



To: Town of Amenia Planning Board

Date: May 30, 2015

Memorandum

Project #: 29011.00

From: Amanda DeCesare, P.E.

Re: Silo Ridge Field Club – Response to Comments

---

The Applicant offers the following responses to the comment memorandum from Mary Ann Johnson dated April 21, 2015 regarding the Silo Ridge February 17, 2015 Submission Review.

**From October 13, 2014 memo:**

1. In response to my comment #15 regarding adding notes to the plans referencing the golf course work, the applicant indicated "hatching" has been added to C2.00 to show golf work performed to date. I do not see that on the revised plan.

*The Applicant has revised the plan to include the hatching.*

2. In response to my comment #18, the applicant has indicated all references to pole lighting have been removed from the amended MDP text. Please see item #2 below.

*As per discussions with Mary Ann Johnson and other consultants on April 29, 2015, the Applicant and the consultants agreed that the reference to pole lighting will only remain in the MDP. The MDP states "street, path and area lighting poles, **if used**, will not exceed 15' in height." The purpose is to provide the Applicant the option of using light poles if needed in the future. However, if the Applicant wanted to include light poles, the Applicant will have to amend its site plan application to include such lighting.*

3. In response to my comment #30, which references limited lighting at the golf maintenance facility, the applicant has indicated the lighting levels are as intended. This area has been reconfigured and safety is a concern – see comment # 50 below.

*The plans have been revised to include all lighting at the rear entrances of the buildings. Additional lighting has been added for the staff parking.*

**Master Development Plan:**

1. Section 1.4.11 Bulk Standards:

**Front setbacks** are being measured from the face of curb/road edge, which includes the right of way. The applicant should address what will happen if a road needs to be widened. There is potential for structures that were once compliant with setbacks to become non-compliant.

*The Applicant has revised the language so that front setbacks are measured from the property line and not the curb/road edge. All plans have been updated accordingly.*

**Note D** states "For Single Family the dimension is both side yards combined with 15' minimum for **each property**...". Does this mean the combined total side yard is 30'? Most of the single family homes are only showing a combined side yard of 15' or 7.5' for each property.



## Memorandum

*The Applicant has revised the note to state: "Side yard setbacks for fee simple lots are measured from the property line to the face of the building, and for condominium lots are measured from the property line to the face of the building or from the face of the building to the face of next building. Patios, retaining walls, and steps are permitted in the side yard setback." All plans have been updated accordingly.*

**Note D** indicates the side combined setbacks are measured from face of building to face of next closest building, but on the plans it looks like they are measured from the property line, which would seem to be an easier way to measure. Please clarify.

*See above.*

**Lot coverage** – for Estate Home lots in excess of .5 acre, some of the lots will allow for coverage greater than the size of the ADA. For example, lot E-48 is 1.79 acres (77,769 sq ft). At the proposed 50% lot coverage, this lot could have 38,884 of impervious surface. This exceeds the maximum amount of the 30,000 square foot ADA allowance. The applicant should eliminate this potential conflict by referencing the Estate Home Guidelines and noting lot coverage cannot exceed the ADA or propose another way to address this conflict.

*A new note has been included to state: "All Estate Homes maximum lot coverages shall not exceed the maximum Allowable Disturbance Area of 30,000 square feet and shall be in compliance with Appendix K: Design Standards for the Estate Homes."*

**Note I** – this note is confusing. Please explain what is meant by "WWTP exterior buffer is depth of island at access".

*The note referencing the WWTP has been removed.*

**Maintenance Facility** setbacks are defined by the Zoning Law because this location is in the OC District, not the RDO. There are two standards for front setbacks in the OC district and the applicant is indicating they are following the front setback for County/State roads. I do not believe this accurate. Based on the Zoning Law definition of **front** (§121-74) which states "the side of a building or structure parallel to and closest to a road or street. On a corner lot, both sides of a building facing the street shall be considered the front"; it would appear that the front setback should be measured from Red Tail Pass. This would change the front setback from 150 feet to 50 feet (the Standard for a Town Road).

There would be implications to the site plan. Building HVL-1.1 is the closest building to the road and is setback from the centerline approximately 15 feet. (I would note under the current proposal by the applicant, this building and the parking lot are in noncompliance with the rear setback of 50 feet.) I would encourage the applicant to explore the possibility of bringing this building into compliance with a 50 foot setback or in the alternative; I would recommend seeking a variance with a supportive recommendation from the Planning Board.

