



Memorandum

To: Planning Board
Town of Amenia

Attn: Norm Fontaine
Chairperson

From: Julie S. Mangarillo, P.E., CPESC

Subject: Comments regarding February 2015
submittal

Date: April 22, 2015

Project: Silo Ridge

The following material was reviewed:

- Refer to Attachment A

Submitted documents have been reviewed for conformance with Master Development Plan (MDP) approval, Site Plan Phase 1 and Subdivision approval.

The following new comments are offered for consideration by the Planning Board:

1. Provide additional information on how refuse will be handled around the Club House and other densely located amenity buildings in the Village Green. If there will be an area of refuse consolidation in one of the buildings before being transported to the Maintenance Facility or other location, label the area on the site plans.
2. Drawing C4.12 shows the location of the propane tanks for some of buildings in the area of the Village Green to be behind the buildings. This appears to make access to propane tanks by delivery trucks difficult. Consideration should be given to how propane deliveries will be made.
3. Provide additional 'No Parking' signs on the other "leg" of the hammerhead turnarounds at the end of roads. For example, on C5.03 at the end of Eagles Pass, Peregrine Drive, and Snowy Owl Court.
4. Drawing C8.04 includes architectural elevation views for the "Well House". Drawing A3.43 includes architectural elevation views for the "Water Treatment Building." Presumably these are the same building. Which architectural elevation is correct? The incorrect sheet is to be removed. Assuming these represent the same building, label the building consistently in the drawings as either "well house" or "water treatment building."
5. Road design per NYS Fire Code: While the Fire Code provides exemptions for single-family homes for road width, there does not appear to be a similar exemption for non-residential buildings. Roads providing access to the Activity Barn (Wood Duck Road) and Golf Maintenance Facility (Redtail Pass) are less than the required 20 foot width. This should be given another look. Also, using truck turning software or other method, confirm a fire truck can turnaround using the loop at Pheasant Run in front of the Club House.
6. In addition to the review of the plans already completed by the Fire Department, the spacing of hydrants should also be reviewed.
7. Water service:

- a. Drawing C7.02 shows a relatively short water line connected to the Water Storage Tank. Presumably this is for the flushing line and hydrant labeled on C8.05. This should be labeled on C7.02. Similarly, the water storage tank 'overflow to daylight' shown on C8.05 should be shown on C7.02 and C7.13. Provide erosion and sediment control where water is discharged to the ground surface, especially on slopes, such as the flushing hydrant and overflow.
 - b. Confirm with Building Inspector if covered Parking Barns, SR-13 and C3.5 require sprinklers. If so, provide water service.
 - c. C7.05 – Provide 'C1' label for water service to lot LL-2. It appears that lot LL-6 has two (2) water services.
 - d. C7.06 – Show the 100 foot and 200 foot radii for well #2.
 - e. C7.07 – Consider adding a hydrant for flushing at the dead-end of the waterline on Wood Duck Road.
 - f. C7.08 – It appears lots E-2 and E-11 have two (2) water services. Show the 100 foot and 200 foot radii for wells 11 and 31.
 - g. C7.10 – There is no water service to the fertilizer and chemical storage building or admin building. The Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP) requires emergency eye wash and showers for the fertilizer and chemical mixing area. Provide water service.
 - h. C7.10 – Revise "Existing Wetland" label to "Existing Landfill."
 - i. C7.10 – There is a long run without fire hydrants, approximately 2000 feet. The Fire Code of New York State has guidance of 600 to 1,000 feet. While currently there are no buildings or other occupied spaces between the hydrants, this spacing should still be reviewed with the Fire Department and consideration should be given for adding hydrant(s).
8. Wastewater service
- a. C9.04 – Provide "S-2" labels for services to building C4.1 and C4.2.
 - b. C9.10 – No sanitary sewer service is shown for the pesticide/fertilizer building or the admin building.
 - c. C9.11 – Provide "S-1" label for the service to lot E-39.
The service for Lot E-35 is not within the ADA or the sewer envelope.
9. Sewer envelopes for the ADAs for Estate Home lots – Some of the sewer envelopes for Estate Home lots appear to be unnecessarily large. This is in conflict with efforts to minimize disturbance on steep slopes. Sewer envelopes should be given another look. For example on drawing C9.11:
- a. Lot E-33 has a large sewer envelope on the east side of the property, adjacent to Oak Tree Lane. The sewer main and service line follow the shared driveway with lot E-34. It appears the sewer envelope could be reduced.
 - b. The sewer envelope between Lots E-30 and E-31 also appears excessively large.
 - c. Lots E-30, E-36, E-37, E-38 and E-39 have sewer envelopes on two-sides of the lots. This seems excessive.

