

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment 2.0-1 (Mr. Goldman, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): ..we have not agreed to accept this project as a Town. You -- it was quoted in the paper that we must be getting used to the idea or because of the low numbers we -- we're accepting the idea and we're going to accept this project. We're not going to accept this project the way it stands. We do not agree to this project.

Response 2.0-1: Public Hearings were held on this project and the requested zone change on June 4, 2009 and on June 8, 2009 to solicit comments from the public. The Ramapo Town Board is interested in receiving all comments as they consider the relative merits of the proposed project.

Comment 2.0-2 (Mr. Romanowski, 177 Maple Avenue, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): This public hearing started off with some comments from Mr. Wortendyke which seemed very disturbing and troubling to me. At this point the applicant is only applying for a zone change. And Mr. Wortendyke is saying that there's going to be a bonus in school taxes, and that few will attend the public schools. How does he -- how is this known at this time, or has it been determined who will be living there? If this project -- was multicultural, it may be more acceptable to the community, but it doesn't seem that to be multicultural, from Mr. Wortendyke's comments.

He also said they'll be affordable homes for mechanics and other trades. Aren't these people going to have any children attending the schools? If this housing is for a specific segment of the community, isn't that called discrimination?

Response 2.0-2: The Patrick Farm project will be open to any and all persons who wish to live here, it will not be restricted or segmented in any way. In addition to the proposed market rate townhouses, the applicant intends to provide below market rate workforce condominium flats and community service rental apartments, to meet the established need, as defined in the Comprehensive Plan, for the Town of Ramapo and the surrounding area.

Comment 2.0-3 (Mr. Rakower, 2 Quince Lane, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2008): I'm here to recommend that the Board vote in favor of Scenic Development's proposal.

My family's lived here, as I said more than 25 years. My wife moved up here when she was only six years old, in 1978. And we are raising our children here. So we'll probably be here for decades to come, that means we have a stake in Ramapo's future and want what's best for the Town and its residents.

My family also owns property along Route 202, adjacent to Patrick Farm. So we have a tremendous interest in how Patrick Farm is developed. We have been following the planning process closely, and believe Town officials and the developer have created a wonderful proposal for the property. More than 40 acres of land will be preserved as open space for the future, which will go a long way to preserving the property's green, country-like nature.

Most of the homes will be built far away from the nearby roads and out of sight, which also helps preserve the feeling of being out in the country.

Over 80 of the single family homes have large setbacks from nearby roads, on one acre lots, which will minimize the impact on the environment and the view. A long host of Route 202 and Route 306 you'll hardly be able to see the houses at all. And, matter of fact, the majority of homes planned, the town houses and the condominiums, will be located at the center of the property, where it won't be visible to the nearby homes or roads. This is a creative solution that let's the developer build the homes along the property, while minimizing the impact on the environment and on the landscape. This is a sound proposal that has been made by a reputable developer, who has been active in Ramapo for decades, so we know we can count on having a high quality neighborhood when it is completed.

Response 2.0-3: *Comment Noted.*

Comment 2.0-4 (Ms. Schwartz, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): And I want to ask the last speaker, if the buildings are so great, then why do we have to talk about hiding them? If it's a good development, then let's be proud. Let's see it.

Response 2.0-4: *Nothing is being hidden. The applicant has provided a ring of single family homes, surrounding the multifamily portion of the project in order to provide a transition between the surrounding neighborhoods of single family homes and the multifamily development proposed.*

Comment 2.0-5 (Mr. Drennen, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): Housing for the work force. Question: How many of the work force people want to live in a rental condo? How many want to live in a town house? I suspect if you pole the work forces, most of them are younger and they want a private home, just like you did when you came here.

Response 2.0-5: *Rental Apartment units and workforce townhouse units are being provided to add to the diversity of housing options in the Town of Ramapo. These units are priced to be more affordable than the single family homes which make up approximately 62% of the housing stock in Ramapo currently. They are being proposed to meet a specific need for persons who wish to live in Ramapo but cannot afford to purchase a single family house.*

Comment 2.0-6 (Mr. Goldman, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): I'd first like to open by asking everybody in favor of this project to stand up.

