demonstrate hardship or property constraints associated with construction of the sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street northerly to Willow Street. An aerial map, tax map property line data, and utility poles were provided to demonstrate the hardship with continuing sidewalks off land owned by Stewart's. Stewart's met with the owner of 799 Lilac St, Schenectady, NY 12306 and the owner asked for 3 arbor vitae be planted on the property. Plans were updated to show plantings.**

We offer the following additional TDE review comments based upon the November 22, 2019 First Preliminary Site Plan Submission:

14) We offer the following comments regarding the Existing Site Plan, Drawing S-1:
a) Adjacent public roadway ownership should be clarified (i.e. Guilderland Avenue is a NYS DOT ROW and Lilac Street is a 'Town ROW'). *Added all ROW labels.*
b) Additional notes, specifications and details regarding demolitions, removals, utilities, service decommissioning, etc. should be provided. *Changed the title to Existing Conditions & Demo Plan. Added note “All utility disconnects will be verified prior to demo”.*
c) Pavement sawcut lines should be shown for offsite utility improvements and service laterals connections. *Sawcut lines have been shown for offsite utilities.*
d) Total area of disturbance should be clearly labeled on the Demolition Plan. *The total area of disturbance has been shown via hatch.*
e) Add a note stating that no soil disturbance should occur until an MS4 Acceptance Form is completed and coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity is obtained. *Note has been added to the general notes section.*
f) Dig Safe NY/Underground Facilities Protection Organization notes and call in number should be provided. *Detail added to include Dig Safe NY information.*
g) Notes should be added regarding coordination with utility providers. *Note has been added to general notes to contact all applicable utilities for disconnect.*
h) Conditions of permits and approvals should be specified (e.g. NYSDOT). *Note has been added to general notes “Highway work permit from NYSDOT will be required”*

15) We offer the following comments regarding the Proposed Site Plan, Drawing S-2:
a) The limits of asphalt pavement (assume to be the drive aisles and circulation routes) and concrete pavement (parking stalls adjacent to the convenience store) should be clarified. *All pavement and concrete has been hatched for clarity.*
b) Additional layout dimensions, radii and control data should be provided. *Added radii dimensions and center points for layout. We also utilize GPS technology for all site layout.*
c) Pavement markings and traffic control signage should be provided conforming to the MUTCD. *Only crosswalk pavement markings be included in this development.*
d) Bike racks should be considered to promote bicycle patrons. *Added a callout to the bike rack on the plan.*
e) Additional bollards may be required to protect building corners, curb lines, mechanical equipment, doors, dumpster enclosures, etc. *Bollards are currently located at building corners in question.*
f) Site Material detail call outs should be provided. *Details are shown on the detail sheets of the plan set.*

16) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3:
a) The location, size and material of existing public watermain along Guilderland Avenue, Lilac Street and Floral Avenue should be shown. In addition, locations of nearby fire hydrant assemblies should be shown. *DWP has been contacted for input and more information on existing utilities. An arrow and not has been added to the nearest hydrant with distance.*
b) The proposed privately-owned water service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. The proposed water service consists of a 1” Type K copper to an unknown connection point along Lilac Street. The potential need for building sprinklers should be verified and sizing of the water service (and/or fire protection main) should be confirmed. *Plans have been sent to DPW for review.*
c) The proposed privately-owned sanitary sewer service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. Please confirm that a 4” service lateral is acceptable, as commercial service laterals are typically 6”. *A 4” service lateral is acceptable for our development.* All 4/-300 shops have 4” service laterals.
d) The proposed public sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. *Documentation will be provided. A condition of Site Plan approval.*
e) Sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue ROW should be reviewed and approved by the NYS DOT. *Sanitary sewer improvements with the Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed and approved*
17) We offer the following comments regarding the Grading Plan, Drawing S-4:

a) Benchmark locations, elevations, description and datum should be shown. **Survey will be provided.**

b) Additional spot elevations should be provided at the Lilac Street driveway to ensure that stormwater runoff from the site parking lot drains to the onsite catch basins along radii, instead of potentially bypassing by sheet flow onto Lilac Street. **Spot grades have been added between structures to illustrate a ridge to increase the chance of water getting to structures.**

c) Clarification is requested regarding the intention of the “Grade to Drain” note listed in the grassed area between the Guilderland Avenue driveway and northern property boundary. The drainage flow arrow appears to be inconsistent with the proposed contours. **Clarification added to the Grade to Drain note stating that drainage flow arrow is consistent with the proposed contours.**

d) The proposed project results in a decrease in impervious area over existing conditions. As such, according to the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual, peak flow mitigation is not required. Nonetheless, the applicant is proposing peak flow mitigation by underground detention in 36” HDPE pipes parallel to Lilac Street and Floral Avenue. **Detail noted. Stewart’s will keep the design provided.**

e) Please confirm that potential ponding depths are generally less than 6”. **No ponding will occur on site.**

f) Please confirm that safe overland conveyance from extreme storm events is provided that would result in exceeding the design capacity of the closed storm system. **An onsite analysis of the proposed conveyance system is included in the 100-year HydroCAD model which confirms the capacity is sufficient.**

18) We offer the following comments regarding the Landscaping Plan, Drawing S-5:

a) Proposed landscaping and islands should be located so as not to obstruct the sight distance at the proposed driveway locations and/or the intersection of Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street. **All landscape planters are comprised of perennials no taller than 2’. Trees can be removed if wanted but were added on the suggestion of CHA.**

b) Proposed street trees should be located to not adversely impact the proposed sidewalks in the public ROW (e.g. long-term root growth buckling the sidewalk). **Multiple street trees have been removed to improve sight distance on Lilac.**

c) Detailed specifications on topsoil and necessary amendments should be provided. Seed mixture should be detailed to include breakdown of species content. **Grass and topsoil specification notes have been added.**

d) Irrigation for the lawn and landscaping is recommended. **Detail added. An irrigation system will be installed.**

19) We offer the following comments regarding the Erosion Control Plan, Drawing S-10:

a) Silt fence should always be installed parallel to contours to providing filtering of sheet flow (never install silt fence crossing contours or perpendicular to the slope). **Silt fence is shown parallel to contours and there is also a note for proper installation of silt fence which has been highlighted in red.**

b) Orange construction fencing should be installed to delineate the limits of disturbance, especially to protect the any existing trees and or vegetation to be protected for screening. **Orange construction fencing has been added to the plan.**

c) A temporary topsoil stockpile area should be shown on the plan with perimeter controls such as silt fence and temporary seeding. **Stockpile location has been added to plan and a note referencing proper stockpile management has been highlighted in red.**
d) Location of temporary facilities such as job trailer, parking, equipment parking and/or storage container, etc. should be shown. **Areas of parking and staging have been shown on plan.**

e) Temporary seeding specifications should be provided. **Detailed notes on temporary seeding has been highlighted in red.**

f) Project phasing and sequencing plans and notes should be provided. **General sequencing note has been added to plan.**

g) Erosion and Sediment Control detail call outs should be provided. **Details are located on same sheet.** Reader has been instructed to see the details on the same sheet.