- d. There is a 'triple' wide sewer envelope between lots E-35 and E-36. It seems a 'double' sewer envelope would be sufficient.
10. Drawing C4.07 - Building SR-17 is labeled "pump station" but does not appear to be used for drinking water or sanitary sewer. What is its purpose?
 11. Drawing C6.11
 - a. Some of the proposed contours are not tied back into the respective existing contours. For example, see grading around lots E-26, 27 and 28.
 - b. Based upon the proposed grading, it appears the driveway envelope for lot E-29 can be reduced.
 12. C12.08 shows Well #25 proposed for irrigation use is outside the limits of disturbance. Presumably there will be some disturbance to connect to this well. The limits of disturbance and erosion control measures should be adjusted so the well is within the limits of disturbance.
 13. C13.04 - Update the construction phasing on C13.04 to match phasing in Appendix H of the SWPPP. In particular, the public overlook should be constructed in the beginning of construction, as is included in the SWPPP as Development Phase 0. The water treatment plant and wastewater treatment plant are not scheduled for construction until Development Phases 3 and 9, respectively. It seems these vital pieces of infrastructure should be started earlier in the construction sequence.
 14. Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP) –
 - a. In the revised NRMP, the number of surface water and groundwater sample locations has been reduced with no explanation. NRMP dated June 2007 Page 8-2 has five (5) Surface Water sample locations and three (3) Groundwater sample locations. NRMP dated December 19, 2014, page 142 has three (3) Surface Water sample locations and only one (1) Groundwater sample location.
 - b. In the revised 2014 NRMP, the following text was eliminated: "New 2" monitor wells will be installed. The wells will be constructed according to New York regulations, under the direction of a hydro-geologist."
 - c. It is our understanding that previously the NRMP was reviewed on behalf of the Town by Marty Petrovic. Determining an adequate number of sample locations and type of sample wells is beyond our scope of work. We recommend the Town consult with Marty Petrovic or another consultant who is qualified to review this change.
 15. Plat Notes – Redlined version submitted by the applicant, dated 2/23/2015: A number of plat notes have been removed without explanation. For example:
 - a. Previous # 36 "No fences, walls, hedges, or other landscaping shall be permitted to obstruct visibility at roadway intersections in this subdivision" taken from subdivision code 105-22.F. Visibility at road intersections is important to the Fire Department. Efforts have been made by Silo Ridge to provide the required 150 feet of required sight distance at intersections. We recommend this note be reinstated.
 - b. Previous # 37 "All driveways in this subdivision shall be constructed to afford suitable access to each home site in accordance with the Town of Amenia

Driveway Specification (Chapter 101 of the Town Code), the Town Zoning Code and the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code.” Silo Ridge has requested waivers for specific aspects of driveway design, such as maximum slope. We recommend this note be re-instated and re-worded as necessary to indicate driveways will be constructed in accordance with the approvals.

- c. Previous #45 “At least five days prior to beginning the construction of any required improvements or utilities in this subdivision, the applicant shall notify the Planning Board Engineer in writing of the time when the applicant proposes to commence such construction...” We recommend this note be re-instated and re-worded as necessary to include the 3rd party inspector.
- d. Previous #52 “The applicant has posted a bond and/or other financial security with the Town of Amenia to insure completion of the rural lanes in this subdivision before lots are sold.” We recommend this note be re-instated and re-worded if needed.
- e. Previous #62 “A 10' wide easement to the Town of Amenia and the homeowners association has been granted on each lot along roads for roadway construction, slope stabilization and for fire protection. This easement has been recorded in the Dutchess County Clerk’s Office.” We recommend this note be re-instated. This is particularly important for retaining walls required for the road that are located along the boundary of the road right-of-way and individual lots. For example, refer to drawing C6.12 and the retaining wall close to the property line for Lot CM-8. If that retaining wall requires maintenance or to be repaired in the future, there should be some mechanism to allow access to lot CM-8 to work on the backside of the retaining wall.

