

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
	<u>ROADS: GENERAL COMMENTS</u>		
1	The main loop road, from the Main Entrance to the secondary entrance on Route 22 by the proposed Golf Maintenance Building should be brought into conformance with the NYS Fire Code for maximum grade of 10%.	<p>The roads have been designed to best fit the existing site grades. In order to minimize disturbances, the roads have been designed to allow up to a maximum grade of 14%. The grade was discussed with Fire Chief Chris Howard in September 2013 and determined to be acceptable as long as the width of the roads was greater than 16'. There was a follow up discussion in February 2014 and Chief Howard's opinion has not changed.</p> <p>Additionally, as discussed on June 12th, 2014 with Julie Mangarillo, the main loop road only has a small section of approximately 50' at station 21+00 with a slope of 12.85%. The slope is above 10% in order to allow the Main Entrance Road to catch grade so that the slope approaching the intersection with Road E can be as close to 1.5% for 150 feet as required.</p> <p>The road to the secondary entrance on Route 22 at the end of Road E is a temporary road that contains a section of approximately 250' at a slope of 12.25%. This road is utilizing the existing topo of the existing maintenance road in order to minimize impact for the temporary access road.</p>	Site Plan Sheets C5.21 and C5.24
2	Gates are proposed at both ends of the main loop road. Provide details on how emergency vehicles will be able to open the gates.	<p>The main gate will be manned 24 hours per day 7 days per week. An access pass will be provided for the southern most gate. The pass will be provided to employees, residents, and emergency services. The main gate will also have communications with and control of the southern most gate.</p> <p>A note has been added to the plans at each entrance indicating the hours of operation.</p>	Site Plan Sheets C5.03 and C5.11
3	For driveways that exceed 500 feet, provide required turn around and turn-outs per Amenia Town Code and NYS Fire Code Section 510.	The plan has been revised to show turn arounds and turn-outs at any driveway exceeding 500 feet.	All Site Plans
4	For Site Plan review - Provide driveway profiles showing conformance with §105-22.1 thru M, including all driveways are to slope down and away from the road for a minimum of 20 feet at a maximum slope of 2% and maximum allowable driveway slope of 12%.	<p>The percent slope of each driveway has been provided in the Grading and Drainage Plans. For all driveways that do not comply with the slope down and away from the road for a minimum of 20 feet, a trench drain is proposed. Please refer to RSA-4 for a sample driveway profile. This requirement will be included in the Design Guidelines for the custom Estate Homes.</p> <p>Furthermore, not sloping down away from the road for a minimum of 20 feet reduces grading, disturbance and clearing impacts within the lot.</p> <p>Driveways have been designed to have a slope less than 14%.</p>	Site Plan Sheet RSA-4 Site Plan Sheets C7.01 to C7.11.
5	Provide copies of permit applications to NYSDOT, correspondence with and any permits issued by NYSDOT for all work in NYSDOT right-of-way including, but not limited to, the main entrance, secondary entrance, Artisan's Park/Overlook entrance, wastewater treatment plant entrance and installation of utilities beneath state roads.	A copy of the NYSDOT application will be provided.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
	<u>ROADS: GENERAL COMMENTS</u>		
6	Per Town Code Chapter 105, §105-22, "rural lanes" shall have a minimum width of 18 feet, minimum slope of 1 % and maximum slope of 10%. There are also minimum requirements for road slope approaching an intersection. Per Town Code Chapter 101, town roads are to be constructed to County road standards. For a subdivision or local road, the minimum width is 24 feet. Driveways cannot exceed 12% slope.	The roads have been designed to best fit the existing site grades, while being consistent with the Hamlet Design Guidelines and Greenway Connections. In order to minimize disturbances, the roads have been designed to allow up to a maximum grade of 14%. The slopes and road design have been discussed with Fire Chied Chris Howard in two separate occasions and he has deemed the design acceptable. An approval letter from the Fire Chief will be provided.	MDP Sheet RI-1
7	Per the 2010 Fire Code of New York State, fire apparatus roads must have a minimum unobstructed width of 20 feet and not exceed 10% slope.	Please see response to comment #1 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews) Additionally, an unobstructed width of 20' will be maintained for all roads and is shown on the Typical Road Cross Section Details.	Site Plan Sheet C14.06
8	The drawing "Roadway Identification Plan" highlights portions of the road layout that are not in conformance with Town road design requirements and will require variances from the Planning Board and Fire Department.	The applicant will request appropriate variances/waiver(s) of the applicable requirements of the subdivision regulations.	
9	The MDP layout has sections of road 16, 18 or 20 feet wide. Road slopes exceed 14% in some locations.	Please see response to comment #6 (Memo: Rhode, Soyka & Andrews)	
10	Public scenic overlook parking lot - provide a turn-around in Phase 1 for vehicles to be able to turnaround if all the parking spaces are occupied. The side slope of the driveway is very steep. Guiderail on the downhill side will most likely be required. Provide a profile of the driveway to the parking lot. Additionally, it appears the majority of driveway running parallel to Route 44 is within the 100-foot "green buffer" required by the SPO in §121-14.1.G(1).	The parking lot design has been revised and includes the ability for a vehicle turn-around and large boulders are provided along the roadway to provide vehicle protection. A profile of the driveway is included. A waiver for the portion of the driveway within the 100 foot buffer will be requested. The previously approved driveway was also within the 100-foot "green buffer." No Parking signage has been added to the Traffic Circulation and Signange Plan.	Site Plan Sheet C5.02 and Sheet C6.05
11	Provide information on the type of activities and occupancy proposed at the Golf Academy. Emergency vehicle access may be required. Due to steep side slope, guiderail may be needed.	The maximum occupancy for the Golf Academy building is 43 people. The facility includes a snack bar, lounge, offices and a training facility. Emergency vehicle access has been provided on the revised Grading and Drainage plan. A note has been added calling out the road as "13' WIDE EMERGENCY ACCESS ROAD"; additionally an asphalt cartpath detail has been added.	Site Plan Sheets C5.04 and C14.01
12	Provide a traffic circulation plan (could be included on "Roadway Identification Plan") to show traffic circulation such as one-way roads, traffic control signage (stop signs, one-way signs, etc.) and pavement striping.	Please refer to the Traffic Circulation & Signage Plan.	Site Plan Sheets C6.01 to C6.05
	<u>REFER TO THE "ROADWAY IDENTIFICATION PLAN"</u>		
13	There is a section of 'Main Entrance North' near Station 21 +00 with slope that exceeds 12%. As this is part of the main entrance and provides access to the most densely populated areas of the project, the slope should be reduced to 10%.	Please see response to comments #1 and 6 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
14	Similarly, the section of Road E near Station 10+00 and 19+00 exceed 10%. These sections should be reduced to 10% slope.	Please see response to comments #1 and 6 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
15	Near the secondary south entrance to the site, the section of Road E that exceeds 12% slope should be reduced to 10% slope. This provides secondary access for emergency vehicles and should be brought closer into conformance with the Fire Code.	Please see response to comment #s 1 & 6 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
16	Consideration should be given to widening Road C from 18 feet wide to 20 feet wide for the section between the Main Entrance road and the Activity Barn and overflow parking.	Please see response to comment #6 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews). As per discussions with the Town's consultant on June 12th 2014, the applicant does not envision a large volume of traffic along Road C and the roadway width is adequate to serve the level of activity generated by the south lawn, Activity Barn and parking lot. The applicant also expects golf carts will be utilized during Spring, Summer and Fall which further reduces traffic volumes.	
17	During the 1/16/2014 conference call to discuss road layout, a turn - around near the end of Road D was requested. This has not been provided.	The driveway of the second from last house has been revised to allow for an emergency vehicle to turn around.	MDP sheet GP-2
18	Per Town Subdivision Code §105-22.G(1) "Cul-de-sac Road": The maximum number of single family home with access from a cul-de-sac is 15. Road I shows 17 homes on the cul-de-sac. Roads C & D, south of the Activity Barn overflow parking lot (which has emergency access to the Sales Building), has 25 single-family homes with no alternate access path. Indicate if waivers will be requested per §105-22.G(6).	The applicant will request a waiver.	
19	Per Town Subdivision Code §105-22.G(2): For cul-de-sacs, the maximum grade is 10% and maximum length is 1500 feet. Sections of cul-de-sacs exceed 10% grade. Roads C & D, south of the Activity Barn overflow parking lot (which has emergency access to the Sales Building), appears to be longer than 1500 feet. Indicate if waivers will be requested per §105-22.G(6).	The applicant will request a waiver.	
20	Per Town Subdivision Code §105-22.G(3 and 4): Cul-de-sacs are to a turnaround with a pavement radius of 30 to 40 feet and center landscape island. The drawings show turnarounds similar to "acceptable alternative to 120' hammerhead" included in Appendix D of the NYS Fire Code, which do not have the opportunity for center landscaping. Indicate if waivers will be requested per §105-22.G(6). Provide detail on the hammerhead turnaround with dimensions to show conformance with NYS Fire Code.	Standard hammerhead details have been added to the site plan. The applicant will request a waiver.	Site Plan Sheet C14.01
21	The Estate Homes at the south end of the project, E-30 to E-33 appear to share a common driveway. Because this driveway is so long and provides access to multiple homes, provide a driveway profile. Due to the length of this common driveway, provide a turn-around and pull-offs per the NYS Fire Code.	Comment noted. These homes are part of phase II of the project and will be designed at a later date.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
22	Under the previously approved MDP, House E had access from Road K, which created a shorter driveway. Provide reasoning for creating a longer driveway.	When siting the lot for "House E", it was determined in the field that the driveway coming from Road K would be impractical and require a substantial amount of fill. To reduce impacts to the existing natural vegetation, the design was revised to utilize the existing trail to gain access to the house location. These homes are part of Site Plan Phase II which will be designed in detail at a later date.	
23	Per Town Code §105-22.1, all driveways are to slope down and away from the road for a minimum of 20 feet at a maximum slope of 2%. The maximum allowable driveway slope is 12%. Drawing SP-9 "Site Plan - Estate Homes" in the MDP drawing set should be revised to reflect driveway requirements. If code requirements cannot be met, provide other methods for preventing driveway runoff from flowing onto roads.	Please see response to comment #4 (Memo: Rhode, Soyka & Andrews)	Refer to Sketch RSA-4 Site Plan Sheets C7.01 to C7.11.
24	Town Subdivision Code §105-21.F.12: - Flag lots have additional driveway requirements.	Comment noted.	
25	Per §121-30.D, "Driveways on lots with 100 feet or more of road frontage shall be set back at least 10 feet from side lot lines ..."	Comment noted. All driveways on lots with 100 feet or more of road frontage comply, except for Estate Home lot E-50. A waiver will be requested for Lot E-50.	
26	Per §121-30.I, provide sight triangles at road intersections, 50 feet from the corner as shown in the code. The sight triangles should be shown on the individual site plans and landscape plans to ensure proposed landscaping does not interfere with traffic safety. Similarly for visibility at intersections, refer to §105-22.F.	Sight triangles have been provided on site plans and landscape plans for locations where private roads intersect public roads on NYS Route 22 and US Route 44 only. All roadways within the community are private. We will not adhere to the 50 foot sight triangles on private road intersections. Private intersections will be planted without sight obstructions.	Site Plan Sheets C5.00, C5.02, C5.03, C5.10, and C5.11.
27	Provide road design information for Vineyard section of project.	The Vineyard Cottages section of the project has not been modified from the approved MDP.	
28	Incorporate the "Roadway Identification Plan" into the MDP drawing set.	The plan has been added to the MDP	MDP Sheet RSI-1
28	Public scenic overlook - provide a turn-around in Phase 1 for vehicles to be able to turnaround if all the parking spaces are occupied.	The plan has been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C5.02, C6.05 and C7.02
	<b><u>SWPPP - MDP: GENERAL COMMENTS</u></b>		
29	There are references to requirements that are no longer valid under the current general permit for construction activity, GP-0-10-001 (such as inspections after 0.5 inch or greater rainfall event) or requirements that have not been updated to meet GP-0-10-001 standards (such as record retention for a minimum of five years instead of three). Recommend review of the SWPPP to ensure it reflects the requirements of the current permit, GP-0-10-001.	Comment noted.	
30	Provide additional and consistent labeling of stormwater management practices between the MDP drawings, Site Plan drawings (site plans, grading & drainage plans, E&SC plans), SWPPP narrative, and SWPPP appendices (HydroCAD print-outs and water quality calculation worksheets).	Additional and consistent labeling of stormwater management practices have been provided on the MDP drawings and site plan drawings, and in the SWPPP narrative and SWPPP appendices.	MDP and Site Plan drawings.

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
31	Provide required runoff reduction volume (RRv) analysis in accordance with NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual (SMDM).	Runoff reduction volume analysis has been performed. The runoff reduction volume analysis and water quality map are provided.	
32	Per Town Subdivision Code §105-25.B.(2)(c)[2] "The drainage system shall be large enough to accommodate potential runoff from the entire upstream drainage area whether inside or outside of the subdivision. The Town Engineer shall approve the design and size of the drainage facilities based on anticipated runoff from a fifty-year storm under conditions of total potential development permitted by the Zoning Law in the watershed." Per NYSDEC regulations, peak discharge from the 100-year storm under developed conditions cannot exceed the peak discharge under existing conditions. Confirm other stormwater infrastructure, such as piping and swales are designed to handle runoff from the 50-year storm under full-build-out conditions.	The 100-year peak discharge under developed conditions is less than the peak discharges under existing conditions at all four study point (Point A, B, C and D) as show in the hydrologic analyses. Additionally, in accordance with zoning standard and as discussed with the Town's engineer, the design accounts for the fifty-year storm utilizing both the pipe network in combination with the roadside swales under full-build-out condition.	
	<b><u>MDP SWPPP: NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI)</u></b>		
33	Page 4, #9 - Consider selecting "Stream/Creek On Site" instead of offsite for the Amenia Brook.	"Stream/Creek On Site" has been selected instead of off site.	
34	Page 4, #13 - Provide a response. Based on the soils map, it appears there could be disturbance on soils with Soil Slope Phase of "E". Provide a drawing showing proposed conditions as well as soil type boundaries to confirm.	Not applicable, because the project is not located in watershed area associated with AA or AA-S classified waters.	
35	Page 4, #14 - Response indicates there will be no disturbance to protected 100 foot adjacent area of State regulated wetland. Drawing GP-2 "Grading Plan - 2" of the MDP drawing set and drawing C7.07 of the Site Plan Phase 1 drawing set show the outlet pipe and associate grading for stormwater pond SWM #1 crossing the 100-foot buffer boundary. Confirm if there will be disturbance in 100-foot buffer of NYSDEC wetland.	The outlet pipe and grading have been adjusted to be outside the 100-foot buffer of the NYSDEC wetland.	
36	Page 5, #15 & 16 - Response indicates runoff does not enter separate storm sewer system. Confirm that no runoff enters NYSDOT drainage systems along Route 44 and/or Route 22. Site Plan drawing C7.11 shows a proposed point discharge from the WWTP parking lot into NYSDOT right-of-way.	Comment noted.	
37	Page 7, #26 - Will 'dust control' be provided? Dust control is included in the SWPPP narrative.	Yes, dust control will be provided. "Dust control" option has been selected in the NOI at page 7, #26.	
38	Page 8, #27 - Waivers are being sought to have road widths less than required per Town Code. Consider selecting "Roadway Reduction" as a site planning practice.	"Roadway Reduction" option w has been selected in the NOI at page 8, #27.	
39	Page 8, #36 - Regarding Channel Protection Volume (Cpv), provide documentation that response is acceptable to NYSDEC.	All correspondence with NYSDEC will be provided. Because the project provides WQv using 1-year storm as design practice, it also satisfies the CPv requirement.	
40	Page 13, #40 - Presumably additional DEC permits will be required for wastewater treatment discharge among others.	Additional DEC permits have been indicated.	

## Silo Ridge Ventures LLC

### Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
41	Page 13, #44 - If this NOI is an expansion of the NOI provided to NYSDEC for the golf course work which is underway, include the NYSDEC PIN.	NYR10X867 has been included.	
	<u>MDP SWPPP: DOCUMENT</u>		
42	Under "Introduction and Instruction to Owner/Operator, at the bottom of page 2, it is stated " ... the SWPPP documents must be maintained by the Site operator for a period of three years." Per GP-0-10-001, Part VI.A, records must be maintained for a minimum of five (5) years.	The language has been revised to provide for retention for 5 years.	
43	<u>Section IV "Project Description"</u>		
a.	Page 7, include the breakdown of the project area with the lot line adjustment and easement areas.	The text has been revised.	
b.	Page 8, Existing and Proposed Drainage Maps listed as being located in Appendix E could not be found.	The Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps were hand delivered during the meeting on April 30, 2014. Electronic copies of the drawings were also provided.	
c.	Page 9, Peak runoff values in NOI is for 1 of the 4 design points, not the entire project. Provide total peak runoff for entire project. Or provide discussion as to why the peak runoff values for only 1 discharge point was provided in the NOI.	There are four study points for the drainage analysis. The peak runoff values of the existing and proposed conditions for the four study points are tabulated in Table 1 and 2 in SWPPP. As per discussions with the Town's consultant, the NOI has been updated to reflect the total peak runoff values of all four points.	
d.	Page 10, Values for water quality volume are not consistent with those provided in NOI	The water quality volumes are revised to be consistent in the SWPPP and the NOI.	
e.	Provide discussion of Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) and RRv practices.	The SWPPP has been revised to include discussion regarding Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) and RRv practices under section "Step 3: Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv)".	
f.	Provide "The Five Step Process for Stormwater Site Planning and Practice Selection" as required in NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual (SMDM) Section 3.6.	The SWPPP has been revised to include the five step process for stormwater site planning and practice selection under section "Five Step Process for Stormwater Site Planning and Practice Selection".	
g.	Page 11, "Resource Protection" - Specify protection of stream buffers and phasing lines.	Note regarding stream buffers and phasing lines protection has been added to the SWPPP under section "Resource Protection".	
h.	Page 11, "Surface Water Protection" - Specify protection of the buffers in addition to the surface water body.	Note has been revised in SWPPP under section "Surface Water Protection" to include protection of the surface water body buffer.	
i.	Page 12, "Perimeter Sediment Control" - requires use of erosion control blankets on slopes 5: 1 or greater. Section V Construction Schedule and Sequence, page 19 "Erosion Control Slope Blankets" requires use of erosion control blankets on slopes of 4:1 and greater. Revise sections to be consistent with each other.	Revised to provide that erosion control blankets are required on slopes 4:1 and greater.	
j.	Page 12, "Groundwater Recharge Measures" - Include soil decompaction or minimizing unnecessary soil compaction.	Note regarding provide soil decompaction or minimizing unnecessary soil compaction has been added to SWPPP under section "Groundwater Recharge Measures".	
k.	Page 13, "Grading" includes "Avoid disturbance of steep slopes." This should be revised or clarified as the project layout includes disturbances on steep slopes.	Note has been revised as follows: "Avoid unnecessary disturbance of steep slopes."	

## Silo Ridge Ventures LLC

### Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
l.	Page 13, "Erosion Control (Stabilization)" Remove reference to 21 days in conformance with GP-0-10-001. Add stabilization requirements for projects that are permitted to disturb more than 5 acres at one time.	Reference to "21 days" has been removed, and a note has been added providing stabilization for disturbance of more than 5 acres at one time, under section "Erosion Control (Stabilization)."	
m.	Page 14, "Maintenance and Inspections" - Inspections after rainfalls greater than 0.5 inches of rainfall are no longer required per GP-0-10- 001. Include requirement for color photographs in inspection reports. Quarterly reports are no longer required per GP-0-10-001.	References to "Inspections after rainfalls greater than 0.5 inches of rainfall" and "Quarterly reports" under section "Maintenance and Inspection" have been removed. A note regarding the color photograph requirement has been added.	
n.	Page 15, "Finalize Grading & Landscaping" include information on required soil decompaction.	Note regarding soil decompaction has been added to SWPPP under section "Finalize Grading & Landscaping".	
44	Section VI Required Erosion and Sediment Control		
a.	Page 19, "Mulching" - Add the more stringent temporary stabilization schedule required by GP-0-10-001 if more than five (5) acres of land is approved for disturbance at one time.	Note regarding more stringent temporary stabilization schedule required by GP-0-10-001 if more than five (5) acres of land is approved for disturbance at one time has been added under section "Mulching".	
b.	Page 19, "Erosion Control Slope Blankets" - requires use of erosion control blankets on slopes 4: 1 or greater. Section IV, Project Description, Page 12, "Perimeter Sediment Control" - requires use of erosion control blankets on slopes 5:1 or greater. Revise sections to be consistent with each other.	Revised to provide that erosion control blankets are required on slopes 4:1 and greater.	
c.	Page 19 "Permanent Seeding" - Per the NY State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (aka Blue Book), all areas that are seeded require mulching, not just those on slopes 4: 1 or greater. As stated elsewhere in the SWPPP, areas with 4:1 slopes or greater should receive erosion control blankets.	Note has been revised to provide that all areas that are seeded require mulching. SWPPP revised to provide that erosion control blankets are required on slopes 4:1 and greater.	
d.	Page 20, "Catch Basin Inlet Protection" - Use of SiltSacks™ in a catch basin is not a recommended practice for inlet protection. When full of sediment, they are difficult to remove without sediment being spilled. During heavy rain events, they can clog, causing runoff to bypass the catch basin and create erosion issues in other locations. Use an approved catch basin inlet protection practice as described in the NY State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (aka Blue Book).	Proposed catch basin inlet protection has been revised to reference the approved Standard and Specifications for Storm Drain Inlet Protection.	
i.	Similarly, use of "Dandy Bag" as shown in Site Plan drawing C14.02 "Civil Site Details 2" is not recommended.	Please see response to comment #43.d. (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
e.	Page 20, "Stabilized Construction Exits" - Per NY State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (aka Blue Book), the standard specifications for stabilized construction entrance is for a minimum thickness of 6-inches.	Minimum thickness of the stabilized construction entrance has been revised to 6 inches.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
f.	Page 20, "Diversion Channels" - In NY state, use of polymers requires NYSDEC approval prior to use. Use of polymers is not recommended. If polymers are used, they must conform to the restrictions on the NYS DOT website, under "Geotechnical Engineering Dust Palliatives." If a pre-approved product is considered for use, the NYSDEC Regional stormwater contact person should be notified prior to use. Information on the restrictions and limitations is to be included in the SWPPP. Use of polymer must also be evaluated as part of the Habitat Management Plan.	Use of polymers in diversion channels has been removed from the list.	
g.	Page 21, "Temporary Sediment Basins" - Add a reference to the calculations in Attachment E.	Note has been added under section "Temporary Sediment Basin" to refer to Attachment E.	
h.	Recommend adding a section on riprap outlet protection with reference to calculations in Attachment E.	A section regarding "Riprap Outlet Protection" has been added to the SWPPP with reference to Attachment E.	
i.	Recommend adding a note to inform the reader where construction details of erosion & sediment control practices can be located, such as in the drawing set.	Note has been added under section "Construction Detail of Erosion & Sediment Control Practices" to refer to site plan set for construction details.	
45	Section VII Additional Erosion and Sediment Controls, Page 22 "Dust Control" - Calcium chloride is listed as an acceptable dust control method. NY State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (aka Blue Book) does not include calcium chloride as an acceptable dust control method, however it is included on the NYS DOT list. If calcium chloride is proposed for use, approval from the NYSDEC should be obtained prior to its use. Use of calcium chloride for dust control must also be evaluated as part of the Habitat Management Plan.	Calcium Chloride has been removed from the list of dust control practices. Water is being used for dust control; it is for mitigation.	
46	Section VIII Water Quality and Water Quantity Controls, Page 25, "Infiltration Practices" includes dry wells. Dry wells are not listed in the Notice of Intent. Add notes that calculations for the practices are in Attachment E.	Dry wells are no longer proposed. It is not necessary to provide these practices at each home site in order to meet the stormwater management requirements under GP-0-10-001.	
47	Section IX Maintenance, Inspections and Project Documentation,		
a.	Page 26 "Inspections" - Per GP-0-10-001, inspection after 0.5 inch or greater rainfall is no longer required. Include requirement for color photographs as part of the inspection, per GP-0-10-001.	References to "Inspections after rainfalls greater than 0.5 inches of rainfall" and "Quarterly reports" under section "Maintenance and Inspection" have been removed. A note regarding the color photograph requirement has been added.	
b.	Page 27 "Inspections" - Per GP-0-10-001, records must now be maintained for five (5) years (not three years).	Revised to provide for retention for 5 years.	
c.	Page 28 "Documentation" - Per GP-0-10-001, quarterly reports are no longer required.	Reference to quarterly report has been removed.	
d.	Include information required per NYS SMDM Section 3.5, such as signage.	Notes have been added under section "Maintenance" to include the signage requirement as suggested. Notes referring to site plan sheets C14.01 & C14.02 for drawing details and to Attachment B for maintenance inspection checklist were also added.	



