

CONSULTING ENGINEERS P.C. RICHARD D. MCGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA) WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY & NJ) MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA) MAIN OFFICE 33 Airport Center Drive Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

### TOWN OF NEWBURGH <u>PLANNING BOARD</u> <u>REVIEW COMMENTS</u>

PROJECT: PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION: PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:

ROGAN SUBDIVISION 11-33 SECTION 8 BLOCK 1 LOT 87.1 ARDEN CONSULTING ENGINEERS 10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012

- 1. Comments from 19 January meeting must be addressed.
- 2. This office takes no exception to the Planning Board granting final approval to the two lot subdivision.

Respectfully submitted,

McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, P.C.

Patrick J. Hines Associate

REGIONAL OFFICES

111 Wheatfield Drive
Milford, Pennsylvania
18337
570-296-2765
540 Broadway
Monticello, New York
12701
845-794-3399

## **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

MUNICIPALITY: Town of Newburgh

#### TOWN PROJECT NO. 2011-33

PROJECT NAME: Rogan Subdivision LOCATION: 47 Lockwood Lane (8-1-87.1) TYPE OF PROJECT: 2 lot subdivision (6.74 acres) DATE: February 10, 2012 REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

#### PROJECT SUMMARY:

Approval Status: Submitted January 3, 2012, Public Hearing on February 16, 2012 SEQRA Status: Unlisted, Negative Declaration issued January 19, 2012 Zone/Utilities: AR/Individual well and septic systems Map Dated: December 4, 2011 Site Inspection: January 3, 2012 Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012 Consultant/Applicant: Michael Morgante, Arden Consulting Engineers Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board office, James Osborne, Gerald Canfield, Michael Donnelly, Patrick Hines, Karen Arent and Ken Wersted on February 10, 2012

#### COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. The applicant has not provided revised plans for the public hearing. If there is an approval from the Planning Board after the Public Hearing, the applicant will need to address the following comments as conditions of approval.
- The applicant will need to show the 10,000 square foot buildable area requirement on the plans, as required by Zoning under the Residential Lot Area section (185-48.5). There is more than enough room on the lot so this should not be an issue. There are no other zoning or subdivision regulation issues for this project, and no variances would be necessary.
- 3. A common driveway access and maintenance agreement must be submitted for Mike Donnelly's review.
- 4. A surveyor's seal and signature will be required for approval of the existing conditions plan.

5. Chad Wade at the Orange County Planning Department has said he will try to get the review in by the meeting of the 16<sup>th</sup> so the applicant can receive approval. He received the plans on January 24<sup>th</sup> so the 30 day timeframe will not expire by the Planning Board meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>.

The above comments represent our professional opinion and judgment, but may not necessarily, in all cases, reflect the opinion of the Planning Board. Please revise your plans to reflect these comments with the understanding that further changes may be required. In all cases the requirements of the Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations shall be adhered to by the applicant and shall be shown on the plans. Where variances to the Zoning Law are required or where waivers from the Subdivision Regulations are needed, specific requests shall be made to the Planning Board for a waiver or for referral to the ZBA. These comments are prepared based on current zoning and subdivision regulation requirements. Any change in those regulations prior to final approval of these plans could require revisions beyond the scope of our existing comments.



MAIN OFFICE **33** Airport Center Drive Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

## **TOWN OF NEWBURGH** PLANNING BOARD **REVIEW COMMENTS**

**PROJECT: PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION: PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: FINE AND ASSOCIATES REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:** 

CALLAS SUBDIVISION 12-03 SECTION 3 BLOCK 1 LOT 144 **10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012** 

- 1. Existing two family structure appears to need a variance for side yard setback based on house location and setback lines depicted existing structure loses protection upon subdivision.
- 2. Metes and bounds and lot line lengths must be provided.
- 3. NYSDOT approval for driveway must be provided. NYSDOT driveway details will most likely be required
- 4. Subsurface sanitary sewer disposal and design must be provided. Bedroom limits of 3 bedrooms should be labeled on the plans based on septic tank size identified.
- 5. Recommend a note be added to the plans requiring staking of the proposed structure as it is located at the side yard setback line.
- 6. The two family use in the AR zone requires greater than 40,000 square feet. Bulk table for two family should be added to the plans.
- 7. A 4,800 square foot house is identified as being proposed on Lot 2. Septic design details currently limit house to 3 bedrooms. This should be clarified.
- 8. Clarify bulk table for Lot 1, one side yard is identified as 36.8 feet it appears that the 1 side vard is less than the required based on building envelope depicted.