16. Subdivision Code Waivers – Appendix O of the Addendum to the EAF

- a. Per 105-22.H(3)(b) the maximum right-of-way width for a Rural Lane is 33 feet. The rights-of-way of the proposed roads for Silo Ridge measure at 40 feet. A waiver should be requested.
- b. The waiver request letter prepared by DeiBello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr, LLP dated February 5, 2015 in Appendix O includes the Subdivision Code 105-22.H(3)(e) minimum rural lane pavement width of 18 feet. The waiver request letter should be revised to specify the request for 16 foot wide paved roads.

17. Floodplain permit, Volume 6, Appendix 6.0, memorandum prepared by VHB, dated 1/8/2015 – The flood plain analysis shows with the proposed grading within the flood plain, there will be a net increase in storage volume during flood events. The memo also references the FEMA allowance of increasing the flood elevation by no more than 1 foot. The memo should be revised to also include the more restrictive Town of Amenia standard. Per Town Code Chapter 67 “Flood Damage Prevention”, 67-15.B.(2)(a) “A technical evaluation by a licensed professional engineer shows that such an encroachment *shall not result in any increase in flood levels* during occurrence of the base flood...” (emphasis added). The analysis provided shows no increase in flood levels, but the memo is to be revised to specify the proposed grading meets this more restrictive standard. As acknowledged by the Applicant, approval will have to be issued by NYSDOT before any work can begin within the Route 22 right-of-way.

18. Drainage easements – For drainage easements provided to the Town, ensure Town has legal access to each drainage easement.
19. For review purposes only, not as part of the official subdivision plats, provide drawings that show the utility piping (water, sewer, drainage) with the respective easements overlaid to confirm the piping is within the easements.
20. Traffic – Appendix G of the Addendum to the EAF:
 - a. Page 5 of the revised traffic memorandum (MDP) from VHB (revised 1/23/15) states “after the completion of Phase 1, peak hour surveys will be conducted at the [entrance] driveway to confirm that the average delay exiting the site does not fall below the projected LOS E. If the surveys indicate that excessive delays are experienced on the exiting movements, the applicant will consider permitting residents to exit at the secondary (southern) access driveway.” This should be a condition of any approval.
 - b. Page 10 of the revised memo (MDP) also states “as in the approved [SEQRA] Findings Statement, it is recommended that the [Route 22/Route 44] intersection be monitored by the NYSDOT after project completion and, if required, signal timing changes were to be implemented based on NYSDOT input.” This should be a condition of any approval.
 - c. Page 10 of the revised memo (MDP) states “as in the approved Findings Statement, it is recommended that the [Route 22/Lake Amenia Road/Dunn Road] intersection be reassessed upon project completion in conjunction with NYSDOT input.” This should be a condition of any approval.
21. Addendum to the EAF – Page 22 and 23 regarding Low Impact Design:
 - a. Section includes “These measures will be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (“NYSDEC”) regulations.” Sections lists various places pervious materials will be used. However, the SWPPP only includes calculations for the grass pave parking lot near the Tennis Courts. The SWPPP also includes text that no credit is taken for porous pavement (page 12). Therefore these measures are not in accordance with NYSDEC regulations.
 - b. Revise the text in the Addendum to the EAF or provide additional calculations in the SWPPP showing conformance with the NYSDEC regulations.
 - c. The section also includes “using pervious materials for the Artisan’s Park Overlook parking...” Drawing C4.02 shows a compacted gravel driveway and parking lot. NYSDEC guidance has indicated that compacted gravel surfaces are to be treated as impervious surfaces, in the same manner as asphalt pavement, for stormwater calculations. This item should be removed from the list.
 - d. The site plans call for the hammerheads to have grass pavers. This could be listed in this section of the Addendum to the EAF.
 - e. Regarding the grass pavers – Grass pavers are typically used for areas of limited use, such as the emergency access road. Based upon the amount of available parking, the parking lot by the tennis courts and possibly even the overflow parking lot by the golf maintenance building, may get used more frequently than the design of grass pavers is intended for. For the parking lot by the tennis

courts, consider having some spaces paved for frequent use and/or paving the entrance driveway.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