Now I'd like to ask everybody opposed to this project to stand up.

Not a single person in this room has stood up, including the developers, to say they support this project. How can you support this project? I mean, I respect them as builders. I respect them as businessmen. But if you were trying to present something and you cannot even stand up in front of these people who managed to take themselves here, and in front of you, who availed yourselves this evening to listen to us, I don't understand how you can present this project. This is a project that makes no sense.

Response 2.0-6: *As stated, the project has been designed to meet an established housing need, as described in the Comprehensive Plan, for increased diversity of housing types and price points in Ramapo.*

Comment 2.0-7 (Mr. Sofer, Miele Road, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): I'm volunteering for an organization called Havarum. I'm basically here thinking that there's finally someone who came up and willing to do a project to help volunteers get affordable homes. I think that's the right thing to do.

Response 2.0-7: Comment Noted.

Comment 2.0-8 (Mr. Stefansky, 20 Mariner Way, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): I live in a development that was developed by the builders that are proposing to develop the property in question.

I'd just like to point out that the development that I live in now was built well. I have a quality house in which to raise my family. The neighborhood at the time was concerned, the neighbors were concerned, that the development would impact the community negatively. As it turns out, not only has it been a positive impact to the community, but, as far as I can see, there's people that are constantly walking through our neighborhood because it's a beautiful place to walk, all bringing their bikes there, with their children.

The house that I live in, my children being are brought up in a wonderful, quality house. The builder was honest, and gave us everything he said he was going to give us.

And I think that the proposal that he's proposing now looks like it's the right thing for the property.

Response 2.0-8: Comment Noted.

Comment 2.0-9 (Mr. Servideo, Servideo Landscape, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): Now, it not up to me to decide whether it's right or wrong, but for dealing for ten years with the builder, he's always done over and above what he needed to do. When he handed me plans, he says, how can we make this look right? We switch trees. We switch plants. We added plants. He added sprinkler systems, which no builder does. Very few. He wants the place to look nice.

Again, it's not my place to make a call, but when it comes to beautifying the Town, the neighborhood, whatever it may be, he's doing the right thing.

...I've seen some of the plans for the proposed development. And we're coming up with ideas on how to develop it better than what may even be on the plans.

So all I can attest for, for the last eight-years, is that Liebowitz family, as far as I'm concerned, has gone over and above what they needed to do as far as the plans that they submitted to the Planning Board.

Response 2.0-9: Comment noted. The applicant has developed more than 500 units of single family and multifamily homes locally which have become an asset to the community and in which he kept all commitments which were made. .

Comment 2.0-10 (Mr. Sternhell, 7 Antoinette Court, Public Hearing Transcript, June 8, 2009): Looking very carefully at the presentations presented by the developer, I think the development won't only maintain, it will be landscaped and the overall look of the neighborhood, and I think there's some parts of it that it will improve it. It will look nice.

From what I understand, 45 acres will be preserved as open space. The homes will have large setbacks. And along Route 202 and Route 306 there basically will be no view of any houses at all.

One of the gentleman who spoke earlier said that he understands that Patrick Farm will be developed. So I think we need to focus on who the developer is and their reputation, what you know, what they've built. And I think there was no one here that can say anything bad about them. In fact, they've been around for many, many years, with the pristine reputation. And, these are the people, these are the developers that, we want. Instead of in the future getting a group that's not as qualified, not as well or not as reputable as the developers.

So I urge you tonight to approve the proposal and hopefully the community can get together and work together and make it work for everyone.

Response 2.0-10: Comment noted. As stated above, this applicant stands upon his reputation of keeping his commitments and envisions that the Patrick Farm community will provide a benefit to the Ramapo community.

