

Members Present:

Peter Klose (Chairman)
Daniel Jean-Gilles
Alan Englander
Peter Voletsky
Seth Kestenbaum-Alternate Member
Donald Wilen-Alternate

Also Present:

Walter Sevastian
Don Yacopino, Building Inspector
Bob Galvin—Village Planner

Absent: Glenn Keene.

Other Business: Motion to approve the August 3, 2015 Minutes-- second by Voletsky-- Vote 5-0 approved.

1. 263 Main Street. Continuation of Site Plan application for demolition of existing building and construction of three story multi-family dwelling. Proposal is to demolish single story structure and construct a three story multifamily apartment building with parking below ground. Property is in both the DMU (Main Street) and TFR (Depew Avenue) zoning districts, with the rear of the building encroaching into the TFR 25'+/-. An area variance will be required from Article II VON 360-2.2C which states: "Lots in two or more districts. Where a single lot is divided by one or more district boundary lines, the regulations for the less restrictive portion of such lots shall not extend into the more restricted portion of the lot."

An area variance will be required from Article IV VON§360-4.3 Dimensional Standards Table 4-1, footnotes (g) and (k) which requires a 15' rear yard building setback from an adjacent residential zone (TFR). GRANTED With a density of 50 units per acre and a ½ acre parcel of land 25 Dwelling Units are permitted by right. The applicant proposes to implement green infrastructure incentives which will bring the number of permitted DU's to the requested 33.

PARKING Per Article IV VON§360-4.5B (3), the current use of a 5,040 sf retail space requires 13 parking spaces (5,040/400 =13). With a change of use the zoning code requires off street parking to be met by calculating the difference of parking requirements between previous and new use. In this case, proposed use requires 43 spaces with 41 being provided. Previous retail use required 13 spaces (43-13=30) required spaces with 41 provided. Parking requirements are deemed to be met.

Applicant returns with design changes as discussed at recent workshop meeting with ARB.

ARB approved application on March 18, 2015 with conditions agreed to by applicant. They offered a recommendation to Planning Board regarding front yard plantings. Variances granted by ZBA on April 27, 2015.

Revised site plan included, addressing Village Engineer's comments.

Lighting and planting plans included.

Hydraulic Analysis and Storm Water Design Calculations included. Four seepage pits to be installed.

Nyack Ambulance Corp President had requested, of the applicant, an elevator car to accommodate a stretcher size of 24" x 84", which would be required for a building four stories or more in height. The applicant's architect, through correspondence, has agreed to comply with this request.

SEQRA - & LWRP - completed. SEQRA – The Planning Board at their August 31st meeting made a Neg. Dec on the EAF for this project and closed out SEQRA. The Board also made a positive consistency determination for this project. The Board at their August 31st meeting also authorized the preparation of a Draft Resolution for this application to be reviewed and voted on at their September 14th meeting.

Applicant-- Village Planner

Public Comment - NONE

Board-- RESOLUTION Adopted September 14, 2015

RE: Nyack Point, 263 Main Street – Resolution of Site Plan Approval

After due discussion and deliberation, on motion by Klose, seconded by Voletsky, motion and carried, the following resolution was adopted as set forth in the attached Resolution to permit the site plan application was submitted to the Planning Board of the Village of Nyack (“Planning Board”) by the Rockland Housing Action Coalition, Inc. (“the “Applicant”), (all references to which shall include and be binding upon the Applicant’s successors and/or assigns), to demolish the existing structure and construct a three-story multi-family residence consisting of 33 residential rental units including nine efficiencies, 12 one-bedroom and 12 two-bedroom units. The Applicant will set aside 8 units for individuals with disabilities and provide supportive services. There are 41 parking spaces being provided with 33 in a garage under the building and 8 spaces outside at the rear of the site. A playground will be provided at the rear of the building which will be fenced in with a gate. The development is being funded through 9% tax credits from the New York State Housing Trust Fund and is completely affordable being targeted for households at 30% - 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for Rockland County. The one-story building on the property was formerly occupied by a fabric store (“Project”). The Project is being constructed on a single lot consisting of 0.493 acres, and identified on the tax maps of the Town of Orangetown as Section 66.44, Block 2, Lot 6; and

WHEREAS The full text of the Board’s action and Resolution has been filed by separate cover, a copy of which was filed with the Clerk during the week of September 14th.