**REGIONAL OFFICES** 

 111 Wheatfield Drive • Milford, Pennsylvania 18337 • 570-296-2765 • • 540 Broadway • Monticello, New York 12701 • 845-794-3399 •

## Town of Newburgh

9. Project narrative identifies septic to be pumped details for the septic system should include this if so required.

Respectfully submitted,

*McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, P.C.* 

Patrick J. Hines Associate

## MUNICIPALITY: Town of Newburgh

### **TOWN PROJECT NUMBER:** 12-03

PROJECT NAME: Callas Subdivision
LOCATION: Route 300, north of East Rock Cut Road (3-1-144)
TYPE OF PROJECT: Two lot subdivision with one existing 2 family dwelling, new lot will be a single family dwelling (3.306 ac)
DATE: February 10, 2012
REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

Approval Status: Plans submitted February 8, 2012

SEQRA Status: Unlisted

Zone/Utilities: AR/individual well and septic

Map Dated: January 30, 2012

Site Inspection: February 8, 2012

Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012

Consultant/Applicant: Fine and Associates

Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board office, James Osborne, Michael Donnelly, Karen Arent, Ken Wersted, Patrick Hines and Gerald Canfield on February 10, 2012

- 1. The applicant is proposing a two lot residential subdivision of a parcel with an existing two-family home. The new home will be a single-family residence. The parcel is located on Route 300 between the East Rock Cut Road and Rock Cut Road intersections.
- 2. The bulk table will need to be revised to show the proper bulk requirements for twofamily homes in the AR zone. The lot area is required to be 100,000 square feet, which is met. The rear yard setback should be shown as 40 feet.
- 3. Due to the subdivision of the parcel, the two family lot does not meet the required lot width of 200 feet, 186.1 is shown. A variance will be required for this lot.
- 4. The two-family lot is showing a side yard setback violation, even though the 30 foot requirement is met. The setback line should be revised.
- 5. The 10,000 square foot buildable area requirement should be demonstrated on the plans for each lot.
- 6. The location plan should be revised, as it is hard to see the parcel in question.
- 7. A surveyor's seal and signature are required.
- 8. Sight distances should be shown at the driveway locations.

- 9. The two family lot looks to depict another driveway leading to lot 3-1-148. Is there a common driveway easement and maintenance agreement in place? The lot is also owned by Mr. Callas but if it is sold an agreement must be in place.
- 10. NYS DOT Approval will be required for the new driveway location.
- 11. The plans will need to be referred to the OCPD for their review since the parcel is on a State Highway.
- 12. The applicant will need to identify where they obtained information on threatened and endangered species in the EAF.

The above comments represent my professional opinion and judgment, but may not necessarily, in all cases, reflect the opinion of the Planning Board. Please revise your plans to reflect these comments with the understanding that further changes may be required. In all cases the requirements of the Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations shall be adhered to by the applicant and shall be shown on the plans. Where variances to the Zoning Law are required or where waivers from the Subdivision Regulations are needed, specific requests shall be made to the Planning Board for a waiver or for referral to the ZBA. These comments are prepared based on current zoning and subdivision regulation requirements. Any change in those regulations prior to final approval of these plans could require revisions beyond the scope of my existing comments.

#### **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

#### MUNICIPALITY: TOWN OF NEWBURGH

TOWN PROJECT NO. 2006-19

PROJECT NAME: Secure Property Management (Orchard Properties, Inc.) LOCATION: Lakeside Road, north of Jenny Lane (28-1-18.2) TYPE OF PROJECT: 3 lot residential subdivision (formerly 6 lots) DATE: February 10, 2012 REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

#### PROJECT SUMMARY:

Approval Status: Submitted March 9, 2006, Preliminary Approval granted June 21, 2007 SEQRA Status: Unlisted, PB lead agency as of April 6, 2006, negative declaration issued March 29, 2007

Zone/Utilities: R-1/municipal water and sewer for lots 1 and 2, well and septic for lot 3 Map Dated: January 28, 2012

