

III. H – TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION

H-1 Comment:

Based upon the representations made by the applicant and its consultant in the material provided to date, it appears that the nature of the concerns have been addressed and I want to break these down, specifically the Traffic and Transportation Chapter 4.H. It was absolutely imperative there were assurances at the intersection of Fenimore Road and Railroad Way would not be blocked during business hours thereby assuring the flow of traffic by vehicles and tractor trailers making deliveries and pickup for all of the building and properties located along Railroad Way.

*There was a letter dated February 19, 2019 from Cuddy and Feder which proposed that the hours of construction would be from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Obviously, with the applicant coordinating in advance with the building department, we feel very confident that the intersection and egress and access to Railroad Way would remain open so that the businesses could receive their shipments from these large tractor trailers.
(Andrew Spatz, Public Hearing, May 6, 2021)*

H-1 Response:

Comment noted. The intersection of Fenimore Road and Railroad Way will not be blocked as a result of the Project and the egress and access to Railroad Way will remain open.

H-2 Comment:

*There was also reference to the removal of a curb cut near a barn, which we don't oppose. This is also made reference to in the DEIS as long as no additional obstructions were installed. Again, the access is absolutely imperative from Fenimore Road into Railroad Way, that's how the vehicles go from I-95 and gain access to all the buildings along Railroad Way. And it indicated nothing in the applicant's reports indicated that they were going to replace that curb with anything that can serve as an obstruction to the traffic and transportation.
(Andrew Spatz, Public Hearing, May 6, 2021)*

H-2 Response:

Comment noted. There will be no obstructions from the Project that will block the access to Railroad Way.

H-3 Comment:

Communication that would be held with CSX Railroad, this is absolutely imperative in advance of any construction as we do have active railroads that rail cars that come in late at night. The applicant addressed these issues during construction. The applicant would ensure that no impedance were placed in the required clearance envelope which was discussed and relayed in the DEIS, and also it would not interfere with the CSX crews operating on those tracks. Unfortunately, on that strip, if you've actually been down there, you can imagine having a railroad car, an engine I should say, very, very little room for error, but the applicant was very proactive. They reached out to CSX and they also made references that the representations that they would be in contact with the CSX train master prior to construction to ensure that the crews were aware that there was construction ongoing.

*Obviously, the applicant would adhere to any and all identifications that would be required by CSX because that were in proximity to an active railroad, there's also control devices and mechanisms for those tracks. The report, I understand, indicates that they will also take adequate measures to address the shoring and stability of the railroad tracks in advance of construction commencing. That is actually pursuant to the CSX design and construction standard specifications.
(Andrew Spatz, Public Hearing, May 6, 2021)*

H-3 Response:

Communication with CSX has been held and will continue before and during construction. Appropriate construction measures consistent with CSX design and construction standard specifications will be utilized.

H-4 Comment:

Figure II-8 is the “Traffic Management Plan” for the proposed facility and Figure II-10 is the “First Floor Plan.” There are four loading spaces shown on the plan, but only three of the loading spaces have direct access to a door. It is unclear how the fourth loading space would access the loading area.
(AKRF Memorandum, April 30, 2021)

H-4 Response:

The revised Site Plan illustrates three loading spaces to be provided. Each loading space aligns with a door leading directly to a loading area. Loading spaces are for various size loading vehicles. Typically vans & any vehicle without an elevated deck will also use loading spaces & transport items with business-provided wheeled carts via entry door to elevator lobby.

H-5 Comment:

The size of the loading spaces and clarification on the maximum sized truck should be provided.
(AKRF Memorandum, April 30, 2021)

H-5 Response:

The majority of the vehicles will be personal automobiles, such as SUV's, vans or pick-up trucks. Any trucks utilizing the site tend to be small based on the operational characteristics of the existing facility. The maximum size truck anticipated would be small box trucks up to an SU-30 (30-foot long) which would be rare. The size of the loading spaces are illustrated on the Site Plan. Each loading space is 30 feet long. The southernmost loading space is 14 feet wide while the other two loading spaces are 9 feet wide.

H-6 Comment:

The FEIS should go into more detail on the break-down of the proposed number of parking spaces and the use of the parking spaces. It should also refer to the shared parking regulations in the Village of Mamaroneck zoning code.
(AKRF Memorandum, April 30, 2021)

H-6 Response:

Based upon the Village's Code, storage space is to provide one parking space per 750 square feet (sf) as is the woodworking space while office space is to provide one parking space per 2350 sf.

