

## Paul S McCreary

---

**From:** Paul S McCreary [pmccreary@morrisingengineers.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2006 5:16 PM  
**To:** 'mmarzocchi@Widewaters.com'; 'sboisvert@BERGMANNPC.com'  
**Subject:** Widewaters Retail Development Application in the Town of Greenport, NY

Gentlemen:

The following are some initial comments to the revised plans given me at the special meeting of the Greenport Planning Board. I am providing these to you prior to issuing a letter to the Planning Board. As you will see there will likely be more comments to follow. We will get those to you ASAP.

Please feel free to call with any questions you have. It may be best if Steve, Ilie and myself met to discuss/go over these comments and other small items on the plans.

Regards,  
Paul McCreary

### **MORRIS ASSOCIATES**

ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS. P.L.L.C.  
389 Fairview Avenue Hudson, NY 12534  
Ph.: (518) 828-2300 Fx.: (518) 828-3963

#### **I. General**

- 1) Per a previous recommendation, the Applicant has shown truck routes on the Site Plans. The truck routes identified are the internal roadways that access U.S. 9 at the proposed traffic signals and head toward the Proposed Retail A, B & C buildings. There is no reason to believe, and it is highly unlikely, that the remaining retail spaces will not have deliveries made by tractor-trailer trucks. We recommend that those routes be identified and sufficient room/space and appropriate curb radii be created to allow ease of access by these large vehicles without hindering other traffic movements/flow. This may result in significant revisions of parking areas and internal thoroughfare intersections.
- 2) Per a previous recommendation, the Applicant has shown curb/curve radii on the Site Plans. There are still areas where maneuvering will be tight for both trucks (tractor-trailers) and passenger style vehicles. Examples we recommend being modified include:
  - a. Internal thoroughfare between the Retail A and Retail B lots to be 36 feet wide to allow for large truck movements as in other internal thoroughfare locations.
  - b. At the internal thoroughfare intersection located just west of the Retail A and Retail B parking areas, we recommend that the radii of the southeastern curb be 65 feet to accommodate a right turn by a tractor-trailer truck. This intersection should also have traffic control.
  - c. The space allowed at the southwestern corner of the Retail C building for trucks to make the movement from the truck route (along the south side of the Retail C parking area) to rear of that building does not seem sufficient, plus, no traffic control is shown at that intersection. We recommend that the Applicant either demonstrate that trucks can make this maneuver easily and without interference or modify the alignment to do so. We also recommend that all intersections have traffic control shown.
- 3) Per a previous recommendation, the Applicant has shown curb/curve radii on the Site Plans, truck routes and the areas of different pavement thickness (Standard Duty and Heavy Duty).
- 4) The plans show two pylon signs near US 9. There are no details on the signs given. Also, on pylon sign is shown in a proposed detention basin. We recommend that the sign in the detention basin be

relocated and that details of the sign be provided for review by the GPB.

- 5) While some internal thoroughfare intersections have been improved for potential problematic and conflict movements, others have not. We recommend the Applicant make improvements in the following areas:
  - a. The westernmost internal intersection on the "right-in-right-out" roadway has vehicle conflict points very close to the intersection. We recommend the Applicant move all parking lot ingress/egress points away from that intersection.
  - b. The westernmost internal intersection on the southern internal thoroughfare has a vehicle conflict point just to the south of the intersection. We recommend the Applicant move all parking lot ingress/egress points away from that intersection.
  - c. The central internal intersection on the southern internal thoroughfare has a vehicle conflict point just to the south of the intersection. We recommend the Applicant move the parking lot ingress/egress point away from that intersection.
- 6) There are at least eight (8) instances where retaining walls are being proposed along the internal thoroughfares. While a cross section of the proposed wall has been given, there are no details noting the relationship of guiderailing, the wall and the vehicular travel lanes at these locations. The wall type proposed is not one that will allow the placement of a vehicular guiderail atop it without a dramatic revision to the wall, therefore, the guiderail must be placed between the wall and the travel lane to account for deflection of the guiderail during an impact and the ability for the wall to resist that impact load. We recommend that the Applicant show how this will work or be accounted for.
- 7) The heavy-duty pavement shows binder and top paving courses where the NYSDOT would stipulate base, binder and top. The base, binder & top combination would result in a total asphalt pavement thickness of 5.5 inches. The proposed detail would only provide a 5-inch total asphalt pavement thickness. We recommend this be revised or the Applicant demonstrates the ability for this pavement to perform well.
- 8) While the Applicant has noted that they as yet do not know specifically what retail or restaurant enterprises will be occupying the noted buildings we still believe that some representation can occur for most, if not all, of the buildings proposed. Therefore, we again note that per Greenport Code, specifically § 101-3 A, Site Plan Checklist; we recommend the following be added to the plans:
  - a. proposed use and height of all buildings;
  - b. provision for pedestrian access;
  - c. location of outdoor storage, equipment and materials;
  - d. the location, design and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements including drains, culverts, retaining walls, and fences;
  - e. the location of fire and other emergency zones, including the location of nearest water supply (hydrants) for fire emergencies;
  - f. the location, design and construction materials for all energy distribution facilities, including gas, electric and solar energy; and,
  - g. the location and design of outdoor lighting facilities, including data regarding lighting levels and heights.
- 9) The detention ponds, part of the overall stormwater pollution prevention plan, have been modified to show an access roadway, for maintenance, and vegetative planting in the form of seeding. Per our previous comment, we recommend the proposed ponds have fencing that will prevent shoppers, or other wanderers, from entering the pond and to protect them from blown in litter. Additionally, the plans should indicate the composition of the roadway/driveway that will allow access to the ponds for maintenance.
- 10) The Applicant has indicated some protection notations for the federally regulated wetlands on the site. We recommend that information regarding these wetlands be indicated on the subdivision plan.
- 11) The Applicant has shown utility easements on the submitted plan set. We recommend that all