Site Inspection: February 8, 2012

Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012

Consultant/Applicant: Doce Associates

Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board Office, James Osborne, Gerald Canfield, Michael Donnelly, Patrick Hines, Karen Arent and Ken Wersted on February 10, 2012

#### COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. The applicant has revised the plans to show a 3 lot residential subdivision instead of the 6 lot subdivision originally proposed. The main factor in making this change is the cost of the private road construction. The new lots meet all bulk table requirements and will not require any variances at this time.
- 2. The applicant has provided two driveway locations for lot 1, one accessing the common driveway and one directly onto Lakeside Road. Three lots utilizing a common driveway would require a Town Board waiver; the Planning Board is not able to make this determination. The Town of Newburgh Highway Department will need to approve the common driveway location and possibly the singe driveway location.
- 3. The lots must demonstrate the residential lot area requirement; it looks as though there is adequate room on each lot so this should not be an issue.
- 4. All seals and signatures are required, including the surveyor and wetland delineation.
- 5. Approval for the ACOE crossing could be required, depending on the amount of fill the applicant is proposing. This should be labeled on the plans.
- 6. The Orange County Health Approval that was granted for the 6 lot subdivision will not be required because of the reduction in lots.
- 7. The applicant will be looking to obtain outside user status for the sewer connection.
- 8. A common driveway easement and maintenance agreement is required.

- 9. The applicant has indicated they will preserve the stone walls on site to the extent practicable, this should be stated in a note on the plans.
- 10. The Planning Board should discuss holding a new public hearing for the project since it has changed. The environmental impacts are less than the previous 6 lot subdivision due to the reduction in number of lots.

The above comments represent my professional opinion and judgment, but may not necessarily, in all cases, reflect the opinion of the Planning Board. Please revise your plans to reflect these comments with the understanding that further changes may be required. In all cases the requirements of the Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations shall be adhered to by the applicant and shall be shown on the plans. Where variances to the Zoning Law are required or where waivers from the Subdivision Regulations are needed, specific requests shall be made to the Planning Board for waiver or for referral to the ZBA. These comments are prepared based on current zoning and subdivision regulation requirements. Any change in those regulations prior to final approval of these plans could require revisions beyond the scope of my existing comments.



RICHARD D. MCGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA) WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE **33 Airport Center Drive** Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

## **TOWN OF NEWBURGH** PLANNING BOARD **REVIEW COMMENTS**

**PROJECT: PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION:** PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: VINCE DOCE ASSOCIATES **REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:** 

SECURE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT 06-19 SECTION 28, BLOCK 1, LOT 18.2 **10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012** 

- The deep hole test pit information should be provided on the plans. 1.
- Clearly identify the system as a shallow trench system on Sheet 2 of 4. Show limits of fill and 2. expansion area.
- Three houses on a private drive would require a Town Board waiver. 3.
- 4. Show size of wetland fill required.

Respectfully submitted,

McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, P.C.

Patrick J. Hines, Associate



RICHARD D. MCGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA) WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY & NJ) MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE **33** Airport Center Drive Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

## TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD **REVIEW COMMENTS**

**PROJECT: PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION:** PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: TALCOTT ENGINEERING **REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:** 

CARLOS DOMINGUES DUPLEX 12-04 SECTION 39 BLOCK 1 LOT 14.0 **10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012** 

- The applicants representatives are requested to address whether there is an easement for 1. the pipe shown crossing New Road through this parcel and adjoining property and back into the subject parcel.
- Reduced plans are not to scale, show 35 foot separation distance between pipe and 2. proposed septic system.
- It is unclear why a cut area is depicted on the plans over the subsurface sanitary sewer 3. disposal areas.
- Septic design notes identify 4 bedrooms while infiltrator system notes identify 6 bedrooms. 4. This should be clarified.

Respectfully submitted,

McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, P.C.

