

June 19, 2002

Mr. Donald F. Cropsey, Jr.
Chief Building Inspector & Zoning Administrator
Town of Guilderland
Route 20, PO Box 339
Guilderland, NY 12084-0339

**RE: Styvesant Plaza, Executive Park Office and Restaurant
Town of Guilderland, New York**

Dear Mr. Cropsey:

Vollmer Associates LLP has reviewed the plans submitted including related traffic impact study dated April 29, 2002 and a parking study dated April 8, 2002 for the above noted project. Based upon the information provided, we submit the following review comments:

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

1. In general, the traffic impact study followed the methodology used to develop a traffic impact study. The traffic study evaluated the potential impacts from the proposed 6,000 SF restaurant and a future proposed 30,400 SF office building.
2. The traffic study analyzed the Weekday PM peak period only, noting that the weekday afternoon period represents a peak commuter travel period of the proposed office building and represents a peak travel time for the restaurant. While the PM period is a peak travel time for both uses, the report dismisses the AM period by noting that the Restaurant will not be open and it dismisses the Saturday period by noting that the Executive Park office complex will have minimal operations during this period. Office buildings typically have an AM peak and restaurants typically have a weekend peak. The traffic study fails to note that Styvesant Plaza is essentially a multi-use park containing office buildings, restaurants, and retail facilities, which effect each of the peak periods. Furthermore, the traffic volumes on the adjacent street traffic will also vary depending on the time period. The conclusion that the AM and Saturday periods will not be effected cannot be made until actual traffic counts are performed to support such a statement.
3. The 2004 No-Build traffic was developed by adding a 1.5% background growth rate to the existing traffic volumes. While the report indicates that the Mangia restaurant will enclose the existing exterior dining area and no additional traffic will be added to the network, it does not indicate if the Town has any other known, planned and/or approved projects that should be included in the analysis.
4. Trip generation for Office Buildings, ITE Land Use Code (LUC) 750, Office Park, is appropriate, unless specific information about the tenants is know for the office building. However, the trip generation for the Restaurant uses ITE LUC 831, Quality Restaurant which may not be appropriate, given the unknown tenant. ITE Trip generation LUC 832, High Turnover (sit down) restaurant may be appropriate as well since these facilities generally serve lunch and dinner, may contain a bar area and have turnover rates of approximately one hour or less. Therefore, the study should include the trips generated from this use. The traffic figures and analysis should be revised to reflect this change.
5. The 2004 Build capacity analysis for the Fuller Road/Plaza Service Drive uses the 2004 No-Build traffic volumes. A revised capacity analysis should be performed to determine the LOS obtained at this intersection with the proposed project.

6. The capacity analysis does not include the effect of the upstream traffic signals. However, the traffic study concludes for the Fuller Road/Stuyvesant Plaza Driveway, "The two adjacent traffic signals on Fuller Road at Executive Park Drive and Western Avenue create gaps in the traffic flows on Fuller Road to better accommodate the traffic exiting Stuyvesant Plaza than shown in this analysis." Since the HCS software permits data on upstream signals to be input, this analysis, as well as the other unsignalized intersection analyses should be revised to show the effects of upstream signals.
7. The traffic volumes observed during the delay study for the Western Avenue/Stuyvesant Plaza Driveway were approximately 168 vehicles less (85 vehicles less for the southbound and 83 vehicles less for the eastbound movements) than the traffic volumes observed during the traffic counts. Using the traffic volumes obtained from the delay study, the report notes that this would equate to a LOS C/D. However, there were no traffic volumes noted for the east and westbound approaches for which the southbound and eastbound left turn movements would have to merge with or cross over. Since the eastbound and southbound turn movements were less than originally observed, it is likely that the westbound through/right turn movements would also be less, thereby reducing the delay to the turn movements.
8. Although no traffic from the proposed restaurant has been assigned to the Fuller Road/Plaza Service Driveway, there is the potential for some of the traffic to/from this site to use this access drive and avoid the Executive Park/Fuller Road intersection.
9. The traffic study should discuss the existing and forecasted queue lengths for each of the intersections and its effect on the surrounding roadway network and the internal circulation of the plaza. The report should identify the lengths of the left turn lanes and the adequacy of such facilities to accommodate turn movements without impeding through movements.
10. The applicant should review the traffic counts, capacity analysis, queuing and any additional information to address the need for a southbound right turn lane on Fuller Road at Executive Park Drive.