22. The revised SWPPP indicates it is in compliance with the new NYSDEC general permit for construction activity, GP-0-15-002.
 - a. SWPPP narrative page 19 – revise 3rd bullet to be consistent with NYSDEC general permit GP-0-15-002 regarding time frame for start of stabilization. Per GP-0-15-002 Part 1.B.1.b “In areas where soil disturbance activity has temporarily or permanently ceased, the application of soil stabilization measures *must be initiated by the end of the next business day* and completed within fourteen (14) days from the date the current soil disturbance activity ceased...” (emphasis added.)
 - b. Similarly, Erosion Control Note #12 on site plan drawing C1.01 should be revised to reflect the “initiated by the end of the next business day” language.
23. The revised SWPPP includes the requested hydraulic grade line (HGL) analysis. The data show the drainage system can carry the 50-year storm without catchbasins overtopping. Analysis of the 50-year storm is above and beyond the standard engineering practice of analyzing the 10-year or 25-year storm.
24. Language under Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) techniques has been revised to remove text from some methods that previously indicated the method was encouraged by the HOA for the estate homes. Per the Design Standards for Estate Homes, WQV and RRv are to be provided for each Estate Home lot. There should be some reference to this required stormwater treatment in the SWPPP.
25. Provide a legend for Figure E3 “Proposed Conditions Water Quality Map” in both the SWPPP and Addendum to EAF appendix D.3.
26. Notice of Intent, page 7, #26, recommend “check dams” be selected as a temporary structural practice.

The following is offered for consideration by the Planning Board from a memo dated 10/13/2014:

New or supplementary comments are shown in **bold**. Some original comments have been abbreviated if portions of the comment have been satisfied.

2. Comment regarding retaining wall heights...
 - a. **Response from VHB states in part “It is noted that the Village Green lodge buildings have retaining walls approximately 11’-0” high as part of the transition to the formal green behind them; these walls are to provide access to the underground parking garages for the Condo buildings at the Village Green...”**
After a review of the grading drawing C6.12, 11’-0” high retaining walls could not be located. Which specific buildings does the term “Village Green lodge buildings” refer to? Just C4.1 and C4.2? Or the other condo buildings with underground parking? If the 11’-0” walls are part of the

building structure, then they are not considered “retaining walls” per Town of Amenia Subdivision Code and their reference should be removed from the MDP booklet, page 48 and MDP drawing LA-3. Please clarify.

3. The Phase 1 Environmental Assessment conducted in 2007, with addendum in 2008 and tank closure report in 2014 does not include documentation of the close-out of the private landfill. Now that there is the easement and lot line revision on the southern parcel, documentation of the landfill close-out and monitoring is to be provided.
 - a. **Silo submitted a letter dated 12/19/14 from Roy T. Budnik & Associates (“RBA”) concluding that the proposed development on the HVLC property will not affect the landfill footprint, the geo-synthetic cap or monitoring wells/points. The letter also requested that “final plans for development of the access road should be reviewed by our firm and the limits of the area of disturbance delineated in the field for our inspector prior to commencement of any construction so that we can verify both our findings and conformance with NYSDEC requirements.” After the road has been laid out and before construction starts on the road, RBA should certify to the Town that no improvements or NYSDEC requirements associated with the landfill will be impacted by the access road. This could be a condition of any approval.**
4. Sight Distance...
 - a. **The response to comment includes “Waiver of Section 105-22(L)(2) [105-22.H(3)(k)] of the Subdivision Regulations is requested for the intersection of Wood Duck Road with Pheasant Run (Site Plan Drawing C5.02)...” Presumably this is for reduction of sight distance caused by vehicle parking along Pheasant Run. There is also a sight distance limitation at the intersection of the parking loop in front of buildings C1.2 and C1.3 with Wood Duck Road. Both of these sight distance limitations can be addressed by having three-way stop signage at the Pheasant Run and Wood Duck Road intersection. We recommend three-way stop signage be provided as a condition of granting the sight distance waiver.**
9. Comments regarding the Subdivision Plat will be issued under separate cover.
 - a. **Response states “All comments regarding the Preliminary Subdivision Plat in the Memorandum and Review Chart provided by Julie S. Mangarillo dated October 28, 2014 are addressed on the revised Subdivision Drawings – please refer to the Subdivision Drawings in Appendix A of Volume IV: Subdivision.” A memo with individual responses should be provided.**

