

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of North Salem Planning Board

FROM: William Agresta, AICP, Director of Planning
Joseph T. Bridges, PhD, Senior Biologist

DATE: March 30, 2012

RE: BRIDLESIDE (former Salem Hunt)
SITE PLAN, WETLAND PERMIT, STORMWATER PERMIT
June Road - Sheet 5, Block 1735, Lot 19
Our File NS05005

REVIEW SUMMARY

- The applicant was to provide in writing, a letter of withdrawal of the previous application for Subdivision; we are unaware of any such letter. However, the expiration date of that application was March 1, 2012, which has passed without extension by the Planning Board. Therefore, the previously granted Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval is expired.**
- The application materials and plans should be revised to address the comments below, including the March 22, 2012 NYCDEP comments.**

MATERIALS RECEIVED

- ▶ Application for Site Plan Approval;
 - ▶ Application for Wetland Permit;
 - ▶ EAF Parts 1, 2 and 3, Tim Miller Associates, February 15, 2012;
- NEW / REVISED INFORMATION**
- ▶ EAF Narrative (Part 3), revised March 15, 2012;
 - ▶ Buffer Enhancement and Monitoring Plan, Tim Miller Associates, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Integrated Pest Management Plan, Tim Miller Associates, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Herptile Protection Plan, Tim Miller Associates, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Invasive Species Monitoring and Control Program, Tim Miller Associates, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Well Monitoring and Mitigation Plan, Tim Miller Associates, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Non-Salt Winter Traction Materials Monitoring & Maintenance Program by Insite Engineering, March 14, 2012;
 - ▶ Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Bridleside), Insite Engineering, March 12, 2012;
 - ▶ Site Plans, Sheets 1 through 20, Insite Engineering, January 11, 2012, revised March 12, 2012;
 - ▶ Easement Map, Insite Engineering, March 7, 2012;
 - ▶ Architectural Documents, A-0 through A-17, L&M Design LLC, March 13, 2012;
 - ▶ Architectural Plan and Sections, Wastewater Treatment Plant, A-1 through A-2, Milnes Engineering Inc., February 15, 2012.

CONSTRUCTION MONITORING and POST CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS PROGRAMS

1. Buffer Enhancement and Monitoring Plan

- a. The revised sheet references made in the last line on Page 1 under “Mitigation Proposal” and in the third paragraph under “Planting Details” on Page 2 remain incorrect; in both instances, revise “SP-1” to **SP-2**.
- b. Under “Mitigation Proposal,” the statement indicating that plant “species will be chosen which are known to be resistant to deer browsing” is at odds with the plants proposed, as deer will readily browse all of the plants indicated, particularly during extended periods of snow cover. In addition to deer repellent, plastic fencing should be set in place to protect planted materials immediately after they are installed, rather than wait to determine if fencing is necessary.
- c. Ferns which are generally resistant to deer browse, such as cinnamon fern (*Osmunda cinnamomea*), shield ferns (*Dryopteris* spp) and Christmas fern (*Polystichum acrostichoides*) should be included in the proposed planting plan.
- d. Some stock Eastern redbud is not listed as native in New York (*Cercis canadensis*) and is not particularly cold hardy at this latitude. It should be substituted with more shadblow (*Amelanchier canadensis*).
- e. Page 3, last paragraph, replace the word “rate” to: **threshold**.
- f. The list of invasive species targeted for control as indicated on Sheet SP-2 should be referenced.
- g. Page 3, last paragraph, 3rd line, replace “i.e.” to: **e.g.**, as more than *Lythrum salicaria* and *Phragmites australis* are proposed for removal / control.

NYCDEP COMMENTS

2. The EAF and project plans should be revised to address the March 22, 2012 NYCDEP comments (see below for related comments), particularly the suggested revisions related to site landscaping, seed mixes and realignment of the proposed pedestrian / bridle trail outside of wetland buffers now made possible due to the reduced proposed disturbance of the site.

SEQR - EAF

3. EAF PART 3

- a. The applicant should confirm that the indicated “mathematical rounding error” in the grading at the site entrance occurred in relation to the Salem Hunt FEIS plan and that the proposed extent of shown disturbance to site wetland buffer has not physically changed or increased, but rather was only understated (due to the rounding error) in the FEIS.
- b. Page 16, 1st full sentence, revise to: **NYSDEC regulates Wetlands A, D, E and F, which are all part of NYSDEC Wetland L-32.**
- c. Page 16, 5th paragraph, change “(also NYSDEC Wetland D”) to: **(also NYSDEC Wetland L-32).**

- d. Page 28, 2nd paragraph, last sentence, revise anticipated number of school children to: **16**.
- e. The response “all sources of income are figured into the calculation” to previous Comment 6d dated March 5, 2012 does not provide specific clarity [*The indicated maximum incomes for the affordable units are not explained as to how they are calculated (i.e., what is included, what if anything is excluded from income, etc)*]. The specific income formula utilized should be detailed.
- f. The applicant should confirm that the response to our previous Comment 6h dated March 5, 2012 is indicating that lease renewals would be made to renters even if their income at the time of renewal exceeds the then maximum affordable income eligibility standards.
- g. The response to previous Comment 6j dated March 5, 2012 does not actually address the specific question raised in the noted previous comment [*It is not evident if the stated maximum number of persons per affordable unit (which are consistent with the Town’s Moderate-Income Housing Regulations), are at odds with or pose any inconsistency with regard to the applicable project public funding standards or requirements?*]. Specifically, do the conditions or terms of the public funding conflict or otherwise differ from the Town’s Zoning standards and/or those in the County Model Regulations?

PROJECT PLANS

4. SP-1, Overall Site Plan

- a. On this and all other plan sheets where noted, label the area designated by flag sequence WL F1 to WL F12 as both **Wetland F and NYSDEC Wetland L-32**.
- b. The limits of the Wildflower meadow should be delimited on the plan to coincide with the label “Proposed 4-inch wide wood chip trail through wildflower meadow only.”

5. **Mailboxes** - Based on discussion at the March 7, 2012 Planning Board meeting it was our understanding that the plans would be revised to locate (possibly near the clubhouse building), label and detail centralized mailboxes.

6. **Architectural Sheets** - The wall features as shown on the East Elevation of the proposed Wastewater Treatment Plant should be labeled; are these vents?

7. **Easement Map** - The proposed Easement Map should be revised to address the following:

- a. Add the following label in the center loop of the proposed development area: **Proposed Site Development (see General Note #4)**.
- b. Add the word **Existing** to the label for the “100' Wide Utility Easement.”
- c. Revise General Note #2 to also include reference to **General Note #4** in regard to the reference to “Drawing TP-1.”

- d. Add a prominently placed and sized list of Easement Dedication notes describing the intent and intended recipient of each of the following:
 - ▶ Conservation Easement
 - ▶ 20' wide Bridle/Walking Trail Easement
 - ▶ Fire Department Access to Water Storage Tanks
- e. The location of the water storage tanks and related access easement are not shown.
- f. Revise the size of the labels for the "Proposed 20' wide Bridle/Walking Trail Easement" to match that as for the "Proposed Conservation Easement."
- g. Delete the following data tables:
 - ▶ Supplemental Requirements
 - ▶ R-MF/4 Zone Requirements