



October 20, 2024

Mr. Chris Brand
Town of Marlborough Planning Board
21 Milton Turnpike
Milton, NY 12547

**RE: Review Comments for Marlborough Resort, Lattintown Road, Town of Marlborough, NY;
CM Project #124-004.2, Town Project #23-2001pc**

Dear Chairman and Board Members:

We are in receipt of the following documents and have prepared the subsequent comments based on our review of these materials:

- Traffic Impact Report by Passero Associates dated July 16, 2024
- Fire Access and Roadway Design by Passero Associates dated August 2024
- Site Plan Rendering by Passero Associates dated August 2024
- Cover letter by Passero Associates, dated October 11, 2024
- Site Plans by Passero Associates, last revised October 11, 2024
- Response to traffic comments by Passero Associates dated October 11, 2024

Traffic Study

1. The study provides a crash analysis and reports the Potential Safety Improvement and Performance Function. It appears the results for the Route 9W/Lattintown Road intersection are provided, but were any other intersections studied and reported?
2. The Traffic Impact Report (TIR) included the Hudson West and Dock Road residential projects, along with several other unnamed projects under consideration by the town. We suggest citing which projects these are and defer to the Planning Board if this is an accurate list.
3. NYSDOT traffic counts collected on Lattintown Road in September 2011 (1,780 vpd ADT) compared to July 2024 (1,715 vpd ADT) suggest a flat to slight downward trend. Similarly, volumes on Route 9W from May 2014 (22,781 vpd ADT) to August 2024 (18,037 vpd ADT) suggest a downward trend. We concur with the conservative positive growth rate of 0.75% per year.
4. The project has a unique set of land use offerings and amenities which results in a complicated trip generation estimate but the applicant approached it from a logical perspective. Each major use was estimated followed by an assumption about internal credits. The internal trip credits reduced the baseline traffic for the dining uses by about 38% and spa by 50%. In other words, it assumes that 38% of the dining guests come from the resort while 62% come from off-site guests, and 50% of the spa users are from the resort while the other 50% is from the public. The resulting non-event trips are estimated at 150 total trips in the PM peak hour and 205 trips in the Saturday peak hour, which equates to a trip rate of 1.61 trips per room in the PM peak hour and 2.2 trips per room in the Saturday peak hour. In comparison, the Mirbeau Spa cited generated traffic at a rate of 1.17 trips per room and 1.5 trips per room in the PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively. We concur with the approach and trip generation estimates, noting that the October 11, 2024 Response to Comment letter made several adjustments lowering the trip generation as a result of decreases in land use sizes.
5. The regional trip distribution appears reasonable, however, there may be a shift in traffic coming from the south. GPS may route arriving traffic from Route 9W onto Carter Avenue, where a signal and left turn

lane exist, rather than a left turn onto Lattintown Road in Newburgh. This may depend on traffic conditions and the driver's GPS program.

6. The trip distribution assumed that 20% of trips would use the Ridge Road entrance. In the October update, the distillery and tasting room was moved off Ridge Road to the center of the site. With a gate provided just west of the staff quarters, will any guests be using the Ridge Road driveway? The trip assignment indicates that the volume entering/exiting this driveway is around 20 trips in each direction. We don't expect that moving this low volume to the Lattintown Road driveway will have a significant effect on intersection operations.
7. If the gate near the staff quarters is to restrict through access, then all guests will use the Lattintown Road driveway adding more two-way volume on what is otherwise an 825-foot one lane road. CM asked Passero to model the driveway as a two-lane road with the projected traffic volumes and observe the number of potential conflicts between cars passing each other. This exercise suggested that the conflicts were enough to consider additional modifications to the site driveway. We anticipate that the applicant will offer additional widening of the Lattintown driveway to improve two-way operations and agree this will offer better condition than a one-lane road with pull offs.
8. We concur that the project volumes won't warrant left turn lanes on Lattintown Road or Ridge Road.
9. The intersection operations analysis does not offer any surprising results. The unsignalized approaches of Old Indian Road, King Street, and Lattintown Road to Route 9W operate with the longest delays. With the conservative trip generation volumes used in the July 2024 TIR, the unsignalized approaches increase by 4 seconds or less at Old Indian Road, 2 to 6 seconds at King Street, and about 7 seconds (Saturday peak hour) to over 100 seconds (PM peak hour) at Lattintown Road. The Lattintown results will be very dependent on the volume split between this road and Carter Avenue. Out of town guests will follow the GPS directions while local guests, with an awareness of Route 9W traffic, may use the traffic signal at Carter/Route 9W.
10. The rest of the study area intersections all operate a very good conditions will little to no effect on capacity from the proposed project.
11. The TIR acknowledges the couple of intersections with longer delays but generally attributes the conditions to existing/background traffic volumes with little contribution from the project, and that the improvements noted in the Route 9W Corridor Study, if programmed and completed, would provide relief from some of the longer delays. We generally agree with this conclusion, but unless these improvements are programmed by the county or NYSDOT, there will be no relief. The Corridor Study has a number of recommendations ranging from sidewalk and pedestrian oriented improvements in the Marlborough hamlet to widening, turn lane, and traffic control improvements along the corridor. The Town may wish to review/refresh themselves with these improvements and discuss a fair-share contribution with the applicant to progress a selected improvement. While the traffic impacts of the Marlborough Resort project may be minor and dispersed to various intersections, their contribution to improvements could be focused in one area of greatest need or benefit.
12. The sight distance analysis on Lattintown Road generally indicate adequate conditions. However, does the distance looking right account for existing vegetation or assume it's been cleared? Field observations (image below, left) suggest the sight distance is limited to around 200 feet given the low approach of the driveway and the existing vegetation. Looking left appears adequate, but if the roadside grass/weeds are allowed to grow taller, sight distance will be reduced (image below, right). Routine maintenance may correct this condition.