Stormwater

10. Notice of Intent (NOI) Page 12, #39 – Provide justification for not meeting 100% RRV.

- a. **The response states: “A note has been added to Notice of Intent (NOI) Page 12, #39, referring to the section of the SWPPP that justifies not meeting the 100% RRv.”**

This is not sufficient. The NOI text states “...summarize the *specific site limitations and justification* for not reducing 100% of the WQv required...” (emphasis added). The referenced section in the SWPPP narrative provides limited *specific site limitations and justification*, such as references to the soils hydrologic soil group and slopes. Most of the discussion in the SWPPP is how multiple runoff reduction techniques are partially implemented, but no credit is taken.

In the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual, dated January 2015, under Chapter 4, Section 4.3 “Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv),” second bullet point on page 4-6 “Projects that cannot meet 100% of runoff reduction requirement due to site limitations that prevent the use of an infiltration technique and/or infiltration of the total WQv shall identify the specific site limitations in the SWPPP. Typical site limitations include: seasonal high groundwater, shallow depth to bedrock, and soils with an infiltration rate less than 0.5 inches/hr.”

However, ultimately, this will be up to NYSDEC to determine if the justification provided is sufficient.

11. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) page 10 regarding use of golf course and NYSDEC regulated wetland adjacent area as sheet flow to filter strip - Provide confirmation that contributing area is not too steep and otherwise meets the design criteria for the green infrastructure practice of “Sheetflow to Riparian Buffers or Filter Strips”.
- a. **The revised page 10 now states “The slope of contributing area is within the acceptable range as per the requirement.” This is not sufficient. Provide a numerical slope value to compare against the limitations included in the Stormwater Manual.**
14. Recommend taking credit for SWM #11 as an infiltration practice in NOI and SWPPP.
- a. **Credit has been taken for SWM #11 as suggested. Include Infiltration Basin SWM #11 under Step 4 ‘Water Quality volume by Standard Stormwater Management Practice.’**
18. Provide details and restrictions for concrete truck wash-out, both in the SWPPP and the drawings, C14.04.
- a. **The SWPPP indicates concrete truck wash-out should be at least 100 feet from waterbodies. Update the detail on C14.03 to include the 100 foot restriction.**

Water/Wastewater

21. Have requirements from the “New York State Design Standards for Intermediate Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems” dated March 5, 2014 been met, particularly for separation distances of wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) from property lines and residences?