*The Applicant has obtained an interpretation from the Town Building Inspector stating that "the proposed golf-maintenance buildings and waste water treatment plant buildings in the OC district are not required to meet any particular setbacks from Red Tail Pass. Red Tail Pass in the OC district is proposed to be a private "rural lane" under the Town of Amenia Zoning Law. The Dimensional Table of the Zoning Law requires setbacks in the OC District from either a "Town road" or a "County/State road," but there is no corresponding set back requirement for a private "rural lane." Consequently, there is no minimum requirement for the front or side yard setback.*



## Memorandum

*However, the Applicant has moved building HVL1.1 slightly away from the road. All plans have been updated accordingly.*

2. Section 2.3 Signage. This section mentions an entry sign on Route 22. In response to my comment #33 from my October 13, 2014 memo, the applicant states there will be no entry sign.

*There will be no entry sign. The sentence referencing the sign has been removed.*

The second paragraph references up-lighting for the entry, Winery Restaurant and neighborhood signs. Please remove references to up-lighting and please clarify whether signs will be illuminated. In response to my comment #32 from my October 13, 2014 memo, the applicant states there will be no lighting for signs.

*The Applicant has removed the sentence referencing up-lighting for signs.*

3. Section 2.5 Lighting – the bulleted list on page 51 still contains a reference to pole lighting although no pole lighting is proposed in the Lighting Plans contained in the Site Plan set. Please clarify.

*As per discussions with Mary Ann Johnson and other consultants on April 29, 2015, the Applicant and the consultants agreed that only the MDP will reference pole lighting. The MDP states "street, path and area lighting poles, **if used**, will not exceed 15' in height." The purpose is to provide the Applicant the option of using light poles if needed in the future. However, if the Applicant wanted to include light poles, the Applicant will have to amend its site plan application to include such lighting.*

There are references to street lighting throughout this section although there does not seem to be any proposed. Lighting plans show bollards along the paths that are transmitting a small amount of light onto the roadways in the Village Green area. Please clarify.

*References to street lighting have been removed.*

Please clearly identify the actual curfew hours (not an example) in both the MDP and the lighting plans.

*Curfew hours will be 11pm to 6am on weekdays and 1am to 6am on weekends. A sentence has been added to the lighting section.*

4. Open Space Plan – page 60. The Open Space Calculation table is missing the section on Natural Woodlands/Wetlands (only the subtotal appears on the page).

*The section on Natural Woodlands/Wetlands has been added.*

5. Please revisit the parking at the Sales Center. According to calculations, 21 spaces are needed but the plans shows 25 (not 23) being provided. This will also affect the number of surplus spaces. If it is intended to be 23, then a surplus of 2 is correct. If it is intended to be 25, then there is a surplus of 4. Page 78 and sheet P-2 of the MDP plan set indicate there are 6 surplus spaces.

*The total number of spaces at the Sales Center is 23 as per the plans. Therefore, Page 78 of the MDP and sheet P-2 have been updated to show a surplus of 2.*

6. Section 6.0 – Zoning Compliance. Section §121-10.H.2. of the Zoning Law states that buildings in the OC District shall be placed in front of their parking lots to screen parking from road. The site plans shows parking along the road and the buildings in a court yard type configuration. The law also provides for the Planning Board to waive this



## Memorandum

requirement and I recommend the applicant seek this waiver. The location is isolated from residences and the buildings and parking lots are screened with adequate landscaping. It seems that a waiver would be acceptable.

*Zoning Law Section 121.10.H.2 provides that "the Planning Board may modify or waive this requirement where unusual lot configurations such as corner lots or through lots make compliance with this requirement impractical or impossible or where the predominant character of surrounding development is such that compliance with this requirement would serve no useful purpose, provided that the applicant minimizes the visual impacts of such parking areas." The Applicant believes that considering the location, existing and proposed vegetative screening, and the surrounding development, placing these buildings in front of parking will not yield any public benefit, and will therefore request this waiver.*

7. Scenic Protection Overlay District Landscaping provisions – page 90. Applicant states "shade trees are provided at intervals of every 50'...". This does not appear to be the case in the planting plans. Perhaps the language could be changed to reflect the accurate range of spacing and the applicant should verify if all the trees are shade trees.