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
48	Section X Spill Prevention Plan and Response Procedures, Pages 30 and 32 "Fertilizers" - include a reference to the 'NYS Dishwasher Detergent and Nutrient Runoff Law' which regulates use of fertilizers.	Note has been added under section "Fertilizer" to refer to "NYS Dishwasher Detergent and Nutrient Runoff Law" for regulation regarding usage of fertilizer. Note regarding restriction of fertilizer usage in the Aquifer Overlay District and any restrictions from the Habitat Management Plan also added. Also, a note referencing the document to the NRMP has been added.	
49	Attachments A and B - There are checklists included for stormwater management practices that are not listed in the SWPPP narrative. If these practices are proposed, they should be included in the SWPPP narrative.	Attachment A and B checklists have been revised to eliminate stormwater management practices that are not provided.	
50	Attachment E - Referenced existing and proposed drainage drawings could not be located.	The Existing and Proposed Drainage Area Maps were hand delivered during the meeting on April 30, 2014. Electronic copies of the drawings were also provided.	
51	Provide a key in the SWPPP and on MDP drawings linking the stormwater practice identification (SWM #1, etc.) to the type of practice (pond, swale, etc.). This has been done for the design worksheets for the water quality basins. It should be expanded to include the swales, dry well, and sand filters.	Figure FB title "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan" shows the name, location and type of storm water management practice for the full-build condition. Tables have been revised to identify the stormwater management practices. Figure FB will be part of the MDP drawing set.	
52	Swales - Refer to NYS SMDM Section 6.5	<p>The infiltration basins will be constructed during the early golf phase. As per NYSDEC requirement, WQv of these infiltration basins for the golf work are designed according to the 90% rule, not the East of Hudson standard. Only infiltration basin E, which will be utilized to receive runoff from the full-build condition, is sized to satisfy the WQv requirement under the East of Hudson standard.</p> <p>Some of the infiltration basins that are constructed during the golf work phase will be eliminated in the full-build condition. Figure FB "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan" shows the infiltration basins that will remain under the full-build condition.</p> <p>The WQv provided for the full-build condition are self satisfied by the proposed ponds and underground sand filters even without considering the WQv contributed by these remaining infiltration basins. In fact, the total WQv provided are much greater than the required WQv. Detail calculations of these infiltration basins are attached in Attachment E3 of the SWPPP. The design conforms with the SMDM.</p>	
a.	Per previous agreement, the stormwater management design is to be done to East of Hudson watershed standards. The design storm for the swale design is the water quality storm (1.09 inches). To be considered for East of Hudson watershed standards, the design storm should be the one-year storm.	Please see response to comment #52 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
b.	Provide longitudinal slope (max permissible is 4%) If slope is greater than 2%, provide check dams.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
c.	Confirm minimum 2 foot separation from groundwater.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
d.	Provide peak velocity for two-year storm.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
e.	Provide cover type (vegetated, stone, etc.)	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
f.	Provide ten-year storm flow depth to ensure the required minimum freeboard depth of 6 inches is provided. Only the water quality (Wq) depth is provided. For some swales, less than 6 inches of free board is provided for the WQ depth.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
g.	Calculate maximum ponding time	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
h.	Per SMDM "Channels shall be designed with moderate side slopes (flatter than 3:1) for most conditions. 2:1 is the absolute maximum side slope." [underlining per SMDM]. All of the 13 proposed swales are designed with 2: 1 side slopes. It seems that at least of few of the proposed swales could be designed with 3: 1 or flatter side slopes and reserve the steeper 2: 1 side slopes for more extreme circumstances.	Not applicable since the previously referenced swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
i.	Provide information on soil media for the swales.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
j.	Provide a calculation to show the swale can temporarily store the WQv within the swale for a minimum of 30 minutes.	Not applicable since the swales are designed as infiltration basins.	
k.	The units for "Water quality elevation, X" should be given a second look.	The units for "Water quality elevation, X" have been corrected.	
l.	Provide WQv provided at the selected depth of swale.	Water quality volume required and provided are shown in the infiltration basin calculation.	
m.	Include calculation for runoff reduction volume (Rrv) provided by the swales.	Runoff reduction volume (Rrv) is not necessary for the golf course phase, because the work was considered redevelopment. The full-build project does not need any runoff reduction volume (Rrv) or WQv provided by the golf phase in order to satisfy the overall project storm water management requirements. The full-build project Rrv and WQv analysis have been provided.	
n.	Provide a drawing showing the locations of the swales.	Figure FB title "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan" that is part of the MDP drawing set provided the locations of the infiltration basins that will be remain under full-build conditions.	
o.	If dry swales are a temporary measure only during construction and are proposed to be replaced at a later stage of construction, that should be explained within the SWPPP.	Some of the infiltration basins constructed during golf work phase will be eliminated. The infiltration basins that will remain under the full-build condition are shown in Figure FB titled "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan". The infiltration basins that will remain in the full-build condition are explained in the SWPPP.	
53	Dry well - Refer to NYS SMDM Section 6.3	Please see response to comment #46 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
a.	Provide additional design information and calculations to show the design is in conformation with the SMDM. (Similar to multiple comments above regarding dry swales in reference to design requirements and limitations in the SMDM).	Please see response to comment #46 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
54	Water Quality Basins - Refer to NYS SMDM Section 6.1		
a.	Specify the type of pond per SMDM classifications.	Types of ponds have been specified in Attachment E3 of the SWPPP.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
b.	Provide additional design information and calculations to show the design is in conformation with the SMDM. Ensure larger storms can be routed through the water quality basins without over-topping. Confirm required pond benches and maintenance access are provided.	<p>* Detail calculations have been revised to show conformance with the SMDM. The detail calculations are in Attachment E3 in the SWPPP.</p> <p>* The basins are designed to have at least 1 foot of free board from the top.</p> <p>* Safety benches are not required as the basin side slopes are 4:1 as specified in SMDM.</p> <p>* Aquatic benches have been provided in each of the basins.</p> <p>* The basins are accessible by various routes including cart paths, golf course, and roads. Due to the ease of access available to all these basins, a designated maintenance road is not necessary.</p>	
55	Underground Sand Filters - Refer to NYS SMDM Section 6.4		
a.	Provide additional design information and calculations to show the design is in conformation with the SMDM, such as design of practice "off-line". There is information on low-flow orifice, but it is not clear that this to provide off-line treatment.	Additional design information and detail calculations have been revised to show conformance with the SMDM. The detail calculations are in Attachment E3 in the SWPPP. The underground sand filters are designed as "off-line" practice. The low flow orifices carry the water quality flow to the underground sand filters while the high flow pipe diverts the larger storm flow away from underground sand filters.	
b.	Per SMDM 6.4.3 "The typical method is a sedimentation basin that has a length to width ratio of 1.5: 1." Some of the sedimentation basins have a length to width ratio closer to 1 :1. This should be given another look.	The sedimentation basin length to width ratio is designed to best fit with site constraints. The 1.5:1 ratio is recommended but not required.	
56	Town inspections of E&SC measures - Inspection fee. Copies of weekly E&SC inspection reports.	The applicant is already in coordination with the Town of Amenia building inspector and NYSDEC inspector for all site inspections. The building department has received copies of weekly E&SC inspection reports to date and the applicant will continue to do so.	
57	Provide details regarding how discharges from footing drains and roof drains for structures will be managed.	Footing drains are intended to be daylighted while the roof drains will either be daylighted or connected to the existing drainage system. Standard details have been added to the Site Detail Sheets.	
58	Flood Plain Impacts - Project now includes filling of flood plain area to plant trees in the NYSDOT right-of-way at the main entrance to the site. Any work within the flood plain requires a permit per Town Code Chapter 67 "Flood Damage Prevention". The location of this proposed fill is in proximity to a culvert that carries the Amenia Brook below Route 22. Reducing the flood plain storage capacity could have potentially significant impacts to properties upstream and downstream of the culvert. Provide a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of filling this portion of the flood plain.	The project includes filling as well as cutting in the floodplain area. However, the project yields a net cut in the floodplain area, and thus an increase of the floodplain storage capacity. The project does not include any encroachment within the floodway and therefore does not affect the conveyance of the flood flow as per FEMA regulation. A floodplain development permit will be filed with the building department.	

## Silo Ridge Ventures LLC

### Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
59	AQO - Provide the information required by §121-15 for the Aquifer Overlay District (AQO) including recharge and consumption of water calculations. The AQO has additional restrictions on storage of fertilizers and chloride salts. Provide information to show the project will be in conformance with these requirements.	The water report and calculations will be provided. The applicant will request the applicable special permit with respect to the storage of fertilizers (greater than 500 lbs.) in the Priority Valley Bottom Aquifer (PVBA). Please see response to comment #135 (Memo: David Everett) for more detail regarding storage of fertilizers at the maintenance facility. Road salt will be obtained by independent contractor and not stored onsite.	
60	Steep Slopes: Comply with requirements of §121-36, particularly for work on slopes steeper than 30%.	Comment noted.	
	<u>WATER SUPPLY &amp; WASTWATER TREATMENT</u>		
61	Add to the MDP drawing set U-1 Sanitary Sewer System Master Plan and U-2 Overall Water Supply System Master Plan drawings that the golf maintenance facility will be served by individual well and septic system.	The golf maintenance facility will be serviced by the community water and sewer systems.	
62	Provide an existing conditions plan for water supply that shows existing well locations and identifies which wells will remain in use and which will be decommissioned. Provide information on how existing wells will be properly decommissioned.	Comment noted. The water report and calculations will be provided. Please see response to comment #16 (Memo: David Everett)	
63	Provide necessary details for water and wastewater treatment - WWTP building site plan, utility corridors, Route 44 utility crossings, water tanks, pump stations, etc., etc.	WWTP site package has been submitted.	
64	Per Town Subdivision Code §105-25.B "Underground improvements ... and public franchise utilities shall be placed in the road right-of-way between the road paving and the right-of-way line in order to simplify location and repair of the utility lines." And §105-25.C "Utility and drainage easements. Where topography or other conditions make inclusion of utilities or drainage facilities within road rights-of-way impractical, perpetual unobstructed easements at least 20 feet in width for such utilities shall be provided across property outside the road lines and with satisfactory access to the road. Ownership of these easements shall be indicated on all reservations and on the final subdivision plat."	Comment noted. The applicant will seek a waiver.	
65	Refer to Town Subdivision Code §105-25.E for transportation corporation requirements. §105-25.E (6) Provide results of 72-hour well capacity test.	Comment noted. The water report and calculations will be provided. We will provide a draft report prior to the final, complete report.	
66	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.	Comment noted. The project will be served by not yet formed transportation corporations, not public franchise utilities. All correspondence with public utility companies will be provided (cable, electric, telephone).	
67	Provide copies of Department of Health applications and permits.	All correspondence with Department of Health will be provided.	
68	With WWTP no longer providing treatment for hamlet of Amenia, has consideration been given to relocating WWTP onto main Silo Ridge property to reduce number of utility crossings beneath Route 44?	Comment noted. The applicant considered relocation, but the proposed location is preferred and approved.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
69	Are water or sewer connections proposed for the Golf Academy?	Yes. The plan has been revised to show water and sewer connections for the Golf Academy building.	
70	Will the WWTP require potable water? If so, how will the WWTP be served?	Yes. The plans have been revised to show the water connection.	
	<u>NYSEG EASEMENT - SPECIFIC TO 100' EASEMENT NORTH OF ROUTE 44</u>		
71	There are proposed disturbances within the easement. Are these disturbances permitted?	The applicant will obtain all the required permits from NYSEG for the small section of work proposed within the easement. All correspondence with NYSEG will be provided.	
72	Show any existing structures within the NYSEG easement relative to proposed disturbances.	Any proposed grading will not impact existing NYSEG structures.	
73	Label the NYSEG easement on individual site plan drawing sheets and include it on the subdivision plat.	Comment noted. All plans have been revised to label the NYSEG easement.	All Site Plan Sheets.
	<u>PARKING</u>		
74	Identify employee parking areas. Provide an analysis of number of anticipated employees and available parking spaces.	The number of parking spaces provided by the project meet the requirements of Section 121-38 of the Zoning Law, which account for employee parking demand, even though the requirements are not applicable in the RDO District.	
75	Enclosed parking - Provide consistent labeling (Car Barn vs Parking Barn.) For enclosed parking lots, either underground or parking barns, there appears to be only 1 entrance/exit. If there is an emergency or blockage at the entrance/exit, such as a car fire, how will emergency responders gain access? Consider providing secondary garage doors at the opposite end of parking structure for rapid emergency access and ventilation.	MDP Sheet P-1 has been revised to clarify labelling of the Parking Barn. All documents have been revised to be consistent. The plans indicate all accessible spaces within the parking structures. Parking structures include two means of egress for pedestrians.	Site Plan Sheets A3.14. MDP Sheet P-1 and P-2.
76	In the Site Plan drawing set, A3.13 "Car Barn Elevations" - Provide labels for doors - garage doors, person-doors. Include a plan view to depict vehicle circulation. Include clear height for vehicular access. Per ICC/ANSI A117.1 (502.5) minimum vertical clearance of 98 inches is needed to accommodate vans.	Sheet A3.13 has been revised.	Site Plan Sheet A3.14
77	Per Building Code of New York State 1106.1.1 "Accessible parking spaces shall... be provided with access aisles at least 8 feet in width." The access aisle is shown as less than 8 feet wide. Revise the MDP plans, site plans and detail on drawing C14.01 "Civil Site Details 1".	The detail has been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C14.01 and C6.01 to C6.05
78	Per Building Code of New York State 1106.5 "Each accessible parking space shall be provided with signage displaying the international symbol of accessibility. Each access aisle shall be provided with signage reading "NO PARKING ANYTIME". Revise the MDP plans, site plans and detail on drawing C14.01 "Civil Site Details 1" to show required signage.	The detail has been revised in the Site Plan drawings. Please refer to the Traffic Circulation and Signage Plan included in the Site Plan sets. A note has been added to the MDP referencing the Site Plan Traffic Circulation and Signage Plan. "No Parking" signage has been added to the Traffic Circulation and Signage Plan.	Site Plan Sheets C6.01 to C6.05

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
79	The MDP drawing P-1 "Parking Plan" and Site Plan drawing P1.00 "Parking Plan" do not appear to show handicapped parking spaces in the underground parking lots. Per Building Code of New York State 1106.2 "Two percent, but not less than one, of each type of parking space provided for occupancies in Groups R-2 and R-3, which are required to have Accessible, Type A or Type B dwelling or sleeping units, shall be accessible." If accessible units are required, then accessible parking spaces, along with required signage are also required.	The plans have been revised.	MDP Sheet P-1 and P-2; Site Plan Sheets P1.00 and P1.01
80	The MDP and Site Plans show multiple parallel parking spaces reserved as accessible parking spaces. The Building Code of New York State and the ICC/ANSI A117.1 do not have specific requirements for parallel parking spaces. However, the parallel parking spaces are more similar to "Passenger Loading Zones" than to typical parking lot parking spaces. Review proposal for parallel accessible parking spaces for sufficient access aisles. Consider replacing accessible parallel parking spaces with standard accessible parking spaces.	Comment noted. Parallel parking spaces have been revised accordingly, as well as the associated details.	Site Plan Sheets C14.01 and C6.01 to C6.05
81	MDP drawing P-1 "Parking Plan," and Site Plan drawing P1.00 "Parking Plan" state there are 25 accessible parking spaces, but 25 accessible parking spaces could not be located. Identify where these parking spaces are located.	The plans have been revised.	MDP Sheet P-1 and P-2; Site Plan Sheets P1.00 and P1.01
82	MDP drawing P-1 "Parking Plan," and Site Plan drawing P1.00 "Parking Plan" do not include accessible parking spaces for the "Parking Area at Activity Barn." Per Building Code of New York State Table 1106.1, there should be 3 accessible spaces provided. Per Building Code of New York State 1106.1 "Where more than one parking facility is provided on a site, the number of parking spaces required to be accessible shall be calculated separately for each parking facility."	The plans have been revised to include accessible parking spaces for the parking area at the activity barn.	MDP Sheet P-2; Site Plan Sheets P1.01
83	Consideration should be given to adding more parking spaces near the Fitness facility.	Comment noted.	
84	Include the parking lot for the Golf Maintenance Facility in the MDP and Site Plan parking plans.	Golf Maintenance Facility parking plan has been provided.	MDP Sheet P-2; Site Plan Sheets P1.01
85	Include the public scenic overlook parking lot in the Site Plan parking plan.	Parking plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet P1.01
86	Include the public scenic overlook parking lot and Winery parking lots in the MDP parking plan.	Artisan's Park Overlook and Winery Restaurant parking lots have been added to the MDP drawings.	MDP Sheet P-2
87	Public scenic overlook parking lot - provide a turn-around in Phase 1 for vehicles to be able to turnaround if all the parking spaces are occupied. The side slope of the driveway is very steep. Guiderail on the downhill side will most likely be required. It appears the majority of driveway running parallel to Route 44 is within the 100-foot "green buffer" required by the SPO in §121-14.1.G(1).	Please see response to comment #10 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews). Comment repeated.	MDP Sheet P-2; Site Plan Sheets P1.01
88	There has been discussion that golf carts will be a major mode of transportation within the resort. Are there designated golf cart parking areas within the Village Core? If so, label them on the plans.	There is a golf cart storage area under the fitness center.	Site Plan Sheets C5.09; MDP Plan Sheet P-1

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
89	Refer to §121-38.A.4 for design requirements for off-street parking. Provide confirmation that the proposed parking lots meet these requirements.	Dimensions have been added to the site plans and are in accordance with Town Code. Standard parking space detail has been added.	Site Plan Sheets C5.09 to C5.10; C14.01
90	Label off-street loading areas for non-residential buildings, such as the golf maintenance building, sales building, and activity barn. Off-street loading areas are to be in conformance with §121-38.B	All deliveries will made at the Sale Center. Loading areas will be labelled in conformance with 121-38.B. Plan sheets have been revised to identify "LOADING ZONE".	Site Plan Sheets C5.10 to C5.11
	<b>PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT C4.01 AND SUBDIVISION CODE</b>		
91	Add buffers, easements, shared driveways and other important land features to subdivision plat, which has to be filed with County Clerk.	Comment noted.	
92	Label adjacent roads.	Comment noted.	
93	Include information required by subdivision code §105 Appendix C.111 "Submission requirements for preliminary plats - major subdivisions"	Comment noted.	
94	Town Subdivision Code §105-20(G): "Where a subdivision is traversed by a watercourse, drainage way, channel or stream, there shall be provided a stormwater easement or drainage right-of-way, not less than 30 feet in width." Are the required stormwater easements or drainage rights-of-way provided?	Comment noted.	
95	Town Subdivision Code §105-20(H): Show the flood plain on the preliminary subdivision plat.	Comment noted.	
96	Town Subdivision Code §105-30.B: "The final plat shall include statements by the owner granting all necessary easements or other releases where required for the installation of public franchise utilities."	Comment noted.	
97	Town Subdivision Code §105-21: Buildable Lots - Show each proposed lot meets the requirements for a 'buildable lot' which includes 5000 square feet with maximum slope of less than 15%.	The Applicant will request a waiver for Lots 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110 and 111, which do not meet the 5,000 SF buildable area requirement.	
	<b>DRAWINGS: GENERAL COMMENTS</b>		
98	The Site Location Map on the cover sheets of MDP and Site Plan drawings highlight more area than is included in Silo Ridge application. Revise highlighted area to be consistent with the limits of the proposed project.	Site location maps have been revised.	MDP Title Sheets; Site Plan Title Sheets
99	Provide additional labeling of structures and features. On the site plans, provide callouts or references to drawing details.	All plans have been revised.	All site plans
100	Provide consistent labeling of Route 22, Route 44 and West Amenia Lake Road.	All MDP plans and site plans have been revised to be consistent.	All MDP Sheets; All Site Plans.
101	Provide information required for subdivision approval outlined in §105 Appendix C.111 "Submission requirements for preliminary plats - major subdivisions" and §121-65.B for required information for site plan approval for major projects.	Comment noted.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
102	Provide separate drawings in both the MDP and Site Plan sets that show existing and proposed conditions with the zoning districts and zoning overlay districts (SPO, SCO, AQO, floodplain) shown.	Plans have been included in the Site Plans.	Site Plan Sheet C2.10
103	In the MDP for overall existing conditions and overall site plan as well as Site Plan drawing set, on overall plan sheets, C2.00, C3.00, C5.00, C7.00, etc. include property information for all properties, including individual parcels owned by the Applicants and all abutting parcels. Include owner name, acreage, tax map number and any other identifying information.	All plans have been revised.	All Site Plans
104	In the Site Plan drawing set for individual plan sheets (C2.01- C2.08, C3.01-C3.08, C5.01-C5.11, etc.) label property information for all properties shown, as well as zoning overlay district boundaries (SPO, SCO, APO, etc., etc.). Also show proposed buffers as included in Habitat Management Plan and for the archeologically sensitive site.	The applicant does not agree with this request. The applicant and the Town's consultant agreed on June 12th 2014 to show the SCO boundary line on all site plans, where applicable. Additionally, as per discussion with all three of the Town's consultants, the applicant has provided a separate, overall plan showing the zoning overlay district boundaries.	Site Plan Sheet C2.10
a.	For the SPO, the required 100 foot green buffer along Routes 44, and 22 required by §121-14.1.G(1) is to be measured from the road right-of-way/property line. §121-14.1.B specifies the boundary of the SPO is measured from the road right-of-way.	Comment noted. The 100 foot buffers and boundaries are shown on the site plans.	Site Plan Sheet C2.10
105	Highlight the location of the existing silos on drawings. They are useful as an orientation point.	The location of the existing silos have been added.	Site Plan Sheets C2.00, C2.01 and C3.01.
106	Consistently show and label the emergency access road between the Sales Building parking lot and Activity Barn parking lot as well as the overflow parking lot on the drawings.	All MDP and site plans have been revised to be consistent.	Site Plan Sheets C5.03 and C7.03
107	On some drawings, the edge of pavement lines for Routes 22 and 44 are missing.	All plans have been revised.	All Site Plans
108	Information regarding waste disposal containers, such as location, type and screening could not be located. Provide such information.	An updated plan showing the waste disposal containers locations, types and screening has been provided. Private residences will be contracted to have private pickup. A dumpster pad detail has been added.	Site Plan Sheets C5.09, C5.10, C14.01 and L4.03
109	Per §121-65.B.11 - Provide cut and fill estimated volumes.	The Overall Construction Sequencing Plan has been revised to show the estimated cut and fill volumes for Phase I.	Site Plan Sheet C13.00
110	Provide a comprehensive list of all Town Code waivers or variances that are requested.	A list of waivers and variances has been provided.	
111	Is blasting anticipated for any phases of the work?	Blasting is not expected to be necessary over most of the site. Nevertheless, in the event that blasting is necessary, all operations will adhere to New York State laws governing the use of explosives.	
	<b>MDP DRAWING SET: SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b>		



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
112	Drawings for the Vineyard Cottages are not consistent with each other. For example, drawing SP-11 shows turnaround at the end of the roads. The turnarounds are missing from SP-10.	Drawing SP-10 has been revised to show the approved 2009 MDP plan for the Vineyard Cottages.	MDP Sheets SP-10 and SP-11
113	Site Sections drawings (SP-12 to SP-17) include the definition of building height from the Town of Amenia Town Code to clarify that buildings with the peak of the roof above 35 feet are still in conformance with the Town Code. Also include north arrows on the "Key Plan." For drawing SP-17, add a Key Plan and building height dimension.	All site section drawings have been revised. Drawings SP-17 and SP-18 are the previously approved 2009 MDP plans; no height dimensions were added to drawing SP-17. A note has been included to show that the drawings are the 2009 Approved MDP drawings. No further revisions have been made to these plans.	MDP Sheets SP-12 to SP-16
114	GP-1 and GP-2: The majority of proposed improvements are shaded. Proposed emergency access near Sales Building, Activity Barn parking lot and overflow parking lot and the parking lot for the WWTP are not shaded. Does the lack of shading indicate something or is it just an oversight?	All plans have been revised.	MDP Sheets GP-1 and GP-2
115	SP-2 and GP-1 do not show how the Vineyard Cottages pool and cabana are accessed, either by pedestrians or vehicles.	The Vineyard Cottages area shown in SP-1 and GP-2 is from the approved 2009 MDP plans; no changes have been made. Details will be addressed during phase III (Vineyard Cottages) site plan review.	-
116	GP-1 and GP-2 - There are multiple locations where grading extends beyond the project limits, either onto adjacent property, into wetland buffer or outside the proposed lot line adjustment and maintenance building easement. These should be revised.	All plans have been revised.	MDP Sheets GP-1 and GP-2
117	Per discussions with Silo Ridge design professionals, provide revised and reduced grading for the Estate Homes on GP-2 that more closely shows what is intended to be disturbed.	The plans have been revised to reduce the grading for the Estate Homes and more closely represent what intended disturbance. It is noted that these homes are custom and the grading shown is only illustrative. Design guidelines will be established to provide parameters for developmemntg of the lots. Please refer to Estate Homes design guidelines and lot diagrams.	MDP Sheets GP-1 and GP-2
118	On GP-2, the NYSDEC 100 foot buffer line is missing.	All plans have been revised.	MDP Sheets GP-1 and GP-2
119	LA-2 "Site Lighting" the 2nd bullet under 'High Brightness and Glare' states "Street, path and area lighting poles will not exceed 20' in height." Per §121-38.A.4.d "Lighting within parking lots shall be on low poles of 12 feet to 15 feet maximum height, with color-corrected lamps and cut-off luminaries designed to minimize glare and light pollution ... Sidewalks leading from parking lots shall be lit with bollard lighting and indirect illumination of buildings and vegetation." Revise lighting pole height to 12 to 15 feet high. Refer also to §121-40.L and §121-65.B.7 for additional lighting requirements and restrictions. Include discussion of lighting for public scenic overlook parking lot, WWTP and Golf Maintenance Building parking lot. Expand the "Village Core Lighting Plan" or provide additional plans to include lighting of parking lots by the Winery, WWTP and Golf Maintenance Building.	All plans and sheets have been revised. There are no light poles proposed.	MDP Sheet LA-2
120	ENV-1: It appears the colors for slopes in the legend have been switched for areas of slopes 15-30% and areas of slopes greater than 30%.	The legend has been revised.	MDP Sheet ENV-1