---

20) We offer the following comments regarding the Miscellaneous Details, Drawing S-12:

a) The Water Service Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. **The DPW has been contacted and a request to review the plans has been made. As of now, no response has been made.**

b) The Copper Water Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. **The DPW has been contacted and a request to review the plans has been made. As of now, no response has been made.**

c) The PVC Sewer Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. **Added a note to the utility plan calling out required separation of sewer to water.**

d) The Double Cleanout Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. **All details have been added to S-3 Utility Plan.**

---

21) The following additional Construction Details appear to be required:

a) Traffic Control Signage Details. **Traffic control signage details provided.**

b) Pavement Markings (stop bar, traffic arrows, driveway crosswalks, hatching, etc.). **Driveway crosswalk detail provided.**

c) Sewer and Watermain Separation Detail. **Sewer and Watermain separation detail provided.**

d) Town Sanitary Sewer Trench Detail. **Town sanitary sewer trench detail provided.**

e) Town Sanitary Manhole Detail. **Town sanitary manhole detail provided.**

f) Town Road Restoration Detail. **Town road restoration detail provided.**

g) Grease Trap Detail. **Grease trap detail provided.**

h) Ornamental Fence Detail. **Ornament fence detail provided.**

i) Stone Pillar Detail. **Stone pillar detail provided.**

j) 6’ Vinyl Fence Detail. **Vinyl fence detail provided.**

k) Bollard Detail. **Bollard detail provided.**

l) Site Amenities (bike rack, picnic tables, benches, trash receptacle, etc.) **Site amenities are shown on Site Plan.**

---

22) A NYSDOT Detail Sheet should be provided and subject to NYSDOT review and approval, including the following:

a) Maintenance and Protection of Traffic. **NYSDOT Detail Sheet provided.**

b) NYSDOT curb ramp detail. **NYSDOT Detail Sheet provided. Curb ramp will meet NYSDOT specifications.**

c) NYSDOT crosswalk detail. **NYSDOT Detail Sheet provided. Crosswalk will meet NYSDOT specifications.**

d) NYSDOT Pedestrian Warning Sign. **NYSDOT Detail Sheet provided. Pedestrian warning sign will meet NYSDOT specifications.**

e) NYSDOT Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning Sign. **NYSDOT Detail Sheet provided. Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning Sign will meet NYSDOT specifications.**

f) NYSDOT sign post detail. **NYSDOT sign post detail provided.**

---

23) We offer the following comments on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated November 5, 2019:

a) The applicant has prepared a SWPPP and met the requirements of the SPDES General Permit and the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual. Although that stormwater peak flow mitigation is not required
for redevelopment projects with a decrease of impervious area, the applicant has proposed additional underground detention storage volume via installation of ±300 LF of 36" HDPE pipes. The proposed conditions 10-year and 100-year peak flows have decreased from existing conditions based on the HydroCAD analyses. Comment noted.

b) However, the available storage volume listed for “Pond D1” in the HydroCAD model appears to be double (2 times) the volume of ±300 LF of 36" HDPE pipes. Please make revisions accordingly. The plans and Hydro-CAD model have been adjusted accordingly and are now consistent.

c) A copy of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (SHPO) sign-off letter should be provided in the SWPPP. The project is currently under review by SHPO and the sign-off letter will be provided upon receipt.

d) Question #4 on the Notice of Intent indicated the “Total Site Area” to be 1.3 acres and the “Total Area to Be Disturbed” to be 1.5 acres. We recommend changing the total site area to be 1.5 acre and clarify in the SWPPP narrative where the extra 0.2 acres of land disturbance is outside of the project property boundaries. Question #4 on the NOI has been updated as requested and an explanation of the additional 0.2 acres of land disturbance has been included in Section II. Background Information, B. Proposed Conditions narrative section of the SWPPP.

e) Weekly SWPPP inspection forms should be included in the appendix of the SWPPP for the qualified inspector to fill out during construction of the project. The inspection report forms have been added to Appendix C of the SWPPP, as requested.

24) We recommend the following conditions of Special Use Permit and/or Site Plan Approval:

a) Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land. Detail noted. Lot consolidation will occur upon Site Plan Approval.

b) Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue. Stewart’s is willing to add Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue if Planning Commission makes request.

c) NYSDOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks) in the NYSDOT right-of-way along Guilderland Avenue. Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town. Detail noted. All correspondence and Highway Work Permits will be shared with the Town.

d) NYS DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity. NYS DEC SPDES General Permit will be obtained.

e) Town sign permits should be obtained for the proposed project identification signage including any proposed pylon, monument and/or building mounted signage. The appropriate Town sign permits will be obtained.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
December 16, 2019

Jim Gillespie  
PO Box 435  
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: DEC  
Proposed Stewart's Shops  
2970 Guilderland Ave, Schenectady, NY 12306  
19PR08230

Dear Jim Gillespie:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law). These comments are those of the OPRHP and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

Based upon this review, it is the opinion of OPRHP that no properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places will be impacted by this project.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

R. Daniel Mackay  
Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation  
Division for Historic Preservation
January 3, 2020

Mr. Peter Comenzo, Senior Planner  
Town of Rotterdam  
John F. Kirvin Government Center  
1100 Sunrise Boulevard  
Rotterdam, New York 12306

RE: Stewart’s Shops – Final Site Plan Review  
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY  
CHA File: 12669.1030

Dear Mr. Comenzo:

On behalf of the Town of Rotterdam, acting as Town Designated Engineer (TDE), CHA Consulting, Inc. (CHA) has reviewed the following documents for the above referenced Site Plan Application:

• Item by item response to the Town Designated Engineer review comments of December 4, 2019 in a letter dated December 20, 2019 prepared by Tyler Fronte of Stewart’s Shops.

• Final Site Plan Set dated December 20, 2018 and last revised December 17, 2019, consisting of eighteen (18) Plan Sheets, prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. of Stewart’s Shops.

• Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated November 5, 2019 and last revised December 6, 2019 prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. of Stewart’s Shops.

• Map of Topographic Survey dated October 22, 2019 prepared by Bardin Land Surveying, P.C.

• Proposed Site Plan Set depicting a proposed sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from the project site to Willow Street, dated December 18, 2018 and last revised December 17, 2019, prepared by Scott Kitchner, P.E. of Stewart’s Shops.

The following comments from CHA’s December 4, 2019 Town Designated Engineer (TDE) review letter have not been adequately addressed (additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics):

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application. Prior to Site Plan approval, the Planning Commission should make a determination regarding consistency with the Negative Declaration issued by the Town Board.

2) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:

a) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances. A plan has been provided, however, measured intersection and sight distances and stopping sight distances should be compared to the AASHTO recommended distances. The evaluations should consider the effect of the proposed landscaping plan on sight lines. The Dec 20, 2019 Response letter from the applicant notes that their surveyor is in the process of updating the sight distance evaluation. The applicant needs to provide an engineer’s assessment of the sufficiency of the sight distances documented by the survey.

b) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site. Sidewalk curb ramps and detectable warning surfaces should be
specified at each driveway, at the end of the sidewalk on Lilac Street at Floral Avenue, and at the proposed crosswalk per the NYSDOT Standard Sheet 608.01. The plans should provide grading information for the proposed ramp connection from the crosswalk to the existing sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue. The spot elevations provided at the sidewalk ramps on Drawing No. S-4 show that water will drain from the road toward the sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue. Additional information should be provided to demonstrate that there won’t be ponding issues in the area of the proposed ramp connection to the sidewalk.

c) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit, number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad. Crosswalk details should conform to NYSDOT Standard Sheet 685.01. Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning signs should be specified and located per the distance specified by NYSDOT requirements. Back to back Pedestrian Warning Signs with Arrow Panel should be provided at the crosswalk. Refer to CHA’s 11/04/2019 Sketch of Pedestrian Improvements. On Drawing S-2: A callout to the back-to-back pedestrian crossing sign assembly on the west side of Guilderland Avenue is missing for the south-facing signs (“NYSDOT W11-2R PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGN W/ W16-7PR”).

3) As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided long the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac to Willow Street. We continue to recommend that the Applicant provided an aerial map showing planimetric features, tax map property line data and approximate location of utility poles and other obstructions be provided in order to demonstrate hardship or property constraints associated with construction of the sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street northerly to Willow Street. On January 2, 2020 the Applicant provided Site Plan showing the conceptual design of a sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from the project site to Willow Street requested by the Town. We understand that the Applicant is working with the adjoining property owner at 2966 Guilderland Avenue to obtain additional land for the sidewalk construction. Final Design plans should include additional details including existing conditions, topography, Right-of-Way, utilities, grading, accessible ramps, construction details, etc. In addition, the plan should be submitted to NYS DOT for review and approval of the proposed improvements within the NYS Right-of-Way. Upon satisfactory construction of the sidewalk by Stewart’s, the Town would be responsible for maintenance.

4) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3 (Documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided):

a) The location, size and material of existing public watermain along Guilderland Avenue, Lilac Street and Floral Avenue should be shown. In addition, locations of nearby fire hydrant assemblies should be shown.

b) The proposed privately-owned water service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. The proposed water service consists of a 1” Type K copper to an unknown connection point along Lilac Street. The potential need for building sprinklers should be verified and sizing of the water service (and/or fire protection main) should be confirmed.

c) The proposed public sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.

d) Sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue ROW should be reviewed and approved by the NYS DOT. Sanitary sewer improvements with the Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed and approved by the Town Highway Superintendent.
5) We offer the following comments regarding the Miscellaneous Details, Drawing S-12 *(Documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided):*
   a) The Water Service Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department.
   b) The Copper Water Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department.
   c) The PVC Sewer Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.
   d) The Double Cleanout Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department.

We offer the following additional TDE review comments based upon the December 20, 2019 Final Site Plan Submission:

6) We recommend the following conditions of Special Use Permit and/or Site Plan Approval:
   a) Town Water and Sewer Department review and approval of the proposed service laterals, methods of connection and proposed public sanitary sewer extension.
   b) Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land.
   c) Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue.
   d) NYSDOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks) in the NYSDOT right-of-way along Guilderland Avenue. Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town.
   e) NYS DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity.
   f) Town sign permits should be obtained for the proposed project identification signage including any proposed pylon, monument and/or building mounted signage.

Should you have any questions or need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 453-2882 or plilholt@chacompanies.com

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter L. Lilholt, Jr., PE, CPESC, CPSWQ
Vice President

cc: John Denny – Planning Commission Chairman
    Jonathon Tingley – Planning Commission Attorney
    Tyler Fronte – Stewart’s Shops
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January 9, 2020

RE: Stewart’s Shop #465
2970 Guilderland Ave
Rotterdam, NY 12306

Mr. Maher, DPW Supervisor,

This letter is regarding our meeting which took place Jan 8th, 2020 at your office to discuss the utility connections for our proposed new store. The attendees were yourself; Matt Lupi, Water and Sewer Maintenance Supervisor; Jack Denny, Planning Commission Chairman; Tyler Fronte and Ryan Rubado of Stewart’s Shops. The following topics were discussed, and the following decisions were made:

**Stewart’s Shop private sewer connection:**
It was decided that we attempt to locate the existing lateral for the body shop, assess the condition of the line and use if possible. It is shown on the plan to tie into the Town manhole at the street as a contingency. A note has been added stating that the preferred method is to connect to the existing lateral if it is feasible.

**Stewart’s Shop private water service:**
Utilizing the existing service to the body shop was discussed, but because of the probable age of the line it was decided best to not use. The existing line is to be exposed on the opposite side of the street and turned off at the corporation valve. Stewart’s will run a new 1” type “k” copper line to the 6” main on Floral Ave. This has been shown on the plans.

**Public benefit sewer extension:**
The sewer extension from Floral Ave. to Guilderland Ave. was discussed and found to be unnecessary due to the shallow nature of the existing infrastructure. The only possibility for residents to utilize the proposed sewer on Floral is for the Town to install a pump station. It was decided that the number of residents serviced by this new line would not financially justify a pump station. The findings are going to be presented to the Town Board for a final decision on weather the public sewer extension should be abandoned.

Please feel free to contact me if you feel I’ve left anything out or would like to further discuss. Please return this letter with your approval for submittal to CHA to satisfy their comments regarding all DPW concerns.

Thank you,

---

RYAN RUBADO
P.O. BOX 435
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
rrubado@stewartsshops.com
Cell: (518) 932-1791
Work: (518) 581-1201 Ext. 4260
Fax: (518) 581-1209
January 9, 2020

Mr. Peter Comenzo, Senior Planner
Town of Rotterdam
John F. Kirvin Government Center
1100 Sunrise Boulevard
Rotterdam, NY 12306

RE: Stewart’s Shop – 2970 Guilderland Avenue, Rotterdam NY

Dear Mr. Comenzo:

In response to Comment #2a contained within a letter from Clough, Harbour & Associates, dated January 3, 2009, we offer the following response:

The sight distance evaluation performed at the proposed driveway entrances designed for the above referenced project was done so in accordance with Appendix 5C and Chapter 7 of the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual.

Appendix 5C begins by stating that the data presented therein was “either obtained directly or calculated from formulas in Section 9.5.3 of A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 2011 (AASHTO Green Book)”.

The posted speed limit along Guilderland Avenue is 35 miles per hour (MPH) and the posted speed limit along Lilac Street is 30 MPH. As both driveway entrances operate without any traffic control device in place to control vehicle movements, Table 5C-1 of Appendix 5C was referenced. Table 5C-1 requires a minimum length of 165 feet for the approach leg of the intersection sight triangle along Guilderland Avenue and 140 feet along Lilac Street.

A field survey conducted by Bardin Land Surveying P.C., dated November 22, 2019, included a sight distance evaluation at both proposed driveway entrances. It was determined that a vehicle exiting the site onto Guilderland Avenue would have a maximum unobstructed view to the North of 208 feet and an unobstructed view to the South of 204 feet to the intersection of Lilac Street feet. The same analysis was then performed for the Lilac Street driveway entrance. It was determined that a vehicle exiting the site onto Lilac Street would, upon completion of the removal of existing vegetation, have a maximum unobstructed view to the East of 461 feet and a maximum view to the West to the intersection of Guilderland Avenue of 188 feet.

This measured field data is presented in both the Bardin Land Surveying field survey and Contract Drawing S-5 (Landscaping Plan). Drawing S-5 clearly shows that the proposed tree plantings along both roadways will not interfere with the sight triangles described above. Based on the measured distances, the minimum intersection sight distances are met for the proposed driveway locations.

Chapter 7 of the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual contains values for minimum required stopping sight distance for various highway design projects. Exhibit 7-7 specifically contains tabulated minimum stopping sight distances for various posted speed limits. Exhibit 7-7 also notes that “the minimum values are based on AASHTO’s A Policy on Geometric Design of
Highways and Streets, 2011 (AASHTO Green Book)". For a speed limit of 35 MPH, the minimum stopping sight distance for vehicles traveling at highway speeds would be 250 feet and for a speed limit of 30 MPH the minimum value would be 200 feet. As documented within the field survey performed by Bardin Land Surveying, a vehicle traveling Northbound along Guilderland Avenue would have a minimum stopping sight distance of 1,360 feet and a vehicle traveling Southbound along Guilderland Avenue would have a stopping sight distance of 1,283 feet. A vehicle traveling Westerly along Lilac Street would have a stopping sight distance of 461 feet. Based on these measured distances, the minimum stopping sight distances are met for the proposed driveway location.

The only exception being the Easterly approach along Lilac Street which is only 188 feet from the driveway entrance. However, this slight deviation from the published minimum stopping sight distance is insignificant as vehicles approaching from that direction would have been forced to slow to speeds less than the posted 35 MPH speed limit due to the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street intersection.

It is my professional opinion, that based on data collected in the field and an analysis of NYSDOT and AASHTO design requirements, the proposed driveway entrances for this project are located as to sufficiently meet published minimum intersection and stopping sight distance requirements.

