

Mary Ann Johnson, AICP

315 Hapeman Hill Rd

Red Hook, NY 12571

P: 845.849.4077

E: ma\_johnson@frontiernet.net

# Memorandum

To: Norman Fontaine, Chairperson, Town of Amenia Planning Board

From: Mary Ann Johnson, AICP

CC: Town of Amenia Planning Board Members

Date: October 13, 2014

Subject: Silo Ridge Submission of August 21, 2014

I have reviewed the following documents for the above referenced project:

- Silo Ridge Resort Community Addendum to Environmental Assessment Form dated August 20, 2014
- Silo Ridge Resort Community Amended Master Development Plan dated August 7, 2014
- Silo Ridge Resort Community Master Development Plans issued August 11, 2014 (sheets SP-1 through ENV-6)
- Silo Ridge Resort Community Phase 1 Site Plans issued August 11, 2014 (sheets C1.01 through SL1.06)
- Silo Ridge Preliminary Subdivision Plat dated August 20, 2014 (sheets PL 0.00 through PL 1.07)
- Letter from the Amenia Fire Company #1 dated August 18, 2014
- Submission by VHB Engineering to the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation dated August 1, 2014
- Silo Ridge Design Guidelines for Estates Home Sites dated August 21, 2014
- Silo Ridge Resort Community Confirmatory Visual Analysis Phase I and II dated July 20, 2014
- Silo Ridge Comments and Response to Visual Analysis dated August 28, 2014

I offer the following comments for the Planning Board's consideration. These comments should not be considered all inclusive. I may have additional comments as further information is provided during the review of these applications. I have tried to organize my comments by document although you will see there is some overlap between the documents.

I have coordinated review of the Preliminary Plat submission and the Design Guidelines for the Estate Home Sites with Julie Mangarillo and my comments are being incorporated into the forthcoming memorandums from Ms. Mangarillo.

Due to the week-long break I took to attend to my father's passing and the opportunity to preview comments from other consultants, I have tried not to repeat comments on issues raised by the other consultants including but not limited to the concern for impacts to steep slopes in Estate Home area, lighting or the open space calculation. I do however concur with the conclusions and recommendations offered by my colleagues.

## Master Development Plan

1. Section 1.2 on Existing Conditions describes the site as including the 682 acres owned by the Harlem Valley Landfill Corporation. Previously, the site was only described as the 670+ acres referred to as the Silo Ridge site. Please explain why this change was made.
2. In Section 2.5 on lighting, the following bullet, “No street or area lighting fixtures will be tilted upward to project light farther, since this can turn a good quality fixture into one that produces glare or skyglow”, has been deleted. Review of the lighting plan (sheet SL1.01-SL1.06 in the Site Plans reference a “Square Gold Star Uplight” and a Micro Nite Star with manufactures information about the lights provided on sheet SL1.06. Both of these lights will be providing “uplight” to the pool areas and for uplighting trees. The Zoning Code (§121-40.L.) states “All exterior lighting, including security lighting, in connection with all buildings, signs, or other uses shall be shielded and directed downward and away from adjoining streets and properties.” I have also referred this information to Dr. Klemens and George Janes for their input on any wildlife and visual concerns but my recommendation is that all uplights be removed from the lighting plan to be in compliance with Zoning or in the alternative, the applicant may seek a variance from the ZBA.

I also refer the Planning Board to page 57 of the MDP– Appendix E: Lighting. In the paragraph on landscape lighting, there is a reference to “small amounts of uplight”.

MDP - Page 59 – The following sentence has been deleted:

“Light emitted horizontally from light fixtures (from 90<sup>0</sup> to 100<sup>0</sup> as measured from straight downward) contributes strongly to light pollution, so it is important to use fixtures that direct less light at angles”. Again, this appears to be a diminishment of the previous commitment to preserve “dark skies”.