- 2. 176 North Franklin Street. Rocco Perini. Application for removal of twelve trees. Arborist’s letter included. Property is in TFR zoning district. Application has been referred to Nyack tree commission.**

Village Tree Committee-- Memo dated 9/8/2015-- 176 N. Franklin Street Report by Edward Thibert

1. *Silver Maple 18” dbh. The desire for more sun on a lawn is not one of the exceptions provided in the code. Also since the tree is on the north side, it does not cast much shade on the lawn. I would not recommend removing the tree.*
2. *20” White Ash 20” dbh. Based on the report of significant dieback (which I noted also) due to borers it seems prudent to remove the tree. Board Concurred with Applicant and by vote of 5-0 Applicant may obtain permit to remove this particular tree.*
3. *Tulip tree 24” dbh The report says that this tree has root damage, and it may, but I*

didn't note this. This tree does have die back, and I noted significant carpenter ant damage, which was not in the report for this tree (but rather for tree #4). The dieback and the carpenter ants could be a sign of significant rot. (Carpenter ants don't eat the wood. They get into wood that is rotting and damp.) However, if this were my tree and I wanted to keep it, I would ask a qualified arborist to tell me what else he or she might do to further evaluate its condition and options for treatment before I decided on taking it down.

4. *White Ash Tree 18" dbh. I did not see the evidence of the carpenter ants. That's not to say there was no evidence, but it was not obvious the way it was on the tulip tree. The report notes that there is evidence of borers but does not note what kind. It does not present options for treatment. According to Andy Hillman Ash trees are susceptible to a lot of pests and diseases, and the tree does have die back, so it seems prudent to remove the tree. Board concurred with applicant and tree committee and recommended the removal of this tree by vote of 5-0.*
- 5-7. *Trees in the backyard. The report does not comment on tree condition. It just notes that the owner would like to remove them in order to regrade. The Village of Nyack tree ordinance protects trees on private property, recognizing that trees and the benefits they provide are an important community resource. The site plan approval process and the tree ordinance are intended to provide protection to this natural resource by encouraging an approach to landscape design that maximizes the healthy trees among other best management practices. The application for the removal of six 12" diameter healthy trees may not be consistent with these goals. I would encourage the property owner to consider a different approach to the landscaping. However, if grading of the yard requires the removal of these trees, the applicant should be required to plant replacements elsewhere on the property or make a payment to be used for planting the replacement trees elsewhere nearby on Village property.*
10. *Two 18" Maple trees. I could not find these trees.*

General Notes: *The map accompanying the report is marked with Xs to show tree locations in the front. Five trees are shown on the map, but the report includes observations on twelve trees. The report refers to a Silver Maple on the left of the property. The Silver Maple tree is on the north. Other trees that are referred to as on the left are on the east. Two trees (#10: Two Norway maples) listed as in the front on the left were not marked on map, and I did not see them.*

The arborist's report does not make recommendations about treatments or removals. It simply lists observations about tree condition and, in the case of healthy trees, reasons that the owner would like to have the trees removed.

A standard format for submissions should be used to ensure that those required to review the application have accurate and detailed information. The Tree Committee can draft this. The detail should show alternative approaches and rationale for recommendations. For example, in the case of #2, since there is significant dieback due to borers knowing the type of borer is not necessary for a decision about removal. However, the Village could require more specific detail in these reports about the types of pests present to help in determining the best course of action. For example, if Emerald Ash borer is found on a

Nyack Planning Board-- September 14, 2015

healthy ash tree, treatment of the tree rather than removal would be recommended. Also, trees should be identified by species consistently, not just by genus since that can be relevant. The Tree Committee can work on developing a better format.