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
121	ENV-2: Should pond A6 be colored blue?	The plans have been revised.	MDP Sheet ENV-2
122	ENV-2 and ENV-3 label existing culverts.	The plans have been revised. Additional existing culverts have been shown.	MDP Sheets ENV-2 to ENV-4
123	ENV-4 - Explain differences between water body labels A, AQ and SWM. Specifically, does one of labels indicate the water body is jurisdictional to ACOE or NYSDEC. Cross-reference wetland labels from the Chazen wetland survey (Wetland A, B, C-1, etc.).	The plans have been revised to provide clarity. Chazen labels have been included. Please reference the HMP.	MDP Sheet ENV-4, ENV-5, and ENV-6
124	ENV-4 and 5 - Provide details on how buffers will be demarcated in the field.	Buffers will be demarcated in the field in the following manner: * Conservation buffers will be demarcated using 4 x 4 cedar posts (three (3)' high) with 4 x 4 aluminum signs indicating easement holder and protection wording located every 500'. In areas where there is more than one home abutting the forest every 500', a minimum of 1 sign per house lot will be used. Detail has been added to the site plan. * Water quality buffers will be demarcated using round buttons with pins pressed into the grass every 200' (or as applicable). Detail has been added to the site plan. A note had been added to the legend to reference Site Plan Sheet C14.01 for demarcation detail.	Site Sheet C14.01
125	ENV-4 - Turn-arounds are not shown at the end of the residential dead-end roads as shown on SP-11. Pull back the end of the residential road closest to wetland between the Winery and the Vineyard Cottages to allow for 100 foot buffer. [Expand buffer to replace the narrow yellow (30-100 ft. width buffer) section with green (greater than 100 foot width buffer) buffer.]	The Vineyard Cottages area shown in ENV-4 is from the approved 2009 MDP plans; no changes have been made. Details will be addressed during phase III (Vineyard Cottages) site plan review. The intent is to maintain the 100' buffer.	-
	<b>SITE PLAN DRAWING SET - SPECIFIC COMMENTS:</b>		
126	Drawing C1.01 "Legend and General Notes" include a note regarding the Town requirement for as-built drawings per §105-28.B.	Note has been added.	Site Plan Sheet C1.01
127	Individual layout plans for existing conditions and demolition do not include the entire area for the golf maintenance building. The area shown on C2.07 and C3.07 should extend farther to the south.	All sheets have been revised to show the golf maintenance building.	Site Plan Sheets C2.09 and C3.09
128	Drawing C3.00 "Overall Demolition Plan" shows proposed demolition work beyond the proposed easement for the Golf Maintenance Building. Details for this area are not included in the individual plans (C3.01 - C3.08). What is the proposed demolition work on the west side of the water body that is located on the south side of the existing secondary entrance from Route 22?	Any grading outside the easement line has been approved and agreed upon with HVLC. There is no proposed demolition work on the west side of the water body. All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C3.00 to C3.09
129	On individual site plan drawings (C5.01 to C5.11) provide call-outs or references to site civil details.	All sheets have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C5.01 to C5.11
130	Provide additional building and site amenity labels. For the Clubhouse, provide an outline of the Clubhouse expansion in Phase 2.	All sheets have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C5.09 to C5.11

## Silo Ridge Ventures LLC

### Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
131	Limits of work line for Phase 1 on the Site Plans should be expanded to include work for the temporary sales tent at the overlook.	The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	NA
132	The limits of work line for Phase 1 does not include the area of the Practice Area. On Existing Conditions C2.04, the existing contours shown appear to be the proposed contours of the Practice Area. The Site Plan C5.04 shows the practice area, but it is outside the limits of work. The grading plan, C7.04 does not show proposed grading for the Practice Area. The work in this area needs to be documented within the site plan drawings.	The improvements to the driving range and holes 10, 11, 16, 17, and 18 are expected to be completed by July, 2014. Because completion will be prior to phase I site plan approval, the areas are being shown as existing conditions. Furthermore, based on conversations with the Town Consultants on June 19th, 2014, the MDP phasing plan has been updated to reflect the above mentioned area as Phase Zero (0)	MDP Sheet SP5
133	C5.04 - The driveway for lot GV-5 appears narrower than other lots.	The plan has been revised.	Site Plan Sheet C5.04
134	C5.10 - extend viewport for 'Maintenance Facility Plan' to show intersection with Route 22. It is difficult to determine if a line across the existing driveway is an existing gate. If there is an existing or proposed gate, label it. Any gate should be set back far enough from Route 22 to allow emergency vehicles, or even multiple employee vehicles to pull-off Route 22 even when gate is closed.	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet C5.11
135	C5.11 - It appears a gate is proposed for the WWTP. If so, it should be labeled. It does not appear to be set far enough back from Route 22 to allow an emergency vehicle to pull off Route 22 when the gate is closed.	A detailed site plan for the WWTP has been provided. The gate has been labeled and provides enough space from Route 22 to allow an emergency vehicle to pull off.	Site Plan Sheet C5.10
136	Details regarding gates could not be located. Provide information on how emergency services will be able open the gates.	Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews). All details regarding the gates have been provided.	Site Plan Sheet L4.03
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.	Schematic details from the FEIS have been provided. Refer to L3.01 and L3.03 for proposed landscape plans.	* Draft Schematic Floodplain Restoration Plating - Figure 3.2-2 (FEIS); L3.01 and L3.03
138	Individual Grading and Drainage sheets (C7.01-C7.11) show multiple areas where site work extends beyond the limits of the project. For example, there is proposed grading in the Route 44 right-of-way, West Lake Amenia Road right-of-way, on the Amenia Fish & Game property, within the NYSDEC 100 foot buffer, in the NYSEG easement, and outside of the proposed lot line adjustment and proposed easement for maintenance building. There is proposed drainage infrastructure for the proposed loop road that falls outside of the proposed easement and outside of the proposed golf course parcel. These areas need to be reviewed and revised. The proposed easement and lot line adjustment may need to be expanded to include the associated site work.	All sheets have been revised; no site work extends beyond the limits of the project. Please see response to comment #71 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka, & Andrews)	Site Plan Sheets C7.01 to C7.11
139	C7.01 to C7.11 - Label roadside swales used for conveyance and/or treatment of stormwater.	All plans have been revised. All roadside swales are used for conveyance. However, it should be noted that to be conservative, none of the swales are included in the stormwater treatment calculation, even though they provide some stormwater treatment capability.	Site Plan Sheets C7.01 to C7.11
140	C7.01 shows grading within the right-of-way for West Lake Amenia Road. A Town of Amenia highway work permit will be needed.	The line of disturbance and grading has been revised to be within the property line. No grading will occur in the right-of-way of West Lake Amenia Road.	Site Plan Sheets C7.01

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
141	C7.10, extend viewport for 'Maintenance Facility Plan' to show intersection with Route 22. There also appears to be a gap in information along the loop road between the westerly edge (top) of the 'Maintenance Facility Plan' and C7.07. Adjust viewports so all proposed work is shown.	Plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C7.11
142	C7.11 shows a point discharge of stormwater into NYSDOT right-of-way. This will have to be approved by NYSDOT. This should also be included in the narrative of the SWPPP and the Notice of Intent (No) regarding discharge to an MS4. Provide the Stormwater Management Number (SWM #) for the WWTP stormwater management practice.	Under existing and proposed conditions, runoff from the same area will enter the same NYSDOT drainage system along the Route 44 and/or Route 22. Runoff from the WWTP will be treated by an underground sand filter and routed in the underground detention pipe to make sure the developed condition peak discharges are less than existing conditions. This is reflected in the SWPPP and NOI. The stormwater management number for the WWTP stormwater management practice has been added and reflected on Figure FB title "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan". All correspondence with NYSDOT will be provided.	Site Plan Sheets C7.10
143	Drainage Profiles C8.01 -8.06: Provide a legend or labels for the various lines types (existing grade, proposed grade). Provide a key map, written description or other way to reference where the "networks" are located on the site. Provide notes indicating design intent for minimum coverage depth. Some pipe networks have locations with very shallow coverage (less than 12" or so) and should be reviewed:	Pipe networks have been revised. Profiles reference the plan sheets and the plan sheets reference the networks.	Site Plan Sheets C8.01 to C8.07
a.	C8.01 Networks 103 and 215	The golf maintenance facility (Network 103) has been modified. Please refer to the site plans. Network 215 is at the main entrance. The length of pipe with less than 12" of cover is where the pipe discharges to the pond. No change required.	Site Plan Sheet C8.01 & C8.02
b.	C8.02 Network 301(2) [upper RCP]	The pipe shown is for the driveway crossing; the plan has been revised to remove this.	Site Plan Sheet C8.02
c.	C8.03 Networks 450 and 580	The grading has been revised at these locations. Please refer to sheet C7.10.	Site Plan Sheet C8.03 & C8.04
d.	C8.04 Networks 800(1) & 804(A) [upper RCP] and Network 700	The pipes shown on Networks 800 & 804 are for the driveway crossing ; the plan has been revised to remove these. The grading has been revised at these locations. Please refer to C7.04.	Site Plan Sheet C8.06
e.	C8.05 Network 730(1) and 780 [upper RCP]	For Network 730, the cover is greater than 12". For Network 780, the pipe shown is for the driveway crossing ; the plan has been revised to remove this.	Site Plan Sheet C8.05
f.	C8.06 Networks 892 and 850 [upper RCP], 955, 874	Network 892 is at SWM #2. The length of pipe with less than 12" of cover is where the pipe discharges to the pond. No change required. For Network 850, the pipe shown is for the driveway crossing ; the plan has been revised to remove this. For Network 955 & 874, the grading has been revised at these locations. Please refer to C7.07 and C7.08 respectively.	Site Plan Sheet C8.06 & C8.07

## Silo Ridge Ventures LLC

### Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
144	C9.00 "Overall Water Supply System" and C10.00 "Overall Sanitary Sewer System" - refer to comments regarding water supply and wastewater treatment above.	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet C9.00 & C10.00
145	C11.00 "Overall Stormwater Facility Management Plan". Expand table to identify all SWMs. Information regarding long-term stormwater management for the public scenic overlook parking area could not be found. See comments above regarding the MDP SWPPP.	Plan C11.00 has been revised. Figure <b>FB</b> titled "Overall Stormwater Management Practice Identification Plan" shows the name, location and type of storm water management practice for the full-build condition. Tables have been revised to identify the stormwater management practices. Stormwater management for the public scenic overlook parking area has also been included in the plan. Figure FB will be part of the MDP drawing set.	Site Plan Sheet C11.00
146	C12.00 "Overall Erosion and Sediment Control Plan" - Provide a legend for temporary E&SC measures such as silt fence, catch basin inlet protection, etc.	A legend has been provided to C12.00	Site Plan Sheet C12.00
147	Individual E&SC Plans (C12.01 - C12.08) Include buffers and stream protection overlay boundary.	Plans have been revised to include buffers and overlay boundaries. Regulatory buffers have been added to the plans; please refer to HMP for water quality and conservation buffers.	Site Plan Sheets C12.01 - C12.08
a.	Review proposed locations for silt fence to ensure they are within the proposed limits of disturbance and do not conflict with proposed improvements (new cart paths, temporary sediment basins, etc.).	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C12.01 - C12.08
b.	Provide additional E&SC measures at pipe discharge locations, especially at discharges to the stream (C12.01) and on the steep slope at the public scenic overlook parking lot (C12.02).	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C12.01 and C12.02
c.	Provide multiple stabilized construction entrances throughout the site, at the entrance to each construction phase.	The construction entrances have been revised. Refer to the Erosion and Sediment Control Plans and the Overall Construction Sequencing Plan.	Site Plan Sheets C12.01 - C12.08
d.	Label the stormwater management areas with their SWM #.	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C12.01 - C12.08
e.	Provide diversions to divert 'clean' runoff around active, disturbed construction sites. This will be particularly beneficial for the development of the uphill Estate Homes and Golf Villas.	Diversion swales have been included on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plans.	Site Plan Sheets C12.04, C12.06, and C12.08
f.	C12.02 Expand limits of disturbance line to include work for temporary sales tent.	The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	NA
g.	C12.03 Recommend leaving existing asphalt at Route 22 entrance for as long as possible to minimize sediment tracking off property and reduce dust. If the existing asphalt needs to be removed, then the stabilized construction entrance should be set further from Route 22 edge of pavement with a temporary asphalt apron. The asphalt apron at Route 22 improves safety for vehicles turning into the site and for construction workers because it will reduce the amount of sweeping needed on Route 22.	Comment noted. The construction entrance has been modified.	Site Plan Sheet C12.03
h.	Missing erosion & sediment control information for WWTP and Golf Maintenance Building. Is information on Temporary Sediment Basin Plans (C12.10 and C12.12) considered the E&SC control plan for those areas?	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet C12.09

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
148	C12.09 "Overall Temporary Sediment Basin Plan" - Highlight the locations of the temporary sediment basins. Label the Golf Maintenance Building and roads (Rt 44, 22, Lake Amenia Road)	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet C12.10
149	C12.10 to C12.12 - Provide reference to detail for outlet structures. Show outlet protection. Adjust silt fence location (Temp Sediment Basins 9, 10 and 11).	All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C12.11 to C12.13
150	C13.00 "Overall Construction Sequencing Plan" - Note #1. Provide additional explanation. The construction sequencing plan should follow the construction phasing plan.	Plans C13.00 and C13.01 have been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C13.00 and C13.01
151	C13.01 "Construction Sequencing Notes": For 'General Construction Sequencing Notes' include stabilized construction entrances. Add a reference to the SWPPP. State maximum length of time areas may be left exposed per SPDES general permit GP-0-10-001, for situations with less than 5 acres of disturbance and more than 5 acres of disturbance (5 acre waiver.)	All plans have been revised. Reference to the MDP SWPPP is included in the notes and "certified" has been revised to "trained".	Site Plan Sheets C13.01
a.	Note # 6 installing a sediment catching device within the catchbasin or plugging the drainage pipes is not recommended. During heavy rain events, they can clog, causing runoff to bypass the catchbasin and create erosion issues in other locations. Use an approved catchbasin inlet protection practice as described in the NY State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (aka Blue Book).	Note has been revised. "PLUG DRAINAGE PIPES..." has been removed.	Site Plan Sheets C13.01
b.	Note #10 - Include the more frequent Qualified Inspector schedule for projects permitted to disturb more than 5 acres at a time per GP-0-10-001.	Note has been revised.	Site Plan Sheets C13.01
c.	Include a note regarding "Trained Contractor" requirements and inspections per GP-0-10-001.	Note regarding "Trained Contractor" requirement and inspections has been included.	Site Plan Sheets C13.01
152	Landscaping Plan Tile (L3.01-L3.08) could not be located for the Golf Maintenance Building or WWTP.	A landscape plan for the golf maintenance building and the WWTP has been provided. Please refer to Sheets L3.25 and L3.26 respectively.	Site Plan Sheets L3.25 and L3.26
153	L3.31 and L3.32 "Typical Single Family Residential Lots" show reduced disturbance area for 'building envelope' or 'clearing envelope' as discussed with the Applicant and Applicant's design professionals.	Comment noted. Waiver request is for driveway slopes up to 15%.	Site Plan Sheets L3.31 to L3.33
154	L4.01 to L4.03 "Site Details" - Provide additional information on what the surfaces are or where these items will be used. For example, L4.01 #10 "Village core at overflow parking areas." Presumably this is a photo of 'grass-pave' and it is proposed for the overflow parking lot next to the Activity Barn parking lot. Engineering details will need to be provided for some of these items, such as "vehicular bridge (main entry) on L4.03.	The Materials Plan calls out the hardscape elements via symbols which are organized in the Materials Schedule that subsequently links to the Site Details sheets. Please refer to the Materials Plans (Sheets L1.01-L1.04) and Materials Schedule (Sheet L1.10). Further design drawings and details for the vehicular bridges have been provided. Grasspave details have been added.	Site Plan Sheets L4.01 to L4.03
155	Lighting Plan: Provide lighting plan with photometrics per §121-40.L and §121-65.B.7, "The location, height, intensity, and bulb type (sodium, incandescent, etc.) of all external lighting fixtures. The direction of illumination and methods to eliminate glare onto adjoining properties must also be shown."	A Lighting Plan has been provided with photometrics.	Please refer to Sheets SL1.00 to SL1.06

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
156	Per MDP LA-3 "all materials used for wetlands crossings will be reviewed and approved during the Site Plan review." Site Plan C14.02 "Civil Site Details 2" includes two examples for Road E bridge crossing, but no technical details. Details for an arch culvert are also shown. It is not clear where this arch culvert is proposed to be located. Provide details for all wetland and stream crossings. Bottomless box culverts are preferred over bottomless arch culverts for use by wildlife, per Findings Statement dated January 8, 2009, page 44.	Additional details for crossings have been included. Callouts have been clarified on the site plans. Reference to York Pile driving has been replaced by the following note: "DETAILED DESIGN DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY THE TOWN OF AMENIA BUILDING DEPARTMENT".	Site Plan Sheets C14.03; "Deck Level Construction Pile Driving" document.
157	Retaining Walls - Multiple retaining walls are proposed throughout the project. In particular, around the WWTP building. Provide design details and calculations for all retaining walls greater than four (4) feet in height.	Sample details of retaining walls for 4', 6', and 8' have been included in the site plan drawings. The WWTP site has been redesigned and does not call for any retaining walls. Please refer to the site plans.	Site Plan sheet S1.01
158	Signage Plan: Per MOP LA-4 "Final sign designs will be submitted as part of Site Plan review." Provide a signage plan and details.	Traffic Circulation Plan and Signage Plan has been provided.	Site Plan Sheets C6.01 to C6.05
159	As discussed with the Applicant and design professionals, provide individual site plan sets for the amenity buildings (non-residential buildings) to better evaluate site plan, grading plan, landscaping plan and architectural elevations.	Per the Town consultant's request, individual site packages have been assembled for each of the amenity buildings.	
	<u>NYSDOT PERMITS</u>		
160	As acknowledged by the Applicant, multiple NYSDOT highway work permits and occupancy permits will be required for the project.	Comment noted. All NYSDOT correspondence will be provided.	
161	Provide copies of applications to, correspondence with and permits from NYSDOT to the Planning Board.	All NYSDOT correspondence will be provided.	
162	Multiple site plan drawings, including C5.03 have a note "Refer to Highway Work Permit Set for left lane turn design along NYS Route 22." Submit this plan set to the Town for review. Will similar highway work permit sets be prepared for the public scenic overlook parking lot curb cut and WWTP curb cut?	Yes; All NYSDOT correspondence will be provided.	
163	Are there any proposed improvements to Route 44 near the entrance to the public scenic overlook parking lot and Winery? Have turn lanes been considered? Since there is limited sight distance as vehicles drive west on Route 44, up the hill and around the hairpin curve, a dedicated right turn lane from the west-bound lane of Route 44 would reduce the likelihood of collisions for vehicles slowing down to make a right turn into the public scenic overlook parking lot and Winery.	There are no improvements (other than the reconstruction of the driveway) currently proposed to NY Route 44 near the entrance to the public scenic overlook as the anticipated volume of traffic does not warrant a turn lane. There is at least 550 feet of sight distance to the left of the driveway, which is more than adequate to allow vehicles driving west on Route 44, up the hill and around the hairpin curve to see vehicles slowing down to make a right turn into the scenic overlook parking lot and Winery Restaurant, and to slow down, if necessary.	
164	Site grading work that crosses over the property line into the NYSDOT right-of-way will have to be included in highway work permit application. For example, grading on drawing C7.01 along Route 44 and drawing C7.11 for the WWTP. Drawing C7.01 also shows grading within the right-of-way for West Lake Amenia Road. A Town highway work permit will be required.	Please see response to comment #140 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
JM	<b><u>Rohde, Soyka and Andrews: Julie Mangarillo</u></b>		
165	Provide details of any proposed signage with NYSDOT right-of-way, particularly for the public scenic overlook parking area.	Please refer to the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit Plans.	Site Plan Sheet C6.05
166	Provide information regarding any discussions with NYSDOT regarding improvements to State Roads that abut the project properties. Has NYSDOT requested additional land to widen any rights-of-way for potential future road improvement projects? Has there been discussion of extending the two-lanes per direction section of the westbound Route 44 at the top of the hill and hairpin turn?	NYSDOT has not requested additional land; all correspondence with NYSDOT will be provided.	
	<b><u>ADDENDUM TO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM</u></b>		
167	Table 3 - Provide explanation or justification for increase in total disturbed area from 246 acres to 273.8 acres when the number of proposed units has decreased.	Table 3 has been revised. Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
168	Table 3 - Include a category for disturbance on steep slopes: 15% to 30% and greater than 30% slopes.	Table 3 has been revised to include disturbance on steep slopes.	
169	Page 15 "Low Impact Design" use of pervious materials will have to be quantified on the site plans and in the SWPPP.	The SWPPP has also been revised to reflect that quantity.	
170	Page 35 Steep Slope Regulations - Include disturbances on slopes 15- 30%	Text has been revised to include disturbances on slopes 15 - 30%.	
171	Appendix C Soils & Geology: The colors in the legend for areas of slopes 15-30% and greater than 30% are switched.	Legend colors have been corrected.	
172	Appendix D Water Resources D.3: A drywell is proposed in other project documents. Confirm if the Dry Swales are a permanent practice or temporary practice during golf course development. Refer to discussion of peak flows above in MDP SWPPP.	Please see response to comment #52 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	
173	Appendix D.4 Floodplain Comparison Plans: Include a comparison of flood water storage volume.	A comparison of the acreage to be disturbed is provided as part of Appendix D.4. The Approved MDP Floodplain Plan shows 13.22 acres of floodplain disturbance within the property line, while the Proposed MDP Floodplain Plan shows 9.83 acres of floodplain disturbance within the property line. The proposed project includes filling as well as cutting in the floodplain area. However the project yields a net cut in the floodplain area, thus resulting in an increase in floodplain storage capacity. The Applicant has submitted documentation for a floodplain development permit and does not feel the comparison is necessary as the disturbance has been reduced for the proposed project.	
174	Appendix F.1 Archaeological Sensitive Site Avoidance Plan: Proposed grading crosses into buffer. Confirm if area shown on MDP and Site Plans represents the sensitive area or the sensitive area plus 25 foot buffer.	The plans have been revised to show the 25' buffer and the proposed golf cart path has been removed from the buffer.	
175	Appendix H.1 Zoning Map: Expand or add additional drawing to include the zoning Overlay districts (SPO, SCO, AQO, etc.).	Zoning Overlay Maps have been added.	
176	Appendix I: Updated Water Demand - Provide update on well supply testing.	The water report and calculations will be provided.	