If you have any additional concerns or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Scott E. Kitchner, PE
Site Work Project Manager
Stewart's Shops
PO Box 435
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
Phone: (518) 581-1201 (x4249)
Cell: (518) 312-2675
Fax: (518) 581-1209
skitchner@stewartsshops.com
www.stewartsshops.com

Stewart's Shops Corp.
1/10/2020

RE: Stewart's Shops - Concept Site Plan Review
2970 Guilderland Avenue, Town of Rotterdam, NY
CHA File: 12669.1030

Thank you for your review of our proposal. In response to your comment letter dated 12/4/19 I offer the following responses in red:

The following comments from CHA’s December 4, 2019 Town Designated Engineer (TDE) review letter have not been adequately addressed *(additional comments for clarification are provided in bold italics)*:

1) The applicant prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the Unlisted SEQR Action. The Rotterdam Town Board, acting as Lead Agency pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Negative Declaration on July 31, 2019 by Resolution No. 220.19. As long as the project remains consistent with the SEQR review and Negative Declaration, then no additional SEQR action may be required by the Town Planning Commission prior to acting on the Site Plan Application. **Prior to Site Plan approval, the Planning Commission should make a determination regarding consistency with the Negative Declaration issued by the Town Board.**

*DETAIL NOTED.*

2) We offer the following comments regarding site access, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations:

a) Sight distance analysis should be performed for each proposed site driveway for both the intersection and stopping sight distances with comparison to the AASHTO recommended distances. A plan has been provided, however, measured intersection and sight distances and stopping sight distances should be compared to the AASHTO recommended distances. The evaluations should consider the effect of the proposed landscaping plan on sight lines. **The Dec 20, 2019 Response letter from the applicant notes that their surveyor is in the process of updating the sight distance evaluation. The applicant needs to provide an engineer’s assessment of the sufficiency of the sight distances documented by the survey.**

*ENGINEER LETTER PROVIDED.*

b) Sidewalks along the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street frontage are recommended to be provided to facilitate pedestrian access to/from the site. Sidewalk curb ramps and detectable warning surfaces should be specified at each driveway, at the end of the sidewalk on Lilac Street at Floral Avenue, and at the proposed crosswalk per the NYSDOT Standard Sheet 608.01. The plans should provide grading information for the proposed ramp connection from the crosswalk to the existing sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue. **The spot elevations provided at the sidewalk ramps on Drawing No. S-4 show that water will drain from the road toward the sidewalk on the west side of Guilderland Avenue. Additional information should be provided to demonstrate that there won’t be ponding issues in the area of the proposed ramp connection to the sidewalk. Additional spot elevations were added to the plans. No ponding will occur in the area of the proposed ramp connection to the sidewalk.**

c) A crosswalk across the north leg of Guilderland Avenue at Lilac Street should be considered. A review of the existing characteristics at this location indicate that vehicle volume, speed limit,
number of travel lanes and roadway functional classification characteristics are consistent with the qualifying criteria/considerations as outlined in the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (Chapter 18) and The NYS Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. The provision of a crosswalk at this location and the specific design elements are subject to approval and permits by NYSDOT. Sidewalk improvements along the west side of Guilderland Avenue (opposite side from the project site) are recommended to connect it to the crosswalk with an accessible ramp and detectable warning pad. Crosswalk details should conform to NYSDOT Standard Sheet 685.01. Pedestrian Crossing Advance Warning signs should be specified and located per the distance specified by NYSDOT requirements. Back to back Pedestrian Warning Signs with Arrow Panel should be provided at the crosswalk. Refer to CHA’s 11/04/2019 Sketch of Pedestrian Improvements. On Drawing S-2: A callout to the back-to-back pedestrian crossing sign assembly on the west side of Guilderland Avenue is missing for the south-facing signs ("NYSDOT W11-2R PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGN W/W16-7PR). Detail added to Drawing S-2.

3) As a large generator of pedestrians in this densely populated neighborhood, concrete sidewalks should be provided long the property frontage on Lilac Street to Floral Avenue and along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac to Willow Street. We continue to recommend that the Applicant provided an aerial map showing planimetric features, tax map property line data and approximate location of utility poles and other obstructions be provided in order to demonstrate hardship or property constraints associated with construction of the sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from Lilac Street northerly to Willow Street. On January 2, 2020 the Applicant provided Site Plan showing the conceptual design of a sidewalk along Guilderland Avenue from the project site to Willow Street requested by the Town. We understand that the Applicant is working with the adjoining property owner at 2966 Guilderland Avenue to obtain additional land for the sidewalk construction. Final Design plans should include additional details including existing conditions, topography, Right-of-Way, utilities, grading, accessible ramps, construction details, etc. In addition, the plan should be submitted to NYS DOT for review and approval of the proposed improvements within the NYS Right-of-Way. Upon satisfactory construction of the sidewalk by Stewart’s, the Town would be responsible for maintenance.

The property owner at 2966 Guilderland Avenue will give the Town a Permanent Easement allowing the construction of the sidewalks on his private property. The remaining sidewalks are constructed in the NYS Right-of-Way. Stewart’s counsel will be preparing the Easement language for review by the Town and Town’s counsel. Plans will be submitted to NYS DOT for review and approval of the proposed improvements within the NYS Right-of-Way. Stewart’s will construct the sidewalks and the Town will be responsible for maintenance of sidewalks.

4) We offer the following comments regarding the Utility Plan, Drawing S-3 (Documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided): Met with the Town Water Department (1/8/2020). A letter will be provided to CHA providing overview of meeting with DPW.
   a) The location, size and material of existing public watermain along Guilderland Avenue, Lilac Street and Floral Avenue should be shown. In addition, locations of nearby fire hydrant assemblies should be shown. DPW has been contacted for input and more information on existing utilities. An arrow and note have been added to the nearest hydrant with distance.
   b) The proposed privately-owned water service design, location, size, material and method of connection should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. The proposed water service consists of a 1" Type K copper to an unknown connection point along Lilac Street. The potential need for building sprinklers should be verified and sizing of the water service (and/or fire protection main) should be confirmed. A letter will be provided to CHA providing overview of meeting with DPW. Building sprinklers are not necessary according to the International Building Code 2015. See below.
An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings containing a Group M occupancy where one of the following conditions exists:

1. A Group M fire area exceeds 12,000 square feet (1115 m²).
2. A Group M fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane.
3. The combined area of all Group M fire areas on all floors, including any mezzanines, exceeds 24,000 square feet (2230 m²).
4. A Group M occupancy used for the display and sale of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 5,000 square feet (464 m²).

High-piled storage.

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided in accordance with the International Fire Code in all buildings of Group M where storage of merchandise is in high-piled or rack storage arrays.

c) The proposed public sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue and Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. Documentation will be provided once comments are received by the Town Sewer Department.

d) Sanitary sewer improvements within the Guilderland Avenue ROW should be reviewed and approved by the NYS DOT. Sanitary sewer improvements with the Lilac Street ROW should be reviewed and approved by the Town Highway Superintendent. Documentation will be provided showing correspondence with NYS DOT as well as the Town Highway Superintendent.

5) We offer the following comments regarding the Miscellaneous Details, Drawing S-12 (Documentation of Town Water Department review and approval should be provided): Met with the Town Water Department (1/8/2020). A letter will be provided to CHA providing overview of meeting with DPW.

a) The Water Service Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. Town Water Department will review the Water Service Detail. Awaiting feedback.

b) The Copper Water Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Water Department. Town Water Department will review the Copper Water Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail. Awaiting feedback.

c) The PVC Sewer Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. Town Sewer Department will review the PVC Sewer Lateral Trench and Bedding Detail. Awaiting feedback.

d) The Double Cleanout Detail should be reviewed by the Town Sewer Department. Town Sewer Department will review the Double Cleanout Detail. Awaiting feedback.