The Tree Committee recommends that the Village require that the evaluations be conducted by qualified arborists without a business interest in removals.

The Tree Committee can provide a list of recommended trees for planting in the community within a short time. Our inventory shows planting sites. We also recommend that the Village set up a Tree Fund. I will send a memo about this to the Village Board.

SEQRA - & LWRP -- This is a Type II action under DEC 617.5 (c) (6) "maintenance of existing landscaping or natural growth." LWRP consistency is not reviewed for Type II actions.

Applicant-- Homeowner appeared at the meeting and was cooperative and collaborative. Chairman Klose recommended that he meet with Marcy Denker and discuss each and every tree, tree by tree, impressed upon him the need to maintain trees that preserve storm water runoff and to work with a landscape plan. Applicant will return to the board next time with a detailed landscape plan after meeting with the Tree committee.

Public Comment - Richard Kavesh was part of the gathered constituency, and he had no objections to the plan to work with a licensed arborist to remove various trees in the rear yard.

To The Planning Board; I am writing in regards to an application submitted by Rocco Perino for permission to remove 12 trees from his property at 167 North Franklin Street. I hope the town will carefully consider and deny their request to cut down the four Tulip trees that line Franklin Street. These four giant Liriodendron Tulipifera (Tulip trees), are over 100 feet tall and might well be 150 years or older. Their lush canopy gives North Franklin Street, between 5th and 6th, it's distinctive, old world character. Native to North America, the Tulip trees are the tallest eastern hardwood specimen. Tulip trees are prized for beauty as well as their resistance to insect and disease damage. The removal of these beautiful trees will certainly effect our property value, as well as the other houses on the street. I am equally concerned with the environmental repercussions of removing these trees. We live directly east and downhill of the Perino's house. During severe rain storms, water already cascades down our driveway. Many years ago, the previous owners of 167 North Franklin Street (Ed and Maguy Mathez) put an addition on the house and dug up the lawn for a new foundation. Even with bales of hay along Franklin Street, excess runoff poured down into our property during this time. We know the roots of trees absorb water and help mitigate floods. Without the massive roots of these four Tulip Trees absorbing the excess water from severe rain storms, I am afraid we are at risk for floods. And finally, with global warming making our summers longer and hotter, these gentle giants keep all the neighboring houses significantly cooler during these sweltering months. In conclusion, I urge both the Planning Board and the Perino family to reconsider the effect the removal of these trees will have on our street and community. Perhaps the trees can be pruned to avoid such a drastic measure as removing the oldest members of our neighborhood. **Lisa Levart 187 North Franklin Street Nyack, NY**

Board-- Member Englander suggested, that in addition to the Village Tree Committee Report, the need to be aware of the potential stormwater management issues resulting from the removal of not only significant trees, but a group of smaller trees on a property such as this that is receiving runoff from the neighboring locations to the West. RESOLUTION-- none-- public hearing was held open.

3. 14 High Avenue. Application to remove three trees. Arborist's letter included. Property is in TFR zoning District. Application has been referred to Nyack tree commission.

Building Inspector-and Tree Committee- 14 High Avenue Report from Timberline Tree & Landscape I walked by the house. The trees are in the back yard. The elm is clearly hanging over the roof, and all of the trees are very tall. Once again, alternative approaches to removal are not discussed. And again, it would be better to have a consulting arborist without an interest in tree removals do the assessment.

SEQRA - & LWRP - This is a Type II action under DEC 617.5 (c) (6) "maintenance of existing landscaping or natural growth." LWRP consistency is not reviewed for Type II actions.

Applicant-- Applicant-- concerned about the diseased and dangerous trees overhanging various residential buildings. Board concurred.

BOARD-- Motion by Klose to close the public hearing. Second by Jean Gilles -- -- Vote 5-0 to close.

Klose moves to accept application to remove the following trees subject to the applicant planting appropriate foliage and landscaping to ameliorate any storm water runoff caused by the removal of old growth trees. Englander seconds and vote-- 4-0-1 to approve with Voletsky abstaining.

