



McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS P.C.

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: VOLKSWAGON OF NEWBURGH**  
**PROJECT NO.: 13-11**  
**PROJECT LOCATION: SECTION 95, BLOCK 1, LOT 53**  
**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE: JOHN MEYERS CONSULTING**  
**REVIEW DATE: 13 AUGUST 2013**  
**MEETING DATE: 15 AUGUST 2013**

1. Our office awaits submission of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in compliance with NYSDEC and Town of Newburgh standards. Reference to enhanced treatment due to the project being located in the Washington Lake Water Shed should be addressed in the SWPPP.
2. Site utilities for the project should be addressed including provisions for potable and fire flow water and disposal of sanitary sewage.
3. Future submission should contain detail site development plans including grading, drainage, erosion and sediment control and details for all site improvements.
4. City of Newburgh Flow Acceptance letter will be required.
5. NYSDOT and County Planning review are required.
6. FAA clearance due to building location near runway glide path should be received.

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 •



**McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS P.C.**

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:** JPJR HOLDINGS  
**PROJECT NO.:** 11-19  
**PROJECT LOCATION:** SECTION 75, BLOCK 1, LOT 36.2  
**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE:** HUDSON LAND DESIGN, PC  
**REVIEW DATE:** 14 AUGUST 2013  
**MEETING DATE:** 15 AUGUST 2013

1. Lot lines have been revised to provide for a drainage district lot. Access strips to the flag lots have been reduced to 25 feet for most of the lots.
2. Storm water management plan and report has been submitted to this office for review.
3. Provisions for allowing current ponded area on northern portion of the site to drain have been incorporated into the plan sheets. Construction of the swale along Rockwood Drive should be a condition of the first building permit on the lot. Construction of the swale must be accomplished prior to installation of any of the proposed driveways as storm water drains across the entire frontage of the property.
4. Common driveway access and maintenance agreements are required for several of the lots. Lot #11 contains 2 common driveways serving 4 of the lots. The separate driveways must be maintained as no more than 2 lots are to be accessed by a single driveway without a waiver or construction of a private road.
5. City of Newburgh Flow Acceptance letter is required for acceptance of the subdivision.
6. The Applicants are requested to address fencing of the detention pond required by the Town of Newburgh as well as provisions for guiderail along the roadway frontage of the detention pond.
7. Detail for the outlet control structure for the pond modeled in the SWPPP should be provided. It appears pond discharges to two existing pipes.
8. Driveway culverts are depicted at 15 inch hdpe. Stormwater calculations appear to direct

REGIONAL OFFICES

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

stormwater to the driveway crossings which would exceed capacity of the culverts for a ten year return frequency storm event.

9. Discharge from the sediment forbay should be identified. It is unclear how stormwater discharges from sediment forbay to stormwater management pond.
10. Standard notes for connection to Town of Newburgh's water and sewer system must be added to the plans.
11. Driveway or culvert depicted for Lot #2 should be revised.

Respectfully submitted,

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

---

Patrick J. Hines, Associate

ENGINEERS  
PLANNERS  
SURVEYORS



August 9, 2013

Mr. John Ewasutyn  
Planning Board Chairman  
Town of Newburgh  
308 Gardnertown Road  
Newburgh, NY 12550

**RE: Site Plan Review for VW of Newburgh, Route 17K, Town of Newburgh, NY; Town Project No. 2013-11, CM Project No. 113-178.**

Dear Mr. Ewasutyn:

Creighton Manning Engineering, LLP (CM) is in receipt of the Site Plan dated July 1, 2013, and the Traffic Study dated July 31, 2013, both prepared by John Meyer Consulting. After reviewing the referenced materials, we offer the following comments:

1. Two entrance lanes from Route 17K is not necessary for traffic capacity. Is it for truck turning movements?
2. Show the truck circulation route for inventory deliveries.
3. The traffic study follows recommended practices for the analysis of traffic impacts.
4. We concur with the estimated trip generation of the project at 64 trips during the weekday PM peak hour and 85 trips during the Saturday mid-day peak hour.
5. The level of service reports in Appendix C appear to be based on Synchro's Percentile Delay methodology rather than NYSDOT's policy of using the Highway Capacity Methodology. Please confirm the results reported and update the level of service tables if necessary.
6. We concur that traffic signal modifications will be necessary to accommodate the fourth leg to the Route 17K/McDonald Street intersection. NYSDOT will review these modifications as well as the proposed lane arrangement on Route 17K. They may require a wider left turn lane (>10 feet) into the site given the 55 mph speed limit on Route 17K.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or recommendations, please feel free to contact our office.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Creighton Manning Engineering, LLP*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ken Wersted".

Kenneth Wersted, PE, PTOE  
Project Manager

Cc: Bryant Cocks – Planning Consultant  
Michael Donnelly – PB Attorney  
Jim Osborne – Town Engineer  
Jerry Canfield – Fire Inspector  
Pat Hines – MHE  
Karen Arent – KALA  
Siby Zachariah - NYSDOT

2 Winners Circle  
Albany, NY 12205  
518.446.0396 (p)  
518.446.0397 (f)  
www.cmellp.com

F:\Projects\2013\113-178 VW of Newburgh\review 1.doc

**BC Planning, LLC**  
**555 Route 32, PO Box 489**  
**Highland Mills, New York 10930**  
**(845) 827-5763**  
**Fax: 827-5764**  
**Email: [bcocks@frontiernet.net](mailto:bcocks@frontiernet.net)**

### **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

**MUNICIPALITY: TOWN OF NEWBURGH**

**TOWN PROJECT NO. 2013-11**

**PROJECT NAME: Volkswagen of Newburgh**

**LOCATION: Rt. 17K, across from National Guard entrance (95-1-53)**

**TYPE OF PROJECT: Site Plan for car dealership (5.02 acres)**

**DATE: August 12, 2013**

**REVIEWING PLANNER: Bryant Cocks**

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY:**

**Approval Status: Submitted July 12, 2013**

**SEQRA Status: Unlisted**

**Zone/Utilities: IB/municipal water and sewer**

**Map Dated: Not dated**

**Site Inspection: July 18, 2013**

**Planning Board Agenda: August 15, 2013**

**Consultant/Applicant: Dominic Cordisco, Esq.**

**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 August 12, 2013**

#### **COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The applicant is proposing to construct a 23,340 square foot Volkswagen dealership, with 237 total parking spaces for inventory, customer and employee parking. The entrance to the site will be located at the light for the entrance to the National Guard area of Stewart Airport.
2. The site abuts a private residential roadway, Mulbury Lane. This makes this lot a corner lot (Section 185-17). The applicant will need to show a 60 foot front yard setback instead of the 40 foot side yard setback currently shown. If the building cannot be moved a side yard setback variance would be required.
3. The applicant has indicated they will show a 35 foot landscaped area in front of the few display cars in the front yard. The landscaped area is required by Section 185-15, as indicated on the site plan. When the plans are fully designed the type of vegetation and any required grading will determine the visibility of the display cars from Route 17K.

4. I'm unclear on whether the interior design of the building is supposed to match the site at this time. It looks as though the front service entrance is showing the exit through what looks to be a waiting area, and the interior car movement is shown to go through a wall and over a curb. The rear service area exit does not look to have an entrance at this time. The car wash entrance also utilizes the service area exit area; this could be confusing to some customers and will have to be clearly signed to avoid accidents.
5. The parking calculation table should show how the applicant came up with the 237 spaces.
6. Is the future car inventory lot part of a phasing plan? What would trigger the need for this lot to be constructed? It is currently shown to be curbed off, would it be landscaped until construction? How would drainage of this area be handled into the existing system?
7. The front six inventory spaces have a retaining wall screening them from Route 17K. Is this retaining wall necessary for construction of the lot or for aesthetic purposes? Parking in the front yard should be screened with either landscaping or a wall of some sort to meet the intent of the Design Guidelines.
8. The area that holds the four display cars directly in front of the building is a little confusing. A flagpole and retaining wall are shown in this area, are the top two cars elevated with the flagpole in the middle? The retaining wall arrow might be misplaced.
9. A stamped and sealed survey sheet must be submitted with the fully designed drawings. The wetland delineation plan must also be submitted as part of the package.
10. The applicant will need to send the required adjoining notice to the property owners within 500 feet. I will request the mailing list from the Assessor's office and draft the notice.
11. The Planning Board will need to declare their intent for designation of lead agency. The applicant can discuss if they would like to send the plans out in their conceptual form or wait until they are fully engineered to avoid sending it twice.

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.