We offer the following additional TDE review comments based upon the December 20, 2019 Final Site Plan Submission:

6) We recommend the following conditions of Special Use Permit and/or Site Plan Approval:

a) Town Water and Sewer Department review and approval of the proposed service laterals, methods of connection and proposed public sanitary sewer extension. A letter will be provided to CHA providing overview of meeting with DPW.

b) Filing with the County Clerk’s Office a lot consolidation of the 5 existing parcels that comprise of the project site into a single parcel of land. Detail noted. Lot consolidation will occur upon transfer of ownership to Stewart’s Shops Corporation.

c) Deed Restriction which would prohibit access to Floral Avenue. Deed restriction will be added to prohibit access to Floral Avenue.

d) NYSDOT Highway Work Permits will be required for the proposed driveways and any improvements (including crosswalks, grading, utilities, sidewalks) in the NYSDOT right-of-way along Guilderland.
Avenue. Copies of all correspondence with the NYSDOT should be provided to the Town. *All correspondence with NYSDOT will be shared with the Town.*

e) NYS DEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity. *NYS DEC SPDES General Permit will be obtained.*

f) Town sign permits should be obtained for the proposed project identification signage including any proposed pylon, monument and/or building mounted signage. *The appropriate Town sign permits will be obtained.*

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Tyler G. Fronte  
Stewart's Shops Corp.  
PO Box 435  
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866  
518-581-1201x4440  
Tfronte@stewartsshops.com
# ZONING COORDINATION REFERRAL

**SCHENECTADY COUNTY DEPT. OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING**

Recommendations shall be made within 30 days after receipt of a full statement of the proposed action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM:</th>
<th>Municipality:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Body</td>
<td>Town of Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County Department of Economic Development and Planning</td>
<td>(tel.) 386-2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffer Heights, 107 Nott Terrace, Suite 303</td>
<td>(fax) 382-5539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, NY 12308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Zoning Code/Law Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Zoning Map Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Site Plan Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Special Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Use Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Area Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC HEARING OR MEETING DATE:** January 21, 2020

**SUBJECT:** Stewart’s Shops – 2970 Guilderland Avenue Site Plan/Special Use Permit review for the construction of a ±3,847 square foot convenience store with self-service fueling stations on a combined ±1.3 acre parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>ENCLOSURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public hearing notice &amp; copy of the application.</td>
<td>2. Map of property affected. (Including Tax Map I.D. number if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completed environmental assessment form and all other materials required by the referring body in order to make its determination of significance pursuant to the state environmental quality review act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This zoning case is forwarded to your office for review in compliance with Sections 239-l, 239-m and 239-n of Article 12-B of the General Municipal Law, New York State.

2. This material is sent to you for review and recommendation because the property affected by the proposed action is located within 500 feet of the following:

- ☐ the boundary of any city, village or town;
- ☐ the boundary of any existing or proposed County or State park or other recreation area;
- ☐ the right-of-way of any existing or proposed County or State parkway, thruway, expressway, road or highway;
- ☐ the existing or proposed right-of-way of any stream or drainage channel owned by the County or for which the County has established channel lines;
- ☐ the existing or proposed boundary of any County or State-owned land on which a public building or institution is situated;
- ☐ the boundary of a farm operation located in an agricultural district, as defined by Article 25-AA of the agriculture and markets law. The referral requirement of this subparagraph shall not apply to the granting of area variances.

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Name: Peter Comenzo  
Title: Sr. Planner

Address: 1100 Sunrise Boulevard Schenectady, NY 12306

E-mail: pcomenzo@rotterdamny.org  
Phone: 518-355-7575 Ext 338

Signature:  
Date: 1920
PLANNING & ZONING COORDINATION REFERRAL

Case No. R-03-20

Applicant Stewart's Shops

Referring Officer Peter Comenzo

Municipality Rotterdam

Considerations: Located on the northeasterly corner of the Guilderland Ave. (SR 158)/Lilac Street intersection approximately .3 miles south of Curry Road (SR 7). Access proposed via SR 158 and Lilac Street.

RECOMMENDATION

Receipt of zoning referral is acknowledged on January 14, 2010. Please be advised that the undersigned Commissioner of Economic Development and Planning of the County of Schenectady (having under the Schenectady County Charter the powers and duties of a County Planning Board) has reviewed the proposed action stated on the opposite side of this form and makes the following recommendations:

☐ Approve of the proposal.

☐ Defer to local consideration (No significant county-wide or inter-community impact)

☑ Modify/Conditionally Approve. Conditions:
   NYS DOT approval for highway work in the state right-of-way.

☐ Advisory Note:

☐ Disapprove. Reason:

* A recommendation of approval should not be interpreted that the County has reviewed all local concerns and/or endorses the project; rather the proposed action has met certain County considerations.

Section 239-m of the general Municipal Law requires that within 30 days after final action, the referring body shall file a report of the final action it has taken with the Schenectady County Department of Economic Development and Planning. A referring body which acts contrary to a recommendation of modification or disapproval of a proposed action shall set forth the reasons for the contrary action in such report.

1/17/2020

Ray Gillen, Commissioner
Economic Development and Planning
2. **Quality Petroleum 2, LLC - 330 Becker Drive & Duanesburg Road.** Sketch Site Plan/Special Use Permit review to construct a ±8,000 square foot travel center with a drive-thru window and a five island motor vehicle fueling station on a consolidated ±3.37 acre parcel. Engineer: MJ Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.

1. Perimeter fencing and vegetative berms should be installed along the southern property line on Becker Drive behind the drive thru queue and parking lots to buffer residential properties located nearby. Additional trees along the entirety of the drive through lane to ensure minimal light will affect the residential properties along Becker Drive.

2. “No Parking” restrictions should be implemented and signs installed along both sides of Becker Drive to reduce impacts to traffic flow and nearby residential properties.

3. To allow for vehicle movements, the proposed parallel parking spaces on the north side of the property in the vicinity of the fueling islands should be moved to the property line. This proposed variance can be included in the parking space variance request needed. The width of the State Route 7 ROW is extremely large and would not impact sight distances on Duanesburg Road.

4. Bollards should be placed along the entire building frontage for the safety of customers that enter the building.

5. Parking spaces along the front of the proposed building should be concrete instead of asphalt to prevent degradation of surface and collection of vehicular fluids.

6. The proposed planting beds provided along Duanesburg Road are fairly removed from the building and may be difficult to water/maintain. DPW recommends reduction/modification of these planting beds or possible replacement with grass and deciduous trees along roadway.

7. Applicant should install commercial ornamental fencing with pillars along Duanesburg Road to supplement grass/landscaping area and discourage pedestrians from crossing over to/from the Pilot Truck Stop.

8. Planning Commission should consider restrictions on placement and height of illuminated signage to prevent impacts to neighboring residential properties.

9. Planning Commission may want to consider reducing the height of the proposed 16 foot high light poles along the southern property line and discuss the height/size of wall packs proposed along the drive thru lane.

10. A note should be added to the plans that recorded messages are prohibited at drive thru speaker and speaker should be shielded/directed towards vehicles ordering during operating hours.

11. Underground fueling tanks have been relocated as suggested.
Quality Petroleum 2, LLC
330 Becker Drive & Duanesburg Road
January 21, 2020
Page 2

DPW Comments from October 15, 2019
1. The TDE (Greenman Pedersen Inc.) has been retained to assist the Town in the review of this project and has worked closely with the developer, staff, and DOT to review the conceptual layout of this travel center. Comments are enclosed regarding where we are in the review process of the conceptual layout.
2. Soil tests were requested by the Town and performed on September 13, 2019. Information and analysis of these results have not been provided.
3. Location of the fuel tanks appears to be problematic. Applicant should consider relocating them to a less congested area away from the exiting/merging traffic.

DPW Comments from May 21, 2019
1. Existing traffic movements on Duanesburg Road are currently problematic at this location with existing Pilot Travel Center located immediately north of this site. Access, accessibility, lack of a turn lane, and queuing of tractor trailers are potentially problematic due to the size and configuration of property and nature of truck fueling operations.
2. Planning Commission should authorize the Chairman to enter into an agreement with a Town Designated Engineer (TDE) to assist in the review of the project.

SEQR Requirement: 6 NYCRR 617 Unlisted Action. Rotterdam Planning Commission declared lead agency on May 21, 2019. Plans should be sent to involved/interested agencies for comment.