4. 202 High Avenue. Jessie and Brett Brigham. Site Plan application for exterior alterations and rear yard deck and request for recommendation for required variances. Property is in TFR zoning district. Chairman Klose Recuses. Seth Kestenbaum sitting in as 5th member for this application

Building Inspector Per Article I VON§ 360-1.9E a variance will be required for the following pre existing nonconforming Dimensional Standards: Minimum lot area of 4799 sq. ft. where 5000 sq. ft. is required; Lot width of 40 ft. where 50 ft. is required; Minimum front yard of 12.6 ft. where 24 ft. is required and minimum side yard of 1.4 ft. where 5 ft. is required. Applicant has previously informally met with ARB and will incorporate suggested changes for formal ARB meeting of 9/16/2015.

SEQRA – This is a Type II action under NYSDEC 617.5 (c) (10) “construction, expansion or placement of minor accessory/appurtenant residential structures, including garages, carports, patios, decks, swimming pools, tennis courts, satellite dishes, fences, barns, storage sheds or other buildings not changing land use or density;” LWRP Consistency is not reviewed under the Nyack Code for Type II actions (they are automatically considered to be consistent.

Applicant-- All work to remain in existing footprint, will not be increasing the non-conformities

Board-- Chairman Klose recuses from the discussion and vote taking, will continue to do the minutes.

The applicant discussed the renovation project and responded to questions from Board members

indicating that there would be no change in the house footprint height or width of the structure, other than the small deck in the rear. That none of the work would create an increase in non-permeable surfaces and that any exterior lighting would be down facing. It was noted that the house as built had some limited pre-existing non-conformities and that no significant increases are being sought.

Board Actions and Resolutions: These are pre-existing non-conformities of the property and no major increase is sought.

Motion to close the public hearing by Voletsky, seconded by Jean-Gilles, Vote of 5-0 (Klose recusing) to co close.

Variances-- RESOLUTION By motion of Voletsky and seconded by Jean Gilles to issue a positive recommendation that the requested variances and planned improvements appear to be solely due to the fact that this home was not renovated or changed since long before the Village Code went into existence and the Planning Board would respectfully make a positive recommendation to the ZBA with respect to the Per Article I VON§ 360-1.9E a variance will be required for the following pre existing nonconforming Dimensional Standards: Minimum lot area of 4799 sq. ft. where 5000 sq. ft. is required; Lot width of 40 ft. where 50 ft. is required; Minimum front yard of 12.6 ft. where 24 ft. is required and minimum side yard of 1.4 ft. where 5 ft. is required on the ground that there is no significant increase of the alleged non-conformities and the neighborhood benefit to permit the renovation and refurbishment of this project will improve the neighborhood. . **Vote: 5 – 0 in favor of the requested variances.**

SITE PLAN--Member Voletsky moves, and Englander seconds the motion to accept the Site Plan application Plans as submitted, subject to reasonable conditions imposed by the ARB and the ZBA, all exterior light down facing, Vote of 5-0 to grant the site plan application.

5. **2-6 North Midland Avenue. Barry Terach for Joseph Lagana. Site Plan application to demolish existing structure and construction of a three story multi family apartment building. Property is in DMU zoning district. Architectural Review Board offered a positive recommendation for demolition at 12/17/2014 meeting.**

Member Englander recuses himself from this application.

Building Inspector --*Tax maps and prior Site plan drawings indicate this to be a two parcel property. A subdivision and special permit will be required to merge properties. a Site plan of existing conditions should be provided. Density calculations indicate 41 dwelling units are permitted @ 50 units per acre. With a 10% increase in density for Affordable Housing (+4), a 10% increase for Brownfield Cleanup (=4) and a 10% increase for exceeding NYS Energy Code requirements (+4), 53 Dwelling units would be permitted. Applicant must provide details outlining how requirements will be met for the requested additional dwelling units. Proposal is for 48 DU's.*

PARKING

The following Parking requirements have been calculated for 48 Dwelling Units:

26 1 bedroom units @ 1.25 spaces per DU=36.25 spaces required.