*The language has been revised to state "Shade trees and other plantings consistent with the aesthetic character of the landscape are provided within 25' of all internal right-of-ways."*

8. Resort Development Overlay – page 93. Why are you not addressing items 1 & 2 under 121-18.C?

*Items 1 & 2 have been added.*

9. I defer to the Town's Visual Consultant to provide comments (if necessary) on the Scenic Protection Overlay section.

*Comment noted.*

10. I defer to the Town's Engineer for comments (if necessary) on the Aquifer Overlay District.

*Comment noted.*

11. Minor edits/typos:

Table of Contents – 1.4.13 Door is spelled incorrectly.

*The word has been revised.*

Sewer System Conceptual Plan – page 74. "Legend" is cut off.

*The legend has been included.*

Page 91 – "NOT" in reference to visibility of buildings should be lowercase.

*The word has been revised.*

Aquifer Overlay District – page 92. Text in item F. is repeated in first bullet under item G.

*The text has been removed.*



## Memorandum

### MDP Plan Set

12. SP-11. Please add correct reference in the Site Plan for the Artisan Park in the note.

*The correct reference to sheet C4.02 has been added.*

13. RR-1. It is difficult to see the circles that denote the intersections which do not meet a maximum grade of 1.5% within 150 feet of the centerline at intersection.

*The color has been revised.*

14. C-1. The previous plan set showed a sidewalk the entire length of Red Tail Pass from the Golf Villas to the southern entrance. This version has the sidewalk ending at CM-28. Please explain.

*This sidewalk has been removed in order to minimize grading impacts and provide a more rural feel to these homes. It is anticipated that future owners will also travel within the resort utilizing golf carts. However, when they decide to walk, they will walk along the roads and experience a more rural setting like the majority of the roads in Amenia.*

15. Minor edits/typos:

SP-9 – please add road name that serves Lots E-29, E-30 and E-31.

*The plan has been revised.*

### Volume I - Addendum to Environmental Assessment Form

16. Section II.7 – why is there no mention of Phase 0? Please add and describe.

*A description of Phase 0 has been added to the document.*

17. Table 3 – Footnote 1 needs to be have acreage numbers updated.

*The numbers have been updated.*

18. Table 4, Page 23 – 4<sup>th</sup> full paragraph contains language indicating the “East of Hudson Standards” are not legally required. These standards were required as mitigation in the adopted Findings Statement from 2009. I do not believe this language is appropriate or useful and should be revised – see item #19 below.

*The language has been revised.*

19. Table 4, Page 27 – first bullet in Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed Amended MDP contains same language regarding East of Hudson Standards.

*The language has been revised.*

20. Table 4, Page 29 – second bullet in Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed Amended MDP contains the **appropriate** language regarding the East of Hudson Standards and should be used throughout.

*Comment noted.*



## Memorandum

21. Table 4, Page 37 – third bullet for Utilities – Wastewater in Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed Amended MDP. Please provide the correspondence from the NYSDEC that provides support for this statement.

*All NYSDEC correspondence to date has been provided.*

22. Page 40, bullet #2, I believe there is a typo – 2178 acres.

*The number has been revised.*

23. Section V. Compliance with Zoning Requirements – see items 6-8 above.

*All revisions have been made.*

24. Page 52 – last bullet. The term “shallowest locations” does not seem to convey what I believe the applicant is intending. The word “flattest” is more appropriate as shallow seems to indicate more disturbance to the slope rather than less.

*The word has been revised.*

Page 58 – Please add the date of approval and name of document containing the Planning Board approval for the waiver regarding the Winery Restaurant.

*The following text has been added: “The June 25, 2009 Special Use Permit and Master Development Plan approval granted by the Planning Board is for the Master Development Plan last dated revised in October, 2009. That approved Master Development Plan shows the Winery Restaurant and associated access driveway. The Special Use Permit and Master Development Plan approval, therefore includes the grant by the Planning Board of waivers necessary to accommodate the development of the approved plan.”*

25. Page 73 – top of page. Please see item 18.

*The language has been revised.*

26. Appendix I & I.2 include tables that calculate water demand and wastewater flow for the project. This calculation includes an equestrian center and a field house. The applicant was made aware of these errors and corrected tables have been resubmitted.

