

EXHIBIT "M"

**FREDERICK P. CLARK ASSOCIATES, INC.**  
CDRC STC:  
Planning/Development/Environment/Transportation  
Rye, New York and Fairfield, Connecticut

350 Theodore Fremd Avenue  
Rye, New York 10580  
(914) 967-6540 • FAX (914) 967-6615

David H. Stolman, AICP, PP  
Michael A. Galante

PLANNING BOARD  
 CONSULTANT  
 BLDG. DEPT.  
 D.P.W.  
 TOWN ATTY  
 REC'D

Joanne P. Meder, AICP

David J. Portman, FAICP

**MEMORANDUM**

*D. Stolman*  
DATE 7-21-10

To: Alan Simon – Director of Planning and Zoning Administration  
Date: July 19, 2010  
Subject: Patrick Farm Subdivision Review - Town of Ramapo

**General Comments:** This office, as requested, has received and reviewed a set of plans for the subdivision prepared by Leonard Jackson Associates Inc, consisting of 83 sheets, dated May 24<sup>th</sup> 2010. This office did not receive a narrative to accompany the plans, so a few questions raised during the review will have to wait for CDRC to be answered.

**Environmental Comments:** The environmental review was completed during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement under the SEQRA process for the overall development. The environmental review permitted the tree survey to be completed at the time of subdivision and site plan. However, the tree survey provided is just a list and does not depict the actual location of the trees. Please provide a map of the trees on a subdivision/housing location/grading map so that comments on impacts can be fully determined.

**Site Plan Comments:** This office offers the following comments on the Subdivision Plan.

**RECEIVED**

JUL 21 2010

TOWN OF RAMAPO

1. Although the subdivision plan includes a bulk table to demonstrate basic compliance with the bulk requirements, the plans showing housing locations sites do not have dimensions to verify compliance. Please provide.
2. The practical division of some of the lots provides houses that do not meet one or more of the bulk requirements, or offer a lot that is either non-desirable or barely developable. One lot shows a 20 foot setback from the street. Others have extensive areas that are not usable. (See item 24 of this list for further clarification of lot deficiencies)
3. The drainage basins are shown on individual lots. They should be placed on homeowner association property. As shown they severely restrict use of the individual lots they are located on. Common facilities should be located on common property. In the case of lot 79, no homes are included on the lot, just drainage basins. In other cases, the drainage basins have been placed on individual lots with homes, decreasing the usable lot size and values.
4. There are excessive slopes on proposed roadways. In some cases the roads meet the maximum permitted slope of 10 % but require walls on both sides to complete the cuts required to service the lots. The walls on both sides of the street are six or more foot tall providing a road with a 10 % slope with elevation changes of 12 feet or more from the walls supporting the roadway. This is not low impact development as was expected from the EIS process.
5. The amount of grading on specific lots is excessive and should be reduced in view of reducing the impacts to the natural environment and in lieu of low impact development requirements. It will not be possible to save any trees on some of the proposed single family homes with the amount of grading proposed
6. Lot 79 shows the water quality basin directly adjacent to the proposed home. The home should be a minimum of 100 feet from a basin. The basin is shown approximately 10 feet from the building outline. The amount of grading is excessive.
7. Lot 23 has WQ basin number 6 covering most of the lot and approximately 50 feet from the rear building line.
8. Lot 81 has a 16 foot drop in elevation right off the building line and the grading depicted is excessive. No tree preservation can be accomplished on this area.
9. Sheet 83 shows a list of trees, but these tree *locations* should be shown on the subdivision plans so that design efforts to preserve the maximum number of trees can be conducted. A list of trees does not show their locations. Please provide.

10. Lot 22 and 13 share a common driveway.
11. Lot 33 has WQ Basin number 5 on the lot.
12. The driveway for lot 51 crosses the volunteer housing lot and also serves at the public access to the archaeological site. This is not a good combination.
13. The house on lot 67 has the building foundation directly on the easement line for the high pressure gas main and 25 feet from the high pressure gas main marker. This is not a recommended location for a home.
14. Lots 72 and 73 show WQ Basin number 10 spanning their property. Almost fifty percent of these properties are dedicated to the drainage system leaving this portion of their lots unusable.
15. Lots 67 and 69 share a common driveway.
16. In accordance with the subdivision regulations Section 21 F, the applicant should prepare temporary staking in preparation for a site visit by CDRC and/or the planning board. The centerlines of the roads should be staked so that CDRC and Planning Board members can walk the site and get a feel for how the roads will fit the topography. A site visit should be arranged as soon as possible.
17. In accordance with Section 40 (C), all homes should have frontage on an improved road. This subdivision relies on common driveways to serve residences without proper frontage on an improved road. New subdivisions should be created without common driveways and inadequate road frontages.
18. Section 41 Roads, subsection A requires that roads shall be related appropriately to the topography. Local roads shall be curved wherever possible to avoid conformity of lot appearance. *Streets shall be arranged so as to obtain as many as possible of the building sites at or above the grade of the streets. Grades of streets shall conform as closely as possible to the original topography. A combination of steep grades and curves shall be avoided.* Specific standards are in article IV, Section 41 (I) of the subdivision regulations.
19. Many lots have irregular boundaries and side yards that will not be perpendicular to the street. These should be eliminated. *Section (D) Side lot lines requires, "In general, side lot lines shall be at right angles to street lines (or radial to curving street lines) unless in the opinion of the Planning Board a variation from this rule will result in a better street or lot plan. The Planning Board will discourage the use of small angular sections of lots that have no useful purpose by discounting those areas in calculating minimum lot size."* This subdivision has many instances of irregular areas.

20. Section (I), regarding trees states that "No existing trees shall be removed from any portion of any required side yard of a subdivision created pursuant to these regulations." The grading plans violate this provision on many of the lots. This should not be waived and the applicant will have to demonstrate how this regulation can be implemented on a lot by lot basis.
21. The table of recreation requirements requires that 3% of the total land be preserved for recreation. It is noted that this is active recreation, not open space. Please designate compliance with the required 3% for the single family portion of the development.
22. The minimum size of a recreation area "shall have an area of at least four acres...and have a total frontage on one or more streets of at least 200 feet." Please demonstrate compliance with this regulation.
23. For the record, the above recreation standards are the minimum requirements
24. Section 45 subsection B (4) requires that low lying lands subject to flooding or overflowing during storm events, whether or not included in areas for deductions, shall be preserved and retained in their natural state as drainage ways. Such lands or lands subject to periodic flooding shall not be computed in determining the number of lots to be utilized... nor for computing the area requirements of any lot. It appears that many lots in the proposed subdivision rely heavily on the use of these prohibited areas. Please adjust as appropriate.
25. Section 46 subsection (A) states, "No trees shall be removed from any subdivision nor any change of grade of the land effected until the final plat has been filed. All trees on the plat required to be retained shall be preserved, and where required, all trees shall be welled and otherwise protected against change of grade. The sketch plat shall show the number and location of existing trees, and shall further indicate all those marked for retention, which shall be keyed to a table listing species, height, caliper and condition as certified by a licensed landscape architect or botanist. The public improvement security shall include the amount as set forth in the standard schedule of fees.

---

Should you have any comments on this review, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Kind regards,

John Lange

Senior Associate / Planning  
F. P. Clark Associates, Inc.