Involved/Interested Agencies
Schenectady County Economic Development and Planning
Schenectady County Department of Health
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation – Region #4
New York State Department of Transportation
New York State Thruway Authority
United States Department of Army, Corps of Engineers
Rotterdam Highway Department
Rotterdam Police Department
Metroplex Development Authority
Fire District #6
Schalmont School District
Princetown Town Clerk (239nn)
December 30, 2019

Mr. Peter Comenzo
Planning & Zoning Department
Town of Rotterdam
1100 Sunrise Blvd
Rotterdam, NY 12306

Re: Duanesburg Road Travel Center
Preliminary Site Plan Submission

Peter,

We have enclosed the following for your review:
- Site Plan Set, dated December 30, 2019, 12 full size copies
- Stormwater Report, dated December 2, 2019, 3 copies
- Water and Sewer Report, dated December 20, 2019, 3 copies
- Traffic Impact Study, dated December 20, 2019, 3 copies
- No Effect Letter, dated September 5, 2013, 1 copy
- Waiver of Subdivision Application, 1 copy

Since our last Concept Plan submission in October, we have revised the plan to remove the second building. We have progressed the drawings to a level of detail so that the TDE and Planning Board can review prior to obtaining an area variance for the proposed reduction in parking. Below are comments from NYSDOT, GPI and Town of Rotterdam Planning that were answered for the October 2019 concept submission (in red) and now since we have advanced the drawings, have provided more detail to the comments (in blue).

From Tina Crowley at NYSDOT:
1. The exiting driveway onto Route 7 needs to be right-out only.
   Response: See revised drawing.

From Fred Mastroianni and Peter Faith at GPI:
1. The south-west corner of the property is identified on the survey as “marsh area.” Marshlands are considered wetlands and should either be delineated as appropriate or the survey updated to avoid confusion.
   Response: See revised drawing.

2. Sheet C-2 shows the proposed site layout and setback lines. The 10’ parking setback line and the 30’ building setback lines should be reviewed as they do not appear to be offset parallel from the property lines appropriately.
   Response: See revised drawing.

3. We have reviewed the proposed septic field layout. According to the 10 States Standards, the septic fields currently do not meet the setback requirements from the property line and stormwater management practice and should be reviewed.
   Response: The septic area is shown 10’ from the property line. It is currently being designed, but the space shown on the plans is ample for the proposed system. MJ will forward the septic design once available.
4. The parking requirements outlined on sheet C-2 should also include a separate calculation for each intended use on the site. The “coffee shop” would be defined as a “Restaurants, fast-food” and would require 1 parking space per 50 square feet of gross floor area. The new parking requirements based on building descriptions/areas would be 64 spaces for the Travel Center and 42 spaces for the coffee shop, totaling 106 parking spaces required. The applicant is currently seeking an area variance for reduced parking and proposing 72 spaces.
Response: Since the Concept submission, the Town has provided a calculation worksheet, showing that the convenience store portion of the Travel Center should be calculated at 8 spaces per 1,000 sf, requiring 24 spaces. The remainder of the Travel Center is be calculated as Fast Food, which is 1 per 50 sf, resulting in 100 spaces. The total number of spaces required is 124. The current plan shows 97 proposed parking spaces, which include 4 oversized spaces intended to be used for vehicles towing trailers or motorhomes.

5. The Section of the Town Code that is referenced does not appear to match the reference in the Town’s Code provided online. The section referenced on the plans is “270-15” but the code section quoted below is from “270-145.1”. Additionally, the subsequent code section (270-146) applies to convenience stores and should be incorporated into the design as necessary.
Response: See revised drawings.

6. We have done a cursory review of GI Worksheets based on the information available. It appears the applicant is intending to treat the minimum runoff reduction volume using bioretention and extended underground detention for quantity control. A justification for not treating 100% of the WQv using runoff reduction techniques will need to be included in the SWPPP. Additionally, the value used for “P” (90th percentile rainfall event) should be 1.1” to match Figure 4.1 in the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual and other local projects GPI has reviewed.
Response: A full stormwater report has been prepared, please see enclosed report.

7. The soils identified onsite do not appear to have the characteristics included in the GI Worksheets submitted. The USGS Web Soil Survey shows that the site contains HSG “D” type soils at the site with a maximum infiltration rate of 0.00 – 0.20 in/hr. The GI Worksheets should be updated or supplemental information be provided to justify claimed values should be provided.
Response: A full stormwater report has been prepared, please see enclosed report.

8. As shown in the site information table, the project area (parcel id 57.3-24 and 57.3-25) is within the B-2 zoning district which requires a Special Use Permit for motor vehicle fueling stations and convenience stores.
Response: Understood. A Site Plan/Special Use Permit application was submitted to the Town in May 2019.

9. The 15,000 SF required lot area is accurate for the B-2 zoning district. For this district, the bulk area requirements are referenced back to the B-1 requirements.
Response: Comment acknowledged.

10. The required setbacks are in line with the B-2 zoning district requirements, except the B-2 building height max is actually 40 ft.
Response: See revised drawings.
11. The proposed setbacks are in line with the B-2 zoning district requirements, and seem accurate according to scaling, except the proposed side yard seems exaggerated, but is still in compliance based on rough measurement.
   Response: See revised drawings.

12. The B-2 zoning district lot coverage requirement is not exceed 60% for non-residential buildings. The applicant shows a proposed greenspace at 45% - although it is tough to analyze this based on the concept drawing provided.
   Response: Since removing the second building, the buildings and gas canopy account for about 11,796 sf or 8.4% and the paving is about 69,300 SF or 49.4%, totaling 57.8% of lot coverage or 42.2% of greenspace. See drawing C-1

13. The location of petroleum storage tanks is not shown.
   Response: The tanks are located along the exit lane of the Travel Center drive-through. The Concept Site Plan has been updated to show (2) 20,000 gallon tanks.
   Response: The tanks have been relocated to be placed at the entry drive, with a designated pull-off area for the fuel truck.

14. Based on the Schenectady County Internet Mapping application – the parcels are in Rotterdam Water District 5.
   Response: Comment acknowledged.

15. The FEAF says the project site is located over a principal aquifer, but it is not in an Aquifer Protection Zone.
   Response: Comment acknowledged.

16. The FEAF says the project site is located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory. Coordination with SHPO and signoff should be part of the project.
   Response: Please see enclosed SHPO no effect letter.

17. The routing of the delivery truck past the eastern drive thru window conflicts with the queuing area for this window. If there are more that 5 cars waiting at this window, the truck will not be able to use this route.
   Response: The drive-through opens around 10:30. Deliveries will be scheduled before the drive through opens for the day. But as a precaution, 2 loading areas have been provided to allow for ample room for deliveries.

18. Assuming the fuel storage tanks are located between the parking area and the stormwater management area, a fuel truck stopped to fill these tanks will block the exit from both drive through windows.
   Response: Two pull-off areas have been provided to allow space for a fuel truck and/or delivery truck to unload, while still allowing cars to pass through the drive through lane.
   Response: The tanks have been relocated to be placed at the entry drive, with a designated pull-off area for the fuel truck. This will eliminate all conflicts with the drive-through window.

From Peter Comenzo:

1. Push the parking area to the northerly property line near the fuel islands. The additional maneuvering room in that area would be helpful and may also assist with deliveries that may be necessary through the front.
   Response: Car parking has been removed in this area and replaced with oversize parallel style parking. By doing this, travel trailers, RVs and landscape vehicles are accommodated, and the drive aisle has been
increased from the standard 24' to 28' allowing extra space for maneuvering. The space from the end of the fuel island bollards to the striped parking stall is approx. 35 feet.

Please let us know when this project will be placed on the Planning Board agenda.