Patrick J. Hines Associate

#### MUNICIPALITY: Town of Newburgh

## **TOWN PROJECT NUMBER: 12-04**

PROJECT NAME: Carlos Dominguez Duplex
LOCATION: New Road (39-1-14.0)
TYPE OF PROJECT: Site plan for two-family home (1.6 ac)
DATE: February 10, 2012
REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

Approval Status: Plans submitted February 2, 2012

SEQRA Status: Unlisted

Zone/Utilities: R-2/municipal water and individual septic

Map Dated: December 23, 2011

Site Inspection: February 8, 2012

Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012

Consultant/Applicant: Talcott Engineering Design PLLC

Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board office, James Osborne, Michael Donnelly, Karen Arent, Ken Wersted, Patrick Hines and Gerald Canfield on February 10, 2012

- 1. The applicant is proposing two-family home on a vacant parcel on New Road, which requires site plan approval and ARB Approval.
- 2. The applicant provided 11 x 17 plans, which are not to scale. A full sized set of plans should be submitted for review by the Planning Board and its consultants.
- 3. The bulk table shows an existing non-conforming lot width requirement. The parcel is not being subdivided so no variance is required.
- 4. Since the plans are small, I cannot see if the buildable area requirement is demonstrated on the plans.
- 5. The adjoining land owners should be labeled on the plans.
- 6. I have no comments on the ARB drawings at this time.



RICHARD D. McGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA) WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY & NJ) MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

#### MAIN OFFICE 33 Airport Center Drive Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

## TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD REVIEW COMMENTS

PROJECT PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION: PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:

ROUTE 300 CENTER 12-05 SECTION 60, BLOCK 3, LOTS 40,41.22 LANGAN ENGINEERS 10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012

- 1. Site must comply with NYSDEC regulations for redevelopment of the former truck terminal with regard to stormwater management. In addition, NYSDEC "hot spots" regulations will pertain to the fueling aisle portion of the site.
- 2. NYSDOT approval for Highway access is required.
- 3. A demolition permit will be required for removal of all structures from the site.
- 4. Hydraulic loading from the site should be calculated with regard to the need for a City of Newburgh sewer flow acceptance letter. Existing and proposed hydraulic calculation should be provided for Town of Newburgh Engineering Department review.
- 5. Future plans should identify site development details, utilities, soil erosion and sediment control, stormwater management details and information required for submission of a site plan to the Town of Newburgh.

Respectfully submitted,

*McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, P.C.* 

Patrick J. Hines Associate

<u>REGIONAL OFFICES</u>
 111 Wheatfield Drive
 Milford, Pennsylvania
 18337
 570-296-2765
 540 Broadway
 Monticello, New York
 12701
 845-794-3399

#### **MUNICIPALITY:** Town of Newburgh

## **TOWN PROJECT NUMBER: 12-05**

PROJECT NAME: Route 300 Center
LOCATION: Route 300 next to Newburgh Mall (60-3-40.0)
TYPE OF PROJECT: Site plan for gas station, tire center and bank (3.07 ac)
DATE: February 10, 2012
REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

Approval Status: Plans submitted February 8, 2012 SEQRA Status: Unlisted Zone/Utilities: IB/municipal water and sewer Map Dated: February 1, 2012 Site Inspection: February 8, 2012 Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012 Consultant/Applicant: Langan Engineering Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board office, James Osborne, Michael Donnelly, Karen Arent, Ken Wersted, Patrick Hines and Gerald Canfield on February 10, 2012

- 1. The applicant is proposing a 10 position fueling facility with a 116 SF attendant kiosk, a 5,600 SF tire service center and a 6,950 SF credit union/bank with two drive thru lanes. The uses are allowable in the IB zone and the site as shown would not require variances.
- 2. The existing truck terminal site has been vacant for many years and this will be an upgrade for Route 300 both aesthetically and commercially. The Route 300 corridor has many business of this type and this development will fit in with the surrounding community character.
- 3. The applicant indicated in the EAF that a variance would be necessary; I am assuming this will be for the amount of allowable signage on site. A detailed signage chart should be submitted for the Planning Board so they know what referral they are making to the ZBA.
- 4. The drive thru lanes for the bank are somewhat awkward, there should be adequate signage leading customers to the correct location to enter the drive thru so that they do not go the wrong way into the lanes. Signage will also be required for the exit of the gas station so that no customers try to turn in the lane straight from Route 300.