3. The Artisan Park is shown as open space on page 53 of the MDP. There have been discussions about the applicant offering this land to the town. I defer this issue to Dave Everett to ensure the park can count as open space.
4. The Golf Academy is shown as being included in the open space calculation as well. According to §121-18.C.4, non-agricultural buildings larger than 200 square feet in foot print cannot be included.
5. I recommend the Planning Board also confer with Dutchess Land Conservancy (DLC) for any input they may have and to discuss areas where this overlap with the site plan review and the conservation easement (e.g. demarcation of the easement area, conservation value of the land offered for easement, etc). DLC’s input at this stage is critical to ensure that open space requirement can be achieved. I have spoken with Chairperson Fontaine and we have agreed that I will coordinate scheduling a meeting with DLC and the appropriate town’s consultants.
6. The Water Supply Conceptual Plan shows the water storage tank has been relocated to the north side of Route 44. I understand this has raised concerns regarding visual impact and whether or not the land can be counted as open space (this area is shown in the open space calculation).

7. The following is an analysis of the proposed parking against the §121-38 of the Town's Zoning Law:

<b>Standard in §121-38</b>	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Single or Two Family - Two spaces per dwelling unit	159 dwelling units = 318 spaces	318 spaces in two car garage/unit + 318 spaces in driveways but not counted in total	0
Multi-Family dwelling – 1.5 spaces per unit	52 condominium units = 78 spaces.  13 townhomes = 20 spaces	Condos: 78 spaces in underground parking + 14 surface parking spaces and 5 spaces in the covered parking barn = 97 spaces. Townhomes: 10 surface spaces + 15 spaces in the covered barn for a total of 25 spaces.	+ 19 spaces for condos  +10 spaces for townhomes
Lodging Units – one space for each bedroom plus one space for each non-resident employee and one space for every 200 sq ft of floor space for meetings and functions	This calculation has not been described in the MDP.	1.5 spaces per lodging unit <sup>1</sup> for 16 units (in the two separate buildings) for a total of 24 spaces in underground spaces.	N/A
Restaurant – one space for every 3 seats	80 seat winery restaurant = 27 spaces	34 spaces being provided	+ 7 spaces
Retail or service business – four spaces per 1,000 sq ft of enclosed space <sup>2</sup>	Sales center/general store = 4,062 sq ft = 17 spaces. (Note there is no description of the sq footage of the sales center <sup>3</sup> in the MDP but the general store is described as ~1,000 sq ft).	23 spaces provided	+ 6 spaces
Other places of public assembly – one space for every 3 seats	Family activity barn: 32 seat theatre = 11 spaces	1 space for every 3 seats = 10 spaces + 1 space for every 200 sq ft of general assembly <sup>4</sup> for 3,850 sq ft = 20 spaces or 30 in total	See note # 4
Retail or service business – four spaces per 1,000 sq ft of enclosed space	Fitness center: 3,750 sq ft = 15 spaces	1 space for every 200 sq ft of lodging <sup>5</sup> for 3,750 sq ft = 19 spaces.	+ 4 spaces
Retail or service business – four spaces per 1,000 sq ft of enclosed space	Golf Academy: 1,000 sq ft = 4 spaces	4 spaces provided.	0
Use not listed <sup>7</sup>	Gatehouse:	Proposed 1 space per employee and provided 1 space	
Use not listed <sup>7</sup>	Golf Maintenance Facility	Proposed 1 space per employee and provided 30 spaces	
	Clubhouse <sup>8</sup>	There is no information provided on the number of spaces required.	

Standard in §121-38	Required	Proposed	Difference
	Water and Wastewater facilities <sup>8</sup>	There is no information provided on the number of spaces required.	
	Artisan Park <sup>8</sup>	There is no information provided on the number of spaces required.	
Totals		605 spaces described in the MDP text	46 spaces over the required per Zoning

Notes on the table:

- 1 – It is unclear why the applicant offered a different standard from that noted in the Zoning. Additionally, it is unclear how parking for the 5 lodging units in the Clubhouse is being treated.
  - 2 – The applicant describes the parking standard as 1 space for every 250 sq ft in the MDP which is the equivalent of the parking standard in the Zoning however I recommend the text be edited to reflect the Zoning for consistency.
  - 3 – Please provide the square footage of the Sales Center.
  - 4 – This standard for general assembly is not described in the Zoning. The applicant should offer an explanation for why it has been used for the Family Activity Barn.
  - 5 – It is unclear why the applicant has chosen a different standard. Please explain.
  - 6 – Note #2 above also applies to the Golf Academy.
  - 7 – These uses do not fit easily into the categories provided in the Zoning. The applicant should offer a rationale for the parking standard they have proposed for the Planning Board’s consideration.
  - 8 – There is no discussion in the MDP on parking for these uses.
8. §121-38 does allow for uses not described in the Zoning and does allow the Planning Board some flexibility in determining the appropriate amount of parking. It would be appropriate for the applicant to offer some rationale for those uses where the Zoning does not provide clear guidance, e.g. the Clubhouse, etc. and for those uses where the applicant has offered a standard that is different from the Zoning.
  9. There should be a count of the number of spaces being provided for golf cart parking as seen on MDP sheet P1.
  10. The discussion on shared parking in section 4.4 remains confusing. This section states that the amount of parking provided is equal to or greater than the standards provided in the Town Zoning Law and describes “a balance of parking that can be made available as and when required for shared parking and parking management strategies”. The concept of “shared parking” is utilized to reduce parking but that does not seem to be the case. Clearly, there is a plan for parking management (such as the shuttle for employees and the valet parking), but how this reduces the overall count for spaces remains unclear. If shared parking is not being proposed to reduce the number of spaces, then the references to shared parking should be removed.
  11. The parking for the Golf Maintenance building is described twice in the text. See page 34.

12. The text describing the number of spaces is not consistent with the parking calculation on MDP sheet P1 and P2. For example, the text describes 50 spaces for the Family Activity Barn but sheet P2 shows 67 (maybe 77 in total- not clear how the 10 convenience spaces are accounted for). Sheet P2 states 62 for the Golf Maintenance Facility (35 in the overflow area) but the text states 30 for employees and that would leave 32 for overflow not 35. In addition, I count 78 spaces in the plan for the Golf Maintenance area. Spaces shown on the plans should reconcile with the text in the MDP.
13. In the table above, the total parking spaces are 605 but I can locate 725 combined on sheets P1 and P2. This needs to be reconciled.
14. The Non-Residential Shared Parking section describes a total of 84 spaces – not 166 as indicated in the text.

#### **MDP Plan Set**

15. On SP-1, can you please add a note that states “Existing Conditions as of \_\_\_\_\_ and some language about the applicant seeking approval to do golf course work on holes x,y, z, etc on \_\_\_\_\_”. I think this will help to connect the dots on the changing existing conditions between the MDP and the site plan. On the Site Plan Existing Conditions, a similar note would indicate the when the approval was received and perhaps the area impacted can be shaded to assist in understanding the difference between the plan sets.
16. SP-11 does not show the relocated water tank.
17. GP-1. The Planning Board should consider asking the applicant to relocate the WWTP. The current location is problematic because of the SPO protections for the roadway, the extensive grading and steep slopes. In the original approval, the WWTP was intended to serve the hamlet and this location made sense. Since that option is off the table, this location does not seem as necessary and as the applicant has control over an additional 682 acres, an alternative should be evaluated.
18. LA-2. This sheet offers examples of lighting fixtures and includes pole lighting. The applicant has indicated they will not be using pole lighting and these pictures should be removed.

#### **Addendum to EAF**

19. Table 4 – Transportation section. There was a reference to the applicant that stated “Shuttle will be provided as needed by the resort operator” has been removed in the August 20, 2014 revision of the Addendum. Is this correct? If yes, please explain why this mitigation measure has been removed.
20. As noted in my memorandum of August 20, 2014, the list of waivers in the Table 4 should reflect the final list of waivers requested by the applicant.
21. Table 4 – Local and Regional Plan Consistency section. This section indicates the applicant will be seeking a waiver from RDO requirement to incorporate major design elements of TND, especially the clustering of homes in walkable distances. This

statement is inconsistent with the information provided in the TND memo provided by the applicant. This should be clarified.