Sincerely,

James W. Easton, PE
Director of Land Development
January 14, 2020

Peter Comenzo, Senior Planner
The Town of Rotterdam
1100 Sunrise Blvd.
Rotterdam, NY 12306

RE: Duanesburg Road Travel Center

Dear Mr. Comenzo,

We have received the following documents for review with respect to the subject project:

- Site Plan Set, dated December 30, 2019
- Stormwater Report, dated December 2, 2019
- Water and Sewer Report, dated December 20, 2019
- Traffic Impact Study, dated December 20, 2019
- No Effect Letter, dated September 5, 2013
- Waiver of Subdivision Application
- FEAF, dated January 6, 2019

With respect to the plans and supporting documentation, we understand they are preliminary in nature. However, we decided to review them in detail such that MJ Engineering can address them with the hope of reducing time and effort on future submittals and incorporate all necessary design components while progressing the project. General site features identified on the plans provided were fully reviewed against the Town’s Zoning Laws, State regulations, and Federal regulations. GPI offers the following comments regarding the submitted materials:

**General Comments:**

A. Upon visual inspection of the site, the corner of Becker Drive and Route 7 previous identified as “marsh area” shows characteristics of a wetland and should be investigated as such. It appears that the delineation of other wetlands on the property ends abruptly at the property lines indicating that the area in question may not have been investigated. It does not appear that this area is hydrologically connected to other watercourses and may be classified as an isolated wetland, however that determination must come from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). While this area is outside the property boundary, the concern is the proximity to the sanitary leach fields regarding setbacks potential disturbance from grading that extends into the R.O.W.

B. The letter from SHPO included in the project documentation does not appear to be based on the current project. The submitted letter indicates that the previous evaluation of the site did not include any construction/ground disturbance and was only for rezoning the area. Additional Coordination with SHPO should be performed and a letter of no adverse effect should be provided.

C. The percolation tests appear to be too shallow since a cut is proposed in this area of the sanitary leach fields. The tests must be completed at 2’ below proposed grade of the system. Additionally, the middle septic field bed does not have any valid percolation tests included within the area. Also, it is our understanding that NYSDEC who will be reviewing the sewer system design have not witnessed the perc test.
D. The NYSDEC Design Standards for Intermediate Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems includes a 50' setback between septic fields and catch basins. Three catch basins appear to be within the 50' setback.

E. The final submitted versions of the plans, SWPPP and other documentation will need all appropriate seals, stamps, signatures, and any other necessary professional certifications prior to approval. Additionally, the SWPPP included a section for the General Permit but it was not included in the SWPPP. It is understood that the permit is standard documentation for SWPPP reports and does not need to be included for review. However, the final version must include the General Permit.

F. Typical design of vehicle refueling stations includes an advertising sign with current gasoline prices, store names, and other information. Documentation and details for the sign needs to be submitted for review against the Town’s sign laws if the applicant intends to include a freestanding sign for the refueling station. Additionally, documentation should be provided for menu boards along the drive through to assess their compliance with the Town’s Laws.

G. The site includes a proposed sidewalk from the driveway at the intersection with Becker Drive to the walkway to the building. Has MJ considered allowing a pull-through area between parking spaces? This would involve in providing a striped flush pavement after the 4th or 5th space east of the raised island, then adding another raised island to continue the sidewalk.

H. The pump station for the sanitary septic field will require back up power in the event of a local power outage. Please show the location of the generator on the site plans.

FEAF Comments:
Portions of the FEAF were not completed. Please provide the necessary information to the following questions in the FEAF:

a. Part A: the Property Owner information does not match the property owner information on the Waiver of Subdivision Application.

b. Part B, a: should be checked Yes and the appropriate reviewing board/department should be included to review the Septic System Application through the Town.

c. Part B, d: should be checked Yes and should include a Road Closure Permit to be reviewed by the Superintendent of Highway if directional drilling is not the proposed method of connecting the water service.

d. Part B, e: should be checked Yes and should include a County 239 referral and any septic review/approvals completed by the County.

e. Part B, g: should include the specific permits needed by State agencies.

f. Part D.2, a: only appears to be partially filled out. Please fill out parts iii through ix as necessary.

g. Part D.2, e: should include the onsite wetlands that the stormwater management practice outlets to.

h. Part D.2, f: should be checked Yes and should include the processes during and after construction that will produce air emissions.

i. Part D.2, j: should be completely filled out based on the updated TIS.

j. Part D.2, m, ii: should be checked Yes since the site is currently acting as a natural berm between Rt. 7 and the residential properties along Becker Drive.

k. Part D.2, n: should include descriptions of the lighting proposed and part ii should be checked Yes (see above).

l. Part E.1, d: should be checked Yes and the Schenectady ARC should be included in the facilities.

m. Part E.3, h: should be checked Yes as the Revolutionary Byway and Scenic Route 20 Byway appear to be within five miles of the site as a minimum.
Plan Comments

1) General: The plans need to include a limits of disturbance line (per Town Code Ch. 270-215, F, (1), (b)) to accurately assess the stormwater management calculations and sizing. The total area used for calculating the stormwater requirements cannot be accurately verified without delineated disturbance limits. The Water Quality Volume calculation must account for the entire disturbance area.

2) General: The plans need to include a reference to contact DigSafeNY at least 72 hours prior to the beginning of construction.

3) General: The plans did not appear to contain any considerations for snow removal or storage and should be shown.

4) General: Label the road that intersect with Becker Drive, which is Feuz Lane. The road names should be shown on all plan sheets.

5) C-1: Under note 8, plans should add “All work on state right of way shall conform to NYSDOT Specifications and permit requirements”.

6) C-4: The loading zones provided on the plans do not appear to meet the Town’s required 15’ width for loading zones.

7) C-4: 5’ by 5’ landing pad must be provided at all proposed door locations. Review of the building schematic indicates additional doors that are not shown.

8) C-5: Grading from the proposed project appears to extend beyond the property lines into both the State and Town rights-of-way. It is anticipated that a NYSDOT Highway Work Permit will be required. Any work being completed within the Town right-of-way may require a permit.

9) C-5: A review of the grading, details and inverted has indicated that the underground storage pipe system conflicts with the typical pavement section in some areas. Please review.

10) C-5: Rim elevations on sheet C-5 appear to conflict with the spot elevations shown on sheet C-6 (particular example is CB-1). Additionally, there appears to be multiple contours missing.

11) C-5: A detail for the Hydrodynamic Separator unit was not included in the plan set.

12) C-6: Based on spot elevations and contours, the running slope along the southern sidewalk appears to be 5.2% which does not comply with ADA requirements.

13) C-6: Spot elevations should be included at the top and bottom of each ramp on the site to review compliance with ADA standards.

14) C-7: The plans show a new connection to the water service on Becker Drive using a tapping sleeve and valve. The plans should show if this will be completed by an open cut or directional drilling along with how traffic will be maintained.

15) C-8: the following E&SC practices are noted in the submitted materials and need to be shown and detailed on the plans:
   a. Rock outlet protection
   b. Check dams
   c. Retaining walls
   d. Slope stabilization fabric

16) C-8: Silt fencing is shown crossing drainage ways in several locations. Please revise the silt fencing so that it meets Blue Book standards and does not cross drainage ways.

17) C-8: The concrete washout shown is within 100’ of surface drainage conveyance features. Please relocate the concrete washout to a less sensitive location or provide additional protection measures to ensure the surface features will not be impacted.
18) C-9: It appears that sign 1-17 should be a “no left turn” as it appears to give drivers no viable options to maneuver around the drive through lane.

19) C-9: Plantings for the interior of the bioretention area need to be included in the proposed bioretention design.

20) C-9: The Town’s requirement for parking lots over 6 spaces to include 10% minimum interior landscaping do not appear to be met. Please provide a figure showing how the proposed design meets the Town’s standards.

21) C-11: The WB-50 truck’s turning movement through the drive-through lane appear to travel over the curb.

22) C-11: Large vehicles will be utilizing Becker Drive more frequently for access to the site. Has pavement cores and an analysis been conducted to confirm that the existing roadway section can handle the weight of this additional traffic?