- 5. There are ACOE wetlands in the back of the site which will need to be flagged and verified by the ACOE to ensure there is no impact. The applicant is showing a 100 foot wetland buffer, but that would only apply if they were DEC wetlands.
- 6. The handicap ramp for the tire center should be moved closer to the handicap spaces.
- 7. The plans are currently conceptual in nature, and the applicant will be providing fully engineered site plan sheets, a landscaping plan, a lighting plan and all utility connections in the next submission.
- 8. The applicant should elaborate on threatened and endangered species in the EAF; just saying the site is already developed will not be satisfactory for approval.
- 9. Can the applicant explain the rumble strips between the two buildings, what purpose they serve and why it is limited to that specific location on the site plan?
- 10. A demolition permit will be required for the existing buildings.
- 11. The applicant should submit architectural drawings for the Planning Board's review, including the gas station canopy and attendant kiosk.
- 12. All seals and signatures will be required when the engineered plans are submitted.
- 13. If the Planning Board feels as though the plans are ready conceptually, the plans can to be forwarded to the Orange County Planning Department, NYS DOT, ACOE and DEC.

The above comments represent my professional opinion and judgment, but may not necessarily, in all cases, reflect the opinion of the Planning Board. Please revise your plans to reflect these comments with the understanding that further changes may be required. In all cases the requirements of the Zoning Law and Subdivision Regulations shall be adhered to by the applicant and shall be shown on the plans. Where variances to the Zoning Law are required or where waivers from the Subdivision Regulations are needed, specific requests shall be made to the Planning Board for a waiver or for referral to the ZBA. These comments are prepared based on current zoning and subdivision regulation requirements. Any change in those regulations prior to final approval of these plans could require revisions beyond the scope of my existing comments.



RICHARD D. MCGOEY, P.E. (NY & PA) WILLIAM J. HAUSER, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) MARK J. EDSALL, P.E. (NY, NJ & PA) JAMES M. FARR, P.E. (NY & PA)

MAIN OFFICE 33 Airport Center Drive Suite 202 New Windsor, New York 12553

(845) 567-3100 fax: (845) 567-3232 e-mail: mheny@mhepc.com

## TOWN OF NEWBURGH **PLANNING BOARD REVIEW COMMENTS**

**PROJECT: PROJECT NO.: PROJECT LOCATION:** PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: MASER CONSULTING **REVIEW DATE: MEETING DATE:** 

ALL GRANITE AND MARBLE 11-14 SECTION 97, BLOCK 1, LOT 20.2 **10 FEBRUARY 2012 16 FEBRUARY 2012** 

- The applicant's representatives have addressed our previous comments regarding the subject 1. site modifications including adding permanent curbing at the overflow parking area have been instituted:
- 2. This office has reviewed a revised SWPPP with regard to the subject project and takes no exception to the stormwater plan as submitted. The plan identifies that site runoff is less than 5% of total water shed peak.
- 3. Sewer flow acceptance letter has been received.
- 4. Water service issues with the adjoining property owner are outstanding and must be addressed prior to stamping of plans.

Respectfully submitted,

McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers. P.C.

Patrick J. Hines, Associate

**REGIONAL OFFICES** 111 Wheatfield Drive • Milford, Pennsylvania 18337 • 570-296-2765 • • 540 Broadway • Monticello, New York 12701 • 845-794-3399 •

# MUNICIPALITY: Town of Newburgh

## **TOWN PROJECT NUMBER: 11-14**

PROJECT NAME: All Granite and Marble Corp. LOCATION: Northern Side of Brookside Farm Road (97-1-20.2) TYPE OF PROJECT: 39,133 sq. ft. commercial site plan (3.57 ac) DATE: February 10, 2012 **REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks** 

## **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

Approval Status: Plans submitted July 1, 2011, ARB Approval granted December 15, 2012 SEQRA Status: Unlisted, Negative Declaration issued December 15, 2011 Zone/Utilities: IB/municipal water and sewer Map Dated: January 27, 2012 Site Inspection: July 7, 2011 Planning Board Agenda: February 16, 2012 Consultant/Applicant: Maser Consulting Copies have been sent to: John P. Ewasutyn at the Planning Board office, James Osborne, Michael Donnelly, Karen Arent, Ken Wersted, Patrick Hines and Gerald Canfield on February

- 1. The applicant has addressed my previous comments in the site plan submission.
- 2. The applicant is showing a freestanding sign near the parking lot entrance. The sign is six feet high and eighteen feet long. The applicant is under the allowable amount of signage for the site and no variance would be required.
- 3. City of Newburgh Approval for sewer flow acceptance has been granted on December 15, 2012. The applicant indicated they are working with Pepsi for the water main connection.
- 4. The Orange County Planning Department issued a Local Determination on January 11, ١