19 2 bedroom units @ 1.70 spaces per DU=32.3 spaces required.

68.55=69 spaces required.

67 off street parking spaces are being provided.

Per Article IV VON§360-4.5B (3), the previous use of an 8, 00 sf retail space would have required 20 parking spaces (8,000/400 =20). With a change of use the zoning code requires off street parking to be met by calculating the difference of parking requirements between previous and new use. In this case, proposed use requires 69 spaces, previous retail use required 20 spaces.69-20=49 required spaces with 67 provided. Parking requirements are deemed to be met.

Building Height

Proposal presents as a 4 Story building where 3 Stories are permitted which would require an area variance. Applicant is unable to lower ground floor because of potential flooding issues caused by Nyack Brook as it traverses his property. An area variance will be required from Article IV VON§360-4.3 Dimensional Standards Table 4-1 for a four story building where three stories are permitted.

BASEMENT

That portion of a building that is partly below grade. A basement shall be considered as a story for purposes of height measurement where the finished floor above the basement is:

- A. More than six feet above the grade plane;*
- B. More than six feet above the finished ground level for 50% or more of the total building perimeter; or*
- C. More than 12 feet above the finished ground level at any point.*

STORY

That portion of a building between the surface of any floor and the surface of the floor above it or, if there is no floor above it, then the space between the floor and ceiling next above it. A basement shall be counted as a story for purposes of height measurement if the floor-to-ceiling height is more than six feet above the grade plane, more than six feet above the finished ground level for 50% or more of the total building perimeter, or more than 12 feet above finished ground level at any point. An area variance will be required from Article IV VON § 360-4.3 Dimensional Standards Table 4-1 for an FAR of 2.4 where 2.0 is permitted.

Proposed action is more than 500 ft. from State Road Rte. 9W. The action does not meet any other GML threshold and therefore it does not need to be referred to Rockland County Planning under GML.

SEQRA – The proposed action is an unlisted action. The Planning Board received the Short Form EAF dated 1/30/15 and declared its intent to be Lead Agency on February 20, 2015. The Board received no objections and assumed lead agency status on March 20, 2015. There was no requirement to refer this application to Rockland County Planning under GML. The Board has received

Nyack Planning Board-- September 14, 2015
the following correspondence related to the application which has been made part of the record. These include:

- Eve Mancuso P.E., Brooker Engineering (Village Engineer), Memorandum: Site Plan Review of Montclare Apartments, Engineering Plans (1/7/15) prepared by Anthony Celantano and Architectural Plans (1/13/15) prepared by Barry Terach, January 27, 2015.
- Blue Shore Engineering, Letter re: Federal Permit Requirements for proposed work at 2 – 6 North Midland Avenue, February 25, 2015.
- NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, SEQRA Review: Montclare Multifamily Building (2 – 6 N. Midland Avenue), Project ID: 5682, March 20, 2015

The Applicant has submitted new site plan and related drawings for review by the Board. This is the first time that the Board has reviewed these revised plans since they have established themselves as Lead Agency for the application.

The Traffic Study prepared by Harry Baker Associates has been submitted to the Planning Board for review at this meeting. Mike Galante of FP Clarke Associates has conducted a preliminary review and will review his analysis with the Board at this meeting.

*Escrow – Applicant has been requested to open an escrow account in the amount of \$9,500 for review of the application. This will include engineering and traffic review. **ARB granted approval, with conditions, of this design at it's March 18, 2015 meeting. Traffic analysis and site plan submitted.***

Traffic Review – Proposed Montclare Residential Development, North Midland Avenue at Main Street, Nyack, New York *As requested, we have conducted a review of the Traffic Impact Study prepared by Harry Baker and Associates, dated July 22, 2015, and the Site Plans prepared by Celentano Engineering, PLLC. The following sections describe the proposed development, a summary of the Applicant's Traffic Report and findings, as well as our comments for consideration by both the Planning Board and the Applicant.*

We assume that the lobby access for residents will be at the corner of the building at Main Street and North Midland Avenue or along Main Street. Clarification is needed.