22. Table 4 – Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services section. In the Mitigation Measures for the Approved MDP, there is a statement regarding how exterior lighting will be used throughout the site. I suggest the applicant modify that statement in the Additional Mitigation Measures for the proposed MDP as the lighting plan reflects exterior lighting in limited areas on the site.
23. Comment 51 from my memorandum dated May 14, 2014 which references Table 4 and stated: “Page 35. Please be more specific for the reference “Some buildings will be visible...” by identifying the buildings that will be visible” was not fully addressed. Please provide a summary of the buildings visible from the hairpin turn in addition to referencing the Confirmatory Visual Analysis.
24. Section V on Zoning Compliance still lacks specific details for how the project complies with the Aquifer Overlay District and only states “The Modified Project is not expected to have a negative impact on the AQO District with regard to water recharge and consumption”. Additional information should be provided.
25. Comment 54 from my memorandum dated May 14, 2014 which references Table 4 and stated: “Page 36 – Please reorganize this section to provide compliance details for each of the environmental overlay districts mentioned in the first full paragraph (Aquifer Overlay, Scenic Protection Overlay, Stream Corridor Overlay and Resort Development Overlay) using a format similar to what is provided for the Scenic Protection Overlay (see page 37)” has not been fully addressed. In the revised document, Pg. 39 provides the details of Stream Corridor Overlay District (§ 121-14) but does not describe how the project complies with the regulation. These details should be added. The same is true of the Aquifer Overlay District on pages 41-42.
26. Appendix F – the map showing the boundary to avoid the archaeological sensitive area shows grading in the 25 foot buffer.
27. I expect the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSORHP) will issue a letter regarding the archeological reports submitted to their office. The applicant should provide all correspondence from NYSORHP.

#### **Site Plans**

28. Please see item 15 above.
29. Sheet SL.1.04 indicates there is no exterior lighting for the Parking Barns. Is this correct?
30. The lighting plans show that some of the larger parking lots (the golf maintenance and the overflow area near the family activity barn) do not light some of the parking area. Is that the intent?
31. The plans do not offer information about the lighting for Estate Homes or the Golf Villas. Some of these homes will be visible and night-time lighting may be a concern. Does the applicant have any guidelines for lighting in these areas? Issues for consideration should include fully shielded lights, motion detection lights, curfew and low levels of illumination.

32. Will there be any lighting associated with signs?
33. I can only find signage on street related information (e.g. Stop, Parking, Speed, etc). However, I do not see signage for anything else such as building identification, entrance, etc. as described in the MDP. This information needs to be provided.

### Archeology report

34. The following paragraph can be found on page 139 of the submission to NYSOPRHP: *In the same letter (June 18, 2008), Blakemore stated that no further work on the charcoal hearths was needed. However, she requested that ponds in the APE be avoided because they might be former ore pits. Dignacco (2009) supplied additional photographs of the Island Green pond and adjacent water bodies and they are re-produced here as Figures 8, 9, and 10. **Blakemore (2009) noted in her response to Dignacco that no additional work was needed as long as the pond contour was not impacted horizontally or vertically.** Brian Yates, NY SHPO reviewer, in discussion in July 2013, suggested that further research into ore production and processing in the Wassaic Valley area should be a focus in the Phase I survey of Parcels 1, 2, and 3. HPI (2014) has addressed this issue, and found no basis for a historical district in the Project area based on the elements identified to date. (emphasis added)*

It appears that the applicant needs a letter from OPRHP rescinding the statement by Ms. Blakemore about the ponds and stating they agree with the conclusions reached by the applicant's archeologist **before doing any of the proposed work** on the Island Green Pond. This is critical as I understand some of the golf course work is occurring in this area.

35. The Avoidance Monitoring and Unanticipated Discovery Plan section of the submission notes the applicant will hire an Archaeological Monitor to be "in-the-field for all grading operations or construction activities within 100 feet of the Site - 82 archaeological buffer." Has this person been hired and approved by OPRHP? Again, I understand golf course work is occurring in the vicinity of this site but I am unsure how close to Site – 82.
36. This submission should be included in the Addendum to the EAF so that all of the information submitted on archeology is in one location.