*The tables have been updated.*

27. Appendix P – Will the Town be provided with copies of water sampling reports and any response to the reports (if needed)?

*All reports are being reviewed by Audubon who is responsible for enforcing compliance with the NRMP. Any reports, if not already furnished to the Town, are available for the Town’s review, if requested.*



## Memorandum

### Volume V – Responses to Comments

28. The applicant has provided their correspondence to various agencies including the NYS Department of Transportation, US Army Corp of Engineers and the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation but is notably lacking in correspondence from any of these agencies. Recently, Planning Board member Nathan Roy requested information from the NYS DEC as well. Correspondence from these agencies, as the applicant has provided from other agencies such as NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, the Town of Amenia Fire Department, etc. should be provided as soon as possible to verify the plan is accommodating the requirements and recommendations of these important agencies.

*All documentation and communications to date with all agencies have been submitted to the planning board and its consultants. As of today, the Applicant has not received any formal communications from any other agencies other than what has been submitted. The Applicant will continue to provide formal communications with other agencies and submittals as they become available.*

### Site Plans

29. Please remove sewer envelopes from sheets C2.00, C2.08, C2.09, C2.11, C2.21, C3.00, C3.08, C3.09, and C3.11.

*The sewer envelopes have been removed from the existing conditions plan (C2 sheet set). They have been left as is in the demolition plans (C3 sheet set) as per the Town engineer's original request.*

30. Please remove headwall from C2.03 & C2.04.

*The plans have been revised to not show the proposed headwall.*

31. C2.08 – looks like there is a proposed stone wall near hole 18. Please remove unless it is an existing condition.

*The plans have been revised to not show the proposed overflow weir.*

32. C4.02 – Golf academy – does it need to be on a separate lot? If yes, then please add setback lines and indicate front.

*Yes; the golf academy building setbacks are shown as zero in the MDP Bulk Design Standards.*

33. C4.02 – VG-11, VG-12, VG-13, VG-14 and VG-15 home locations are very close to and/or right on the front setback line. Can homes be shifted slightly? Or does the applicant wish to change the front setback?

*The Applicant disagrees. As long as the building is within the setback limits, specifically outside the front yard setback, then the building complies. This answer applies to all other comments that pertain to this same issue.*

34. C4.02 - Please see item # 1 above in regards to Note D side yards and address accordingly. These lots are showing a combined side yard of 15 feet or approximately 7.5 feet per property. This appears to occur throughout the plans for single family homes.

*Correct. Please see Master Development Plans item #1 above. Note D has been revised and all plans have been updated accordingly.*



## Memorandum

35. C4.03 – VG-19, VG-20, VG-21, VG-22 and VG-23 are showing buildings and/or auto courts very close to and/or right on the side setback lines.

*The Applicant disagrees. As long as the building is within the setback limits, specifically outside the side yard setback, then the building complies. This answer applies to all other comments that pertain to this same issue.*

Please add a crosswalk to connect the paths from the north side of Pheasant Run to the Sales Center.

Please add a crosswalk to connect paths near the entrance of Eagle Pass and Falcon Way.

Please add a crosswalk to connect paths west of entrance to Eagle Pass and Falcon Way.

*As per discussions with Mary Ann Johnson and other consultants on April 29, 2015, the Applicant has reviewed this request and feels that providing crosswalks at all intersections takes away from the rural character of the property and local area. However, as agreed, a crosswalk has been provided to connect the paths from the north side of Pheasant Run to the Sales Center. All plans have been updated accordingly.*

36. C4.04 – VG-4 shows building is very close to side setback. Building C-3.3 shows something in the rear setback. Please clarify.

*Please see responses to items #34 and #36 above.*

Crosswalks should be added to add crossings for pedestrian paths. The intersection of Snowy Owl Court and Red Tail Pass needs to be evaluated for crosswalk location. There is a trail connection on the north side of Red Tail and a pedestrian path on the south side in addition to potential pedestrians from Snowy Owl Court.

*As per discussions with Mary Ann Johnson and other consultants on April 29, 2015, the Applicant has reviewed this request and feels that providing crosswalks at intersections takes away from the rural character of the property and local area.*

37. C4.05 – LL-6, LL-12, LL-15, LL-16, LL-29, and LL-27 shows building/auto court close to and/or right on the side setback.

*Please see response to item #36 above.*

LL-17 shows retaining walls in the setback. There cannot be structures in the setback, however the applicant has the flexibility through the RDO regulations to add a note to the Bulk Table indicating retaining walls would be permitted.

*A note has been added to the Bulk Design Standards table to allow retaining walls within lot setbacks.*

38. C4.05 – note and line by lot LL-3 referring to side setback is confusing. Please see item #1 above regarding Note D.

Please add a crosswalk from the path connecting the parking lot to the west side of Wood Duck Rd.

Please add a crosswalk from the trail in SR-6 to the west side of Wood Duck Rd.

*As per discussions with Mary Ann Johnson and other consultants on April 29, 2015, the Applicant has reviewed this request and feels that providing crosswalks at intersections takes away from the rural character of the property and local area.*



## Memorandum

39. C4.06 - CM-1, CM-2, CM-10, CM-14, CM-16, CM-17, CM-20, CM-21, CM-22, CM-23, CM-24, CM-26, CM-27 shows building/auto court close to and/or right on the side setback.

*Please see response to item #36 above.*

40. C4.07 – there are retaining walls located in the setbacks for LL-18, LL-19, LL-21 and LL-22.

*A note has been added to the Bulk Design Standards table to allow retaining walls within lot setbacks.*

41. C4.08 – ADAs need to be shown on lots E-56, E-52, E-51, and E-50.

*The areas within the setbacks of lots E-50 (29,940 sf), E-51 (29,930 sf), E-52 (27,780) and E-56 (25,000 sf) are less than 30,000 square feet. Therefore, the ADA's are not shown as they are not applicable.*

Side setback between lots E-9 and E-10 should be combined to show 20 feet and the plan currently shows 15 feet.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above. The side setbacks have been revised for lots E-9 and E-10.*

Lot E-11 is less than a .5 acres (requiring a combined side yard of 15 feet) and E-12 is greater than a .5 acre (requiring a combined side yard of 20 feet). It is unclear how the applicant is handling the side setbacks in this instance but if one were to assume a minimum of 7.5 feet for the lot less than .5 acre and 10 feet for the lot greater than a .5 acre based on a side combined total, then the setback for E-12 needs to be adjusted from 7.5 to 10 feet. Otherwise the applicant should explain how the setbacks in this instance are being handled.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above. The side setbacks for lot E-12 have been revised to show the minimum 10' side setback from the property line. The side setback for lot E-11 remains at 7.5 feet from the property line, as the lot size is less than 0.5 acres.*

42. C4.09 – Lot E-16 and E-17 (lot size is greater than .5 acre) are the same as E-11 and E-12.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above. The side setbacks for lot E-17 have been revised to show the minimum 10' side setback from the property line. The side setback for lot E-16 remains at 7.5 feet from the property line, as the lot size is less than 0.5 acres.*

The same is true of E-20 (lot size is greater than .5 acre) and E-21.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above. The side setbacks for lot E-20 have been revised to show the minimum 10' side setback from the property line. The side setback for lot E-21 remains at 7.5 feet from the property line, as the lot size is less than 0.5 acres.*

E-19 is slightly greater than 30,000 sq ft in size and needs an ADA.

*The area within the setbacks of lot E-19 (24,730 sf) is less than 30,000 square feet. Therefore, an ADA is not shown as they are not applicable.*

43. C4.10 – Setbacks for maintenance facility – Please see item #1 above.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above.*



## Memorandum

The MDP states the overflow lot will be used for employee parking. Please clarify, whether this will be used on a daily basis for employee parking. If so, then it must be paved/striped and cannot be grass pavers.

*The proposed paved parking areas will be used for employee daily parking. The overflow parking will only be used on as needed basis (i.e. during resort/Club events).*

44. C4.11 - Lot E-26 and E-27 (lot size is greater than .5 acre) are the same as E-11 and E-12. Lots E-27 and E-28 need a combined setback of 20 feet. Plan shows 15 feet. Lot E-28 needs an ADA.

