



**McGOEY, HAUSER and EDSALL  
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](mailto:MHENY@MHEPC.COM)  
WRITERS EMAIL: [MJE@MHEPC.COM](mailto:MJE@MHEPC.COM)



**TOWN OF NEW WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**REVIEW COMMENTS**

**PROJECT NAME:** LEGACY WOODS (KNOX VILLAGE) SITE PLAN  
(SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING PROJECT)  
**PROJECT LOCATION:** NYS ROUTE 32  
SECTION 70 – BLOCK 1 – LOT 49.2  
**PROJECT NUMBER:** 08-01  
**DATE:** 26 MARCH 2008  
**DESCRIPTION:** THE APPLICATION PROPOSES THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 14.21  
ACRE PARCEL WITH 183 SENIOR HOUSING MULTI-FAMILY  
RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITHIN EIGHT (8) BUILDINGS. THE SITE  
ALSO INCLUDES A 3200 S.F. CLUBHOUSE BUILDING AND OTHER  
SITE IMPROVEMENTS. THE PLAN WAS PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED  
AT THE 16 JANUARY 2008 PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

1. At the previous meeting, the Board raised certain concerns regarding the project density, traffic circulation and emergency access, sidewalks and walkways, and site amenities to be provided. The applicant is back to the review these revised plans, since general layout modifications have been made to the plans, in response to the prior comments. The applicant’s representatives have indicated that, once the general concept layout is endorsed by the Board, they will proceed with preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.
  
2. The applicant’s legal council has advised me that the following changes have been made:
  - As per request of the Board, plan scale has been revised to 1” = 30’.
  
  - Revisions to the roadways, parking areas, sidewalks, site grading, and building locations for the provision of 30' wide fire lanes, and the provision of additional hydrants and hydrant locations based on our meetings with the Fire Inspector on February 4, 2008, and March 4, 2008. It is noted that the some roadways within parking lots are proposed at 26 feet. This may require a waiver from the Fire Prevention Bureau.

**REGIONAL OFFICES**

• 111 WHEATFIELD DRIVE • SUITE 1 • MILFORD, PENNSYLVANIA 18337 • 570-296-2765 •  
• 540 BROADWAY • MONTICELLO, NEW YORK 12701 • 845-794-3399 •

- A parking allocation plan has been included depicting the off-street parking space count to verify the number and assignment of spaces.
- A recreation plan has been included identifying all indoor passive recreation, outdoor active recreation and outside passive recreation facilities.

I have reviewed the plans relative to the items noted above and my comments are provided under #6 of these comments (below).

3. As was discussed at the previous meeting, the Planning Board has the option to consider a Side Yard Waiver. This authority is referenced in Section 300-18 G (2) of the Town Zoning Law, and permits up to a 50% waiver for side yard setbacks. The waiver must also be included in the Town Board's Special Permit (once granted). Normal requirement is 50 ft., and the applicant is proposing the following side yard setbacks:

- 39 ft. building #5
- 43 ft. building #6
- 41 ft. building #8

4. The applicant has also responded to the Board's request to further define the project amenities and accessory uses. The applicant's attorney has advised of the following accessory uses:

- Clubhouse containing a meeting/social room, exercise room, card room, and cyber café.
- Community rooms in each building
- Swimming pool
- Bocci court
- Tennis court
- Seating areas including gazebo and benches
- Sidewalks and walking trails.

The applicant is not proposing any commercial accessory uses on the property based on proximity of the project to "five corners".

5. A critical component of the site development is the site parking provisions. The code requires 2 spaces per unit, with such spaces generally to be within 150-200 ft. of the units served. The plan appears to meet this requirement; however, I have the following concerns regarding the parking on site:

- I believe there is insufficient parking for the clubhouse. With a building area of 3200 s.f. it would be expected that 20 – 25 spaces would be appropriate. Only 16 spaces are provided.
- Also with regard to the clubhouse, I believe handicapped parking would be required by State Law. None are provided.

- There is no separate parking provided for the tennis courts. I am concerned this may impact the available parking for Buildings 2 & 3.
- For the under-building parking (see sheet A-5), the end space would appear difficult to exit from as no side backout room exists (it is along the wall).

