

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Marlborough Planning Board

FROM: Patricia P. Brooks, L.S. Brooks & Brooks Land Surveyors, P.C.  
Andy Willingham, P.E. Willingham Engineering

RE: Our file #8613 Royal Energy Properties Site Plan

DATE: October 25, 2019

---

The following information is submitted to the Town of Marlborough Planning Board for review and consideration in connection with the site plan application of Royal Energy Properties, LLC Cold Storage Warehouse and are in response to the comments received from McGoey, Hauser and Edsall Consulting Engineers, D.P.C. dated October 4, 2019 and October 18, 2019.

1. The County Planning referral documents submitted with the review date of 4 September 2019 identify that the project which was submitted was a 53,200 square foot warehouse. The County comments identify that the submittal was not a "complete" submittal lacking stormwater materials and other materials requested by the Town of Marlborough Planning Board as part of rendering a SEQRA determination. Re- submittal of the plans to the County Planning is required. In addition the County Planning Board has identified that the variance submission was not referred to them in April of 2019. A ZBA referral and re-vote on their previous action is identified by the county as being required.

Response: The Ulster County Planning Board submitted a revised referral document acknowledging the 72,000 square foot building. All proper referrals have now been made to the Ulster County Planning Board for review at their November 6, 2019 meeting.

2. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan compliant with the Town of Marlborough and NYSDEC requirements must be submitted for the Town's use and to refer to the Ulster County Planning Board.

Response: A storm water Pollution Prevention Plan has been submitted.

3. Input from the Town's Code Enforcement Officer regarding fire protection provisions should be provided.

Response: See attached letter from Town Code Enforcement officer.

A NY State Certified Women's Business Enterprise, a US Disadvantaged Business Enterprise  
and a NY City Certified Women's Business Enterprise  
Member:

National Society of Professional Surveyors -New York State Association of Professional Land Surveyors  
American Planning Association-New York Planning Federation  
NYS GIS Association

4. Comments from the Jurisdictional Fire Department should be received. It appears the proposed structure will be equipped with a fire sprinkler system utilizing an on site storage tank.

Response: See attached letter from Fire Chief.

5. Confirmation from the Health Department regarding approval of the septic system should be received. It is noted that the primary and reserve areas have been transposed on the latest plan sheets last revised 19 September 2019.

Response: The plans have been submitted to the Board of Health and we are awaiting a permit. All plans have now been revised to be consistent.

6. It is noted the septic design is limited to ten employees on the site. Appropriate notes should be placed on the plans identifying maximum occupancy of the site to ten employees per day. The septic design does not contain any capacity for processed water, washed down water or other water contributions to the system.

Response: The plans are noted for ten employees. No processed water will enter the system.

7. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan should be provided. The Applicants Engineers is requested to evaluate placement of the stormwater pond against the proposed ten foot high retaining wall.

Response: A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has been submitted.

8. Retaining wall and pond should be evaluated with regard to fencing. Stormwater pond design is not in compliance with NYSDEC standards for side slopes, aquatic benches and other safety measures guidelines designed into the standards. The Applicants are requested to evaluate a requirement for fencing of the stormwater facility in order to mitigate safety concerns.

Response: Safety fencing has been added at the top of the retaining wall to provide compliance with NYSDEC safety standards for the stormwater pond.

9. The Applicant's have now proposed curbing at the access road. Comments from Jurisdictional Fire Department should be received.

Response: The NYS DOT will permit curbing as long as it does not impede drainage.

10. Typical storm sewer manhole identifies a 48 inch inside diameter. It appears that this will be utilized connecting to a 48 inch diameter pipe. This should be reviewed by the Applicants Representative.

A NY State Certified Women's Business Enterprise, a US Disadvantaged Business Enterprise  
and a NY City Certified Women's Business Enterprise  
Member:

National Society of Professional Surveyors -New York State Association of Professional Land Surveyors

American Planning Association-New York Planning Federation

NYS GIS Association

Response: A 6' (72") inner diameter manhole is now proposed for the connection of the 48" diameter pipe.

11. The fire access road depicted is apparently twenty feet wide. Based on building height fire access road may be required to be 26 feet wide. The Applicants architect should weigh in on fire access requirements based on Fire Code, building type, building classification, materials to be stored, sprinkler system availability, etc

Response: The fire access has been analyzed and found to be acceptable as provided on the southerly and westerly sides of the building. The applicants' architect and fire suppression designer will weigh in on all pertinent requirements during the building permit process.

October 18, 2019 Comments:

1. The applicants have submitted a stormwater pollution prevention report for the subject project.

Response: No response required

2. A review of the stormwater pollution prevention identifies the following comments. A Type II rain fall distribution has been utilized in the calculations. Type III rainfall should be utilized within the Town of Marlborough.

Response: The rainfall has been revised to Type III.

3. The permeability testing identifying the .25 inches per hour exfiltration for the bio retention area without underdrains should be provided.

Response: Exfiltration is no longer assumed for the bioretention practices.

4. Cumulative storage for the bio retention area utilize an elevation of 269 while the emergency overflow device number 3 has elevation 268.5. Similar comment for pond emergency overflow device number 3 has elevation 268.5. Similar comment for pond 82 where the primary device 3 has an elevation of 263 while the storage calculation has an elevation of 264. Pond 82 has device 2 and 3 set at the same inverts however device 2 is .2 feet lower on the plan sheets. Pond 82 identifies that the deice 3 discharges at the one year storm event over the broad crested weir. An elevation of 163.08.

Response: The design values for bioretention areas 1 and 2, as well as the stormwater management pond have been revised on the grading plans and in HydroCAD to ensure consistency, clarity and

A NY State Certified Women's Business Enterprise, a US Disadvantaged Business Enterprise  
and a NY City Certified Women's Business Enterprise  
Member:

National Society of Professional Surveyors -New York State Association of Professional Land Surveyors  
American Planning Association-New York Planning Federation  
NYS GIS Association

accuracy.

5. Provide percolation permeability test for sub surface stormwater chambers.

Response: Subsurface chambers have been removed from the design.

6. Pond P1 identifies a starting storage elevation of 245 while permanent pool elevation of 246.5 is identified. No storage below 246.5 should be included in the calculation.

Response: The pond starting elevation is set at the water surface / permanent pool elevation in the HydroCAD model, therefore, no storage below this starting elevation is considered for calculations.

7. Show invert and sizing for pipes which drain the loading dock area to the outlet structure in the vicinity of the existing catch basin.

Response: Additional detail has been provided for drainage pipes at the loading area.

8. The 24 in diameter pipe at .9% cannot convey the flow from 100 year storm event through the site. This pipe has capacity 21.4 CFS while the flow identified at 22.7 CFS which will not convey the off-site flow and on site tributary area.

Response: Pipe sizing has been checked to verify adequate capacity.

9. The comments from the previous meeting date 4 October 2019 are required to be addressed copy attached.

Response: All comments are addressed with this memorandum.

# MILTON ENGINE COMPANY NO. 1

PO Box 282  
Milton, New York 12547

Stephen Kneeter, Chief  
845 590 9307

*Host of the 2017 Ulster County Parade*

September 24, 2019

To: Planning Board Members

Re: Royal Energy Properties

Upon discussing the project with my officers, we agree that 1 sided access to the building would be sufficient as long as a sprinkler and stand pipe system with exterior Fire Dept Connection is installed while anticipating a future connection with municipal water. We specifically recommend 2 1/2" stand pipes at key location(s) within the building.

Sincerely,



Stephen Kneeter

Chief

Milton Engine Co. No. 1

**TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH**  
PO Box 305 Milton NY 12547  
“ Heart Of the Hudson Valley Fruit Section”  
MILTON, ULSTER COUNTY, NEW YORK 12547  
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS

**TEL NO. 795-2406 Ext. # 7  
FAX NO. 795-6171**

**THOMAS CORCORAN JR.**  
BUILDING INSPECTOR  
CODE ENFORCER  
FIRE INSPECTOR

**October 22, 2019**

**To; Planning Board Members**

**Re: Royal Energy Properties**

This letter is to verify that the building department reviewed the updated plans for Royal Energy and finds the building does have access on two sides, the west side which is a dedicated 20' wide roadway, and the south side which only has 4 to 6 truck trips daily and therefore will be substantially accessible. I have been assured that the trailers will not be parked there on a regular basis. I also see signage will be placed upon the property to keep the fire access lanes cleared.

I have also reviewed the letter from Milton Engine Fire Chief Stephen Kneeter and also agree with his assessment as long as a sprinkler and stand pipe system are installed this will provide for safe and timely suppression of any fire.

Ultimately the final building plan submitted will determine sprinklers and the sprinkler layout.

Finally to address planning boards concerns with the existing tanks on the property. In accordance with NFPA 58 the multiple 1000 gal. tanks on the property must be 25 feet from the property line. The reduction to one tank of 1200 gallons or less would reduce the setback to 10 feet if the applicant should decide the multiple tanks are not needed.

**Any other questions please do not hesitate to contact me.**

**Thank You.**



**Thomas J. Corcoran Jr.**  
Building Inspector