The Mamaroneck Self Storage facility currently has 1-2 employees on-site at any one time. With additional units, this could increase to a maximum of 43 employees on-site at times. A self-storage facility with a total of 429 units, based upon the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication "Parking Generation", 5th Edition, would generate a peak parking demand of 6 spaces, inclusive of the employee spaces. The retail use that was previously proposed in conjunction with the self-storage facility has been eliminated from the Project.

The Murphy Brothers Contracting portion of the Site will have 4 full time office staff on-site which are projected to use 4 parking spaces. Murphy Brothers Contracting will generally not generate any visits from the general public or contractors. There were previously 19 parking spaces designated for five businesses that parked on-site. That usage will be replaced by the self-storage building addition, and thus the overall parking demand will be reduced. Many of these contractors/businesses have already moved or are no longer in business since the previous studies were performed and thus are no longer parking there.

The Woodworking Shop is projected to utilize 3 parking spaces while the Incubator Offices are projected to utilize approximately 6 parking spaces. Thus, a total of approximately 19 parking spaces could be utilized if all of the uses were to peak at the same time.

With the proposed self-storage facility addition and the modifications to the layout of the Site, there will be 26 parking spaces provided on-site along with three (3) loading spaces, in addition to the on-street parking spaces along Waverly Avenue. The 3 loading spaces will be utilized by the patrons of the self-storage facility, thus freeing up even more parking spaces.

The Village's Code permits the utilization of "Shared Parking", referred to as "Joint Parking", in Section 342-56 B. Shared Parking is the principle where different land uses would have their peak parking demands at different times during the day/week and thus can utilize or "share" the same parking space during different periods. As described above, 26 off-street parking spaces total are proposed where the estimated demand is approximately 19 total spaces and therefore, there will be ample parking even without the principles of share parking being applied.

[Refer to Response A-33 for a breakdown of required parking by use.](#)

H-7 Comment:

***A truck turning path movement (AutoTurn) analysis should be provided for the largest anticipated size truck for movements to and from the loading bays.
(AKRF Memorandum, April 30, 2021)***

H-7 Response:

A truck turning path movement (AutoTurn) analysis is provided for the largest anticipated size truck (SU-30) for movements to and from the loading bays. It will be rare that an SU-30 truck will be utilized at the Site, but it is illustrated that an SU-30 can enter and exit each loading area. Depending upon what parking spaces are occupied, a slight second maneuver may be required to back into a loading space at times (Figure IV-H-1).

H-8 Comment:

***Will parking be assigned?
(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)***

H-8 Response:

The parking will not be assigned. It will follow the principals of Shared Parking.

H-9 Comment:

***How were the parking calculations made?
(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)***

H-9 Response:

As described in the revised Traffic Study, the parking calculations were performed utilizing the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publication "Parking Generation", 5th Edition, and information provided for the Project including size and number of employees, consistent with the previous parking calculations. Supporting documentation for the Project is contained in the Traffic Study Appendix.

H-10 Comment:

***Confusion over parking counts. Need a chart for the new uses proposed and associated parking requirements for each.
(Chairman Neufeld, November 16, 2021 Work Session)***

H-10 Response:

TABLE H-1 PROJECTED PARKING GENERATION	
Scenario	Weekday
	Parking Demand
429 Self Storage Units (including 269 Existing and 160 Additional Units)	6
Woodworking Shop	3
Incubator Offices	6
MBC Offices	4
Total	19

Formatted: Font color: Background 1

Formatted Table

H-11 Comment:
*Parking table needs to reflect new proposed uses
(Board Member Yergin, November 16, 2021 Work Session)*

H-11 Response:

TABLE H-2 REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING BY USE	
USE	REQUIRED PARKING
Existing Self Storage Facility	55
Self-Storage Addition	46
Woodworking Shop	8
Incubator Offices	8
MBC Offices	2
Total	124

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

See Response H-10:

H-12 Comment:
*Parking numbers are inconsistent in the document.
(Board Member Yergin, November 16, 2021 Work Session)*

H-12 Response:

The parking calculations are contained in the revised Traffic Study. Table H-1 summarizes the anticipated peak parking demand for each proposed use. Not all of the peaks for the respective uses will occur at the same time. There are also three loading zones provided which will reduce the number of parking spaces used for the self-storage facility.

H-13 Comment:

Needs to be updated for new uses, not just trip data provided. Requests a full updated traffic analysis.
(Board Member Kramer, November 16, 2021 Work Session)

H-13 Response:

A revised updated Traffic Study with the traffic analysis has been prepared for the new uses. The findings of the Traffic Study remain the same, that there is no traffic impact and more than sufficient parking is provided.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"