easements be shown on the subdivision the subdivision plans. Additionally, all other restrictions, covenants, etc. shall be noted/indicated on the subdivision plans.

- 12) While the Applicant has noted that they, as yet, do not know specifically what retail or restaurant enterprises will be occupying the noted buildings we still believe that some representation can occur for most, if not all, of the signs proposed. We recommend that all proposed signs/signage (including store signs, directory signs and way finding signs) be shown on the plans and the details that make up their construction, their size, the message, and any lighting or landscaping proposed. This recommendation is made as we expect that there may/are/will be conditions placed on signs by the Applicant. It is also possible the GPB may wish to impose conditions.
- 13) There are no light standards shown on the plans. We recommend the Applicant submit this information for review and comment.

## II. **Parking Lots**

- 1) Parking stalls are now dimensioned as 10 feet, 9.5 feet and 9 feet in width. The parking lot for the Retail A building is the only one noting 9.5 foot wide parking (the 10 foot wide spots are for contractor parking at the Retail B lot). As the Retail B building is to be some type of home improvement store, we understand having some parking larger contractor vehicles. The 9.5 foot wide parking spots is where our confusion comes from. We recommend that the Applicant explain this. It would seem much better to provide consistency in bay width throughout the complex. Additionally, going to a more standard 9 foot wide parking spot width will reduce the overall asphalt placement, reduce stormwater runoff and create more green area.
- 2) The Applicant has indicated that employee parking will be provided within the general parking lots. We recommend that the Applicant give the GPB an indication of how many employee vehicles will be parked for each retail/restaurant/business space.

## III. **Sewer & Water**

Morris Associates will meet with the Water and Sewer Superintendent to discuss the revisions made to-date and send comments to the GPB as soon as is possible.

## IV. **Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)**

Morris Associates will review and have comments by Wednesday of this week.

## V. **Grading Plans**

- 1) The fill that occurs to the north of the Retail B space is directed toward, and in some places very close to, a federally regulated wetland. The Applicant has demonstrated how this wetland will be protected during construction, however, has not proposed any protective measures post construction. Our experience reveals that there is a very high likelihood of litter refuse and other human related throw-aways that result at /in shopping areas. We expect that the same will occur here. Our original question and recommendation meant to imply more than just protection during construction. To keep these wetlands thriving, some maintenance may be required, junk in the wetlands would need removal from time to time and other protections like no lawn/grass fertilizer or weed killer should be applied to areas that drain directly into the wetlands. What ever is proposed to protect these areas evidence should be provided that the Army Corps of Engineers takes no exception to this action.

## VI. **Landscaping**

- 1) Per a previous recommendation, the Applicant has shown revised landscaping around the stormwater management ponds. What they have shown is only seeding. There are still areas where maneuvering

will be tight for both trucks (tractor-trailers) and passenger style vehicles. Examples we recommend being modified include:

The Applicant has provided landscaping along US 9. The designation for those added plantings are not included in the supplied plant list (PSE, PS and NS). We recommend these plant types be included in the list for review.