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
	<u>AMENDED AND RESTATED FINDINGS STATEMENT</u>	As requested by Town consultants, the applicant revised the January 8, 2009 Findings Statement to reflect the modified MDP first submitted in October, 2013, and "redlined" that document to show the applicant's proposed changes. The applicant acknowledges that the Findings Statement is a work in progress and will need to be further revised once the plan has been finalized and potential impacts and required mitigation measures are determined.	
1	Page 1: The development area has increased from 210 acres to 299 acres. There is a lack of clarity as to how much the development has actually increased compared to whether more of the golf course is considered as development. If the development has really increased by a roughly a third, yet has considerably fewer units using more land, one could reasonably posit the question as to whether this development is more sprawling than previously proposed.	The proposed development area is actually 229 acres; 299 is a typo. The increase in development area results from the increase in the number of single family homes. However, "development" does not necessarily mean disturbance. The development area includes entire area of single family home lots, and not just the disturbance area within the lots.	
2	Page 7: There are various wetland acreages and figures which are confusing. While some clarity has been achieved, the acreages still do not all add up correctly. This was also mentioned on Page 3 of Ms. Johnson's memo. Basically the wetlands and watercourses are amalgamated into a single metric, but the storm water wetlands are also added in. There is a policy question as to whether all these storm water wetlands should be credited as wetland acreage.	The metric that represents the wetland acreages has been revised to reflect the natural vs constructed wetlands as per discussions with Dr. Klemens on June 9, 2014.	VHB provide Table for reference

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans																		
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>																				
3	<p>Page 21: Increase in disturbances as well as steep slopes need to be explained fully. While some of the disturbances area a result of more realistic grading to achieve development goals, there needs to be some metrics and discussion of how much natural steep slopes are being lost between the 2009 approved MDP and what is proposed now, versus how much is being conducted on previously disturbed areas. See my discussion concerning ecological principles. It is the amount of disturbance to natural slopes, primarily forested natural slopes, that is my principle concern. The goal was to reduce the amount of steep slope impacts, not increase them. On the MDP Plans I have indicated three estate homes in the south portion of the site that I believe are inappropriately placed very high up on steep slopes. These should be relocated or eliminated.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the 236 acres represents the total disturbance for the FEIS plan, with 20 acres of disturbance on slopes greater than 30% and 83 acres on slopes between 15 and 30%. The disturbance for the approved MDP is 282.9± acres, with 34.5± acres of disturbance on slopes greater than 30% and 101.5± acres on slopes between 15 and 30%.</p> <p>There is a decrease in overall disturbance when comparing the approved MDP to the proposed MDP, under which there will be 268.3± acres of disturbance, with 21.7± acres of disturbance on slopes greater than 30% and 92.4± acres on slopes between 15 and 30%. Table 3 of the Addendum to the EAF has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>Furthermore, when analyzing steep slopes disturbance in the <b><u>natural environment (forested) areas</u></b> and the <b><u>previously altered steep slopes (unforested) areas</u></b>, the results are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1174 822 1494 852">FORESTED SLOPES</th> <th data-bbox="1494 822 1712 852">2009 MDP</th> <th data-bbox="1712 822 1930 852">2014 PROPOSED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1174 852 1494 883">15-30%</td> <td data-bbox="1494 852 1712 883">57.8± acres</td> <td data-bbox="1712 852 1930 883">51.9± acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1174 883 1494 913">30+%</td> <td data-bbox="1494 883 1712 913">20.0± acres</td> <td data-bbox="1712 883 1930 913">14.4± acres</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1174 963 1485 993">PREVIOUSLY ALTERED (UNFORESTED)</th> <th data-bbox="1485 963 1712 993">2009 MDP</th> <th data-bbox="1712 963 1930 993">2014 PROPOSED</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1174 993 1485 1024">15-30%</td> <td data-bbox="1485 993 1712 1024">43.7± acres</td> <td data-bbox="1712 993 1930 1024">40.5± acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1174 1024 1485 1054">30+%</td> <td data-bbox="1485 1024 1712 1054">14.5± acres</td> <td data-bbox="1712 1024 1930 1054">7.3± acres</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The three identified homes are all custom Estate Homes, and are located as shown in the approved 2009 MDP. The applicant does not agree that these homes should be eliminated.</p> <p>As previously discussed, the Estate Home lots show representative typical areas of disturbance. However, until the home is purchased and designed, actual disturbance cannot be known. E-49, which is proposed to be constructed during phase 1, has been re-evaluated in the field and is now shown in a location that better suits the existing site. The other 2 homes are proposed during phase 2 and will be field verified then, with any placement issues being addressed during site plan review.</p> <p>Finally, the Estate Homes will be designed in accordance with the agreed upon design guidelines and each will be reviewed by the Town Building Department prior to receiving a building permit. Please refer to Estate Homes design guidelines and lot diagrams.</p>	FORESTED SLOPES	2009 MDP	2014 PROPOSED	15-30%	57.8± acres	51.9± acres	30+%	20.0± acres	14.4± acres	PREVIOUSLY ALTERED (UNFORESTED)	2009 MDP	2014 PROPOSED	15-30%	43.7± acres	40.5± acres	30+%	14.5± acres	7.3± acres	
FORESTED SLOPES	2009 MDP	2014 PROPOSED																			
15-30%	57.8± acres	51.9± acres																			
30+%	20.0± acres	14.4± acres																			
PREVIOUSLY ALTERED (UNFORESTED)	2009 MDP	2014 PROPOSED																			
15-30%	43.7± acres	40.5± acres																			
30+%	14.5± acres	7.3± acres																			
4	<p>Page 23: Here the Applicant is specifically charged with refining the design to further minimize impacts to steep slopes, yet on the gross numerical figure the opposite has occurred. Again, there are two important break points to be considered in terms of the impacts. The first the ecological break point, which separates the site's steep slopes between natural and previously disturbed/created habit, followed by the metrics of 15-30% slopes, and slopes greater than 30%. Ideally from an ecological view point, the slopes are first divided with the ecological filter, and then the grade feature, and then the amounts of impact in the proposed MDP versus the 2009 revised MDP calculated. Only through this analysis can I determine whether the steep slope impacts are worse (or better) from an ecological perspective.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment #3 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)</p>																			

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
5	Page 25: Pre-construction impervious surfaces have increased from 12 to 14 acres. Please explain.	The increase in pre-construction impervious surface is due to the addition of the proposed easement area, which is not in the RDO district.	
6	Page 33: Wetlands A and B (the entrance ponds) are connected already through groundwater, as well as an ecological nexus. Since the original ACOE determination (2006) there have been Supreme Court decisions (Rapanos) that define nexus between waters of the United States and nearby so called isolated wetlands. I will be forwarding under separate cover an article which I co-authored, dealing with the issues of nexus which is relevant to this matter.	Comment noted. The Findings Statement notes that "Wetlands A and B are proposed to connect, resulting in disturbance of a total of 0.52+ acres of A and 0.87+ acre of B." This is a correct statement. The proposed plan will expand both Wetland A and B and create a new surface water connection between them.	
7	Page 39: The number of stream crossings has increased from six to nine. How many of these are in the created golf course habitat, how many of these crossings are in natural habits as previously described? What is the nature of these crossings, i.e., golf carts, walking trails, vehicles? There needs to be discussion during the Site Plan review concerning which of these crossings are to be arched culverts and which are to be bottomless square culverts as called out as mitigation in the amended findings and the 2009 revised MDP. Furthermore, there is not a construction detail for the square culverts in the Site Plans.	There are a total of nine (9) stream crossings in the golf course and two (2) crossings on the vehicular roads. One (1) of the eleven (11) stream crossings is located in natural habitat. This crossing is located along Road E and serves as vehicular crossing. A similar crossing was shown in the approved MDP plan. This bridge serves for vehicular purposes, providing access to the Estate Homes; the remaining nine (9) bridges are golf cart crossings. There is one (1) arched culvert located at the main entrance to the project. All other crossings are bridges. Construction details for the arched culvert and sample details for the bridges have been provided. Please see response to comment #70 (Memo: David Everett)	
8	Page 43: and Page 53: There is an inconsistent treatment of this vernal pool (Wetland U) throughout the documents. On page 43/53 the correct figures are used. In other parts of the submitted documents a 500 foot exclusion zone is referenced (bottom of Page 46).	Comment noted. The text on page 46 has been revised.	
9	Page 73: Please confirm that the Dutchess Land Conservancy is taking the easement on both the natural areas of open space as well as the golf course. How is this proposed to be monitored and administered?	The applicant has received a draft Memorandum of Understanding from Dutchess Land Conservancy and is negotiating the conservation easement, which will encompass open space areas and the course. DLC will monitor the easement area in accordance with its standard procedures.	
10	Page 77 and 101: TND issues previously mentioned and discussed by Ms. Johnson. Remove TND from page 101.	The applicant has provided a memorandum addressing non-compliance with certain TND design principles. However, the project design does reflect certain TND characteristics, and therefore a reference to "TND type" is appropriate. Furthermore, the mention of TND Design on page 101 has been updated to "compact development."	

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
11	Page 87: Note that re-vegetated field and meadows declines from 43 to 25 acres. This is a large adverse ecological change to the project. I suggest that the Planning Board discuss this and reach a policy decision as to the acceptability of this loss and/or whether this needs to be mitigated elsewhere on the site. Also note that the easement holder is the Dutchess Land Conservancy, not the Dutchess Land Trust.	<p>The 2009 MDP showed that, similar to the current plan, the area west of Wetland/Watercourse JJ is preserved as forest. The 2009 plan showed a buffer along the east edge of the stream (Transitional Grassland, planted to restore a shrub and forested buffer), and the remaining area as a maintained grassland. The proposed MDP also protects the forest west of Wetland/Watercourse JJ and creates a shrub and forested buffer, but replaces the maintained grassland with the golf course practice area. From a visual standpoint, this will have no significant change to the views of the wetland from Route 44 either in comparison to existing conditions or the 2009 MDP. The golf practice area maintains the grassed cover type, open land and vistas of the forested ridge and valley that area available from Route 44 and the proposed scenic overlook. The restored habitat buffer that is proposed at this location will maintain ecological values of the watercourse and stream by providing shade, wildlife habitat, and water quality benefits.</p> <p>Furthermore, the relocation of the driving range from the central portion of the site to its approved location allowed the reduction of impacts to steep slopes at the estate home sites.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that there is a reduction of 18 acres of PROPOSED grasslands due to the reasons stated in this response. Please note that these are reductions of grasslands proposed for the approved 2009 MDP compared to the proposed MDP and that this is not a reduction of existing grasslands.</p> <p>However as shown in the response, this reduction of grasslands allows for ecological benefits to other habitats. In net sum, it is the applicant's position that the net ecological benefit from the reduction is positive and is an overall improvement of the proposed project. And of significance is the protection of Wetland J.</p>	
	<u>UPDATED HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN</u>		
12	Page 1: Change updated to revised.	The Habitat Management Plan has been revised.	
13	Page 5: (Klemens 1993) does not appear in the Literature Cited: Citation as follows: Klemens, M. W. 1993. <b>The Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions.</b> Conn. Geol. Nat. Hist. Surv. Bulletin 112:1-318 + 32 plates.	The literature has been cited.	
14	Page 7: (Calhoun and Klemens 2002) does not appear in the Literature Cited: Citation as follows: Calhoun, A. J. K. and M. W. Klemens. 2002. Best Development Practices (BDPs) for <b>Conserving Pool-breeding Amphibians in Residential and Commercial Developments.</b> MCA Technical Paper No. 5, Metropolitan Conservation Alliance, Wildlife Conservation Society, Bronx, NY.	The literature has been cited.	

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
15	Page 12: Grassland restored drops from 134 acres to 96.8 acres. This is a loss of 37.2 acres of restored grassland. Note that these figures are in conflict with those of the revised finding statement of 43 to 25 acres (loss of 18 acres). This discrepancy needs to be resolved. It is apparent that there is a significant reduction in restored grassland in the revised project. A large part of this loss is attributed to the relocated practice range near wetland/watercourse J/JJ.	Comment noted. There is no discrepancy, because the 43 acres to 25 acres comparison is only for the "field/meadows/re-vegetated" area.	
16	Page 16: Under 3.1.5 first paragraph the wetland acreages again is inconsistent with other statements.	Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	VHB provide Table for reference
17	Page B-2: Under note the term "cultivars" is listed as being used on the golf course buffers. As explained to me by Lisa Stadley, PhD and Amanda DeCesare of VHB these cultivar fescues are not native to the USA, but are naturalized (introduced) in many areas. This conflicts with the representation made in the memorandum of May 9, 2014 where it is stated that "only native species will be used in golf and open space areas".	The VHB memorandum dated May 9, 2014 is not intended to address turf grasses.	
18	Table 1 and 2: It is impossible for me to understand from these tables whether there is more or less buffering (with a 30 foot or greater buffer) around wetlands and watercourses. Part of the problem is that the edges of the ponds, water bodies, and streams are being re-contoured and realigned. So it is not a true apples to apples linear comparison. Moreover, the HMP was never revised to reflect the October 2009 MDP which contained changes to mitigate issues teased out in the FEIS SEQRA process. I would be willing to work with the Applicant to try and find a better way to express these data. I believe that it is important to understand this mitigation in a transparent and accessible manner. This may be an instance where dividing up the wetlands using the ecological principles of natural and created habitats may help get at the actual information more efficiently.	The tables have been revised to reflect the natural vs constructed wetlands and watercourses pursuant to direction given by Dr. Klemens on June 9, 2014.	Table 1 and Table 2 of the HMP. Addendum to the EAF Appendix D.5 "Buffer Management Comparison Plans"
	<u>AMENDED MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN</u>		
19	Page 4-5: Wetland acreage problematic.	Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
20	Page 12: The invasive plant list that is required to be finalized as condition of Site Plan approval has not been prepared as part of the Phase 1 Site Plans.	A revised invasive species list was provided to Dr. Klemens for review on June 9 2014. The approved list is attached. This list is a work-in-progress and there will be continued efforts between Dr. Klemens and Matt Rollins regarding any additions or revisions to the list.	"Silo Ridge Resort Community Invasive Plants List"
21	Page 14: The vernal pool protection area is correct on this page, but incorrect on Page 22.	Comment noted. The text has been revised.	
22	Page 14: No construction details of the proposed demarcation and documentation of conservation and habitat easements and buffers have been presented in any of the documents, including the Phase 1 Site Plans.	Please see response to comment #124 (Memo: Rohde, Soyke and Andrews)	

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
23	Page 16: Under paving, the goal should be to minimize impervious area, not previous area as stated.	Comment noted. The text has been revised.	
24	Page 22: The vernal pool habitat metric under Wetland U is incorrect and should agree with that on page 14. The solid waste management plan should reduce the accessibility rather than address the accessibility?	The text has been revised to reflect the 750 feet.	
25	Page 44: Top of the page. This disclaimer that the site is not actually within the NYC watershed needs to be further explained that the East of Hudson standards were specifically a mitigation measure for the protection of the population of Hill's Pondweed in AM-15.	Comment noted. The text has been revised.	
26	Page 44: Wetland metrics are confusing under point 6.	The text has been revised.	
27	Page 47: This reference to the Open Space Plan sheet conflicts with the slightly less than 80% open space being proposed. Ms. Johnson discusses this in her memorandum too (Page 4:15). I have suggested some additional open space areas on the MDP sheets that have been already received by VHB. Specifically there are two areas within the southern estate homes where additional forested slopes could be protected and incorporated into the conserved open space. At present the proposed development does not conserve 80% as open space. I do not believe that it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to give relief of this requirement; rather the Applicant needs to add additional open space to yield no less than 80%. I would suggest that a few percentage points over 80% would be desirable in case there have been slight boundary errors in calculations—this would be extremely important if the Planning Board was challenged on their determination and it was shown, by calculations of others, that the project falls below the 80% open space threshold requirement	The 80% open space requirement is met under the revised Open Space Plan.	MDP Sheet SP-4
	<u>ADDENDUM TO THE EAF</u>		
28	The breeding bird study that is proposed for the grassland habitats that are located between the easement and the lot-line adjustment, and where the golf course mechanical building and workforce housing is proposed, is not yet completed. This study will need to be added to this addendum and reviewed by the Town's ecological consultant.	The breeding bird survey is attached. None of the species observed on "Parcel 1", whether breeding, foraging, or transient, are considered to be NY species of special concern. None of these are obligate grassland species (for example, grasshopper sparrow, upland sandpiper, bobolink, savannah sparrow). The species observed are characteristic of common oldfield and wetland habitats found throughout Dutchess County (see Kiviat 1984; Cunningham et al. 2010).	"Breeding Bird Survey - Parcel 1" prepared by VHB

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
29	<p>Table 3: Page 13. There is a 27.8 acre increase in disturbed areas between the approved and the proposed MDP. This is a potentially large and significant impact. Impervious areas have decrease by 2.5 acres which is a significant improvement between the approved and proposed MDP. Wetland disturbance has increased by over an acre, but this may reflect the re-contouring and realignment of wetlands (ponds are ditches) on the golf course. The population has decreased by only 60 people. I assume the assumption is that the single family type homes will have more people living in them, so despite the marked decrease in living units (338 to 245) the population is almost the same. If workforce housing is included on the site some of these resident may have children that will attend the local schools. Those numbers need to be adjusted to include workforce housing residents, including the fiscal calculations of revenues that were based on no school children. The table should be expanded to included steep slopes between 15 and 30% and those in excess of 30%. Also the distinction should be made between disturbed steep slopes (grassed and/or cultivated) and forested steep slope habitats.</p>	<p>Table 3 has been revised.</p>	
30	<p>Table 4: This is a very confusing table. It needs to have three columns: The original MDP, the mitigated MDP (October 2009), and the proposed MDP (current). Care must be taken on maintaining a consistent approach. For example under community character, it states that no mitigation is necessary. This is an error; I would suppose that the intent was to be that no <b><i>additional</i></b> mitigation is necessary?</p>	<p>Table 4 has been revised. The approved MDP is now shown as a comparison.</p>	
31	<p>Golf Course Comparison Plans: The major significant difference is the location of the practice and driving range proximal to Wetland/Watercourse J/JJ. It begs the question whether this design negates the mitigation benefits that were part of the revised MDP of October 2009 which relocated housing (6 units) away from this sensitive wetland and visual area.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment #11 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)</p>	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
32	Wetland and Watercourse Comparison Table: Again, it's very difficult to evaluate these tables, because the proposed MDP is altering the sizes and linear feet of the wetlands. For example there is a proposed reduction of 562 linear feet of watercourse between the old action and the proposed MDP. At face value this is a large impact. However, it is my understanding that some of these changes are ecologically beneficial, piping and redirecting water flows away from heavily manicured play areas. Yet there is little narrative to support this. These data need to be explained. The Applicant consistently throughout many of their documents makes little effort to interpret their changes to the general public. While the Town's consultants will attempt to wade through all of this and advise our client (the Amenia Planning Board), it would behoove the Applicant to work on a better communication strategy in their documents to inform the general public of the positive impacts of some of these changes, which at first blush may seem to be a negative impact. This would also help the Planning Board develop a clear record of its evaluation of the various changes proposed	Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
33	Buffer Management Comparison Plans: This is a better document to understand than the previous, the footnotes go a long way in helping explain differences. One also must remember that the baseline for the HMP is 2008, it was never adjusted to reflect the revised MDP of October 2009.	Comment noted.	
	<u>GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT</u>		
34	Page 6: My single comment on this plan is that they recommend that areas be cleared 10 feet beyond the building footprint. This seems an unrealistically limited footprint.	Comment noted. The applicant agrees and the design does not reflect the recommended clearance in the geotechnical report.	
	<u>AMENDED SPECIAL USE PERMIT / MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN DRAWINGS AND SITE PLAN PHASE I</u>		
35	I have discussed the need to clearly monument and demarcate easement edges, particularly at the forest interface, as well as the various width of buffering around the streams and ponds. The documentation detail should be shown on the Phase 1 Site Plans. A different type of documentation is required for grassy mowed areas versus forest edges. All documentation must be easily recognized by workers and residents of the Silo Ridge Resort community, as well as the easement holder and the Town of Amenia land use staff, to avoid incursion into protected and/or managed areas	Please see response to comment #124 (Memo: Rohde, Soyke and Andrews)	Site Plan Sheet C14.01



ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
36	The Phase 1 site plans lack specificity of detail surrounding the golf course maintenance building. The limits of disturbance proposed for this portion of the development extended beyond the easement area. One area of particular concern is disturbance shown behind and immediately adjacent o the large wetland at the base of the landfill. I determined in the field that the rear portion of that wetland had significant biological values, and potentially was vernal pool. I requested that the Applicant study that wetland, but was told that no studies were required because no work was being conducted adjacent to the wetland. The limits of disturbance show an area of disturbance for an unspecified activity occurring proximal to the most sensitive portions of that wetland.	All plans have been revised.	All Site Plans
37	Bottomless box culverts are called out as a mitigation measure in the Restated Findings of March 20, 2014, pp.45. These bottomless box culverts, their placement to be determined as part of the Site Plan review in areas of the site where wildlife connectivity would be enhanced by using these structures. Yet Sheet C-14.02 of the Phase 1 Site Plans only provides detail for the bottomless arched culvert, which is the less ecologically friendly option. Also, as part of the Phase 1 Site Plan review, there has been no dialogue to date with the Town’s ecological consultant as to whether the oversized bottomless arched culvert is to be the sole design used in Phase 1 and no justification has been provided to support that decision	Please see response to comment # 7 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	Site Plan Sheets C14.03; "Deck Level Construction Pile Driving" document.
38	Item No. 74 in Attorney Dave Everett’s Comment letter concerning the IPM and NRMP has been deferred to me. At one of the workshop meetings, it was the recommendation of Ms. Johnson and me that Marty Petrovic, PhD be retained to review the Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM) in the context of the updated MDP and the Phase 1 Site Plans. Dr. Petrovic has been retained previously to advise the Planning Board on the efficaciousness, appropriateness, and ecological soundness of the IPM. It makes the most sense in terms of a consistent review that he be retained to advise us on this matter. Dr. Petrovic could also review the entities proposed for implementation of the IPM and render his opinion as to their ability to manage the IPM. As far as the implementation of the Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP), it is as of yet unclear whether the Dutchess Land Conservancy, or some other entity, will be overseeing the NRMP. Therefore, I cannot address whether the NRMP is being administered by an entity qualified to so this work over the long term.	The applicant does not agree to the retention by the Town of Dr. Petrovic. In a meeting with Dr. Klemens on June 9, 2014, he concurred. The approved NRMP and IPM have not changed. As previously approved, Audubon International will oversee the management of the NRMP in conjunction with the golf maintenance team. The proposed MDP does not warrant any changes to the approved NRMP and IPM.	