- a. **The WWTP has been relocated near the maintenance facility. We believe this is a better location than the steep hillside along Route 44 for multiple reasons. Drawing C4.14 shows the 150 foot radius and 200 foot radius separation distances. However, the separation distances extend beyond the project property line and include Route 22 as part of the separation distance. Provide documentation from both NYSDEC and NYSDOT that use of Route 22 as part of the separation distance is acceptable. Furthermore, our reading of regulations is that separation distance should extend from the furthest point of the facility, not from one central point. For example, the separation distance to the south should extend 150' and 200' from the southern-most edge of the facility. The separation distances also extend onto the Harlem Valley Landfill Corporation (HVLC) property beyond the easement. Additional steps may be required to prevent future building on the HVLC property outside the easement, but within the separation distances.**
26. Provide a plan for water supply that shows existing well locations and identifies which wells will remain in use and which will be decommissioned. Some information on existing wells is included within the individual site plans and in the "Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program" prepared by LBG, dated August 2014. However, a single plan showing which wells are proposed for use and which are proposed to be decommissioned will be beneficial. Wells proposed for continued use should be labeled as drinking water supply, irrigation or monitoring wells.
- a. **The response indicates the Site Plan Drawings and Water System Plans identify the wells. However, not all of the wells are consistently shown on the plans. There are also wells that are on the drawings issued August 2014 but do not appear on these latest drawings. For example, wells # 18 and 28 are shown on C2.06 from the August 2014 issue, but do not appear on C2.08 of the January 2015 issue. For clarity, provide an overall plan, possibly with the site split into only two or three sheets, to identify all wells.**
27. Show locations of existing septic system(s) for main building and maintenance building on Site Plan Phase 1 existing conditions drawings. How will existing septic system(s) be decommissioned?
- a. Refer to Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc., dated June 8, 2007 – Page 26 states "Inasmuch as hazardous materials are used on-site on a regular basis the potential exists that deleterious materials have been introduced into the SSDS [subsurface sewage disposal system]. As such, testing of the septic tank, leach fields, and distribution boxes for contamination would be prudent." Has this testing been performed? If so, the ESA is to be updated.
 - i. **The response indicates the leach field for the existing maintenance building is shown on the demolition plans (C3.03). The access manhole for the existing septic tank is shown, but the leach field could not be located. If the leach field is to be disturbed during construction, the leach field is to be tested for contamination to**

protect both worker safety and to determine standards of disposal for any soil that may be contaminated. This can be handled as a condition of approval. If the leach field will not be disturbed, then no additional testing is recommended.

Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP)/ Maintenance Facility

31. Provide additional notes and labels on Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C5.11, the site plan for the maintenance facility to coordinate with the NRMP and drawing A3.15 "Maintenance Facility Building Elevations"... Any drains are to be connected to the sanitary sewer system, not the storm drainage system. This should be shown on the wastewater drawings.

- a. **The response states in part "...The bay area will be covered and raised to keep any rain water from entering the system. An emergency overflow pipe will go to a basin and no waste water goes into any storm or sanitary system piping." This 'basin' could not be located on the drawing. Will it be similar to an underground vault? Will water in the basin be re-used/recycled? Or pumped out and disposed of similar to a septic tank? Provide additional details.**

34. The water/wastewater plans are to show water and wastewater lines to maintenance buildings, such as where the pesticide mixing will take place, to provide necessary emergency showers and eye wash stations.

- a. **Water and wastewater services are not shown for the maintenance buildings.**

The following is offered for consideration by the Planning Board from a memo dated 5/20/2014:

New or supplementary comments are shown in **bold**. Some original comments have been abbreviated if portions of the comment have been satisfied.

MDP SWPPP Notice of Intent (NOI)

39. Page 11, #36 – Regarding Channel Protection Volume (Cpv), provide documentation that response is acceptable to NYSDEC.

- a. **We defer to NYSDEC's review of response.**

Site Plan Drawing Set – Specific Comments:

137. Individual Site Plan and Grading and Drainage Sheets have references to "proposed stream restoration" (C5.01 & C7.01; C5.08 & C7.08) and "proposed floodplain restoration" (C5.03 & C7.03). Provide additional details on the proposed restorations or a reference to where additional information can be found.

- a. 10/13/2014 - Response to consultants' comments indicates schematic details from the FEIS have been provided on Landscape Plans L3.01 and L3.03. L3.01 has a note to refer to the 'Master Development Plan Floodplain Restoration Planting List'. This list is in appendix G of the MDP Booklet. Drawings L3.03 and L3.08 do not include any references to the proposed stream restorations.

Drawings C5.01, C5.03, C5.08, C7.01, C7.03 and C7.08 include a note "refer to draft schematic floodplain restoration planting (Figure 3.2-2)" or similar. This Figure 3.2-2 is also referenced on the Title Sheet of the Site Plan Phase 1 drawing set. However that Figure will be difficult for the site or landscaping contractor to find and implement. The proposed floodplain and stream restorations are important projects that require careful implementation. The details for the restorations should be fully incorporated into the site plan drawing set. Provide improved notes or details within the Site Plan drawing set regarding the proposed stream and floodplain restoration projects.

