



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: JOSEPH NATALE, CHAIRMAN  
HAVERSTRAW PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

FROM: MAX STACH, AICP  
JONATHAN LOCKMAN, AICP

RE: PAG SELF STORAGE

DATE: JUNE 25, 2018

CC: EVE MANCUSO, PE, ENGINEER  
RUBEN BERRIOS, CCI, BUILDING INSPECTOR  
DENNIS MICHAELS, ESQ., VILLAGE PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY  
AMY MELE, ESQ., FOR THE APPLICANT

\*\*\*\*\*

We are in receipt of the following materials:

- SEQR Memorandum from Zachary E. Chaplin, P.E. dated June 25, 2018;
- Parking Assessment Memorandum from Frank A. Filiciotto, P.E. dated June 20, 2018;
- Planning & Engineering Response Memorandum from Zachary E. Chaplin, P.E. dated June 25, 2018;
- Truck Turning Radius Exhibit from Jeffrey A Martell, P.E., dated March 7, 2018;
- Draft EAF Part 3;
- Four 3-D Renderings by Stonefield Engineering dated June 20, 2018.

We reviewed the following submittals in a memorandum dated June 7, 2018:

- Traffic Engineering Memorandum Transmission Letter, from Andrew Villari, EIT, Stonefield Engineering to Chairman Natale, dated May 2, 2018.
- Traffic Impact Letter Report, from Frank A. Filiciotto, PE and Andrew Villari EIT, to Akhter Shareef, NYSDOT Region 8, dated January 17, 2018
- Letter dated March 6, 2018, from Akhter Shareef, NYSDOT to Frank Filicotto, PE, RE: Self-Storage Development, Review of Traffic Impact Assessment dated 1/17/18.
- Full EAF Part 1 for Proposed Self Storage Facility, signed by Jeffrey Martell, PE, 5/3/2018.
- 24" by 36" Plan Set, entitled "Site Plan for PAG Investments, LLC. Proposed Self-Storage Facility," by Stonefield Engineering & Design, with the following sheets, all with latest revision date 5/04/2017. (Note: We believe the date should be 5/04/2018)
  - C-1, Cover Sheet
  - C-2, Existing Conditions Plan
  - C-3, Site Plan
  - C-4, Grading Plan
  - C-5, Drainage Plan
  - C-6, Utility Plan

- C-7, Landscaping Plan
- C-8, Landscaping Details
- C-9, Plan Cross Sections
- C-10, C-11 & C-12, Construction Details
- Stormwater Management Report, prepared for PAG Investments, LLC, by Stonefield Engineering & Design, May 4, 2018.

For our previous memo, dated January 22, 2018, we reviewed the following submittals:

- Site Plan Application package, dated 12-28-2017
- 24 by 36 Plan Set, entitled Zoning Plans for PAG Investments, LLC. Proposed Self-Storage Facility, by Stonefield Engineering & Design, dated 12.20.17, with six sheets:
  - C-1, Cover Sheet
  - C-2, Existing Conditions Plan
  - C-3, Site Plan
  - C-4, Grading Plan
  - C-5, Landscaping Plan
  - C-6, Plan Cross Sections
- 24 by 36 Plan Set, entitled Proposed Self Storage – Haverstraw, by Remus Architecture, dated 12/07/17, with three sheets:
  - Preliminary Elevations – Scale: 3/16 inch = 1 foot
  - Preliminary Plans – Scale: 1/16" = 1 foot, 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Floors
  - Preliminary Plans – Scale: 1/16" = 1 foot, 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> Floors

### **Notice of Previous Work**

Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, LLC has worked for PAG Investments in the past. The Village and PAG Investments were both notified of this at an informal TAC meeting at which time both the Village and PAG consented to NP&V conducting the planning and SEQR review of the project. NP&V has last worked for PAG investments in March of 2017.

### **Summary of Proposed Project**

The proposed project is new construction of a 100,580 square foot, four-story building for self-storage, located at the northwest corner of US Route 9W and Gurnee Avenue. The application states that variances are required for maximum building height, rear setback and number of loading berths.

The property is located in the Highway Business (HB) zoning district. "Wholesaling, warehousing and distribution businesses," is listed as a permitted use by right (#6) in Column B of the Table of General Use Regulations for the HB District (245 Attachment 7). This use is assigned use group L. See Stonefield Engineering sheet C-3, Site Plan. The tables showing compliance with required zoning and parking standards are shown on the upper left of this sheet.

We offer the following comments:

1. We are still awaiting a site plan submission containing the following requested items:
  - a. §245-16.F(g): A copy of any covenants or deed restrictions that are intended to cover all or any part of the tract.

- b. §245-16.F(h): Location of all existing structures on adjacent properties within 100 feet of subject lot line, if any. It appears that such structures are adjacent to the north property line, and off of the southwest corner.
- c. §245-16.F(k): Any free-standing outdoor signs and building signs.
- d. §245-16.F(q): Outdoor lighting details

**Planning:**

- 2. The applicant has submitted several renderings which show the proposed building relative to the surrounding environment. The rendering showing the northerly approach is not correct in that it shows the building corner at the same grade as Route 9W. The building is actually proposed to be perched approximately five feet above the street. The view from Gurnee Avenue may be similarly incorrect. It is also not clear how the top of the building was placed into the photograph. We cannot verify the accuracy of the renderings, without a description of how the height and scale of the building was related to the photograph.
- 3. We believe that the current design of the structure is odd and will look out of place. The roof is tremendously large and the single row of strange white window projections that support the Mansard appear odd. It is assumed that the windows will be reflective glass and these often look strange. It appears that the atypical architectural is of exaggerated size to make the overall building look smaller. This is effective in making the building appear as three stories, but overall the impact is that the building looks out of place. It may be more effective if the building were made to look more architecturally attractive rather than focusing on making it look smaller. If height is a concern, a more effective way to reduce scale might be to propose the ground story as a different color and/or texture – say stone or architectural block. This may be less obtrusive than the massive mansard roof and exaggerated windows.
- 4. The landscaping can be much more robust and attractive which may help to mitigate the bulky appearance of the building. Currently a low hedge is proposed along the foundation, but a flowering shrub growing up to 10' in height may better mask the first story. Trees that grow in more oval or columnar habits should be chosen based on the limited room between road and building. There is a stone wall at this location that may be able to be relocated and reused to elevate planting beds up against the building along Route 9W.
- 5. The following are examples of large brick self-storage structures that would look more appropriate to the Village than the current proposal:



**SEQR**

6. The applicant has prepared a Draft Part 3. We have revised the Draft as follows and suggest that the Planning Board adopt the Part 3 if it concurs with the conclusion, especially as regards visual impacts:

- a. That the site has been investigated and no areas meeting the description of Rocky Summit Grassland exist on the site.
  - b. That the project will require SHPO review as part of the process of securing a NYSDOT work permit.
  - c. That in addition to the 3D renderings a balloon test was conducted on June 11, and that based on these, the Board believes that an attractively designed building at the heights and location proposed, would not result in adverse visual impacts or character impacts.
7. We suggest that if the Planning Board agrees with the foregoing, that a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance may be adopted. A form for this purpose has been attached.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or comments.

Project :

Date :

***Full Environmental Assessment Form***  
***Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts***  
***and***  
***Determination of Significance***

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

**Reasons Supporting This Determination:**

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

**Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions**

SEQR Status:             Type 1                       Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project:    Part 1             Part 2             Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the \_\_\_\_\_ as lead agency that:

A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.d).

C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action:

Name of Lead Agency:

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Title of Responsible Officer:

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Date:

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

Date:

**For Further Information:**

Contact Person:

Address:

Telephone Number:

E-mail:

**For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:**

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>