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
39	Item 170 in Attorney Everett’s Comment Letter “I will defer to the Town’s planning consultant and ecological consultant about whether the landscaping plan should contain an affirmative commitment by the Applicant to promptly replace any landscaping that is dead or diseased”. The accepted practice on extensive planting plans is to require a bond to ensure that the installed plants survive for minimally several growing seasons (3 years plus). This is especially the case when plantings are being used for mitigation purposes.	As suggested by Dr. Klemens on June 9, 2014, the applicant will deposit \$30,000 in Town maintained interest bearing escrow account, and \$10,000 will be released after each growing season for 3 years (less funds spent by the Town). The funds will be used only for wetland restoration/mitigation plantings (newly created stormwater buffers).	
40	I have reviewed in detail the planting sheets for consistency with the Findings and the MDP of October 2009. VHB has provided a color coded revision of format of the proposed plantings. These are sheets L3.01-L3.08, L3.10. These sheets should be <u>dated with the revision date</u> and submitted into the record. These sheets were based upon a list of all the plants proposed to be planted developed by Matthew Rollins who color coded each species <b>green</b> (for native to the region including cultivated varieties), <b>blue</b> for native to the eastern United States but not New York, and <b>orange</b> for plants that are not native to the USA or the eastern USA. The Rollins list should also be submitted into the record because it contains the coding for the plants in the Amenity Areas which are not color coded on the revised sheets because the Amenity Areas contain mixtures of all three categories, therefore they could not be visually represented on L3.01 to L3.08, L3.10. Therefore these sheets are useful in observing the placement of only the trees in all three categories, but one still has to examine each Amenity Area planting zone manually against the Rollins list. I have reviewed the Rollins list and concur with his categorization of plants, which in turn was carried onto sheet L3.01 to L3.08, L3.10. There are some discrepancies in the transfer of the color coding from the Rollins list to L3.10.	A revision date has been added to color-coded tree plans L3.01-L3.08 and review L3.10 for the discrepancies mentioned. The Rollins list and Sheets L3.01-3.08 and L3.10 will be submitted into the record. The color plans will only be provided to Dr. Klemens, the town, and available online.	Color Coded Plant List prepared by Matthew Rollins; Site Plan Sheets L3.01 to L3.08, L3.10, and L3.25 (Color Copies provided online and to Dr. Klemens)
	<u>TREES</u>		

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
41	L3.01 and L3.02: There are a significant amount of conifers in the planting palette along Route 44. These are both native eastern species as well as Concolor Fir (which is western US species). These conifers will end up being evergreen lollipops over time, as the lower branches die from road salt and attrition and will not effectively create the desired screening. I would recommend tall hedges of native plants such as <i>Myrica pennsylvanica</i> (bayberry), <i>Viburnum dentatum</i> (arrowwood), and <i>Calycanthus floridus</i> (sweetshrub /Carolina allspice) would achieve Silo's screening goals, and these shrubs could be shaped and pruned to 12-14 feet high. <i>Myrica</i> is a halophyte (salt tolerant) and may be the best choice as I anticipate that aerially propelled road salt will be a significant long term problem for conifers planted alongside the eastern/southern aspect of Route 44 on DeLavernge Hill	The plan has been revised and the applicant has removed the conifers that are adjacent to Route 44 on DeLavernge Hill.	Site Plan Sheets L3.01 and L3.02
42	L3.04: The <i>Abies concolor</i> (concolor fir) is a non-native species that should be removed from the interface with the natural areas along stream/wetland J/JJ behind golf villas B. The current planting plan should be revised to reflect only native species in that area.	Abies concolor has been removed from the stream and wetland buffer. The plans have been revised. (Sheet L3.04).	Site Plan Sheet L3.04
43	L3.10: Having tried to decipher the various symbols of the trees on the plans I would suggest the following. The color coding designated by Rollins be kept, but instead of these complex icons, I would suggest that each tree be designated by a colored circle following the Rollins template with the first letter of the genus and species contained within the circle. So for example, the Balsam Fir ( <b><i>which does not have any symbol at all on this sheet despite 28 being planted</i></b> ) would be a green circle, or dot with the letter <b>A.b.</b> inside the circle. That would designate this tree by its genus and species, <i>Abies balsamea</i> . This will make understanding the arrangement of the trees much more user-friendly	Comment noted. As per comment #40 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens), the applicant has already provided a revised color version of the trees along with a color coded list of all the plants being proposed to be planted. Furthermore, using letters to designate trees would make identification difficult in areas where a lot of different tree species have been planted. Therefore, the applicant believes that the suggested change is unnecessary, and cost prohibitive.	
44	Carpinus betulus is the European hornbeam. Its symbol is colored green (for native), when it should be orange (for non-native). But there is also a zero count for planting so this line should be removed from plan if this species is not being used. This species is not on the Rollins list	Carpinus betulus is not included in planting plan. The symbol has been removed. All plans have been revised.	Site Plan Sheet L3.10

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
45	The Amenity Areas present additional challenges attempting to determine if the plants used are in accordance with the previous approvals. The Amenity Area marked "informal evergreen hedge-activity barn and pool fence" is made up of three deciduous species, not evergreen. One of these is a Eurasian viburnum . There is increasing evidence that various Eurasian viburnum species are becoming naturalized and invasive in the Northeast. Therefore I would recommend that <i>Viburnum pragense</i> be eliminated from the planting plans for the site because it is potentially invasive. The native arrowwood ( <i>Viburnum dentatum</i> ) would be an appropriate substitute as would the nannyberry ( <i>Viburnum lentago</i> ) or bayberry ( <i>Myrica pensylvanica</i> )	Viburnum pragense has been removed from the "Informal Evergreen Hedge" and a substitute likely to be non-native, but non -invasive, will be provided. Please see responses to comments #49 and #50 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	Site Plan Sheet L3.10
46	Ornamental Layered Planting Area/Activity Barn: Dart's Red Spirea is duplicated in the colum behind Native Ferns. This should be corrected	The duplicate reference to Dart's Red Spirea has been corrected in the schedule.	Site Plan Sheet L3.10
47	Native Lawn Seed Mix: Are creeping red fescue and sheep fescue in keeping with the commitments made in the VHB memorandum of May 9, 2014?	The Native Lawn Seed Mix around the entry and Sales Center complies with the memo. As stated in the memo, non-native, non-invasive species can be used in Development Areas.	
48	Grassy Slope: Is the creeping red fescue [sic] in keeping with the commitments made in the VHB memorandum of May 9, 2014	The grassy slope is located within the Activity Barn Development Area and complies with the VHB Memorandum. All spelling errors have been corrected. As stated in the memo, non-native, non-invasive species can be used in Development Areas.	
49	Naturalized Woodland Border: A potentially invasive Chinese viburnum ( <i>Viburnum rhytidopyllum</i> "Cree") is proposed for this area which is inappropriate for two of the planting principles contained in the previous approvals. Only native species are to be at the interface between natural and developed habitats, and no potentially invasive species to be used. This Cree viburnum is used in several planting palletes on the site and should be substituted with appropriate native shrubs	Viburnum Rhytidopyllum "Cree" and Viburnum pragense have been removed and will be substituted with a non-invasive shrub that is native when used near existing habitats and likely non-native when used in Development Areas.	Site Plan Sheet L3.10
50	Condo Garden Zones: <i>Viburnum opulus nanum</i> is a Eurasian viburnum. It is not the nannyberry which is native ( <i>Viburnum lentago</i> ). As mentioned before, Eurasian viburnums are increasingly being implicated in invasion into natural habitats and I would recommend elimination from the site. Suggest that these plants be substituted with the native, and morphologically similar, <i>Viburnum trilobum</i> .	Viburnum Opulus Nanum has been removed from the "Condo Garden Zones" and a non-invasive, but likely non-native, substitute will be provided.	Site Plan Sheet L3.10

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MK	<b><u>Dr. Klemens</u></b>		
51	<p>As many of these amenity area plant mixes are very difficult to locate on the plans, I would recommend that the Town’s ecological consultant meet with the landscape consultant (Matt Rollins) to fine tune any additional planting questions and to develop the list of invasive species for the site which is part of the Phase 1 Site Plan approvals which has not yet been submitted. I believe that these landscape technical questions could be readily resolved in this meeting and should be part of an ongoing dialogue that was envisioned in the original approvals as the project was rolled out. While the planting plans are an important part of the project, because it’s a matter of possibly substituting different species in different areas, I see no reason why the project should be delayed until all of this is completely resolved. It is also quite likely that some of the plants specified may not be available in the sizes and quantities described, and it is necessary to have a system of consultation in place to make these minor changes in plant composition without having to return to the Planning Board for modified approvals</p>	<p>Comment noted. The consultant team met with Dr. Klemens to review any further planting issues and discuss the process for approving future plant substitutions. When sourcing plants for the native areas, every effort will be made to find non-invasive plants that are genetically similar to those original to the area. If a specific species is not available, then a suitable alternative plant will be selected. In some cases it may be a different genus and species altogether and on occasion a suitable cultivar of the original native species may be chosen. Invasive species are prohibited. Any alternate selection will need to be approved by the Town of Amenia ecological consultant, landscape consultant or the Planning Board. Furthermore, the applicant and the town consultant agreed that they will work throughout the life of the project to identify new invasive species and adding them to this list.</p>	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
	<u>AMENDED MDP NARRATIVE</u>		
1	The redlined version of the Amended MDP narrative (amended March 3, 2014) submitted by the Applicant does not appear to be a redline of the original MDP approved in 2009. The Applicant should provide this redline document so the Planning Board can evaluate how their original approval is being changed.	The applicant has prepared a redline showing proposed changes to the October, 2009 MDP document. As with the Findings Statement, the applicant acknowledges that the MDP text is a work in progress and will need to be further revised once the plan is finalized.	
	<u>ARTISAN'S PARK OVERLOOK</u>		
2	This park will be open to the public to afford views from DeLavergne Hill. A public access easement should be prepared allowing the public access to this private property. A proposed easement should be provided to the Planning Board. The easement should detail, among other things, the scope of the public's access, hours of operation, public parking locations, the entity responsible for maintaining the park (snow plowing, lawn/brush cutting, trash removal, etc.), proposed signage, proposed park amenities (benches, walkways, flower boxes, etc.), etc.	The applicant does not propose to convey the Artisan's Park Overlook to the Town or dedicate it as public parkland. The applicant does agree to provide a public access/use easement for the Artisan's Park Overlook, and suggests that the requested amended special permit approval and site plan approval be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of this easement and all other required easements by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	
3	The Applicant should agree that the park property shall not be mortgaged or used as a security interest unless it is subordinate to the public's use of the park.	The applicant agrees that the public access/use easement for the Artisan's Park Overlook will be recorded prior to any mortgage, and will not be subordinated to any mortgage or lien.	
4	Because this park will be constructed in Phase 1, a more detailed site plan should be prepared for the park. The site plan should contain the details required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	The applicant has provided a detailed plan for the Artisan's Park Overlook. Please refer to Phase 1 Site Plan Sheets C7.02 and L3.25 for the Artisan's Park Overlook.	Site Plan Sheets C5.02, C5.25, C6.05, C7.02, C8.01, C12.02, and L3.25; "Overlook" mini-site plan set.
5	The Applicant should provide signage on Route 44 notifying the public of the park and the overlook. Signage details should be provided to the Planning Board for its review. A NYSDOT Highway Work Permit and a Use and Occupancy Permit may be required to erect signs in the highway ROW and for access to the park from Route 44. The Applicant should submit to the Planning Board all DOT permit applications and correspondence with DOT on this issue. When will these permits be sought?	Please refer to NYSDOT Highway Work Permit Plan Set.	Site Plan Sheets C6.05 and C14.01
6	Drawing C5.02 shows a retaining wall along the access road to the park. I will defer to the Board's engineer about whether engineering details for this wall should be provided to the Board as part of the Phase 1 site plan.	Comment noted.	NA
7	From Drawing C4.01, it appears the Artisan Park will be part of the lot for the Winery Restaurant. Should the park and its parking lot be located on a separate lot?	As indicated above, the applicant will provide a public access/use easement for the Artisan's Park Overlook. The land subject to the easement can be part of the Winery Restaurant lot, or, if desired by the Planning Board, be made a separate lot.	Site Plan Sheets C4.01
8	The Applicant should indicate which entity will own and operate the park.	Maintenance and operation of the Artisan's Park Overlook will be an obligation of the Master HOA. If the land remains part of the Winery Restaurant lot, it will be owned by the owner of that lot, subject to the public access/use easement. Alternatively, the area could be made a separate lot, if which case it would be common property owned by the Master HOA.	
	<u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u>		

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
9	The EAF Addendum contains an Archeological Sensitive Site Avoidance Plan (dated March 2014) for a site along Route 44. The plan shows a 25' wide buffer around the site. How will this buffer be implemented and enforced to prevent unwanted incursions into the site during and after construction – deed restrictions, permanent field markers/monuments, temporary fencing during construction, erecting signs, restrictions in HOA documents and contract documents, etc.?	All plans have been revised to show the 25' wide buffer. The archaeological site and buffer area will be within the conservation easement area, and protected under that easement.	All site plans.
10	The Applicant should add the buffer to all plans.	The 25' wide buffer has been added to all plans.	All site plans.
11	Drawing L3.01 seems to show proposed landscaping, a cart path and other possible disturbance in the 25' buffer. Is this correct?	Landscaping and the cart path have been removed from this area.	Site Plan Sheets L3.01
12	The EAF Addendum contains a letter from SHPO dated 11/4/13 which states "it is our understanding that the Phase II portion of the Work Plan is still in progress and that an End of Fieldwork letter will be forwarded to our office...." The Applicant should describe the status of the Phase II investigation.	All correspondence with SHPO will be provided as it is available.	
13	The chart on page 23 of the EAF addendum concludes that "Island Green Pond and Quarry Pond have no historical significance regarding or as iron ore so perimeters can be changed as needed to connect and for other golf and drainage improvement." (sic) The Applicant should provide the professional/technical support for this conclusion.	All correspondence with SHPO will be provided as it is available.	
14	On Drawings C5.01 and C12.01, it appears that the limits of project disturbance encroach on the archeological sensitive area. The Applicant should describe this encroachment and whether it has been accepted by SHPO.	All plans have been revised to show the 25' buffer. No work is proposed within the buffer.	Site Plan Sheets C2.01 and C5.02
15	On Drawing L3.01, the Applicant should explain what the cross hatching in the archeological sensitive area means.	The landscape plans have been revised to remove any improvements within the archeological sensitive area or its buffer.	Site Plan Sheets L3.01
16	Drawing C2.01 shows an existing well in the archeological sensitive area. Will this well be abandoned or decommissioned in accordance with applicable laws?	All wells that are not to be used will be called-out as "To be decommissioned" and will be done in accordance with Dutchess County and New York State Departments of Health standards.	Site Plan Sheets C2.01
	<b><u>EXISTING CLUBHOUSE</u></b>		
17	The existing clubhouse and maintenance building will be demolished (if not already). Are there any fuel storage tanks (either underground or above ground) related to these buildings? If so, have they been removed prior to demolition and was there any contamination found?	There are a number of underground fuel storage tanks related to the existing clubhouse, above ground storage tanks at the maintenance building. Please see the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment study for more detail. Prior to demolition, the applicant will remove the tanks in accordance with NYSDEC protocols.	Please see "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" Silo Ridge Country Club prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc. June 8, 2007
18	Have any Phase I Environmental Site Assessments been performed on the property? If so, the Applicant should provide copies to the Planning Board.	Yes; Please see "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" Silo Ridge Country Club prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc. June 8, 2007	Please see "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" Silo Ridge Country Club prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc. June 8, 2007

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
19	Has an asbestos survey been conducted on the buildings prior to demolition as required by NYS Labor law? If so, the Applicant should provide a copy of the survey to the Planning Board.	As per the Silo Ridge Phase I Study, an asbestos survey was performed and "no suspect asbestos containing materials were identified during the site investigation."	Please see "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" Silo Ridge Country Club prepared by IVI Due Diligence Services, Inc. June 8, 2007
20	Under Section 121-54 of the Zoning Code, demolition permits will be required from the CEO to demolish the buildings on the site over 200 square feet in size. The Applicant should state whether these permits have been sought.	The applicant will obtain all the required demolition permits. As discussed during June 13, 2014 meeting, the applicant expects to demolish the clubhouse sometime in July, while the maintenance building will remain as long as necessary	
21	Drawing C3.04 denotes a NYSEG Transformer Easement near the existing clubhouse. Also, Drawing C2.05 shows an electric transformer located next to a pump station. The Applicant should indicate whether these transformers have been investigated for PCBs. Will these easements be extinguished as part of the project?	As per the Silo Ridge Phase I Study, all transformers have been investigated for PCB's. "No transformers or other electrical equipment likely to contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PBC's) were identified on the property..." The NYSEG easement will be terminated and new easements will be established as per the new plans.	
	<u>WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT</u>		
22	Drawing C7.11 shows grading and other possible disturbance within the NYSEG Utility Easement. If so, the Applicant should provide a copy of the easement to demonstrate that this disturbance is permitted under the terms of the easement.	Comment noted. The applicant is researching the title reports to determine which of the existing easements of record affects the area proposed to be graded as shown on Drawing C7.11. Please note that the WWTP has been redesigned and is being issued to the Town for review.	
23	Drawing ENV-1 shows that the WWTP will be located on areas of steep slopes greater than 30%. Drawing C7.11 shows possible retaining walls to be used to level the site. I will defer to the Board's engineering consultant about whether technical details for those walls should be provided by the Applicant as part of the site plan for Phase 1.	Comment noted. The WWTP site plan package has been provided for review.	
24	Further site plan details should be provided for the WWTP - lighting, landscaping/screening, building elevations, retaining wall details, signage, utility lines, loading areas, parking, storm water, etc. The site plan for this site should contain the site plan information required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	The WWTP site plan package has been provided for review.	
25	Further site plan details are required for the pump stations and sewer lines on the site. I will defer to the Board's engineer regarding the level of details that are required.	Site plan details for the sewer conveyance system and pump stations have been provided.	
26	The WWTP will be located in the Road Visual Protection Corridor of the SPO. I will defer to the Board's visual consultant about how the visual impacts of the WWTP should be handled.	Comment noted.	
27	Drawing C10.00 show sewer lines to the WWTP crossing Route 44 and a new driveway for the WWTP onto Route 44. A NYSDOT Highway Work Permit and Use and Occupancy Permit will be required for this work. The Applicant should provide copies to the Planning Board of the permit applications submitted to the NYSDOT and all related correspondence. Also, I will defer to the Board's engineer about whether further details are required for the utility lines crossing Route 44.	All NYSDOT correspondence will be provided as it is available.	



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
28	Cross easements will be required allowing the sewer lines to cross different properties under different ownerships on the project site. These easements could be created as a note on the subdivision plat. The Applicant should provide the language for these easements.	Easements will be provided on the Preliminary Plat when submitted.	
29	The creation of the Sewage Works Corporation will require the approval of the Amenia Town Board as noted in NYS Transportation Corporation Law ("TCL") 116 and approval by the County Department of Health as noted in Section 117 of TCL. The Applicant should indicate when these approvals will be sought.	Comment noted. Application to the Town Board for approval of the sewage works corporation will be made once the project plan is finalized. County Health Department approval will be applied for after amended special permit approval and site plan approval are granted.	
30	NYSDEC SPDES permit will be required to discharge treated effluent to Amenia/Cascade Creek and to a water source on-site. The Applicant should provide copies to the Planning Board of the permit applications submitted to the NYSDEC and all related correspondence. When will this permit be sought?	All NYSDEC permits and correspondence will be provided.	
31	On Drawing C10.00, a number of estate homes and golf villas do not seem to be served by the sanitary sewer lines. Will these units use individual septic systems?	No. All units will be served by the sanitary sewer system. No septic systems are proposed.	
32	Section 4.3 of the Amended MDP narrative states "each community pump station also will be equipped with an enclosed emergency generator with appropriate muffling and will have sufficient landscaping, fencing or architectural features...". The Applicant should provide the site plan details for these pump stations as required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	The applicant has provided detailed information for pump stations. Please refer to Site Plan Sheet C10.01 to C10.21. A reference to the Site Plan sheets has been made in the MDP drawings.	Site Plan Sheets C10.01 to C10.21
	<b><u>WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM</u></b>		
33	The Applicant should identify the locations of the water supply wells on the site and their well head protection zones.	The applicant has provided plans identifying the location of the water supply wells and their well head protection zones. The water report has also been provided.	
34	A NYSDEC Water Supply Permit will be required for ground water withdrawals for the project? The Applicant should provide the Planning Board with all correspondence with DEC and permit applications submitted to DEC. When will this permit be sought?	All NYSDEC permits and correspondence will be provided.	
35	Cross easements will be required allowing the water lines to cross different properties under different ownerships on the project site. These easements could be added as notes to the subdivision plat. The Applicant should provide the language of those easements.	Comment noted. Utility easements will be shown on the plat. Amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of all required easements by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	
36	The creation of the Water Works Corporation will require the approvals of the Amenia Town Board and the Highway Superintendent as noted in TCL 41. The Applicant should indicate when these approvals will be sought.	Comment noted. Application to the Town Board and Highway Superintendent for approval of the water works corporation will be made once the project plan is finalized.	
37	Drawing C9.00 shows a high pressure water main crossing Route 44 to supply water to the Winery restaurant and cottages. In which project phase will this crossing occur?	It is the intent to complete the crossing during Phase III.	
38	The site plan details and architectural elevations should be provided for the water treatment building and the water storage tank. The site plans for these structures should contain the items required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	Site Plan details and architectural elevations have been provided for the water treatment building. The water storage tank site plan details and location will be provided.	Site Plan Sheets C5.04, C9.00, C10.00, A3.16, A3.17, and L3.26.

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
39	Section 121-33 of the Zoning Code provides that "the Planning Board may require an applicant ... to provide evidence of water availability and may require test wells ... sufficient to establish that a proposed development will have adequate supplies of potable water and will not adversely affect aquifer resources or the supply or quality of drinking water in the surrounding area." The Applicant should provide documentation showing that it has drilled test wells which will provide sufficient water for the project.	All water calculations and reports will be provided when they are available.	
40	The Applicant should provide Figure 1 of the LBG letter report dated January 29, 2014.	A copy of Figure 1 of the LBG letter report has been provided.	LBG Report - Figure 1
	<u>ESTATE HOMES</u>		
41	Section 121-18 of the Zoning Code states that "if proposed single-family dwellings exceeding 5,000 square feet in floor space are included in any approved master development plan, such single-family dwelling shall not be subject to minor project site plan review required by Section 121-10B, provided that such dwellings have been subject to the equivalent of minor project site plan review as part of the review of the master development plan." The Addendum to the EAF states that the estate homes will exceed, on average, 5,000 sf. For the estate homes, the Applicant should provide a site plan that contains the elements in Section 121-67 for minor site plan review.	Comment noted. The applicant proposes that the Planning Board approve "Design Guidelines" that would set parameters for approval by the Building Inspector of proposed Estate Homes (which will not be designed until purchased) without need for further site plan review. Please see proposed Design Guidelines and lot diagrams.	Silo Ridge Resort Community Design Guidelines MDP Sheet SP-9
42	Drawings A3.05 and A3.06 depict 4 different single-family home elevations. Which home styles do these architectural elevations relate to - golf villas or estate homes or both?	The home styles depicted in A3.05 and A3.06 represent architectural elevations relating to all the neighborhoods (Golf Villas, South Lawn, and Village Green) except the Estate Homes	
43	Drawing L3.06 references estate homes "C" and "H". Are these different architectural elevations? If so, the Applicant should provide them to the Planning Board.	All Estate Lots are custom lots and are represented by a placeholder footprint labelled "C" in the Landscape Plans. Elevations for Single Family Type "H" have been provided.	Site Plan Sheet A3.06.2
44	On Drawing SP-9, the driveways to Estate Homes 30-33 seem very long. I will defer to the Board's engineer about whether they comply with the NYS Building and Fire Code and the Town Code.	Comment noted.	
45	Drawings SP-9 shows common driveways to Estate Homes 30-33, 40 & 42, 43 & 45 and 47-48. The Applicant should discuss whether these driveways will be owned and maintained by the HOA or by the individual owners for these Estate Homes. If the later, the Applicant should provide a driveway maintenance agreement to ensure that the driveway will be properly maintained and the cost shared by these home owners. Reciprocal access easements should also be provided. Section 105-22 of the Town's Subdivision Code states: "the Planning Board shall require that a statement be placed on the final plat...stating that a common driveway has been approved for the subdivision conditioned upon the recording of the common driveway maintenance agreement in the...County Clerk's office." The Applicant should provide these agreements for the Planning Board's approval.	Common driveways will be maintained by the individual owners. The note will be placed on the plat. The requested amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of this agreement by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	Draft HOA Documents