- b. 4/22/2015 Response indicates landscape plans have been revised to show restoration work. Could not located Floodplain restoration notes on L3.03. Add the notes to L3.03. Update the labels on drawing C4.03 and C6.03 to reference the landscape plan. On drawing C6.09, revise stream restoration reference from L3.01 to L3.09.**

Addendum to Environmental Assessment Form

- 173. Appendix D.4 Floodplain Comparison Plans: Include a comparison of flood water storage volume.
 - a. 10/13/2014: Include the "Floodplain Disturbance Volume (cy)" from Site Plan Phase 1 drawing C7.01.
 - b. 4/22/2015 – Response indicates disturbance volume has been added to Appendix D.4. Floodplain Disturbance Volume (cy) from Site Plan Phase 1 (now sheet C6.01) has not been added to Appendix D.4.**

The following comments [from 10/13/2014] regarding specific, minor comments on individual drawing sheets are offered for consideration by the Planning Board. Some of these comments have carried over from the marked-up set of MDP and Site Plan Phase 1 drawings that were provided to the Applicant in May 2014.

- 2. Existing conditions drawings, MDP SP-1, Site Plan Phase 1 C2.00-C2.09 and other drawings: The majority of abutting properties are properly labeled on the drawing sheets... Additionally, provide parcel labels for parcels on opposite side of the roads, in particular the Dutchess County Department of Public Works (DPW) property proposed to receive landscape screening and the property at the corner of West Lake Amenia Road and Route 44.
 - a. 4/22/2015 Properties on the east side of Route 22 are not consistently labeled.**

MDP Drawings:

- 4. MDP SP-4 "Open Space Plan" – Areas that will be disturbed or graded, but will be returned to vegetation should be shown as the light green "non-golf open space" instead of "natural woodlands/wetlands". For example, the eastern side of Road D of 'South Lawn,' ... grading along west side of Road E on either side of the water treatment building, and grading along either side of Road E between Lots E-48 and E-49 [Now E-47].

- a. **Most of the corrections have been made, but areas along Wood Turtle Lane (formerly Road D) and Redtail Pass (Formerly Road E) need to be revised.**

Site Plan Phase 1 Drawings:

- 23. C3.01 – Label culvert removal per MDP drawing ENV-4.
 - a. **Response indicates C3.01 has been updated with culvert removal. Label could not be located.**
- 28. C5.03, C7.03 - Provide improved reference to floodplain restoration work to make it easier to find. Refer to 5/20/2014 comment #137, above.
 - a. **Drawings are now C4.03 and C6.03. These drawings still need to be updated to reference Landscape Drawings. Also need to update L3.01, L3.03 and L3.09 with “restoration” language.**
- 39. C12.01 – Label stream restoration work. Include additional notes for minimization of sediment during removal of culvert and bridge, as shown on MDP ENV-4, such as only performing work during low-flow period.
 - a. **Response indicated additional notes have been added. These additional notes could not be located. Provide a location.**

The following comments are carried over as reminders to be completed prior to final approval:

From comment memo dated 10/13/2014:

- 7. The proposed water and wastewater systems will require testing prior to start of operations. The Planning Board should determine what level of participation the Town will have regarding the utility testing. For example, does the Planning Board want a Town representative to witness all of the utility testing? If so, a procedure will have to be put in place to ensure the Applicant is aware of this requirement and can coordinate test scheduling.
 - a. **Applicant’s 1/8/2015 response: “The facilities of the sewage-works corporation must be inspected by a licensed professional engineer retained by the Town, at the Applicant’s expense.**
- 25. Refer to “Groundwater Exploration and Pumping Test Program”, prepared by LBG, dated August 2014:
 - d. Based on the report, some of the wells selected for water supply need additional testing or treatment. Follow-up documentation will have to be provided to the Town.
 - i. **Applicant’s 1/8/2015 response: “The Applicant will comply.”**

From comment memo dated 5/20/2014:

- 66. 5/20/2014 Town Subdivision Code §105-30.A, “When public franchise utilities are to be installed, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board written assurances from each public utility company...” Provide the written assurances.
 - a. **10/13/2014: Response to consultants’ comments indicates documentation will be provided.**

Memorandum
Review Comments
Silo Ridge – MDP & Site Plan Phase 1
April 22, 2015
Page 13 of 13

We trust these comments are useful in your review. Additional comments may be provided as this project continues to move forward. Please let us know if we can be of additional assistance. Thank you.