The Applicant indicates that a development of this type and size will generate 23 and 28 vehicle trip ends during a typical weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours, respectively. This includes a 10 percent credit applied for residents walking to and from the site. However, the Applicant has not applied any credit for residents of this proposed development that may use public transportation.

Review Comments 1. Existing Conditions – Our review of the Applicant's Traffic Report included a site visit and an evaluation of area roadways, traffic control, sidewalk locations and width, locations of crosswalks and general conditions in the designated Study Area. Based on the

Nyack Planning Board-- September 14, 2015

results of the traffic counting program the Applicant identified the peak hour conditions at these intersections to occur during the following time periods: Weekday morning – 7:45 to 8:45 A.M.; and, Weekday afternoon – 5:00 to 6:00 P.M.

As part of the traffic counting program the Applicant identified traffic volumes by movements; however, limited the pedestrian traffic counts to only the intersection of North Midland Avenue/South Midland Avenue at Main Street, which is adjacent to the subject property.

Based on a review of the traffic counts, the Applicant should review the traffic volumes illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, which represent the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours, respectively, and verify that all of the volumes in these figures match the traffic volumes provided in the field sheets included in the Appendix of this report. We have identified at least three locations where the volumes do not match. An example of these differences are listed below:

- At the intersection of North Midland Avenue/High Street, southbound through movements should be 137 vehicles and the right turn movement should be 170 vehicles;*
- At the intersection of North Midland Avenue at Catherine Street, the eastbound left turn movement should be 29 vehicles during the weekday afternoon peak hour; and,*
- At the intersection of North Midland Avenue/Depew Avenue, the southbound through movements should be 31 vehicles during the weekday afternoon peak hour.*

It should also be noted that in the Scope of Services the Applicant's Traffic Consultant should have counted pedestrian activities at each of the intersections.

The Applicant's Traffic Consultant has identified sidewalk widths at specific locations along Main Street and North Midland Avenue. It would have been appropriate to provide this information graphically so that the Planning Board could better understand existing sidewalk locations and conditions surrounding the subject property. Further, the Applicant should have provided pavement widths for many of the roads surrounding the subject area.

Based on our field investigation we have measured sidewalk widths at several locations, pavement width at several locations and identified on-street parking restrictions. In the Overall Study Area, a summary of on-street parking conditions in the Study Area indicate that on-street parking is generally permitted throughout the subject area, with overnight on-street parking restrictions along the westerly side of North Midland Avenue, between High Avenue and Catherine Street and between Main Street and Depew Avenue. Currently, parking is permitted along the site's frontage, except for approaching the intersection of Main Street. Parking is prohibited along the site's frontage generally along the northerly side of Main Street, which includes a bus stop. Parking is restricted on Main Street to the east of the intersection with North Midland Avenue. Near the site parking is not permitted along the south side of Catherine Street, between North Highland Avenue and North Midland Avenue, and along the southerly side of Catherine Street to the east of North Midland Avenue.

2. *Accident History – The Applicant has not provided an evaluation of accident history for the Study Area intersections and roadway lengths. This information should be provided in a table format, with a description and findings based on this analysis. This data should be requested from the Orangetown Police Department for a period beginning January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014.*

3. *2017 No-Build Traffic Volumes – The Applicant indicates that this development would be approved, built and fully occupied by 2017. Therefore, the 2015 baseline traffic volumes have been expanded by a two percent per year growth rate, which should be considered very conservative, plus traffic related to other developments. It is unclear what traffic from other developments were included and where. Therefore, separate figures should illustrate 2017 volumes, with only the growth rate and figures showing other development traffic.*

The Traffic Study should have included traffic related to other developments in the Study Area, which are listed below: 48 South Franklin Street – three dwelling units and approximately 2,000 square feet of office space/community services; 116 units at Waterfront, Main Street at Gedney Street; 263 Main Street – 33 residential dwelling units; Nyack Pavilion residential/commercial development; and, Time (Nylo) Hotel.