*Please see response to Master Development Plan item #1 above. The side setbacks for lot E-27 have been revised to show the minimum 10' side setback from the property line. The side setback for lot E-26 remains at 7.5 feet from the property line, as the lot size is less than 0.5 acres.*

*Additionally, the area within the setback of lot E-28 (27,690 sf) is less than 30,000 square feet. Therefore, an ADA is not shown as they are not applicable.*

45. C4.12 – Parking Barn SR-13 is on a separate lot and should have defined setbacks in the MDP Bulk Table.

*The parking barn has been added to the MDP Bulk Design Standards table.*

46. C4.13 - Sales Center – I believe the front is the north side of building based on the definition in Note B of the Bulk Table in the MDP. If that is the case, then the front setback line should be 10 feet not 15 feet as shown, rear setback line should be 20 feet not 10 feet as shown on plan. The trash enclosure, which appears to meet the definition of a structure, is located within the rear setback. Please clarify the side setback lines.

The MDP Bulk Table indicates a combined side yard of 40 feet.

*All front, rear, and side setbacks for the Sales Center have been revised to be five (5) feet.*

Please show/explain the setbacks for the gatehouse.

*The gatehouse does not require any setbacks, as it is located within the HOA property which owns all the roads and road right-of-way.*

47. C14.07 – Signs. The applicant has provided detail for four different signs, but it is unclear if these are the only four signs being proposed or if these “types” will be used in more than one location.

*These are the only signs that are proposed.*

For Vehicular Sign A1 and A2, will the sign include the “blank” slot?

*Yes, it will be a sign board as shown, without any text reserved for “future use”.*

Is there a sign proposed for the Artisan Park area? Is there a sign proposed for the Sales Center?

*No entry signs are proposed at the Artisan’s Park area or at the Sales Center.*

There are only two vehicular sign locations on the site plans. I do not see any building sign locations on the site plans. Please clarify.

*There are no other signs proposed.*



## Memorandum

The applicant has indicated the signs will not be illuminated. Please add a note to the plans stating such.

*The note has been added to the plans.*

48. A3.10 to A3.18. These sheets provide a series of building elevations for single family residential units. Please identify where each type(s) of unit may be located (i.e. South Lawn, Village Green, etc.).

*Any of the built single family product may be located in the Village Green Neighborhood, Golf Villas, and South Lawn. Therefore, a note is not necessary on the plans.*

49. SL1.03 – There is no lighting proposed for the trash enclosure located by the Sales Center. Is this an oversight? This seems like a location where lighting would be advisable.

*This is not an oversight. Refuse at the trash enclosure will be picked up and handled only during daylight.*

There are two entrances for the Sales Center that do not appear to have lighting associated with them. Please clarify.

*The two entrances for the sales center contain ceiling recessed lighting under the porch roof at both entrances, therefore the lighting plans accurately depict the proposed lighting.*

50. SL1.05 – Buildings C4.1 & C4.2 shows entrances along the north side without lighting.

Buildings T-1, T-2 and T-3 also show entrances along the north side without lighting.

The south side of T-1 and T-3 are not treated similar to T-2 for lighting.

The fitness center and clubhouse have multiple entrances and no associated lighting. Buildings C1.1 to C3.4 also have entrances without lighting.

*All entrances with one exception to the above mentioned buildings contain ceiling recessed lighting under the porch or will be lit as indicated. In the same manner, there is ceiling recessed lighting in the south side of T-1 and T-3.*

*The exception is the entrance to the lower level golf cart storage at the Clubhouse which will be lit by way of a fixture Type D located adjacent to the doorway at a height of 7'-6" above the Finish Floor Elevation of 573.00. Therefore this fixture is obscured from view as it is a full level below grade.*

*The doors shown on the rear elevation of the Fitness Center are access doors to a mechanical room/utility close and are not an entrance.*

51. SL1.08 – There is no lighting for the staff parking and "court yard" area of the buildings. Please note if there are entrances to the rear of these buildings, lighting should be shown.

*Comment noted. The plans have been revised to include all lighting at the rear of the buildings. Additional lighting has been added for the staff parking.*



## Memorandum

### **Subdivision Plans**

52. Please add "ADAs" to all Estate Home lots where they are required as noted above.

*The ADA will be delineated on the appropriate site plan drawing(s), but not on the subdivision plat, so that any future change to any ADA that is approved by the Planning Board for a lot owner does not require the filing of an amended plat.*

53. Please adjust setbacks lines as needed per comments above.

*Setbacks have been adjusted where applicable.*

54. I understand the golf course comfort stations will not be separate lots as depicted but the area has been deducted from the open space calculation. These lots should be removed.

*Comment noted. These lots have been removed.*