We would also like to take this opportunity to point out the significant improvement in completeness and coordination in this submittal compared to the previous August 2014 submittal.


Julie S. Mangarillo, P.E., CPESC

cc: Larissa DeLango
David Everett, Esq.
Mary Ann Johnson, AICP

Michael Klemens, Ph.D.
George Janes, AICP
13-352-12-01

Attachment A

4/22/2015

Documents reviewed include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Letters from DelBello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr, LLP to Town of Amenia Planning Board re: Silo Ridge Resort Community, dated February 19, 2015.
2. Volume 1 of 6 - Addendum to Environmental Assessment Form for Silo Ridge Resort Community prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.D., Dated March 19, 2014 and revised January 2015, including:
 - a. Silo Ridge Resort Community Water Budget Report for the Combined Irrigation Pond, prepared by Leggette, Brashears & Graham, Inc., dated January 2015.
 - b. Natural Resource Management Plan, prepared by Audubon Environmental, dated December 2014.
3. Volume 2 of 6 – Amended Master Development Plan (MDP), including:
 - a. Amended Master Development Plan booklet for Silo Ridge Resort Community, prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C., dated October 8, 2009, amended January 2015
 - b. Master Development Plans for Silo Ridge Resort Community, prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C., issued March 3, 2014, latest issue January 8, 2015 (Set includes Drawings SP-1 through SP-18; A-1 through A-6; RI-1, P-1 through P-3, C-1, GP-1 and GP-2, SW-1, U-1, U-2; LA-1 through LA-6; and ENV- 1 through ENV-6)
 - c. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for Silo Ridge Resort Community Master Development Plan prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.D., dated April 2014, revised January 2015 and March 2015
4. Volume 3 of 6 – Phase 1 Site Plans, including:
 - a. Phase 1 Site Plans for Silo Ridge Resort Community, prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C., issued March 3, 2014, latest issue January 8, 2015 (Set includes Drawings C1.01; C2.00; C2.01 – C2.11; C2.21; C3.00; C3.01 – C3.11; C3.21; C4.00; C4.01 – C4.15; C4.16; C4.21 – C4.28; C5.00; C5.01 – C5.08; C6.00; C6.01 – C6.14; C6.21 – C6.31; C6.41 – C6.45; C7.01 – C7.13; C7.21 – C7.30; C8.01 – C8.12; C9.01 – C9.13; C9.21 – C9.35; C10.01 – C10.05; C11.00; C12.00; C12.01 – C12.11; C12.12; C12.13 – C12.15; C13.01; C13.02 – C13.04; C14.01 – C14.07; A1.01; A3.01 – A3.05; A3.10 – A3.18; A3.20 – A3.23; A3.31 – A3.33; A3.40; A3.41; A3.42; A3.43; L0.00; L1.12 – L1.14; L1.20; L2.20; L3.01 – L3.11; L3.12 – L3.14; L3.20; L3.21 – L3.22; L3.31 – L3.34; L4.01 – L4.03; L5.01; P1.01 – P1.03; S1.01; and SL1.00-SL1.09)
5. Volume 4 of 6 – Preliminary Subdivision Plat, including:
 - a. Preliminary Subdivision Plats for Silo Ridge Resort Community, prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C., issued January 15, 2015 (Set includes Drawings PL0.00; PL0.01; PL1.01-PL1.02; PL2.01-PL2.08, PL3.01-PL3.03; PL4.01-PL4.03; PL5.01; PL6.01-PL6.03; PL7.01-PL7.03; PL8.01-PL8.03).
6. Volume 5 of 6 Response to comments
7. Volume 6 of 6 Additional Project Coordination