To assist the Applicant traffic related to the other developments were calculated for three of the developments listed and summarized in the attached Table 1. The Nyack Pavilion should have been taken into account and obtained from a recent Traffic Study completed by this Traffic Consultant. Based on our evaluation of the other developments the proposed development at 48 South Franklin Street could be included in the growth rate and; therefore, no additional analysis is necessary for this particular development. The other three developments listed above, plus the Nylo Hotel, should be included in the figures illustrated for other development traffic volumes. The sum of the other developments and the 2017 projected traffic volumes should be provided for review.

4. *Site Traffic Generation – The Applicant’s site traffic estimates are based on data provided in “Trip Generation,” 7th Edition. However, the Applicant should review the trip generation rates provided in the 9th Edition (the latest Edition) and determine if a modification to site traffic generation is necessary. The application of a 10 percent reduction due to pedestrians walking to and from the subject property is reasonable for this analysis.*

5. *Site Traffic Distribution and Assignment – The Applicant should provide a figure indicating the proposed site traffic distribution in a percentage format so that the Planning Board and our office can better understand the patterns assumed by the Applicant. Further, the Applicant must include the proposed site access drives in this graphic illustration. This information is not included in any of the figures for site traffic generation or a build condition.*

6. *2017 Build Traffic Volumes – This data may need to be modified for a build condition, as necessary.*

7. *Capacity Analysis Results – The Applicant conducted a traffic analysis based on a SYNCHRO model, which is appropriate for each of the intersections. However, the analysis should be modified so that the North Midland Avenue/Catherine Street intersections are analyzed as two separate off-set, T-type intersections. As analyzed in the Applicant’s report it does not represent actual conditions.*

Based on a detailed review of the SYNCHRO files we offer the following comments for the Applicant to review and modify, as necessary:

- *As noted above, the only intersection to include pedestrian activity was the North Midland Avenue/Main Street intersection. However, the inputs need to be adjusted.*
- *The areas and volumes mentioned in Comment 1 above should be revised in the SYNCHRO analysis.*
- *Heavy vehicle percentages should be revised to represent actual conditions for the weekday afternoon, eastbound approach at the North Midland Avenue/High Street intersection.*
- *The analysis includes a northbound left turn pocket at the intersection of North Highland Avenue at Catherine Street. The southbound left turn pocket needs to represent actual conditions in the field.*

We have other comments specifically to the SYNCHRO analysis, which we will provide to the Applicant separate of this letter.

Based on a review of the analyses to date, we reserve further comment on the analyses and the findings of these analyses to determine potential impact to area roads and the need for mitigation, if any, to after we have reviewed updated files.

8. *Parking Analysis – The Applicant provides a discussion of the parking calculations for the subject property and indicated that 40 spaces were grandfathered based on the previous 8,121 square-foot retail business located on the subject property. A requirement was for one space per 200 gross square feet of floor area, which determined that 40 spaces, were required. In the report it indicates that 30 parking spaces are permitted to be grandfathered and the proposed site requires 69 parking spaces. This is unclear and a further and more detailed explanation is necessary.*
9. *On-Site Parking and Access Considerations – It is assumed that the Site Plan indicates that a one-lane entrance drive will be located from North Midland Avenue near the property’s northerly property line and adjacent to an exit only driveway from a condominium-type development. The Applicant has not provided any analysis of this proposed driveway, which should include vehicular activity at the adjacent existing driveway from the condominium. The Applicant should also indicate the volume of traffic entering the site at this location, by direction and indicate how these two driveways will operate, with very limited separation.*

The site will have an exit drive (again assumed) further to the south and closer to the Main Street intersection. The Applicant should include this proposed driveway in the SYNCHRO model to determine the potential impact to the signalized intersection at Main Street and at the proposed exit drive, entrance drive, the adjacent condominium driveway and the Catherine

Street off-set intersections.