23) C-12: Town Code, Section 270-215, J, (1), (a) states “A vegetative buffer (25 feet minimum) shall be maintained between disturbed areas and protected federal designated wetlands. The twenty-five-foot buffer shall not be disturbed without special use permit approval as provided by Article XIX of this chapter.” It is understood that the applicant is going through the special use permit process, however, please show this buffer requirement on the plans and include specific protection measures for the adjacent wetlands where necessary.

24) C-12: The proposed limits of disturbance, landscaping, grading and stormwater outlets should be shown on this plan to confirm the exact wetland impact area.

25) D-1: The Type 3 and Type 6 pavement are old NYSDOT specifications and we suggest using the current specifications for binder and top courses.

26) D-1: The handicap parking stall detail should be revised to show the updated accessibility logo.

27) D-2: The fuel tank concrete pad should include minimum cover for the rebar.

28) D-5: It is unclear what the bio-retention to forebay typical section is detailing on the site. Please provide clarification to what component of the bioretention practice this detail applies to.

29) D-6: The concrete washout detail needs to be updated to reflect the required 2’ depth, 8’ by 8’ bottom dimensions, and horizontal separation to surface features requirements as outlined in the Blue Book.

**SWPPP Comments**

30) The SWPPP report includes multiple outdated references to the Stormwater Design Manual (SWDM), General Permit (GP), and NYS Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (Blue Book). These need to be updated to the most current editions. The following sections and references in the SWPPP that need to be updated:
   a. Part I, Section 1.0: SWDM (multiple years 2003 and 2011, Phase II Guidelines reference)
   b. Part I, Section 5.3: SWDM (Phase II Guidelines)
   c. Part II, Section 2.2: GP (Step 7, bullet 4)
   d. Part II, Section 6.0: Blue Book (2005)
   e. Part II, Construction Site Log Book: GP (under pre-construction meeting documents)

31) The SWPPP does not appear to contain references to the Town Code requirement to notify the Town’s Stormwater Management Officer prior to certain construction activities. Please include the appropriate code provisions to ensure compliance with the Town’s notification requirements

32) Part I, Section 2.0 and its subsections: These sections should include specific descriptions of the soils onsite and a summary of the Test Pit data collected onsite. Currently there is no test pit discussion in section 2.3.

GPI
33) Part I, Section 5.2: indicates that the bioretention area’s overflow is set above the maximum 6” ponding depth as required by the SWDM. Additionally, the bioretention worksheet includes a ponding depth that meets the design requirements in the SWDM but does not match the design provided on the plans.
   a. Section 5.3 of the SWPPP: The requirements for hot spot runoff treatment do not appear to be met with the current design. Practices that treat hot spot runoff require a second, redundant pretreatment practice prior to reaching the management practice.
   b. Section 5.4’s last paragraph states that there is an additional 1’ storage depth within the bioretention area which does not meet the design requirements in the SWDM.
   c. The SWPPP indicates that the WQv for the site is 7,499 cf which is treated by a bioretention area. The SWDM requires that the treatment system (pretreatment and the 6” ponding in the bioretention area) must be sized to hold 75% of the entire WQv prior to filtration. Please provide information how the pretreatment and practice will detain 75% of the WQv prior to filtration.

34) Part I, Section 8.0: The calculations for the predevelopment area #2 time of concentration line’s flow length varies from the watershed maps provided in the SWPPP. Additionally, the grading in the proposed watershed map provided in the SWPPP do not appear to match the grading in the proposed plans.

35) Part I, Section 8.0: Please verify that Node 8 also includes the contributing area from subcatchment #2A. Node 8’s hydrograph indicates a contributing drainage area of only 1.824 acres to DP#2.

36) Part I, Section 8.0: Hydrological analyses need to be included for all nodes in both pre- and post-construction conditions. The subcatchment descriptions provided indicate that larger storm events cause ponding in subcatchment #1 which overflows into subcatchment #2. Subcatchment #3 drains into the Town’s drainage system and should be provided in the hydrological analysis to identify the change in flowrate through the Town’s drainage system.

37) Part I, Section 8.0: The hydraulic modeling Pond Report for the underground array has a slope of 0.03% which varies from the slope of 0.25% indicated in the detail on the plans. Increasing the slope of the storage pipes will reduce the amount of available storage below the bioretention’s orifice elevation.

38) The NOI should include the wetland disturbance permit, petroleum storage permit, any other necessary NYSDEC permits.

39) Part II, Section 5.0: Section includes a construction sequence that indicates clearing the area of the building prior to installing silt fence and grubbing. This does not appear to comply with Town Code Section 270-215, J, (5) which does not allow for clearing except for that required to install E&SC practices until they are installed.

40) Part II Section 3.0 includes a description of stockpiles during construction which does not appear to comply with Town Code section 270-215, J, (11). The Town has a local requirement to stabilize or cover soil stockpiles at the end of each workday.

41) Part II, Section 2.3, B: Section indicates the geotechnical report that supports the boring investigations is included but could not be located in the submitted materials.

42) Part III, Section 4.0: A maintenance agreement is referenced but could not be located in the submitted materials. The maintenance agreement should be provided to the Town prior to approval to ensure proper maintenance of facilities.
Traffic Comments:

43) We have questions regarding the trip generation forecasts presented in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) dated 12/20/2019:
   - Table 3 lists 4 specific uses while the text of page 5 lists only 3 uses. It appears that one of the uses listed in table 3 is a repeat.
   - The application of Pass by Trips does not reduce the number of turning movements at the site driveways. Therefore, the total trips entering and exiting the site as shown on figure 5 should equal the “Trips” column in table 3. This correction should be carried through to the rest of the analysis including the SYNCHRO modeling and the LOS summary tables. Also, please provide the raw count data so we can verify the peak hour factor and heavy vehicle percentage used in the capacity analysis.

The remainder of the TIS has not been reviewed at this time pending a resolution these questions. Please also consider as part of the analysis any delays and queuing related to trucks turning in and out of the Pilot complex and this site.

44) D-7: Regarding the information presented on sheet D-7 of the site plan set, we offer the following:
   - The plan view has no dimensions or stationing shown. We cannot identify the proposed changes without a properly dimensioned before and after plan view of the area.
   - The proposed sections are not keyed to station numbers on the plan view. Without this we cannot determine the intent of the proposed modifications.

45) We suggest that prior to site plan approval the applicant obtain and provide a “conceptual approval” letter from NYSDOT indicating their acceptance of the driveway locations, treatment of the route 7 frontage and the findings/recommendations in the traffic impact study.

46) D-7: Since this drawing applies to work on state right of way, we defer to NYSDOT to review and provide any comments. One item we would like to bring to your attention is has pavement cores been taken to confirm that there is adequate asphalt to mill the existing pavement. Also, since the new roadway section utilizes a portion of the shoulder, is there adequate pavement thickness (full depth shoulder) so that reconstruction is not necessary.

47) MPT-1 and MPT-2: Since these drawings apply to the work on Route 7, we defer to NYSDOT to review and provide any comments.

48) Previous meetings and correspondence have expressed the benefits and the desire to have the median on Route 7 extended to provide sufficient storage for vehicles turning into the existing Pilot Complex at the western driveway. A review of the traffic flow diagrams on figure 5 of the TIS with section 9.7.3.1 of the 2018 AASHTO “Green Book” indicates a left turn lane is warranted in this location. As the project is already proposing to conduct a rehabilitation of the existing cross section, adding a short (100 foot) segment to the rehabilitation does not appear to be a significant addition to the scope of work.

49) It appears that all the traffic related comments on the site plan circulation have been addressed.

50) Parking: We suggest the applicant provide the Town justification to accept the variance in parking spaces from 124 to 97 spaces.

If you have any questions, please contact my work phone: (518) 898-9528; or cell phone: (518) 641-9192 or via e-mail at fmastroianni@gpinet.com.

Sincerely,

GPI/Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.

Fred Mastroianni, P.E.
Vice President