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
46	Section 2.1 of the Amended MDP narrative states "in areas of steep slopes, cutting of existing vegetation will be minimized by a required field survey of each building site, including trees 8" caliper and larger, prior to Site Plan submission." In addition, Section II(A) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "cutting of existing vegetation will be minimized by field surveying each building site including trees 8" caliper and larger prior to site plan submission and custom designing each building for the site." The Applicant should state whether this tree survey been done and submitted as part of the site plans.	The current survey includes all trees 8" caliper and larger located within the phase I area. The applicant will provide a new field survey of each building site, including trees 8" and larger, prior to phase II site plan submission.	Site Plan Sheets C3.00 to C3.08
47	Reportedly, many of the estate home lots will allow for custom homes. The Applicant should denote which lots are custom lots on the plans. For example, Drawing L3.31 shows some of the custom lots but not all custom lots.	All Estate Homes will be custom designed. The plans have been revised.	Draft Estate Homes Design Guidelines
48	Reportedly, all custom homes must comply with architectural review standards to be adopted by the HOA and obtain an approval from the HOA Architectural Review Board (ARB). The Applicant should provide a draft copy of these architectural standards and the ARB process.	The architectural review standards of the Master HOA have been provided.	
	<b><u>PROPOSED GOLF MAINTENANCE BUILDING</u></b>		
49	The new maintenance building and access drive will be located in the OC zoning district, not in the RDO. A small portion of the access road will also be located in the RA district. A golf maintenance building (and related access roads) would be allowed in the OC and RA district as a "recreational business" with a Special Use Permit from the Planning Board and a referral to the ZBA. The Applicant should apply for a Special Use Permit to allow this building and road in the OC and RA districts. This permit application should also include the golf course proposed as part of the lot line adjustment.	Comment noted. The applicant will apply for special permit approval of the golf maintenance facility and golf course improvements in the OC District.	
50	Drawing C5.10 shows a very general site plan for the golf maintenance building. The plan should contain more details such lighting, screening, landscaping, building elevations, utilities (well location, septic system location), etc. The site elements should be labeled. The site plan for this facility should contain the site plan information required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	A revised site plan for the golf maintenance facility has been provided.	Site Plan Sheets C5.11, C5.24, C6.05, C7.11, SL1.05, L3.25
51	The well and septic systems for this facility will require DCDOH approval.	The golf maintenance facility will be connected to the projects proposed water and sewer system.	
	<b><u>LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT</u></b>		
52	The plans show a lot line adjustment along the southern boundary to facilitate the development of golf course holes 13 and 14 in the OC district. Under the Zoning Code, a golf course would be allowed in the OC district as a "recreational business" with a Special Use Permit from the Planning Board and a referral to the ZBA. The Applicant should apply for a Special Use Permit to conduct a recreational business on this OC land.	Comment noted. The applicant will apply for special permit approval of the golf course improvements in the OC District.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
53	The lot line adjustment will allow the Applicant to receive land from Harlem Valley Landfill Corp. (HVLC) for part of the golf course. The Applicant should provide documentation showing that HVLC agrees to the lot line adjustment.	The agreement between HVLC and the applicant, whereby HVLC agrees to the proposed lot line adjustment, has been provided.	
54	The lot line adjustment will allow golf course work to be conducted in between two former landfills--the Town of Amenia Landfill, a State Inactive Hazardous Waste Site (Class 2) which is undergoing remediation and the Harlem Valley Landfill, a closed landfill. The grading plan (Drawing C7.07) shows work along the border of the landfill property and the planting plan (Drawing L3.07) shows numerous plants being installed next to the landfill property. The Applicant should provide documentation demonstrating that this work will not encounter waste material from the landfill and will not adversely affect the remediation of the landfill. The Applicant should consider whether a soil management plan should be prepared for any waste material encountered during the golf course work.	The proposed excavation work is outside the boundaries of either landfill. The remediated Harlem Valley Landfill, which was closed in 1997, is over 300 feet from the proposed work. The recently closed and remediated Town of Amenia Landfill is located over 600 feet from the proposed work and will not adversely affect the remediation of the landfill. Additionally, preliminary boring test and probe tests were performed as part of the Geotechnical Analysis in 2013. There was no evidence of waste material. However, if waste material is encountered during construction a soil management plan will be prepared. Additionally a plan has been provided to show the proximity of the proposed work to each of the landfills.	Refer to Sketch DE-54
55	The Applicant should explain why the lot line adjustment cannot be extended to include the new golf maintenance building and access road (and possibly workforce housing) to eliminate the use of an easement for these structures. Workforce Housing	HVLC is not willing to transfer fee simple title to that land to the applicant.	
	<u>WORKFORCE HOUSING</u>		
56	Under Section 121-18(C)(8) of the Zoning Code, the Applicant is required to provide workforce housing pursuant to Section 121-42(P) of the Code. Section 121-42(P) gives the Applicant a number of options for satisfying this housing obligation including building housing off-site provided that is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and the purposes of workforce housing. At a recent ZBA meeting, the Applicant stated that it was considering building the workforce housing near the proposed golf maintenance building on land owned by HVLC in the OC district. Under the Zoning Code, single-family and multi-family housing is allowed in the OC district with a Special Use Permit from the Planning Board and a referral to the ZBA. If the Applicant desires to pursue the construction of workforce housing at this location instead of a payment "in-lieu", it will need to submit Special Use Permit, site plan and possibly subdivision applications for review by the Planning Board. The site plan should contain the items required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	Pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing into a dedicated Town workforce housing trust fund.	
57	The Applicant should also add this housing to its Amend MDP and submit documentation showing that this housing will not create any significant adverse environmental impacts under SEQRA. It does not appear that housing in this area was not evaluated under the Board's prior SEQRA review in 2009.	Pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing into a dedicated Town workforce housing trust fund.	
58	If multifamily work force housing is proposed in the OC district, the Applicant should submit a narrative demonstrating that it meets the requirements of Section 121-12 of the Zoning Code or whether any variances will be required.	Pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing into a dedicated Town workforce housing trust fund.	
	<u>TEMPORARY SALES TENT</u>		

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
59	The Applicant has asked to erect a temporary sales tent for the project at the location of the winery restaurant. This restaurant and its parking lot were approved as part of the original MDP and SEQRA Findings. The Applicant should include the tent in the Amended MDP and submit a detailed site plan for this temporary use for review and approval by the Planning Board.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
60	The site plan for the tent should provide standard site plan details including, but not limited to, tent location, parking, signage, site lighting, water supply, waste water disposal, utility lines, etc. The site plan should contain the items required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
61	Because the tent is temporary and will be removed before the winery restaurant and its infrastructure will be constructed, the Applicant should provide a site restoration plan describing how the site will be restored after the tent and related infrastructure is removed.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
62	The Applicant should provide written confirmation that the proposed tent, access drive and related amenities will be located outside the wetland buffers shown on Drawing ENV-4.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
63	The tent will be located in the road visual protection corridor of the SPO. I will defer to the Board's visual consultant for an evaluation of any potential impacts of this temporary use on the SPO.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
64	The tent will utilize the existing curb cut onto Route 44 which is now used for a residential home at this location (now the Applicant's field office). The Applicant should provide written confirmation from DOT that this existing curb cut can be used simultaneously for a temporary sales office as well as the Applicant's field office.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
65	The Applicant should provide written proof to the Building Inspector that the tent complies with the Building Code requirements for temporary structures and that the membrane of the tent complies with the non-combustibility requirements in the Building Code and Fire Code.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
66	Section 105-5(B) of the Subdivision Code states "no building permit or certificate of occupancy, whether permanent or temporary, shall be issued for the erection of any building within a proposed subdivision unless the subdivision has been given final plat approval by the Planning Board...except that the Building Inspector/Zoning Administrator may issue a building permit and certificate of occupancy for a single building on the tract of land where there is no existing building within the proposed subdivision and where the location of the proposed building is in accordance with approved preliminary plat." The Applicant will need to seek a waiver from the Planning Board to allow a building permit and CO for the tent before preliminary plat approval.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
67	Section II(B) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "the improvements to the existing driveway [for the Miller House], which will become an access road, will be designed to address the current bank erosion. This will need to be designed for protection of the adjacent wetland/stream system, especially during storm events and will be reviewed by the Town's environmental consultant during site plan review." The Board's wetland consultant should review the access road for the sales tent to ensure wetland protections.	Comment noted. The applicant will not be pursuing approvals for a temporary tent.	
	<u>WETLANDS</u>		
68	Drawing C3.08 shows wells (including a well within the DEC wetland buffer). Also, Drawing C3.05 shows gravel cart paths within the DEC wetland buffer. Will these be removed? If so, a DEC permit may be required for work in the buffer.	None of the wells the applicant will be using will be located within the DEC wetland buffer. Any existing wells located within the DEC wetland buffer will be decommissioned. Furthermore, the trail shown in the DEC wetland buffer will be abandoned.	Site Plan Sheets C3.05 and C3.08
69	Drawings C5.08 and L3.08 shows possible work in the DEC wetland buffer. Is this correct? If so, what kind of work is proposed?	There is no work proposed in the wetland buffer. All plans have been revised.	Site plan Sheets C5.08, C7.08, C12.08, and L3.08
70	Drawing LA-3 states "all materials used for wetlands crossings will be reviewed and approved during Site Plan review." Section 2.4 of the Amended MDP narrative says the same thing. The Applicant should indicate when these materials will be submitted for site plan review.	A detail design for the main entrance arched culvert has been provided. This has been provided as a separate package. Furthermore, a typical timber bridge design and specifications has been provided as reference for the nine (9) timbre bridge crossings located in the golf course and a typical timber bridge design for the vehicular bridge over Stream J.	
71	Drawing ENV-4 and the HMP describe a number of different buffers around water bodies. Which entity will implement and enforce these buffers?	The conservation easement will be enforced by the Master HOA and the conservation easement holder. All buffers in the easement area will be maintained by the club (the golf superintendent) in accordance with the HMP and BMP.	
72	The Applicant should describe how these buffers (especially the DEC wetland buffers) will be legally enforced and demarcated in the field to prevent unwarranted incursions and disturbances by home owners, staff and guests - deed restrictions, HOA documents, signs, monuments, fencing, etc.	All wetland buffers (including DEC buffers) are within the conservation easement area and will be protected by the conservation easement.	
73	Page 9 of the HMP states that "the design of each culvert at any given location will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.... Case-by-case evaluation of the appropriate type of construction to use at each culvert/mitigation structure will be completed as part of the Site Plan Review and Approval Phase of the project." Have these culvert details been provided in the site plans?	The project only proposes one culvert at the main entrance, which has been identified on the site plans. Details have been provided.	
74	The Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM) identifies guidelines for pesticide use on the golf course with no spray zones being demarcated. I will defer to the Board's ecological consultant about whether he needs to review the IPM or the Audubon International Natural Resource Management Plan ("NRMP"). Which entities will be responsible for implementing and enforcing the IPM and NRMP?	The club, which will be owned by an affiliate of the existing ownership, will be responsible for implementing and enforcing the IPM and NRMP. Please see response to comment #38 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
75	The Applicant should identify whether the restoration of Streams V or P will require ACOE approval. If yes, please provide the Planning Board with all correspondence with ACOE and permit application materials to ACOE.	All correspondence with ACOE will be provided.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
76	Section 121-35 of the Zoning Code states "the Applicant shall submit copies to the Town of any application to or correspondence with ACOE and DEC concerning required wetland permits for the project." The Applicant must submit these documents to the Planning Board as soon as they are submitted to the agencies.	All correspondence with ACOE and NYSDEC will be provided.	
77	On July 25, 2008, the Applicant received a jurisdictional determination ("JD") from the US Army Corps of Engineers for the wetlands on the project site. The JD states "this determination regarding the delineation shall be considered valid for a period of five years from w:\21600\21663\cor\memo to pb-initial comments 5.12.14.docx11the date of this letter...". Based on this statement, the JD was set to expire on July 25, 2013.The Applicant should state whether the JD has been renewed.	The Applicant submitted a Nationwide Permit application to the ACOE for the "Early Golf" improvements and received approval; the ACOE commented that the 2006 JD was still valid. Please refer to correspondence attached.	ACOE Correspondence
	<u>HOA</u>		
78	The HOA's will be governed by Declarations of Covenants, Reservations, Easements Charges and Liens and By-Laws. A draft of these documents should be provided to the Planning Board for its review.	Comment noted. The amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon approval of the Master HOA covenants and restrictions and condominium declarations by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney. A draft copy of the HOA documents will be provided.	
79	The Condos will be governed by a Declaration of Condominium and By-Laws of the Condominium. A draft of these documents should be provided to the Planning Board for its review.	The amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon approval of the Master HOA covenants and restrictions and condominium declarations by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney. A draft copy of the Condominium By-Laws will be provided.	
80	Section 3.3 of the Amended MDP narrative states "the conservation easement shall be expressly referenced in all deeds for the lots and condominium units." The condo deeds provided by the Applicant did not contain this reference. The Applicant should indicate whether such a reference needs to be added to the condo deeds.	The form of condominium deed has been revised to reference the conservation easement.	
81	Section 6.0 of the Amended MDP narrative states "restrictions will be added to the governing documents of the master HOA and each component association as necessary to implement requirements of the conservation easement." The Amended SEQRA Findings say the same thing. The Applicant should submit the HOA Declarations containing such restrictions	The amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon approval of the Master HOA covenants and restrictions by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney. All Master HOA documentation will be provided.	
82	Section II(H) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "the deed restrictions and Master HOA documents shall be in a form acceptable to the Planning Board with the advice and assistance of its attorney. The conservation easement, deed restrictions and Master HOA documents shall be approved by the Planning Board during site plan review." The Applicant should submit these documents to the Planning Board.	Comment noted. The forms of the conservation easement and deeds will be submitted for approval in conjunction with the amended special permit approval and site plan approval, which should be expressly conditioned upon approval of the Master HOA covenants and restrictions and condominium declarations by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	
	<u>SUBDIVISION</u>		

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
83	The Applicant should provide a map showing only all the existing lots lines on the project site so the Planning Board can see how they are changing.	Comment noted. Subdivision plat will be provided at a later date.	
84	All the private roads in the project will require emergency access and public service easements. Such easements can be added as a note on the subdivision plat. The Applicant should provide the language of the easements.	Comment noted. Amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of all required easements by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	
85	On Drawing C4.01, the Applicant should explain why the new parcel numbers are not consecutive.	Preliminary and final Subdivision plats will have consecutive numbering, and will be provided at a later date.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
86	On Drawing C4.01, the Applicant should explain what each new lot will be used for.	Subdivision plat and descriptions will be provided at a later date.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
87	Why is Lot 203 necessary? Can Lot 203 be combined with Lot 206 (golf course lot)?	Comment noted. Lot 203 has been combined with Lot 206.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
88	Can Lots 209 and 210 be combined?	Comment noted. Lots 209 and 210 have been combined	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
89	Can Lot 204 be combined with Lot 206 (golf course lot)?	Comment noted. Lot 204 has been combined with Lot 206.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
90	Will Lot 118 require an emergency access easement to benefit Lot 117? If so, that easement could be added as a note on the subdivision plat. The Applicant should provide the language of the easements.	Lot 117 and Lot 118 have been combined.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
91	What are Lots 123 and 124? No homes are shown on these lots in Drawing SP-6.	Comment noted. Lot 123 has been combined with Lot 115 and will be part of that condominium association. Lot 124 has been combined with Lot 206.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
92	What is Lot 125 for?	Lot 125 serves as a green / landscape area for the project. Lot 125 will be owned and maintained by the club.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
93	The Applicant should provide a map showing which entities will own the various lots that are being created for the common areas, open space, sales office, golf academy, clubhouse, WWTP, WTP, water tank, golf course, etc.	An ownership map will be provided with the subdivision plat.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
94	Section 105-2(H) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "all subdivisions, development... shall be consistent with the Town of Amenia Comprehensive Plan, Dutchess County Master Plan, Town Zoning law and the Town Highway Specifications ...." The Applicant should provide a narrative demonstrating compliance with these documents.	The Applicant has prepared a memo addressing compliance with the Town of Amenia Comprehensive Plan and Dutchess County Master Plan. Compliance/non-compliance with the Town Zoning Law and Town highway specifications (subdivision regulations) is indicated by the list of requested waivers. Also please see response to comment #1 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews).	TND, SCO, Comprehensive Plan, Dutchess County Memos
95	Section 105-4 of the Town's Subdivision Code states "nothing in this chapter shall prohibit the subdivide/applicant from placing self-imposed restrictions, not in violation of this chapter, on the development. Such restrictions, however, shall be indicated on the subdivision plat." The plat should contain a reference to the Declarations noted above.	Comment noted.	
96	The Applicant should indicate whether it will be following the sketch plat process set forth in Section 105-9 of the Town's Subdivision Code. The "preliminary plat" submitted by the Applicant is very general and seems to be more like a sketch plat.	The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
97	The preliminary plat should contain all the requirements set forth in Sections 105-16,105-17 and Appendix C of the Town's Subdivision Code unless waived by the Planning Board under Section 105-33. Any waivers should be requested in writing.	Comment noted. Subdivision plat will be provided. A list of waivers is provided. The applicant will submit a written request for the waivers.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
98	The Applicant should submit a proper preliminary plat containing the requirements above in as close to final form as possible. This will avoid delays in the future.	Comment noted. The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
99	Section 105-17 of the Town's Subdivision Code states that "the Applicant shall submit a preliminary plat certified by a licensed land surveyor and engineer, as required by law...". The plat submitted by the Applicant should satisfy this requirement.	Comment noted. The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
100	Section 105-20(G) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "where a subdivision is traversed by a watercourse, drainage way, channel or stream, there shall be provided a stormwater easement or drainage right-of-way not less than 30 feet in width." The site contains a number of watercourses. As a result, the Applicant should identify these easements on the plat and add a note to the plat with the easement terms. The easement should be in favor of the Town.	Comment noted. The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
101	Similarly, Section II(B) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "easements to all stormwater treatment facilities shall be granted giving the Town of Amenia a perpetual right of free access to the facilities that runs with the land...". Details of these easements are further described in the Amended SEQRA Findings Statement. The Applicant should note these easements on the site plans and provide the easement documents.	Comment noted. The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
102	The Applicant should prepare a plan showing all the easements (existing and proposed), on the site. Section 105-25 states that ownership of all easements shall be indicated on the final plat. The Applicant should provide this information.	Comment noted. Subdivision plat and descriptions will be provided at a later date.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
103	Section 105-21(A) of the Town's Subdivision Code states that "all lots must contain a buildable portion of 5000 square feet providing sufficient suitable area for dwelling, driveway and other permitted accessory structures." The Applicant should provide a chart demonstrating compliance with this requirement for each lot and indicating which lots, if any, require waivers from this requirement.	The Applicant will request a waiver for Lots 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110 and 111, which do not meet the 5,000 SF buildable area requirement.	
104	Section 105-21(A)(1) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "the buildable portion [of each lot shall meet] the following criteria: maximum slopes of less than 15%." The Applicant should demonstrate compliance with this requirement because many homes will be constructed on slopes currently greater than 15%. I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether the lots meet this requirement	Comment noted. The Applicant will request a waiver for those lots which do not meet the 15% slope requirement.	
105	Section 105-21(A)(3) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "the buildable portion [of each lot shall meet] the following criteria: a depth of undisturbed usable soil with respect to seasonal or prolonged high-water table and bedrock of not less than four feet." I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether the lots meet this requirement	Comment noted.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
106	The preliminary subdivision plat shows a number of flag lots (e.g., Lots 1, 9, 10, 91, 117, etc.). Section 105-21(F) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "Flag lots...are allowed only by express waiver of the Planning Board granted in its sole discretion. Such lots may be approved only where they will not endanger public health and safety, will not increase the otherwise allowable density of development, will provide an alternate to the development of new Town roads, will not conflict with existing residential uses and will advance the purposes of this Chapter and Chapter 121 Zoning, including compliance with" the twelve standards set forth in Section 105-21(F). The Applicant should seek a waiver from the Planning Board to allow these Flag lots. I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether these Flag lots meet the standards set forth in Section 105-21(F)(1)-(12).	Comment noted. Please see response to comment #82 (Memo: Mary Ann Johnson)	
107	Section 105-21(D) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "driveways shall be designed and built to afford suitable access to the building site in accordance with the provisions of the Town Driveway Specifications (Chapter 101 of the Town Code), the Town Zoning Law, and the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code." I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether the proposed driveways meet this requirement.	Comment noted. The Applicant will request waivers for those driveways which do not meet the requirements.	
108	Sections 105-22 and 105-24(D) of the Town's Subdivision Code contain requirements for roads within the project. I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether the project complies with these requirements.	Comment noted.	
109	Section 105-23(C) of the Town's Subdivision Code states in the event that an area to be used for park, playground or common open space is required to be shown, the Applicant shall submit, prior to final plat or site plan approval, the "boundaries of said area, giving lengths and bearing of all straight lines; and radii, lengths, central angles and tangent distances of all curves." The Applicant should provide this information for the boundaries of the open space	Comment noted. The applicant will provide these details on the subdivision plat.	
110	Section 105-24(E) of the Town's Subdivision Code provides that prior to final plat approval, the Applicant shall pay an inspection fee to allow the Town Engineer to inspect the improvements to ensure that all Town specifications and requirements shall be met during construction. The Board should address this issue as part of its final plat review.	Comment noted.	
111	Section 105-25(A) of the Town's Subdivision Code states that public "underground improvements required by the Planning Board...and public franchise utilities shall be placed in the road right-of-way line in order to simplify location and repair of the utilities." The Applicant shall indicate whether all utility lines will be installed along roadways.	The utility plans have been revised. Please refer to the individual water, sewer, drainage and utility plan sheets for locations of the proposed utilities.	Site Plan Sheets C7.00 and C7.11 and C9.00 to C9.11.

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
112	The Applicant should explain whether all utility lines within the project site will be owned by the Applicant or by utility companies.	The electric lines are expected to be owned by NYSEG; the water and sewer mains and appurtenances will be owned by the duly formed water works and sewage works corporations, respectively. Telephone and internet lines are yet to be determined, but will potentially be owned by the Applicant.	
113	Section 105-27(A) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "where a subdivision includes roads which have not been dedicated to the Town of Amenia...the Planning Board shall condition the final approval upon the Applicant forming a homeowner's association which shall own any [private road] pursuant to a declaration of covenants and restrictions approved by the Planning Board and recorded in the County Clerk's Office...". The Applicant should provide the HOA declarations and covenants for the Planning Board's approval.	Comment noted. See response to comments 78, 79 and 81, above. (Memo: David Everett)	
114	Section 105-27(A) of the Town's Subdivision Code states the Planning Board shall condition final plat approval upon "a note [being] placed on the face of the final plat...to the effect that the roads in the subdivision [are private] not qualifying for, nor intended for, dedication to the Town of Amenia and there is no obligation on the part of the Town of Amenia to accept such road, in any event and under any circumstances...". The Applicant should add this note to the preliminary plat.	Comment noted. The preliminary subdivision plat will be provided.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
115	Section 105-27(B) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "all homeowner's associations owning and/or maintaining a [private road] must have the power to assess the subdivision lot owners for their share of the maintenance cost of the [private road]. All road maintenance obligation agreements and declarations of covenants and restrictions shall contain a provision granting the Town of Amenia with the authority to enforce the terms of those documents, including without limitation, the provisions relating to construction, maintenance and repair of the [private roads]. All road maintenance obligation agreements and declarations of covenants and restrictions shall also grant the Town of Amenia the authority to charge the common lot owners of the HOA for the reasonable cost actually incurred in enforcing the terms of those documents, including any repair, maintenance or construction costs and attorney's fees, which charge shall become a lien on the property of the common lot owners or the HOA, and enforceable in the same manner as a property tax lien. The Town Attorney shall review and approve all road maintenance obligation agreements and the by-laws of such homeowner's association and any restrictions and covenants to be accepted by the homeowner's association in connection with the subdivision...". The Applicant should provide by-laws and declarations and covenants that meet the requirements above.	Comment noted. See response to comments 78, 79 and 81, above. (Memo: David Everett)	
116	Section 105-30(A) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "when public franchise utilities are to be installed, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board written assurances from each public utility company that such company will make the necessary service installations within a time limit...". The Applicant shall provide such assurances to the Planning Board.	All correspondence with utility companies will be provided to the Planning Board as available.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
117	Section 105-30(B) of the Town's Subdivision Code states "the final plat shall include statements by the owner granting all necessary easements or other releases where "required for the installation of public franchise utilities." The Applicant shall provide such statements.	Comment noted. Amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of all required easements by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
118	Section 105-33 of the Town's Subdivision Code gives the Planning Board authority to waive any requirement or improvement for approval of the subdivision submitted. The Applicant should list in writing any and all waivers it is seeking. A complete waiver list will be critical for the Planning Board.	A list of all waivers is provided. The applicant will submit a written request for the waivers.	List of Waivers and Variances
119	Section II(N) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "the Planning Board would also waive the prohibition against non-municipal water systems contained in the Town's subdivision regulations." The Applicant should add this waiver to the list of waivers needed for the project.	Comment noted.	
	<u>FLOODPLAIN</u>		
120	The plans show that the Applicant will be developing golf holes and conducting other work in the floodplain. Also, the EAF Addendum (page 18) states that "the Applicant is restoring floodplain around Amenia/Cascade Brook in the area around Hole #4." Any work within the flood plain must comply with Chapter 67 of the Amenia Code which requires a permit for any development within the flood plain. The Applicant should submit an engineer's report demonstrating that the work complies with the standards for permit issuance - i.e., whether the proposed development will adversely affect the flood plain and cause physical damage to adjacent properties.	Comment noted. The applicant has submitted documentation for a floodplain development permit.	Floodplain Development Permit
121	The Applicant should discuss whether a DEC Article 15 Permit (Protection of Waters) or ACOE permit (nationwide or individual permits) will be required for any work conducted on the bed or bank of Amenia/Cascade Brook. If so, the Applicant should provide the Planning Board with all correspondence with DEC and permit application materials to DEC.	All correspondence with the NYSDEC and ACOE will be provided.	
	<u>AMENIA FISH AND GUN CLUB</u>		
122	The project site surrounds the Amenia Fish and Game Club on three sides. This is an active gun club located on Route 22 which conducts regular shooting events. It appears that-initial comments 5.12.14.docx16 shooting may occur within 500' of the Sales Center (and its parking lot), golf hole 9, the family activities barn (and its parking lot) and a number of homes in the south lawn neighborhood. Section 11-0931(4)(a)(2) of the NYS Environmental Conservation Law prohibits the discharge of fire arms within 500' of a residence. However, this section expressly exempts membership gun clubs from this restriction and would not prohibit Silo from subsequently building new homes within 500' of the gun club. This conclusion is also supported by NYSDEC Declaratory Ruling 11-04 (Woodlawn Sportsmen's Club).	Comment noted.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
123	Reportedly, the shooting activities at the club are conducted in a north/south direction with most of the shooting occurring in a northerly direction toward a berm area shown on Drawing C7.03. It is also reported that trees growing on top of this berm have numerous bullet holes and that machinery at the old golf maintenance building (located slightly to the side of the berm) had been shot in the past. From these reports, it appears that some bullets are leaving (or could leave) the gun club. The berm area is owned by Silo Ridge and will contain a walking path from the Sale Center to Pond A. The obvious safety issues are further complicated by the fact that the new homes, the family barn parking lot, golf hole 9 and other new facilities will be situated at a slightly higher elevation than the gun club (as noted on the grading plan - Drawing C7.03).	Currently, the gun club is shooting in a northerly direction, not south or west, therefore not affecting the Activity Barn parking lot, golf hole 9, and the South Lawn neighborhood. However, the applicant recognizes the current issue with the club shooting north towards the existing maintenance building / future sales office. The applicant is in the process of working with the Gun Club to ensure safety on the Silo Ridge site.	
124	The Applicant must describe what safety measures will be implemented (such as berms, stockade fencing, etc.) to ensure that people on the Silo Ridge property will be protected from stray bullets from the gun club. The site plan contains no such safety measures to protect people on the Silo Ridge property. The Planning Board has the authority to impose conditions on the site plans to ensure that public safety is protected to the maximum extent practicable, especially in this situation.	The applicant is in the process of working with the Gun Club to formulate a safety plan to ensure safety on the Silo Ridge site. The plan will be provided as it becomes available.	
125	Any berms or other safety measures erected around the club may be located within the SPO. I will defer to the Board's visual consultant regarding the potential impacts of such structures on the SPO.	Comment noted.	
	<u>RDO</u>		
126	The EAF Addendum (page 25) states that "the project will also require a waiver from Section 121-18(C)(6) of the RDO which requires a 100' buffer between properties in the RDO and adjacent residential properties." Section 6 of the Amended MDP states "permission is required...to build a portion of the access road to the Vineyard Cottages within the 100 foot residential open space buffer." This access road will be built off Route 44, a State highway. Section 121-18(C)(6) of the Zoning Code states that the 100' buffer from the RDO does not apply when the residential use to be buffered lies across a State or County highway. Based on this, it does not appear that a buffer is required for the access road. However, it is noted that there are some residential homes located across the street from the project site on West Lake Amenia Road, a town road. The Applicant should demonstrate that the buffer requirements have been met for these homes.	A waiver will not be required for the homes.	
127	Section 121-18(C)(3)(b) states "the master development plan shall require special permit approval by the planning board and shall be consistent with the Town of Amenia Comprehensive Plan." The Applicant should provide a narrative demonstrating compliance with the Comp. Plan.	A narrative has been provided.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
	<u>SCO</u>		
128	A portion of the northeast corner of the site is located in the SCO. Under Section 121-14(E)(4) of the Zoning Code, the Planning Board must determine that the site plan meets the SCO criteria in Section 121-14(E)(3). The Applicant should provide a narrative demonstrating compliance with these criteria.	Please refer to the Amended MDP Section 6.0 Zoning Compliance for further narrative regarding the SCO criteria.	
129	Under Section 121-14(E)(3) & (4) of the Zoning Code, the Applicant must submit an erosion and sediment control plan for work in the SCO. I will defer to the Board Engineer's about whether the draft SWPPP submitted by the Applicant satisfies this requirement. SPO	Comment noted. Erosion control has been provided as part of the Phase 1 site plan.	
	<u>SPO</u>		
130	Portions of the project site are located in the SPO. Section 121-14.1(F) of the Zoning Code requires the project to comply with the general standards for the SPO. I will defer to the Board's visual consultant regarding whether the project complies with these requirements.	Comment noted. The applicant has provided the Town's Visual Consultant with new updated visual studies.	Silo Ridge Resort Community Confirmatory Visual Analysis Phase I and II.
131	Section 121-14.1(G) of the Zoning Code requires a continuous green buffer, at least 100 feet deep along Routes 44 and 22. From the site plans, it appears that the new golf maintenance building and its parking lot may be within the 100' buffer along Route 22. Also, it appears that the WWTP and some vineyard cottages and other related buildings may be within the 100' buffer of Route 44. The Applicant should move these structures outside the buffer or seek a waiver from the Planning Board as allowed under Section 121-14.1(L) of the Zoning Code.	The Vineyard Cottages and the Golf Maintenance building are not within the 100' buffer along Route 22 and Route 44. The applicant will be requesting a waiver for the 100' buffer long Route 44 for the WWTP site plan. Please refer to the waiver list for further details.	
132	Section 121-14.1 of the Zoning Code contains a variety of standards related to landscaping, architecture and rural siting principles. I will defer to the Board's visual consultant regarding whether the project complies with these requirements.	Comment noted.	
	<u>AQO</u>		
133	The Project is located in the Aquifer Overlay District ("AQO"). Part of the project is in the Priority Valley Bottom Aquifer (PVBA) along Route 22 and the bulk of the project is located in the Upland Aquifer. Section 121-15(D)(4) of the Zoning Code prohibits the installation of any USTs less than 1100 gallons in the AQO. The Applicant should indicate whether there will be any USTs installed as part of the project. If so, the location and storage capacity of each tank should be specified.	Please see response to comment #59 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews). The applicant will be installing 1,000 gallon propane underground storage tanks at all the single family homes. The plans have been updated to call out the general location of the tanks. Detail drawings of the tanks have been added to the Civil Detail.	Site Plan Sheets C5.00 to C5.25, C14.01, and L3.32 to L3.33
134	The Applicant should indicate whether any ASTs will be installed as part of the project. If so, the location and storage capacity of each tank should be specified.	The applicant has revised the Site Layout Plan to show the location and size of the "dual-fuel" above ground storage tank, and above ground 250 gallon propane tank, at the golf maintenance facility. The dual-fuel tank will contain 500 gallons of diesel fuel, and 500 gallons of unleaded gasoline, and will have dual wall with leak detection, containment, and emergency shut off switch.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
135	Section 121-15(E)(1)(l) of the Zoning Code requires a special use permit for the storage of fertilizer, pesticide and herbicides of 500 pounds or more within the PVBA. The golf maintenance building appears to be in PVBA. The Applicant should explain whether such substances will be stored on site as part of the golf course maintenance building. If so, the Applicant should amend their special use permit application to include this storage. The Application should also describe the measures that will be implemented to ensure that the storage of these chemicals will not pollute the aquifer.	The applicant will obtain a special use permit, since the golf maintenance building is located in the PVBA and will contain some fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides in excess of 500 pounds. The substances will be stored in accordance with the NRMP Section 9.0 "Best Management Practices for the Maintenance Facility" - Subsection 9.1.1 "Pesticide Storage and Mixing." All other chemical storage will be in a separate secure storage building.	Site Plan Sheet C14.05 and C5.11
136	Section 121-15(E)(3) of the Zoning Code requires a variety of information to be included in this special use permit application. The Applicant should provide this information.	Comment noted. Chloride salts will not be stored on site.	
137	Section 121-15(E)(4)(c) of the Zoning Code states "any project where water consumption exceeds natural recharge, as defined in subsections F and G herein, shall demonstrate through SEQRA how such impacts will be mitigated through, for example, compensatory recharge equal to the identified recharge deficit through a combination of artificial on-site or off-site recharge, or provision of compensatory natural recharge areas elsewhere." I will defer to the Board's engineer on whether this requirement has been met.	Comment noted. The water report and calculations will be provided.	
	<b><u>PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES</u></b>		
138	Section 105-28 of the Town's Subdivision Code states "a performance bond, letter of credit or equivalent security shall be delivered to the Town Board to guarantee thereby that the Applicant shall faithfully cause to be constructed and completed within a reasonable time the required improvements...". "Improvements" are defined under Appendix A of the Subdivision Code to mean "a physical change to the land or installation of certain services necessary to provide usable lots or sites from raw land including, but not limited to, water and sewer facilities, recreation and open space areas, grading, pavement, pedestrian walkways or sidewalks, curbs, betterments to existing watercourses, road signs, sodding or seeding and monuments." The Planning Board should require the posting of this security as a condition of its subdivision approval.	Comment noted. Under State law, the Town can require bonding of public improvements and public infrastructure. As previously agreed with the Town, only the new wastewater treatment plant, and utility infrastructure to be dedicated to the Town, if any (at this time, there is none) will be bonded. All roads and appurtenances will be private, and will therefore not be bonded. However, the applicant will post a reclamation bond for excavated areas, not including golf course areas currently being improved.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
139	Section 121-34 of the Zoning Code states that "the Planning Board may, in connection with a major project site plan or major project subdivision, require an applicant to furnish an irrevocable letter of credit, certified check or other form of security to guarantee reclamation of areas to be excavated or graded if a project is abandoned. Such security shall be for an amount reasonably related to the potential cost of such reclamation and shall be in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney." Also, Section II(A) and (H) of the Amended SEQRA Findings says the same thing. The Applicant should provide a reclamation guarantee for the current golf coursework and any future work related to the rest of the Phase 1 project.	Comment noted. The applicant's position is that the current golf course work does not warrant a reclamation guarantee. The applicant will post a reclamation bond for site plan phase I excavation.	
140	Section 274-a (site plans) and 277 (subdivision) of the NYS Town Law and Section 121-68 of the Zoning Code allow the Planning Board to obtain a performance guarantee in a sufficient amount to ensure that the project infrastructure and all improvements are completed. If such improvements are abandoned in mid-construction, the guarantee will allow the Town to complete or remove the improvements and restore the site. The Board should discuss with the Applicant potential guarantees for the Phase 1 project.	Comment noted. Please see response to comments #138 and #139 (Memo: David Everett)	
	<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>		
141	Section 121-18(C)(7) of the Zoning Code states that "the layout of streets, blocks, public spaces and buildings in the RDO District shall follow the principles of traditional neighborhood development [TND] described in Section 121-12.1 to the extent practical, unless the Planning Board determines that this requirement does not apply as provided in Section 121-12.1(H)(2)." (Emphasis added). Section 121-12.1(F) states that "all streets shall be offered for dedication to the Town and no street shall be gated." The project is a gated community with private streets. In 2009, the Planning Board approved the original MDP for the project with gates and private roads.	The applicant has provided a memorandum addressing TND.	
142	The Addendum to the EAF (page 5) states that "there is also a 66' wide abandoned roadway, identified on the site survey as "Former Turnpike Road," that crosses a portion of the project site near the hairpin turn on Route 44." This road is shown on Drawing C2.02. Was this a public road? If so, the Applicant should provide documentation (or legal analysis) showing that the road has been formally abandoned and that the Applicant now owns the road bed.	The applicant is investigating. Initial research indicates that the applicant owns insured title to the bed of the former road.	
143	Drawing L3.01 shows a number of new trees being planted in the NYSEG utility easement. Does the easement allow trees to be planted under the utility lines? The Applicant should look into this issue.	Proposed trees have been removed from the NYSEG easement.	
144	Is there any proposed walking or golf cart access from the Vineyard cottages to the golf course or other amenities near the golf course?	There are no proposed walking or golf cart access from the Vineyard Cottages to the golf course or other amenities.	



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
145	The plans show a proposed easement across lands owned by HVLC for the emergency access road and golf maintenance building. The Applicant should provide a copy of the easement and written confirmation that HVLC has agreed to provide the easement.	A copy of the written confirmation from HVLC has been provided.	
146	Drawing C2.07 shows monitoring wells near the proposed access road on HVLC land. What are these wells for? Are there any easements related to these wells? The Applicant should discuss how these wells will be protected during construction of the access road.	The two wells (MW9 and MW2) are landfill monitoring wells. As of today only MW9 is monitored. There are no easements for these wells as the wells were owned by the same entity that owns the landfill and the entity is responsible for monitoring the landfill. The applicant will protect the existing monitoring wells with construction fencing.	Site Plan Sheet C2.09
147	Drawing C2.07 shows a number of rock outcrops near the new golf maintenance building. The Applicant should discuss whether blasting will be necessary to construct this building or other buildings on the site. Blasting has been necessary to undertake some of the golf course work already. The Applicant should provide a blasting plan detailing how blasting operations will be conducted and how workers and nearby property will be protected during blasting operations.	Please see response to comment #111 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	
148	Page 17 of the Amended MDP narrative states "a rock excavation concept plan has been prepared for the project." Has this plan been submitted to the Planning Board?	The Applicant found this comment under the Addendum to the EAF. Table 4 has been revised to remove this. Please see response to comment #111 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	
149	Drawings C2.08 and C3.04 shows a number of existing wells on the project site. The Applicant should discuss whether these wells will be abandoned/decommissioned in accordance with any applicable laws.	Please see response to comment #16 (Memo: David Everett).	Site Plan Sheets C3.00 to C3.10
150	Drawing C3.05 shows a number of billboards located on the project site along Route 22. Will these billboards be removed? If not, will they comply with the Town of Amenia sign regulations? Under Section 121-39(D)(6) of the Zoning Code, all non-conforming signs must be removed by 2012. Some of these billboards are located in DEC Wetland AM-15.	The billboards were previously removed. The existing conditions plan has been revised to reflect this.	Site Plan Sheet C3.05
151	The site plans should label the various site elements for the sales center, the activities barn, the clubhouse, the fitness building and the amenities in front of V-1 and V-2. The site plans for these buildings and areas are very general. The site plans should contain all the details required by Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code.	Site layout plans have been revised to include information from the materials plan. Furthermore, per the Town consultant's request, individual site plan packages have been assembled for each of the amenity buildings.	Amenity Buildings mini-site plans
152	Drawing L1.01 shows architectural elevation "H". However, I did not see that elevation in the plans. Is it missing or is the reference to elevation "H" mislabeled?	Elevations for single family home Type "H" have been provided. Please see Sheet A3.06.2	Please refer to Sheet A3.06.2
153	Drawing L3.01 states that an "agreement [is] in place allowing additional screening on DPW property." A letter from the Applicant to the Planning Board dated 3/6/14 also mentioned this agreement. The Applicant should provide the Planning Board with a copy of the agreement.	All correspondence with DPW has been provided.	
154	Drawing L3.01 states "existing silos to remain." The Applicant should explain the structural condition of these silos and whether they are sound.	The silos have been studied for structural integrity. A report will be provided as it is available. In summary, the study has found that the silos are structurally sound. However, the interiors have some decay and will need concrete parging repair to extend longevity and existing silage needs to be removed.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
155	Drawing P1.00 shows parking beneath a number of buildings. Based on these plans, as many as 20+ parking spaces are accessed by a single entrance. The Applicant should explain whether both ends of the buildings will be accessible by emergency vehicles or to remove cars incase of an emergency if the single entrance is blocked.	Please see response to comment #75 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	Site Plan Sheets A3.14. MDP Sheet P-1 and P-2.
156	The Applicant has stated that the store located at the sale's center will be open to the public. Will there be any signs indicating that public is welcome in the store? If so, the Applicant should include these signs in its signage plans.	No signage will be provided.	
157	All building elevations from site plans should be incorporated into the Amended MDP drawings.	The MDP is by definition only a conceptual plan, and is intended to confer future design flexibility within approved conceptual parameters. General design concepts and parameters-including conceptual building elevations-are already in the MDP. Adding the building elevations from the site plan drawings (which are available for public review) means that 21+ additional plan sheets will have to be reproduced for every copy of the MDP the Town requires the applicant to print for distribution and filing. As per discussions with David Everret on Friday June 14, 2014, a note will be added to the MDP plan sheets to refer the reader to the Site Plan drawings.	
158	Drawing LA-2 states that: "a detailed lighting plan that specifies lighting location, intensity and trespass will be prepared during site plan review." Section 2.5 of the Amended MDP narrative says the same thing. Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code also requires a detailed lighting plan. The Applicant should submit this plan.	A detailed lighting plan has been provided. Please refer to SL1.00 to SL1.06	Site Plan Sheet SL1.00 to SL1.06
159	Drawing LA-4 states "final sign designs will be submitted as part of Site Plan review." Section 2.3 of the Amended MDP narrative says the same thing. Section 121-65(B) of the Zoning Code also requires "the location, height, size, materials and design of all proposed signs" must be submitted. The Applicant should submit a signage plan.	A Traffic Circulation and Signage Plan has been provided. Please refer to Sheet C6.01 to C6.05	Site Plan Sheet C6.01 to C6.05
160	Drawing LA-4 refers to Appendix E. Where is this appendix?	The sheet has been revised. The reference is to Appendix E (Amended MDP).	
161	The Applicant should provide written confirmation that the Amenia Fire Department and paramedics have reviewed and accepted the site plans.	Written confirmation from the Amenia Fire Department showing that they have accepted the site plan has been provided.	
162	Sections 1.4.7 and 2.1.1 of the Amended MDP narrative states "single-family home sites at the toe of the forested slope on the west side of the golf course will have the limits of the yards demarcated. The methods of demarcated will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board during site plan review." The Applicant shall denote what methods of demarcation will be used i.e., deed restrictions, fencing, monuments, stone cairns, signage, etc.	Please see response to comment #124 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	
163	The open space on the site will be placed into a conservation easement held by the Dutchess Land Conservancy (DLC). Section 3.3 of the Amended MDP narrative states "the conservation easement shall be in a form acceptable to the Planning Board and shall be approved by the Planning Board during site plan review." A draft of the easement should be provided to the Planning Board for review and approval. Also, written confirmation should be provided from DLC that they will accept the conservation easement.	All correspondence with Dutchess Land Conservancy will be provided. A draft MOU with DLC has been provided.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
164	Section 121-32(E) of the Zoning Code provides that "all erosion and sediment control measures shall be periodically inspected by the Town and maintained by the developer ...." I will defer to the Board engineer as to whether these inspections will be required or whether the Applicant's required inspections under the DEC storm water regulations will suffice for the inspection requirements in this section.	Comment noted. The stormwater management report includes the requirements necessary under the SPDES General Permit. Please see response to comment #56 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	
165	Section 121-36 of the Zoning Code provides that cutting of trees and other natural vegetation on slopes 15% or greater shall be minimized. The Applicant should explain whether the plans minimize such disturbance. This section also requires five conditions to be attached to a special use permit to minimize impacts to slopes over 15%. The Board should consider these conditions.	Comment noted. The project has been designed to minimize disturbance to steep slopes, and to existing vegetation. The applicant has staked each proposed home and lot to ensure that the location works best with existing conditions, including minimization of disturbance to existing vegetation. Additionally, all required sediment control practices will be implemented during construction to mitigate disturbance impacts.	
166	Section 121-36 of the Zoning Code states that "no disturbance ... shall be permitted on any slope of 30% or greater except ...where an applicant can demonstrate that the impacts of disturbing slopes do not negatively impact visual resources, that the area impacted are part of a broader plan for the site that weighs and balances the full range of environmental issues, and that such disturbance is fully mitigated by engineering and soil erosion control practices." The Applicant should submit a narrative making this demonstration.	Comment noted. The Town's Visual Consultant is reviewing the project's potential impacts on visual resources.	Visual Study
167	Drawing SP-6 shows a common driveway to VG-1 & VG-2. The Applicant should discuss whether these driveways will be owned and maintained by the HOA or by the individual home owners. If the latter, the Applicant should provide a driveway maintenance agreement to the Planning Board to ensure that the driveway will be properly maintained and the cost shared by these home owners. The same is true for SL-20 and SL-21 on Drawing SP-7 and GV-16 andGV-17 on Drawing SP-8. Reciprocal access easements should be provided. Section 105-22 of he Town's Subdivision Code states: "The Planning Board shall require that a statement be placed on the final plat...stating that a common driveway has been approved for the subdivision conditioned upon the recording of the common driveway maintenance agreement in the...County Clerk's office." The Applicant should provide these agreements for the Planning Board's approval and add this note to the plat.	Common driveways will be maintained by the individual owners. The note will be placed on the plat. The requested amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon subsequent approval of this agreement by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	Site Plan Drawing SP-6
168	Section 63-10 of the Town Code requires an operating permit from the Code Enforcement Officer for any building containing one or more areas of public assembly with an occupant load of 100 persons or more. The Applicant should indicate whether the clubhouse, fitness center, family activities barn or any other buildings or places on the site will have an occupant load of greater than 100 persons.	The Activity Barn and phase I Clubhouse will have an occupant load greater than 100 persons. As per Section 63-10 of the Town Code, the applicant will obtain an operating permit from the Code Enforcement Officer.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
169	Section 209-u of the General Municipal Law requires any person who possesses hazardous materials at a place of business, construction site or storage yard shall report annually the presence of such materials to the chief of the local fire department. The Applicant should indicate whether such a notification will be required for any hazardous materials to be located onsite during and after construction including at the golf maintenance building.	The applicant will comply with General Municipal Law Section 209-u.	
170	I will defer to the Town's planning consultant and ecological consultant about whether the landscaping plan should contain an affirmative commitment by the Applicant to promptly replace any landscaping that is dead or diseased.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment #39 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
171	Section II(F) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "during site plan review, materials must also be submitted that demonstrate that the Master HOA will dedicate sufficient resources to the ongoing care, maintenance, life-cycle and eventual replacement of vegetative screening." The Applicant should submit these materials.	Comment noted. The amended special permit approval and site plan approval should be expressly conditioned upon approval of the Master HOA covenants and restrictions and condominium declarations by the Planning Board and Planning Board attorney.	Draft HOA and Condo Documents
172	I will defer to the Board's planning consultant as to whether the amended project meets the requirements in the Town Code for a conservation analysis.	Comment noted. The previously accepted DEIS, and supplement to the EAF, constitute the Conservation Analysis for the modified project.	
173	Section 3.4 of the Amended MDP narrative states "a solid waste management plan that addresses the accessibility of waste and refuse on the site...will be implemented." The Applicant should provide this plan.	The Master HOA will be contracting with a private carting company to remove refuse on a regular schedule from the refuse locations indicated on the plan and from the end of the driveways for the single family lots. Refuse will be located in compactors or containers provided by the carting company. Please refer to the site plan drawings.	Site Plan Sheets C5.09, C5.10, C14.01 and L4.03
174	Section 3.8 of the Amended MDP narrative states "a spill prevention and response plan will be developed for the site detailing the steps that need to be followed in the event of an accidental spill." The Applicant should provide this plan.	A spill prevention and response plan is included within the NRMP. Please refer to Section 6.9 of the NRMP.	NRMP Section 6.9
175	The Applicant should identify which entity will own and manage the golf course and its lot.	The club and its lot will be owned by an affiliate of the existing owner.	
176	The Grading Plans show some grading off the project site onto neighboring properties. The Applicant should indicate whether grading easements will be required for this work.	The grading plans have been revised to maintain all work within the existing and adjusted property lines. The easement with HVLC will permit the grading outside the permanent easement area.	Site Plan Sheets C7.00 to C7.11

