Patrick Farm SUBDIVISION Application for Preliminary Plat Approval

Reponses to Comments from October 25, 2010 Public Hearing November 22, 2010

Responses have been prepared by the offices of:
Terry Rice, Esq.
Tim Miller Associates
Leonard Jackson Associates

The format of this document is:

Part I: Summary Table of Outstanding Items from October 25, 2010 Public Hearing.

Part II: Back-Up Information Supporting Items Discussed in Part I.



NOV 2 9 2010

TOWN OF RAMAPO
BUILDING • PLANNING • ZONING

Part I: Summary Table of Outstanding Items from October 25, 2010 Public Hearing

<u> </u>	Outstanding Item	Response Summary
1	Report: The Concerns with the	The Report challenged three aspects of the completed
	Design of the Patrick Farm	Environmental Review:
	Development Submitted to the	Potential water supply impacts
	Town of Ramapo Planning Board,	The timber rattlesnake assessment and
	October 25, 2010.	The box turtle assessment.
		Potential water supply impacts:
		Potential impacts are not significant and will be
		discussed in further detail in a forthcoming document
		to be submitted under separate cover. In addition, a
		detailed discussion of this topic will be presented to
		the Planning Board on November 29, 2010.
		Timber rattlesnake assessment:
1		The assessment was performed by Jason Tesauro
		Consulting, LLC and he stands by the conclusions of
l		his investigation. Attachment "A" in Part 2 of this document is a November 11, 2010 report by Jason
		Tesauro Consulting which defends his assessment and
		his qualifications.
		Box turtle assessment:
	·	The box turtle assessment was performed by both
		Carpenter Environmental Associates and Tim Miller
		Associates. Attachment "B" in Part 2 of this document
		is a November 16, 2010 report by Tim Miller
		Associates which provides a complete review of the
	·	assessment as provided as part of the finished
		Environmental Review. The information previously
L		provided stands.
2	Columbia Gas Comments	Review comments were requested by CDRC.
		Attachment "C" in Part 2 of this document is an
		October 28, 2010 letter from Columbia Gas.
		Columbia's comments are relatively minor in nature.
l		Many of the comments include the following
		statements: "No engineering impacts are noted," or
		"is not objectionable to Columbia". The Applicant
_	ATTOO OF	will comply with all of Columbia's comments.
3	NYSDOT	The Planning Board has inquired into the ongoing
		NYSDOT review. A coordination meeting was held
		with the DOT on November 10, 2010. The meeting
		outlined the framework for compliance with the October 15, 2010 DOT review comments. The
		Applicant will comply with all of the DOT's comments.
4	Palisades Interstate Park	A coordination meeting was held with the PIPC on
*	Commission	November 16, 2010 which resulted in a November 17.
	- California	2010 resubmission which is included as Attachment
		"D" in Part 2 of this document. We anticipate a
ш		and a summary in a unitary and a

		11.
		positive response from the PIPC and will provide the Planning Board with any forthcoming correspondence
		we receive from the PIPC.
5	Workforce and Volunteer Housing Agreement	This document incorporates the criteria, pertaining to Workforce and Community Service Worker housing, set forth in our Response 11 from our October 6, 2010 submission, into a formalized agreement ready for execution by the Town of Ramapo. This document is included as Attachment "E" in Part 2 of this document.
6	Public comment made at the	The East Ramapo School district has been
	October 25, 2010 public hearing	experiencing declining enrollments for several years.
	regarding Impact on the East	The influx of additional students projected to live at
	Ramapo School District	Patrick Farm would be a beneficial impact. As
	_	described in Attachment "F", a total of 609 students
	,	are expected to live at Patrick Farm, of which 201
		students are projected to attend the East Ramapo
		Central Schools. The total cost to educated the public
		and private school students is estimated to be
		\$2,621,574, whereas the total school taxes projected
		from development of the project site are projected to
		be 3,215,732, thus the district is expected to realize a net benefit, after covering costs, of more than
	· ·	\$750,000 annually. Please refer to Attachment "F" for a
		more detailed description of this analysis.
7	Scenic Roads District	Response 8 and Appendix A from the October 6, 2010
		Planning Board Submission provided the Planning
		Board with a thorough review of how the development
		complies with the intent and the requirements of
		Chapter 215 of the Town Code. In addition, the
	ŧ	Applicant has further enhanced development plans to
		identify how rock walls will be rebuilt along Route 202
		and how a new rock wall will be built along the
		frontage of the Volunteer Housing Site. The Volunteer
		Housing wall will require archeological oversight and can only be constructed if no significant artifacts are
		unearthed. Attachment "G" provides sketches of the
		proposed walls that have been added.
LL		proposed man that have soon duded

Part II: Back-Up Information Supporting Items Discussed in Part I.

Attachments

- A. November 11, 2010 report by Jason Tesauro Consulting.
- B. November 16, 2010 report by Tim Miller Associates.
- C. October 28, 2010 letter from Columbia Gas.
- D. November 17, 2010 resubmission to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission.
- E. November 22, 2010 Workforce and Volunteer Housing Agreement.
- F. September 27, 2010 Excerpts from DEIS Comm. Services and Fiscal Analysis (Impact on the East Ramapo School District)
- G. Proposed Stone Walls at Scenic Road District