10. *Site Access Considerations – Sight Distance and On-Street Parking Conditions – The Applicant notes that to provide appropriate Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) from the proposed exit drive to the site on-street parking should be prohibited along the site’s frontage to provide 260 feet of ISD. However, the Traffic Study based the requirement for ISD on the posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour. The calculation for determining appropriate ISD for exiting this site drive should be based on the 85th percentile speed of motorists traveling both northbound and southbound on North Midland Avenue along the site’s frontage. Therefore, the Applicant should take samples of speeds of motorists traveling on this roadway during off-peak hours.*

comment-- Klose-- would like site lines and turning radii for intersection at MIDLAND and MAIN

11. *Pedestrian Circulation and Access Considerations – It is assumed that the Applicant proposes an entrance to the new building at the intersection of Main Street and North Midland Avenue. This intersection has crosswalks located at each of the approaches to the signalized intersection, a bus stop located at the site’s frontage on Main Street and NO PARKING permitted generally at this intersection along the site frontage. This traffic signal does not include any pedestrian signals.*

Comment-Klose-- the parking lanes are for 21 feet-- should be larger

The plan indicates that the proposed sidewalks located along the site’s frontage on North Midland Avenue will be four feet wide. The Applicant should consider five feet. Specific treatment of the sidewalk traversing the proposed site driveway should be provided in a detail for the Village to review.

A review of the internal layout of the parking garage indicates that the entrance drive lane will be approximately 12 feet in width and, as noted above, immediately adjacent to an exit drive from the adjacent residential development. The plan shows no separation between the two driveways. It is our opinion that this is too close and the Applicant should; therefore, consider shifting this entrance drive further to the south and away from the exit drive from the adjacent residential development.

The exit drive is proposed to provide a pavement width of approximately 10.5 feet. The layout of the curb cut for both the entrance and exit drives do not show any radii to accommodate turning vehicles. The plan, as shown, is not acceptable and should be modified to accommodate a passenger vehicle and large SUV. The plan shows dumpsters will be located on the exit drive. Therefore, it is necessary for the Applicant to determine how these dumpsters will be loaded onto refuse trucks. For example, will the dumpsters be rolled out to the street or will a small refuse truck travel through the parking garage or back into the exit drive? This option is not acceptable and; therefore, should not be recommended or proposed by the Applicant.

A further review of the internal layout indicates that all of the aisle widths will be typically 21 feet, 4 inches, except for the aisle located parallel to Main Street. The Applicant should indicate if this meets Village standards for aisle widths within parking garages. It will function; however, it is our opinion it will be restrictive for larger vehicles.

It is important to note that the traffic signal located at the intersection of North Midland Avenue at Main Street does not include any pedestrian signals. It is recommended that the Village consider the upgrade of this traffic signal to include traffic signal heads for pedestrian activity.

Findings -- At this time, we cannot provide a findings statement to the Village or the Applicant until we have further information, updated traffic volumes and analyses from the Traffic Consultant. However, a development of this type and size with the estimated increase in traffic of up to 28 vehicle trips during the weekday afternoon peak hour should not have a significant impact on the overall operation of nearby intersections. However, it will be necessary to further investigate pedestrian activity at the signalized intersection of Main Street at North Midland Avenue, along the site frontage and at each of the access drives to and from the site from North Midland Avenue.

Applicant-- Appeared at the meeting without having opportunity to really review, comment or otherwise address the Traffic Report by Village Planning Consultant, it was discussed and agreed that the Building Department would organize a special meeting of the design consultants to discuss the size, bulk and scope of this particular building on this location. Board feels handicapped by the piecemeal submissions of Plans and inability to oversee the entire project.

Public Comment - Three members of the public appeared and agreed that Main Street is very narrow there, and that any more encroachment onto the public way should not be encouraged.

Board-- Members seemed willing to meet with design consultants upon completion of finalized plans, to discuss the site plan issues identified by the traffic consultants.

OTHER BUSINESS-- Motion to adjourn by Chairman Klose, seconded by member Voletsky - passed by a vote of 5-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM