

February 22, 2010

Mr. Fred Rood, Chairman  
Town of Lysander Planning Board  
8220 Loop Road  
Baldwinsville, NY 13027

Re: Proposed Northwest Family YMCA Project  
Preliminary Site Plan Application Review

Dear Mr. Rood and members of the Planning Board:

Bergmann Associates, on behalf of the Town of Lysander Planning Board, has reviewed the application submitted by YMCA of Greater Syracuse, NY in support of the proposed Northwest Family YMCA facility. The application for preliminary site plan approval was submitted on 12/11/2009.

The following materials were provided and have been reviewed:

- Cover letter
- Preliminary Site Plan Application to the Town of Lysander Planning Board
- USGS Site Location Plan
- SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form (long form EAF) Part I
- Physical Characteristics of Site (map and description)
- Site Plan Graphic
- Neighborhood Plan Graphic
- Topographic and Boundary Survey
- Existing Conditions and Site Demolition Plan
- Erosion Control Plan
- Site Grading Plan
- Site Drainage and Utilities Plan
- Site Layout Plan
- Site Planting Plan
- Site Details (L106)
- Site Details (L107)
- Stormwater Sections
- Proof of Ownership (Deed)
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Report
- Traffic Report
- ACOE Jurisdictional Determination Letter



- Phase 1A Literature Review and Archeological Sensitivity Assessment Report and “No Impact” Letter from NYS Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation
- Agency Correspondence
- Lighting Plan and Photometrics
- Building Elevations

**State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR):**

- The Planning Board is required to implement the provisions of SEQR and determine whether the project (action) may have a significant impact on the environment.
- The Town of Lysander Planning Board has declared its intent to be SEQR Lead Agency for this project and has sent out the requisite Notice of Intent to potentially involved and interested agencies. If no involved agency objects within 30 days, the Planning Board will be deemed Lead Agency.
- We recommend that the Planning Board undergo a coordinated review with potentially involved agencies.
- Once Lead Agency has been determined, we recommend the Planning Board set up a workshop to discuss and complete Part 2 of the EAF form. The Planning Board should also discuss whether there is additional information that they feel the applicant needs to provide in order to aid in making a determination of significance.

**Document Review:**

**A. Cover letter**

1. The letter states that the Applicant sent the EAF to potential involved agencies and asked whether they would consent to the Town Planning Board acting as lead agency. This action should be performed by the Town of Lysander Planning Board, and not the Applicant. Subsequently, the Town transmitted the Lead Agency Notice to potentially involved agencies and notified them that a lead agency must be agreed upon. This Notice of Intent to establish lead agency was dated February 9, 2010.

**B. Preliminary Site Plan Approval Application to the Town of Lysander Planning Board**

1. No comments at this time.

**C. USGS Site Location Plan**

1. No comments at this time.

**D. SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form (long form EAF) Part I**

1. The EAF notes that 68% of the site is poorly drained. The Applicant should provide additional information as to the reasons for this poor drainage condition.
2. The EAF notes that the depth to bedrock is 2.5 (+/-) feet. The Applicant should provide additional information on the proposed construction methods to address this condition. Will blasting be necessary?
3. The EAF notes that the water table is one foot deep. The Applicant should provide additional information on the proposed construction methods to address this condition.
4. (page 4) Number A-16 asks for any lakes, ponds, wetland areas to be noted. The EAF reads “none”. The on-site wetland needs to be identified.



5. (page 6) Number B-16 asks if the project will generate solid waste. The answer is incorrectly checked "no".
6. The Applicant should confirm any and all approvals/permits necessary for the proposed swimming pool.
7. Part 2 of the EAF is to be completed by the Lead Agency at a later date.

**E. Physical Characteristics of Site (map and description)**

1. No comments at this time.

**F. Site Plan Graphic**

1. No comments at this time.

**G. Neighborhood Plan Graphic**

1. No comments at this time.

**H. Topographic and Boundary Survey**

1. No comments at this time.

**I. Existing Conditions and Site Demolition Plan**

1. The plan needs to show the proposed limits of disturbance.
2. Applicant should provide a Title Sheet or Cover Sheet that identifies the plan sheets included in the set. Project information should be provided, such as a list of drawings, agency review entities and consultants for the project.

**J. Erosion Control Plan**

1. The plan needs to show the proposed limits of disturbance.

**K. Site Grading Plan**

1. If the project is within the 100 year floodplain, indicate the flood elevation if applicable.
2. Provide permanent erosion control at the pond spillway.
3. The driveway and a portion of the east parking lot are not detained and drains toward Drakes Landing. Can this area be curbed and sloped toward a catch basin so that it will then drain into the water quality pond?

**L. Site Drainage and Utilities Plan**

1. North arrow/bar and scale/legend are missing.
2. Where is the proposed electric transformer to be located?
3. Are there light poles and if so, where will they be located?
4. Show location of exterior meters such as electric and gas.
5. Add sanitary manhole at parking lot. A detail is provided but nothing is shown on the site plans.
6. Are the utilities proposed within Drakes Landing to be saw cut or bore beneath the road?
7. Why are the water services separated?
8. Indicate on the utility plan where backflow and meter are to be located.
9. Indicate water service size.
10. Storm sewer pipe sizing and manhole sizes are missing from the plan.



#### **M. Site Layout Plan**

1. Handicap parking in east parking lot should match the detail. A shared loading area should be included.
2. Concrete sidewalk should extend to the end of parking aisle along the east side of the one-way driveway.
3. Can the south driveway be aligned with Oak Brook Road?
4. A gate located at the service entrance to match the west side would be better than the proposed chain and sign across the service drive on the east side of the building.
5. The parking along the one way driveway should be relocated. This parking could provide a conflict between cars backing out and the cars dropping off patrons.

#### **N. Site Planting Plan**

1. Although there are no requirements for plant quantities, the plan has a minimal amount of trees and even fewer shrubs.
2. Plant material is easy to locate, but other areas and limits of seeding areas are difficult to read.
3. Sheet L100 shows existing vegetation is to remain along NYS Route 31. This needs to be added to the Landscape Plan.
4. In all areas where existing trees are to remain, it should be listed as "Existing trees are to remain".
5. Where existing vegetation is to remain, any gaps, or where screening is minimal, should be supplemented with additional plant material.
6. Delineate limits of lawn and groundcover areas.
7. There is only a maintenance strip around portions of the building. If this is to accommodate drainage, it should be relabeled. If it is for maintenance, it should be around the entire building.
8. A legend should be added to the plan showing line types, hatch patterns, etc.
9. Additional flowering shrub plantings near the main building entrance and the main entrance drive should be added.
10. The triangular area in front between the parking lots is not labeled. What is the surface treatment in this area?
11. Opposite the main entrance to the building, there is a curved area adjacent to the parking lot that doesn't appear to be paved. What is going to be there? If lawn, it is a small area that will be walked over and difficult to maintain. Suggest it be planted.
12. There is only one type of shrub specified on the plan. There is opportunity to plant additional, different species in the parking lot islands, and at greater quantity.
13. No planting bed limits are shown for the shrubs.
14. The Applicant may want to consider the use of a decorative guiderail along the parking lot edge adjacent to the pond.
15. Lawn areas and groundcover areas are listed. Seed mix and application rates need to be added to the plan.
16. The symbol used for groundcover is typically a detail reference. If it is going to be referencing a detail, list the page and detail # in the circle. If it's not, remove the circle.
17. Wetland zone plantings appear to be reversed. 0-6" plants are shown as being planted below plants that have 6-12" of water depth.
18. Plant List - No Hedge Maples (Ac) are shown on the plan, but are called out on the legend.
19. Plant List - The Serviceberry (As) should be installed at a larger size (at least 8')
20. None of the three notes is referenced in the drawing as indicated by the triangles around them.
21. For note 2: where is landscape edging specified?
22. For note 3: where are bluestone pavers specified?
23. No Perennials or Grasses are listed.
24. For wetland plantings, specify a quantity per square foot. They can still be planted at 3' on center.



**O. Site Details (L106)**

1. The details need to be coordinated with the proposed plans (e.g. the sign on the bollard and chain detail does not match the plan and the detention basin cross section does not match the pond design).

**P. Site Details (L107)**

1. All plant details state that "all non-biodegradable material is to be removed from the plant and the pit. Is it the intent to remove the wire basket?
2. All plant details specify a soil mix but none is listed on the landscape plan or details.
3. Remove the tree wrap from the tree planting detail.
4. The Seeded Lawn Slopes detail isn't referenced on the Landscape Plan.
5. The Ground Cover detail shows "existing lawn" and "seeded lawn" and specifies Birdsfoot trefoil. This should be clarified and a mix and application rate given.
6. The Seeded Lawn detail states that "General seed mix as specified", but no seed mix is shown on the Landscape Plan or the detail sheet

**Q. Stormwater Sections**

1. No comments at this time.

**R. Proof of Ownership (Deed)**

1. No comments at this time.

**S. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Report**

1. Need to update the SWPPP to the New General Permit GP-0-10-001.
2. Figure 9 (Proposed Land Use Map) does not match the drawing set.
3. It does not appear that the HydroCAD model matches the pond shown on the plans.
4. The pond does not have a drain and therefore Item #23 on the NOI should be answered NO. (The SWPPP is not in conformance with the Design Manual.)

**T. Traffic Report**

The format of the traffic report follows the generally accepted industry methodology for determining the potential impacts of a recreational community center such as the proposed YMCA on the existing transportation corridor. Based on the stated adjacent developments and the local knowledge gained from the Town of Lysander, the existing and expected future traffic generation was developed in the anticipated year of completion of the proposed YMCA facility. The trip generation calculated for the proposed Northwest YMCA utilized the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition for Land Use 495 Recreational Community Center. The description specifically mentions the generation rate is for "stand-alone public facilities similar to and including YMCAs". While this is a generally accepted procedure to develop trip volumes, the count data was obtained in the 1990s and 2000s throughout the US and was also noted to be from a small sample size. We suggest confirmation of trip generation rates by obtaining counts from a similar existing local facility. Such verification would benefit the capacity and delay studies and confirm the proposed signal timing alterations.

Drakes Landing is a single lane roadway in each direction that, with the build condition traffic volume in 2011, shows degradation at the intersection with Route 31 to a LOS E during the morning and evening peak periods and a LOS D during the Saturday peak with the additional growth due to the site development. Proposed signal improvements were identified to improve the overall LOS and individual lane movements without additional geometric improvements to the intersection with NYS Route 31. The study showed individual lane movements exiting from Drakes Landing could be improved to a more acceptable LOS C, however this



comes with some degradation of lane movements on NYS Route 31. Consideration of segregation of turning traffic from the single-lane exit on Drakes Landing could reduce the amount of green time suggested to be directed to Drakes Landing and offer some relief for the opposing traffic flows.

The driveway egress locations are shown in the attached site plan. It would be more desirable to locate these egress points opposite the existing roadways rather than as shown. The existence of wetlands opposite the northern location makes this a more challenging accomplishment. Though not specifically identified in the report, the estimation of queue length development on Drakes Landing southbound at the intersection with NYS Route 31 in the peak periods should be compared to the driveway location and may be the reason for off-setting the southern driveway from the opposite roadway. When possible, consideration of re-alignment opposite the existing roadways would be more desirable and if not achievable, should be clarified in the document.

**U. ACOE Jurisdictional Determination Letter**

1. No comments at this time.

**V. Phase 1A Literature Review and Archeological Sensitivity Assessment Report and “No Impact” Letter from NYS Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation**

1. No comments at this time.

**W. Agency Correspondence**

1. No comments at this time.

**X. Lighting Plan**

1. The design appears to meet the recommendation of Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) published ninth edition handbook parking lot minimum maintained illuminance value of 0.2 foot candela fc.
2. Section 139-23-2 of the Town of Lysander building code states: (2) Site lighting shall be recessed or shielded in such a way that source light is not visible at the lot line. Consider lowering the lights to 20ft. to minimize the ability to view the light source from the lot line and increase the light level on the parking and walking surfaces.
3. Provide pole and base detail on the drawing.
4. General note A. requires a 32 pole site lighting control panel. Will this be used for interior lighting control also? If not, consider a much smaller panel.
5. Please provide Max./Min. and average levels for the parking and walking areas.

**Y. Building Elevations**

1. No comments at this time.

The Planning Board should reserve its right to a SEQRA Determination until all studies, plans, and responses have been submitted for review.



Sincerely,

Kimberly J. Thompson  
Project Coordinator

Cc: Owen Densk, Zoning Administrative Officer  
Karen Rice, Planning Board Clerk  
Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney - Harris Beach PLLC