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
D	<b><u>David Everett</u></b>		
177	The 2009 MDP approval states "the Planning Board recognizes that the project may place additional demands on Town recreational facilities and that there may be a need to expand such facilities in the near future as a result of the project... If the Planning Board determines during site plan review that a fee in lieu of providing these expanded recreational facilities is appropriate, the Planning Board will impose that fee according to applicable local and state regulations." The Planning Board should address this issue during site plan review.	Comment noted. The applicant's position is that the extensive on-site recreation facilities (which are the essence of the resort community) will adequately serve demand within the resort community and of its residents. Furthermore, as discussed with Mary Ann Johnson and Dr. Michael Klemens on June 9, 2014, the Town of Amenia exceeds National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) standards set for the amount of parks, recreation, and open space to adequately provide for the recreational needs of its residents. The DEIS states that "The total amount of park and recreational land recommended by the NRPA is 6.25 to 10.5 acres per 1,000 people for "local parkland" and 15 to 20 acres per 1,000 people for "regional space." Based on information provided in Table 3.12-1, the Town has a total of 50± acres of local parkland and 553± acres of regional space to serve its 4,080 residents. Therefore, the Town of Amenia exceeds NRPA standards with approximately 12.3 acres of local parkland and approximately 135.5 acres of regional space per 1,000 residents"	
178	The Applicant should identify which conditions on the 2009 original MDP approval will remain valid.	As discussed with David Everett on June 13, 2014, the applicant will prepare a list of conditions once the plans have been finalized and deemed complete by the Planning Board and the Town's consultants.	List of Conditions to follow
179	Section II(B) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "provide rain gardens and/or drywells for drainage from the roofs of all single family homes and vineyard cottages, as practicable, with a technical explanation provided during site plan review, if these practices are not used." The Applicant should explain whether these practices are being used for each home.	The overall design allows for stormwater runoff to sheet flow to the roadside swales and ditches, which ultimately discharges to the stormwater management ponds. It is not necessary to provide these practices at each home site in order to meet the stormwater management requirements in accordance with GP-0-10-001.	
180	Section II(B) of the Amended SEQRA Findings states "a snow storage plan will be developed during site plan review to ensure that snow is not deposited in water bodies." Has this plan been submitted to the Planning Board?	Language regarding the snow storage plan has been added to the Site Layout Plan. Please refer to Sheet C5.11. In the event of a snow storm, where by the existing capacity provided on the side of the roads is not enough, management will be required to truck the snow to the Overflow parking located north of the maintenance facility.	Site Plan Sheet C5.11
181	The Amended SEQRA Findings discuss a number of mitigative measures that will be further developed during site plan review. The Applicant should describe how each of these measures has been developed and implemented in more detail in the site plans.	Please refer to Table 4 of the Addendum to the EAF.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
	<u>GENERAL COMMENTS</u>		
1	Throughout the various documents, the applicant makes reference to seeking a variety of waivers from Zoning and Subdivision provisions. It would be helpful to have one consolidated list of the waiver requests.	Please see response to comment #118 (Memo: David Everett)	
2	In order to ensure the mitigation measures from the Findings Statement are addressed in the Modified Project, I suggest the applicant prepare a table that lists each of the mitigation measures, a description of how it has been addressed and if applicable, where it is located on the MDP and/or site plans.	Please refer to Table 4 of the Addendum to EAF.	
	<u>AMENDED MDP</u>		
3	I suggest the total site acreage noted in Existing Conditions consist of the existing 670 acres+ the 5.8 acres of "lot line adjustment" +the 4 acres of easement for access for a total of 681 acres. This should be consistent throughout the document.	Comment noted. The applicant considers the "project site" to be only the land owned in fee. The easement area remains part of the Harlem Valley Landfill Corp. parcel for purposes of calculating lot and bulk requirements for improvements on that property. Additionally the MDP text has been updated to include: "The 676±-acre site (the "Site", 682 +/- acres including the 6.6 +/- acre easement area on the adjoining property owned by Harlem Valley Landfill Corp.)"	
4	Please reconcile the wetland acreage with Dr. Klemens. There still seems to be confusion.	Please see response to comment #2 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
5	Please indicate what portion of the project is in the floodway.	The portion of the project site that is in the floodway is 1.937 AC. There is no proposed development within the floodway except for the two pipes that discharge from the proposed entrance pond to Amenia Cascade Brook.	Site Plan Sheet C7.03
6	Please include an explanation of how the design is consistent with the "Hamlet Design Guidelines" and Greenway Connection as noted in Section 121-12.1.D of the Town Zoning Law.	Please refer to the "Silo Ridge Project - TND" memorandum.	TND Memo
7	Please explain how the streets and blocks are compliant with Section 121-12.1.F	Please refer to the "Silo Ridge Project - TND" memorandum.	TND Memo
8	Please indicate the square footage of the General Store in Section 1.4.3.	The 1,000 square feet of the General Store has been added in Section 1.4.3	
9	Please add the total square footage of all commercial components of the modified project in Section 1.4.3 of the MDP.	The approximate total square footage of all retail components, 9,000 square feet, has been added in Section 1.4.3 of the MDP. Retail components include the winery restaurant, the pro shop, the sales office, and the general store.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
10	In the description of the Artisan's Park Overlook, "Benches and perennial flowers are expected to be placed in the overlook area". Please clarify whether there is a firm commitment to the benches and flowers.	Yes, this is a firm commitment. Please refer to the landscaping plan.	Site Plan Sheet L1.05 and L3.25
11	Please add the hours of operations to the gatehouse description.	The gatehouse will operate 24 hours per day 7 days per week.	
12	Please label the structure located between the Clubhouse and buildings V-1 & V-2 on page 15.	The structure ("Trellis") located between the Clubhouse and buildings V-1 & V-2 on page 15 has been labelled.	MDP Page 15
13	Please clarify which total the Vineyard Cottages are included in on the MDP Bulk Design Standards - page 36.	The Bulk Standards table has been revised.	
14	In Section 2.5 regarding lighting, the following statement appears "Heavily used pathways may have pole mounted lighting or landscape lighting in order to improve the perception of safety for pedestrians." Is it the perception of safety or actual safety you are improving?	The word perception was removed from the sentence. The text has been revised to read "...in order to improve safety for pedestrians."	Section 2.5 of the Amended MDP
15	Section 3.3 notes that 540.5 acres of the site are being preserved as open space or 79.9% of the site if the total site acreage is determined to be 676 acres. If, as I suggest in bullet #1, the total site acreage is 681, the percentage is 79.3%. Please adjust the open space are to make sure it is in fact 80% of the site.	The open space area has been revised to +/- 541.82 acres which represents +/- 80.19% of the total 676 acres. Please see response to comment #3 (Memo: MaryAnn Johnson).	
16	Please provide justification for using multiple stormwater ponds, dry wells and sand filters instead of the Town's preference for the biofiltration practices.	The project proposes use of multiple stormwater ponds and sand filters to meet the prior commitment of East of Hudson Standards. On this site, biofiltration practices are implemented through use of vegetated swales, buffered areas, sand filters, infiltration basins and stormwater management ponds.	
17	Please explain why the MDP text was changed for the following: "Retaining all existing forest area within buffers and on undeveloped slopes" to "Retaining most existing forest ... ". (Emphasis added)	The use of the word "all" was inaccurate because there is some disturbance proposed at the undeveloped slopes.	
18	Please indicate the source of water and wastewater treatment for the golf maintenance building.	Please see response to comment #11 (Memo: Rohde, Soyka and Andrews)	
19	The section on parking is a bit confusing. At points, the discussion leads one to believe less parking is need because of the management strategies. However, the "highlights" subsection states "parking for almost all land uses will exceed what is called for by traditional requirements under the Town Zoning." Please define the standard being used to determine the "Base Parking Requirements".	The parking requirements shown are based on Section 121-38 of the Zoning Law, even though it doesnot apply in the RDO District.	Section 4.4 of the Amended MDP
20	Please include the square footage of the pro shop in the calculation on the amount of retail space in the RDO compliance section.	The pro shop has been included as retail space.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
21	Section 121-18.C.3.b states "The Master Development Plan shall require special permit approval by the Planning Board and shall be consistent with the Town of Amenia Comprehensive Plan." Please provide an explanation of the Comprehensive Plan consistency in Section 6.0. See section on Comprehensive Plan above.	Please refer to the "Silo Ridge Project - Comprehensive Plan" memorandum.	
22	General standards for the Scenic Protection Overlay (Section 121-14.1) state proposed activities will not result in clearing a building site area, including accessory structures and parking area, greater than 30,000 square feet in area for a single-family residence. It appears from the subdivision map that there several lots in the Estate Home area that are larger than 30,000 square feet. The grading plan shows grading across the entire area of these lots, many of which are in the SPO district.	Design guidelines have been established in order to provide parameters with which each lot must comply. Please refer to Estate Homes design guidelines and lot diagrams. Additionally, the plans have been revised to more accurately show the proposed grading for each lot within the SPO district (no more than 30,000 square feet of clearing for the building site of each lot).	
23	In the subsection on Compliance with Major Special Permit Criteria, please note the site is also located in the OC district.	The Office/Commercial/Industry Mixed-Use (OC) District has been added under the Zoning Compliance section point #1.	
24	In the section on Wetlands and Watercourses, there is a list of disturbances to both wetlands and watercourses. In this Compliance section, it only states seeking permission to "fill two small wetlands not regulated by the ACOE" . Please clarify.	The text has been revised to reflect all physical disturbance of all wetlands. The two isolated wetlands proposed to be filled are part of the original MDP approval.	
25	In bullet #6 of the Compliance with Major Special Permit Criteria, the first paragraph states there will be a small amount of wetland disturbance and notes it will be "mitigated as discussed in this revised MDP." Please cite where the mitigation is discussed.	The text has been revised to reflect all physical disturbance of all wetlands. Furthermore, wetland disturbance has been revised to study natural vs. constructed as per Dr. Michael Klemens suggestion during the June 9, 2014 meeting. Proposed mitigation measures have been added to this section.	
26	If the applicant is proposing to alter how the project will comply with the Workforce Housing law, please revise bullet# 10. The applicant should submit a site plan and an analysis of how the project complies with Section 121-12 of the Zoning.	Pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing.	
	<u>ADDENDUM TO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM</u>		
27	Page 4 - In the description of the Clubhouse/Lodge, can you clarify that the lodging units are located in three buildings. Please update Table 1 on page 3 to indicate the same.	Page 4 and Table 1 have been revised.	



**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
28	Page 8-The discussion on parking is incomplete. Please provide a summary of the total number of proposed spaces as described in the MDP for all components of the project.	The current text refers to Section 4.4 of the MDP and Sheets P-1 and P-2 of the MDP plans, which details the parking plan.	
29	Page 9 - please explain how much of the Clubhouse/Lodge is being built in Phase 1 by noting the square footage and if any other amenity besides the Pro Shop is included (e.g. the restaurant, spa, etc.).	Approximately 4,850 square feet of the Clubhouse is being built in phase I. Phase I will include a: (i) pro-shop, (ii) bathrooms, (iii) a small wine cellar, (iv) bar/lounge, and (v) a small lobby area.	
30	Page 13 - Table 3. Please add total number of acres disturbed, total number of acres of disturbance to steep slopes (15% to 30% and 30% and greater), total number of acres of land to be disturbed that has not been previously disturbed and the amount of cut and fill.	Table 3 has been revised to provide the total number of acres disturbed and the total number of acres of disturbance to steep slopes. Footnote 3 has been added to the last value.	
31	Page 13 - Table 3. For the# of school children and fiscal impact to the school district, please present the worst case scenario numbers from Appendix K. Note the impact to the school district will need to be revised to reflect the applicant's decision to build workforce housing on the site.	The number of school children and fiscal impact have been revised to assume the worst case scenario of 175 school children. Please note that pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing.	
32	Please note comments 32-49 are all related to Table 4. As discussed with VHB, this table should show potential impacts from the FEIS compared to the impacts of the approved MDP and the impacts of the Modified Project in addition to the Mitigation Measures for the FEIS and the additional mitigation related to the Modified Project. If mitigation measures from the FEIS are being altered or are no longer relevant, the applicant should note such in the narrative.	Table 4 has been revised accordingly.	
33	The potential impacts to Soils and Geology notes there will be 243 acres of disturbance on the site. The EAF notes 274. Please reconcile.	The Soils and Geology Potential Impacts column has been revised.	
34	Please provide the water budget report noted in the additional mitigation for Water Resources.	The water analysis and report will be provided.	
35	Please clarify if there will be a floodplain restoration project along the Amenia Cascade Brook. If not, please address this in the Mitigation Measures column for Water Resources.	The applicant will implement the floodplain restoration plan previously approved as part of the 2009 MDP.	
36	Page 20. The potential impacts column notes 536 acres will be preserved. Please reconcile as other information has indicated 540.5 acres. Please reconcile all other acreages noted as well. Also see bullet #13 above.	Page 20 (Table 4) has been revised.	
37	Please clarify how many planting palettes there will be - see Additional Mitigation for Wildlife. Text is confusing.	Page 20 (Table 4) has been revised.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
38	Page 22 - last bullet on page in the Mitigation Measures Approved MDP states there will be two restoration projects. I believe one restoration project is no longer needed. Please clarify.	The applicant will implement both the floodplain restoration plan and the stream restoration plan previously approved as part of the 2009 MDP.	
39	Page 23 - Cultural Resources. Was there a Phase 2 study done and was there additional correspondence with OPRHP? Is there documentation regarding the Island Green Pond and the Quarry Pond?	Phase 2 testing of NY SHPO Site A02701.000082 (aka Site 3662-2) was conducted in September 2013. The testing was not completed, however, as the applicant determined that the archaeological site can be avoided. The report detailing the results of that work and an Unanticipated Discovery Plan (UDP) are being submitted to NY OPRHP for review. The site's boundary as defined to date and an adjacent avoidance buffer have been mapped and these locations are presented on various figures in the report and UDP. The UDP specifies monitoring within 50 feet of the site buffer's exterior edge. The UDP also specifies the procedures to be followed in the event that "Unanticipated Discoveries" are found during pre-construction, construction, and post-construction activities. All correspondence will be provided as it is available.	
40	Page 24 - Visual Resources. This section will need to be revised based on input from the town's visual consultant upon the satisfactory completion of the visual analysis.	Comment noted.	
41	Page 25 - Transportation. I defer comment on this section to the town's engineer.	Comment noted.	
42	Page 25 - Land Use and Zoning. Please revise this section based upon comments above and discussions with the applicant and their consultants on April 30th.	The Land Use and Zoning Resource section has been revised accordingly.	Page 26 (Table 4)
43	Page 26 - Local and Regional Plan Consistency. Please revise this section based on comments above and discussions with the applicant and their consultants on April 30th.	The Local and Regional Plan Consistency Resource section has been revised accordingly.	Page 27 (Table 4)
44	Page 28 - Please clarify the statement in the Additional Mitigation column that states "Exterior lighting will be per lighting narrative and is not necessarily "throughout the site", the Modified Project...". (Emphasis added)	The bullet point has been deleted.	Page 28 (Table 4)
45	Page 28 - School District Services. For the # of school children and fiscal impact to the school district, please present the worst case scenario numbers from Appendix K. Note the impact to the school district will need to be revised to reflect the applicant's decision to build workforce housing on the site.	Table 4 has been revised to provide the worst case scenario for the fiscal impact analysis. Please note that pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing into a dedicated Town workforce housing trust fund.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
46	Page 29 - Recreation, Open Space Resources and Tourism. The applicant should discuss changes to the project that now minimizes the tourism benefits noted in the Mitigation Measures of the Approved MDP.	Table 4 has been revised accordingly.	
47	Page 30 - Utilities - Water and Utilities - Wastewater. Please revise these sections as needed once additional engineering details become available. I defer comments to the town's engineer.	Table 4 has been revised accordingly.	
48	Page 31- Fiscal Resources and Demographics. Note the impacts to these sections will need to be revised to reflect the applicant's decision to build workforce housing on the site.	Please note that pursuant to Section 121-42N of the Town Zoning Law, the applicant will pay a fee in lieu of providing workforce housing into a dedicated Town workforce housing trust fund.	
49	Page 32 - Community Character. In the Additional Mitigation column, it appears there is a word missing.	The text has been revised to read "No additional mitigation is necessary."	
50	Page 34 - Section IV.4. There is language that refers to "Limited development is proposed at the toe of slope along the eastern edge ... ". The word "limited" does not seem to reflect the current MDP.	The text has been revised to read "Development is proposed..."	
51	Page 35. Please be more specific for the reference "Some buildings will be visible ... " by identifying the buildings that will be visible.	The text has been revised and references the "Confirmatory Visual Analysis."	
52	Page 35 - Section IV.5. I defer to the town's visual consultant for comments on this section in regards to visual impacts and mitigation.	Comment noted.	
53	Page 35 - Steep Slopes Regulations. This section indicates the project would not be financially viable unless there is some development on slopes greater than 30%. The Findings Statement encourages the applicant to refine the design so as to further minimize impacts to steep slopes. The applicant should provide information on how impacts to steep slopes have been minimized in this Modified (scaled down) version of the project.	Please see response to comment #3 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens).	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
54	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).	The text has been revised to include compliance details for the AQO and SCO using a format similar to the SPO.	
55	Page 37 - Scenic Protection Overlay. I note there is a 30,000 square foot limit for grading related to single family homes and that there are single family homes sites being proposed where there is grading shown in excess of 30,000 square feet. As we discussed with the applicant in a working session, building envelopes on the proposed subdivision lots should be provided along with the any other restrictions the applicant will be imposing through the Home Owners Association (HOA) to show compliance with this provision of the Zoning. In the alternative, the applicant can seek a waiver from the Planning Board for this grading limit provision. For the remainder of this section on visual impacts, I defer to the town's visual consultant.	Please see response to comment #22 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens).	
56	Appendix A - please add a legend to the drawing.	The maps have been revised to show a legend.	
57	Appendix B - please add the red line along the stream to the legend.	The legend has been revised to include the buffer line.	
58	Appendix D.1- Can the applicant add a column that includes impacts from 2009 MDP for comparison?	Please see response to comment #18 (Memo: Dr. Michael Klemens)	
59	Appendix D.2 - The town's engineer raised a question about floodplain impacts beyond the property line. I defer this issue to Ms. Mangarillo.	Comment noted.	
60	Appendix F - The Archaeological Sensitive Site Avoidance Plan shows a grading intrusion into the buffer area.	The plans have been revised to show the 25 foot buffer. No work is proposed within the buffer.	
61	Appendix F.1- Correspondence with NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) note there was to be additional submission to their office. Please provide copies of the submission End of Fieldwork letter and Phase II report along with any additional correspondence with OPRHP.	Please see response to comment #39 (Memo: Mary Ann Johnson)	
62	Appendix H.1-This should be a Zoning map for the entire project area.	An 11x17 zoning map for the entire project area has been added.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
63	Appendix I - This report provides an evaluation of water for the site for the extended project that is no longer being considered by the applicant. However, this report notes that "Based on the layout of the proposed development, none of the existing on-site wells meet the NYSDOH 100-foot radius of ownership/200-foot radius of sanitary control well siting requirements ... ". (Emphasis added) I understand the applicant is addressing this issue and expect a revised report from Legette, Brashears & Graham, Inc. will be provided. Please note that none of the drawings referenced in the report have been provided in this appendix. Please ensure all components of the revised report are submitted.	The revised final report will be provided and it will include all components including drawings.	
64	Appendix J - I understand the wastewater system is still being evaluated and will be provided for review in the near future.	Plans of the wastewater treatment plant and conveyance system will be provided.	
65	Appendix K.1-This report, titled Fiscal Impact Assessment Memorandum, is difficult to understand unless one has read the assumptions and methodology from the DEIS & FEIS. The logic and flow of the report need to be reconsidered and should follow the presentation of information from the DEIS.	Appendix K.1 memorandum has been revised following Mary Ann Johnson's direction from June 10, 2014.	
66	Appendix K.1- Page 3 of the report notes that budget increase ratios provided in the FEIS were used to estimate costs. Please indicate what these ratios are, the year they were developed and if any discussion has been had with the current Supervisor to verify whether these assumptions remain valid.	The budget increase ratios are meant to determine potential impacts from the project on Town expenses. Discussions have been had with the Town's Supervisor, Fire Chief and Superintendent of Highways. The applicant does not have written confirmation that the assumptions remain valid. This was communicated to Mary Ann Johnson on June 9, 2014 and she is following up with the appropriate agency representatives to try and obtain written confirmation. The original estimated increments were as follows: 15% increase to the General Fund, 5% increase to the Highway Fund and 80% increase to the Amenia Fire Fund.	
67	Appendix K.1- Table 1. Please explain the difference between the single family home types and why some types are listed twice, e.g. Single Family Home A and & Single Family Home A*.	The table has been updated.	
	<b><u>MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN SET</u></b>		
68	Consolidated comments from joint meetings of the town's consultants have been provided on specific sheets to VHB on a separate plan set.	Comment noted. Plans have been received and plan revisions have been addressed.	
69	Sheet SP-3 Program Details. The Residential and Lodging Summary Table should clarify there is no " lodge" building. In fact, lodging units are located within three different buildings.	All tables have been revised.	MDP Sheet SP-3

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
70	Sheet SP-3 Program Details. The Summary tables should include details for all phases of the project, not just the first phase. The residential detail tables should reconcile to the summary in a coherent way. For example, in the summary table, please refer to a specific detail table for more information. Detail tables should include totals to assist with reconciling numbers.	All tables have been revised.	MDP Sheet SP-3
71	Sheet SP-3 Program Details. More information is needed for the Estate Homes and Vineyard Cottages. If the applicant is unable to provide a specific building footprint for each home, then a maximum square footage should be provided.	The tables have been updated to be consistent with the Approved 2009 MDP.	MDP Sheet SP-3
72	Sheet SP-3 Program Details. Please provide the size of the lots for all lots that the applicant is seeking subdivision approval in the applicable detail tables.	The applicant has provided the lot sizes in the Sketch Plat. Please refer to the Sketch Plat provided with the site plan. This was confirmed with Mary Ann Johnson and David Everett on June 13th, 2014.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01
73	Sheet SP-6. Can you distinguish between cart paths and walking paths on all sheets? There is a double row of paths to the south of buildings TH-1, TH-2 and TH-3. Is this necessary?	MDP Sheet C-1 Path Diagram has been provided indicating pedestrian and golf cart circulation. Regarding the two paths at TH1, 2, and 3, one path is part of the formal oval design element at the Village Green lawn, while the second is more for direct access to the central gardens and fitness center.	MDP Sheet C-1
74	Please provide a plan showing pedestrian/cart paths circulation.	MDP Sheet C-1 Path Diagram has been provided indicating pedestrian and golf cart circulation.	MDP Sheet C-1
75	Sheet LA-2. Please review and ensure the language reflects current thinking on lighting. Please add commitments that are prescribed in Zoning (Section 121-38, 121-40.L) and the Subdivision Regulations.	Sheet LA-2 has been updated.	MDP Sheet LA-2
76	Sheet ENV-6. Please add the area of the landfill to the drawing.	Sheet ENV-6 has been revised.	MDP Sheet ENV-6
	<b><u>SITE PLAN - PHASE 1</u></b>		
77	Sheet C2.00. Please add the location of the silos to the drawing. Will the silos remain as part of the project? If so, please add to all other appropriate drawings.	The locations of the silos have been identified on the drawings. The silos will remain. Please see response to comment #153 (Memo: David Everett)	Site Plan Sheet C2.00
78	Sheet C4.01. This should not be titled "Preliminary Subdivision Plat" as it does not contain the enough information. This should be a Sketch Plan and should provide the information as described in Section 105-9(2). See also Section 105-16 and Appendix C.	The title of the plan has been revised to "Sketch Plan". The preliminary subdivision plat will follow.	Site Plan Sheet C4.01

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
79	The applicant should review Section 105-2 of the Subdivision Regulations and provide information regarding how the subdivision is meeting the objectives. It is declared to be the policy of the Town of Amenia to consider land subdivision plats as part of a plan for the orderly, economic, environmentally sound, and efficient future growth and development of the Town consistent with its community character and the continuing needs of its people for quality residential building sites and enjoyable open space. This chapter shall supplement and facilitate the provisions of the Town Comprehensive Plan and Town Zoning Law.[1] The following objectives shall guide the Planning Board's decisions as related to the public health, safety and welfare:	These standards are more directly applicable in "conventional" subdivision applications in which the subdivision approval is the only, or principal, development approval. In the RDO District, the principal development approvals are the MDP special permit and the site plan approval(s), and the subdivision approval is designed to conform with the approved MDP, and the approved site plan(s). These standards are therefore addressed in the context of the amended MDP and phase 1 site plan for which approvals are currently being sought.	Subdivision Plat (follow)
80	Sheet C4.01. There are a few lots that are less than 5,000 square feet in size. Please see Section 105-21.A that states for each lot there needs to be a buildable portion of a minimum of 5,000 square feet.	The applicant will seek a waiver for parcel numbers 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111. Each of these lots pertain to the townhomes located in the Village Green.	
81	Sheet C4.01. As has been discussed, there are lots in size that are 30,000 square feet and greater that show grading throughout the entire lot. For these lots that are in the Scenic Protection Overlay, this creates a problem per Section 121.14.1.F.5. that limits clearing for a building site to 30,000 square feet for a single-family residence. It is my understanding the applicant is working on placing building envelopes on the plans and may possibly seek waivers.	Please see response to comment #22 (Memo: Mary Ann Johnson)	
82	Sheet C4.01. There are several flag lots being proposed. The applicant should describe how the lots are compliant with Section 105-21.F. or acknowledge if they will be seeking a waiver.	The applicant will seek a waiver for parcel numbers 1, 7, 9, 10, 17, 18, and 91.	
83	Sheet C4.01. Road I is a cul-de-sac road that services 17 homes. Per Section 105-22.G.(1) specifies not more than 15 single-family residential lots. The applicant should indicate if they will be seeking a waiver from this provision.	The applicant will seek a waiver from this provision.	

**Silo Ridge Ventures LLC**

Consultant Comments: Site Plan and MDP

Original Submission: July 3rd, 2014

Revision: August 14th, 2014

ID	Comment	Responses	Reference Plans
MA	<b><u>Mary Ann Johnson</u></b>		
84	The SEQR Findings Statement - Section L. Recreation, Open Space Resources and Tourism states in the mitigation subsection that the Planning Board may impose a fee in lieu of during Site Plan review. Consideration should be given as to whether or not there is a need to expand town recreational facilities as a result of the proposed project.	Please see response to comment #177 (Memo: David Everett)	
85	Sheet C5.09. There appear to be many locations where interactions between golf carts, pedestrians and cars can occur in the Village Green. Can the applicant provide some rationale for the layout and design of these roads and paths and what will be done to ensure the safety of pedestrians at the interaction points? Can you clearly distinguish between cart paths vs. pedestrian path?	Signage will be provided for safety to alert golf cart users of pedestrian crossings. Please refer to Site Plan Sheet C6.01-C6.05 for the Traffic Circulation and Signage. Please refer to MDP Sheet C-1 Path Diagram for indication of pedestrian and golf cart circulation.	Site Plan Sheet C6.01 to C6.05
86	Sheet C5.09. Many of the paths seem to cross lot lines. Can you alter the location to minimize the crossing of multiple lot lines?	The applicant has rearranged the lot lines so that the pedestrian paths are located outside the townhouse property lines. The pedestrian paths that are located within the lots will be allowed by easement.	Site Plan Sheet C5.09
87	Can you move the general store into the Village Green area? It would be more accessible from a pedestrian perspective and would add to the reasons people will visit the Village Green area.	The General Store is intended to provide a positive first impression for prospective purchasers and a first experience of the theme of the resort community. The applicant therefore considers its location to be critical for the successful marketing of the project.	