PARKING STUDY

1. As noted in the parking study, the parking lots for Nos. 2 and 4 Executive Park were divided into distinct parking areas with Lot A (Building #2), outlined such that the distance between the parking lot and the restaurant would be less than 500 feet. However, Town Code Section 280-25, Section E states that other required parking spaces shall be located on the same parcel or on another parcel, provided that the farthest parking space is not farther than 300 feet from the commercial building or use they are intended to serve. Therefore, in order to assess the number of available parking spaces from No. 2 Executive Drive that could be used by the proposed restaurant, Lot A should include only that area within 300 feet of the restaurant.
2. The site plan dated 5/21/02 shows a proposed parking lot by No. 2 Executive Park (formerly the existing green space reserved for future parking) with 32 spaces. This parking area will reduce 8 of the existing parking spaces used by 2 Executive Park and should be included in the assessment of available parking.
3. The parking study should identify the number of parking spaces proposed for this project and the number of proposed shared spaces.
4. The applicant has noted that Nos. 2 and 4 Executive Park are each approximately 97% occupied. The study should identify the additional parking that would be required for this extra 2%-3% per building to accommodate 100% occupancy.

SITE PLAN

1. The site plan (sheet 3 of 5) is missing the north arrow.
2. As per Town Code, parking isle widths should be 26 feet wide for ninety degree parking. The site plans onsite parking (parking surrounding the building) proposes isle widths of 24 feet.
3. The proposed off site parking lot could be moved to the south such that the proposed isle aligns with the existing parking isle on the south side of No. 2 Executive Park.
4. No fire lane is designated on any side of the building.
5. The loading dock should be revised as per Town Code. The site plan shows a 28 foot long loading dock. Town Code requires 35 feet.
6. Lighting is required for the parking facility adjacent to No. 2 Executive Park Drive since the proposed restaurant and therefore, this parking lot, will be used during non daylight hours.
7. Turning templates should be used at the secondary access (Fuller Road/Plaza Service Drive) to demonstrate that the revised access drive will not impede the traffic flow on Fuller Road.
8. Traffic control should be investigated for both the Fuller Road/Plaza Service Driveway and Fuller Road/Stuyvesant Plaza Driveway.
9. The Executive Park Driveway shows two lanes entering the site: an exclusive through lane and a shared left turn/through lane. The plan should show the driveway tapering to the one lane which occurs just past the proposed restaurant access drive.
10. The term "guard rail" as shown on the plans and details should be replaced with "guide rail".
11. The site plan shows three proposed parking lot light fixtures. However, no photo-metrics have been included.
12. The applicant has noted that the May 21, 2002 site plan (sheet 3 of 5) will be revised such that the driveway for the Stuyvesant Plaza service entrance opposite the No. 2 Executive Drive Building would remain in its existing location. All site plans should be revised as necessary and submitted as part of the application. The applicant should provide a detailed discussion as to why the driveway will remain and should identify other possible driveway locations and its feasibility.

ke align

STORM DRAINAGE

1. The orifice information shown for areas "A" through "E" indicates a 3.7 foot head on the orifice. The head on the orifice will be 3.26 feet, taken at the center of the orifice. This should be corrected and all related calculations adjusted, or the orifice elevation adjusted.
2. The storage calculations for drainage area "F" indicate that both the 24 inch pipe and both catch basins will be used for the required storage. The location of the orifice on the inlet side of the catch basin eliminates this structure as storage.

3. A calculation should be made which shows how the time of concentration was determined.
4. The runoff coefficient for pavement/roof would more appropriately be 0.95.
5. No detail is shown for the proposed clean-out in area "F". A manhole would best serve for cleaning of this line.
6. Do the drainage calculations reflect the area of the most recent building roof layout?

SANITARY SEWER

1. The 6,000 gallon grease trap proposed is adequate for the 165 seats cited for this restaurant.

WATER SERVICE/SYSTEM

1. Subsequent to receipt of plans for review, we received a sprinkler riser detail. This detail should be included on the final drawings. The vertical restraining rods on this riser should extend to the 90 degree bend or be more detailed with respect to their embedment into the floor slab.
2. A valve should be installed on the hydrant side of the building water service lateral to allow shutting of the hydrant without closing the building service.
3. The plan should clearly indicate that abandonment of the existing water service shall include shutting off of the corporation stop at the main and disconnecting the service line from the corporation stop.
4. Thermal expansion in the hot water system should be considered with respect to the possible need for an expansion tank.
5. The existing water distribution system main in Fuller Road is old asbestos cement pipe which has experienced numerous breaks in past years. If new roadway construction is to occur above this main, the main should be replaced. Proposed planting of trees should not be done above this main and tree planting should consider maintaining a clear route for replacement of this main in the future.

Once you have reviewed this material, should you have any questions, we are available to further discuss any questions.

Very truly yours,
Vollmer Associates, LLP



Thomas J. McGrath, PE
Project Manager