13. Similarly, the sight distance onto Ridge Road appears excellent looking to the right but limited to less than 200 feet due to vegetation immediately north of the driveway (image, below, left). A southbound driver may only see a cars front bumper pulling out due to the vegetation (image below, right). Although the applicant recommends an intersection warning sign, additional effort should be provided to mitigate this condition.



Site Plan

14. Sheet C131 - The main entrance from Lattintown Road has additional pull offs added to allow vehicles to yield to each other along this +/-825 foot driveway. Each of capable of holding one standard vehicle or two compact vehicles. The sight lines appear adequate to see an approaching vehicle between pulloffs, the longest stretch of which is 200 ft, however the frequency of conflicts may exceed the capacity of this layout under peak conditions.
15. Sheet C132 - Porous pavement is proposed for several of the parking areas. We presume this will be porous asphalt and parking will be striped. If the parking area is gravel or structural pavers, we recommend that some type of parking space demarcation be provided. What's the Road A width immediately north of the Clubhouse Dining Room 1? Are any deliveries (truck movements) expected to the dining room?
16. General - Will each guest/guest cabin have access to club cars (carts)? Are guests expected to use these cars to navigate the property, leaving their car in the main parking lot? Is there cart parking at each cabin or the tennis courts, main lodge, etc.?

17. General – Guest house and general wayfinding signs will be necessary. “Carts Only” signing may be needed where cart access is allowed but not vehicles. Any internal traffic control (stop, curve, steep grade, etc.) will need to be considered.
18. Sheet C133 – Label the roads. Road M on this sheet is labeled as Road N in the fire access sheets. Is any cart parking necessary at the tennis/pickleball courts?
19. Sheet C135 – Label roads.
20. Sheet C137 – Label roads. There is a gate proposed on the west leg of the road. Who has access? How will it be open? Can carts drive or people walk around it? When is Dining 2 used and by whom? The tasting room moved to this location with parking provided. Are guests allowed to drive here? Arriving from the Ridge Road or Lattintown Road driveways?
21. Sheet C138 – An “employees only” sign may be necessary. Will garbage service/dumpster be provided at the staff quarters? We assume staff may get deliveries (mail, parcels, etc.) – will the staff dorm have it’s own address? There is a gate proposed on the west leg of the road. Who has access? How will it be open? Can carts drive or people walk around it?
22. General – We expect Google, Apple, Waze, etc., may eventually identify the project roads as having access from Lattintown Road to Ridge Road. It will be important to follow up with those mapping services to identify the road is “private” so that drivers aren’t accidentally routed through the site.
23. General – there may be a missing sheet between C136 and C138 showing the end of Road A and the intersection with Road K.
24. Vehicle Maneuvering Plans –
 - a. General – if cabins anticipate providing space for cart parking, consider enough room away from the sections of roads with steep grades to allow for maintenance and cleaning service vehicles to park on a less steep grade. Will any of the carts struggle to climb the steep grade sections?
 - b. General – It appears that fire and ambulance access can be provided in all areas and that there are alternative routes for most of the steep sections. The Removal of Road A (E-04, PR-03, -20) will leave one section of Road G with a 9% to 22% grade that may need to be used depending on the location of the emergency and the location of the responding department/vehicle.
 - c. E-02 – confirm North direction.

Summary

25. Our overall summary of the project is that we don’t foresee any significant SEQR issues relative to traffic. The projects off-site impacts are generally minor, but additional review and site plan modifications are suggested.

If you have any questions about the above comments, please don’t hesitate to contact our office at 518-689-1834 or kwersted@cmellp.com.

Respectfully,
Creighton Manning Engineering, LLP

C: Pat Hines – MHE



Kenneth Wersted, PE, PTOE
Associate