6. We have reviewed these revised concept plans, and have the following initial comments:

- Drawings G-2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 all have minimal information, dimensionally. Building dimensions, offsets, road widths, aisle widths, parking dimensions, sidewalk widths, etc. should all be dimensioned. The site plans should have location control such that the buildings can be located in the field from these drawings, as well as the ability to locate and construct the other related site improvements.
- Drawing G-2.1 calls for a proposed 100' easement. It does not appear to be of that width, nor is the purpose of the easement clarified.
- Drawing G-2.1 calls for a proposed 75' easement. It does not appear to be of that width, nor is the purpose of the easement clarified.
- The application information indicates provision of a bus stop. Where is it?
- Drawing G-2.1 depicts sidewalk out to NYS Route 32, which does not appear to connect to anything. What is the intent?
- The site plan drawings should identify adjoining properties by owner name and/or business name.
- Drawing G-2.1 depicts a 14+/- ft wide recess in the curblin at the northwest corner of the building. No purpose is indicated. Clarify.
- Drawing G-2.2 depicts a brick paver courtyard "to provide possible emergency vehicle access". This should be reviewed by the Fire Inspector's office and the appropriate construction detail provided, with load capacity as appropriate for fire vehicles.
- Drawings G-2.2 and G-2.3 calls for a side yard variance. Please correct reference as "side yard waiver".
- Drawing G-2.2 depicts a "Preliminary Emergency Vehicular Access", presumably out to Haight Drive. This should be reviewed by the Fire Inspector's office and further clarified. An appropriate lockable gate should be provided.

- The grading plans appear incomplete and very preliminary. They will be reviewed once more complete.
- Drawing G-4.1 depicts the approximate location of the existing 10" watermain and meter vault serving the Town of Cornwall Firthcliffe Heights Water District. Once as-builts are obtained for this main, the exact location can be incorporated onto these plans.
- Building sewers from each of the eight buildings should be connected to the main trunk sewer line at a manhole location. Diameter of all sewer piping should be indicated.
- Layout and details of all site utilities will be further reviewed at a later time.
- The stormwater plans have not been reviewed at this time. Once the general layout is endorsed by the Board, the applicant should prepare the required SWPPP.
- The typical building layout plan (sheet A-5) indicates 23 units per building. With eight buildings we would anticipate a total of 184 units. The project information on sheet G-2 indicates 183 units. Explain.
- A review of the floor plans shown on Sheet A-5 reference rooms called "den". Such room for the 2-bedroom / den unit has the configuration of a bedroom, rather than the open den as depicted for the 1 bedroom / den unit. The Board and the code enforcement officer should review the configuration to determine if the room in fact qualifies as another bedroom.
- The project sign depicted on sheet A-6 appears to significantly exceed the permissible sign dimensions for multi-family residential sites. (There is also a detail on sheet S-9 which appears to be a duplicate).
- It is unclear where the walls (detail on sheet S-9) are provided. Insure location is clearly indicated on site plans.
- Drawing A-11 appears to be a recreation location plan, but is identified as a parking allocation plan. Explain.
- Drawing A-13 indicates that seating, gazebos, etc are part of the plan, but no such elements are located on the plans. Also, the pool, tennis and bocce should be called out (rather than having to reference back to another plan to locate the areas).
- Please improve clarity of drawing A-16, as dimensions are difficult to read. Also, for convenience, the buildings should be numbered.

7. The site plan provides for a full complement of site lighting fixtures to illuminate the internal roadways, parking lots, walkways, etc. This may be an ideal site for the applicant to consider solar lighting fixtures, so as to mitigate some of the impacts of the site development, and potentially save the residents some operating costs. A complete review for compliance with 300-18 H (11) has not been made at this time.
8. A review of compliance with Section 300-18 H(7) is not possible at this time. That section prescribes building spacing based on relationship of related buildings (front-front, rear-front, etc.) The applicant must clarify the orientation and height of all buildings, and provide dimensions between buildings.
9. The plan sheet for the clubhouse (once separate design sheet prepared) should indicate that the clubhouse will be 100% complete and available for use prior to 50% unit occupancy, as per Section 300-18 H(14).
10. As previously noted, Section 300-18 I (1) provides specific requirements with regard to Laundry provisions. Applicant should explain compliance and verify same is depicted on plans submitted.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark J. Edsall, P.E., P.P.  
Engineer for the Planning Board

MJE/st  
NW08-01-26Mar08.doc