Comment 2.0-11 (Letter #1, Robert Solomon, Resident, June 9, 2009): The first misperception was yours, Supervisor St. Lawrence, when you indicated to James Walsh, of the Journal News, that judging by the attendance there was a declining interest in this project. Nothing could be further from the truth! My wife and I have been fighting this project for seven years and we are prepared to fight it for another seven years, as are our friends and neighbors. Your misperception may have been caused by the venue in which this hearing was being conducted and that many of our spokespeople had to attend the Democratic Committee meeting in New City.

Response 2.0-11: Comment noted, Public hearings are conducted so that all parties who wish to be heard will have an opportunity.

Comment 2.0-12 (Letter #1, Robert Solomon, Resident, June 9, 2009): Another misperception was that there were only twice as many people speaking against this project. You must be aware that those few poor souls who expressed support for the project were so obviously solicited, (perhaps even paid), by the builder and his agents, that it was embarrassing. In addition, some of them didn't even live in Ramapo, or anywhere near the Patrick Farm.

Response 2.0-12: Comment noted.

Comment 2.0-13 (Letter #1, Robert Solomon, Resident, June 9, 2009): And then, Supervisor St. Lawrence, you are quoted as saying; "...that it's a much better project." Better than what? And better for whom? It almost sounds like you have already made a decision to grant this variance. I pray not.

Response 2.0-13: The applicant has put significant thought into making the a project which meets multiple needs in the Town of Ramapo in addition to providing benefits to the emergency service community while blending in with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Comment 2.0-14 (Letter #3, Lee Ross, Resident, July 1, 2009): As a resident, taxpayer, voter, and citizen of the Town of Ramapo, I wish to express for the record that I am 100% against this project and urge you in the strongest terms to disapprove it.

Response 2.0-14: Comment noted.

Comment 2.0-15 (Letter #3, Lee Ross, Resident, July 1, 2009): This property is historic in nature and is the last and final large undeveloped parcel in the Town ... one of the only places where wildlife continues to prosper.

Response 2.0-15: Section 3.3 of the DEIS discusses the impacts to Ecology and Wetlands including wildlife habitats. Although significant environmental review was conducted including an assessment for Timber Rattlesnakes and Indiana Bats, no federal or state-listed rare animal or plant species, habitats or significant natural communities were identified on the site by project biologists.

Comment 2.0-16 (Letter #4, Doris F. Ulman, Attorney at Law, July 6, 2009): The DEIS continually states that the project consists of 208.5 acres. This is incorrect and misleading. The 12.1 acres on the north side of Route 202 is not contiguous to the project site and cannot be used for the bulk requirements. The total acreage of the project is only 196.4 acres, thereby changing the development coverage, building coverage and FAR calculations.

Response 2.0-16: The 12.1 acres of land on the north side of Route 202 was part of the original parcel, and was later isolated. It was never subdivided, however when Rockland County assigned new section block and lot numbers to this area, the parcel of land north of Route 202 was assigned a separate designation to this area. This area is adjacent open space in the ownership of the project applicant and will be left undisturbed as part of this project. The 12.1 acres on the north side of Route 202 were not included when calculating the allowable FAR or the development coverage of the project.

Comment 2.0-17 (Letter #13, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 7, 2009): It has come to our attention that the comment period deadline for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed amendment to the Town's Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Code amendment and the zone change petition for the above referenced property is July 23, 2009 not July 8, 2009. This extended review period seems advisable given the amount of information to be considered. As indicated in our letter of June 4, 2009, this department will not be issuing a GML review for the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning Code Amendment before reviewing the DEIS. We believe that the information contained within the DEIS is critical to a thorough GML review. We hope to submit our comments on the DEIS on or before the July 23, 2009 deadline for receipt of public comments.

Response 2.0-17: *It is the applicant's intent to facilitate a complete and thorough review of the proposed project and the environmental impact studies in any way possible, and thus an extension of the review deadline until July 23, 2009, as requested by the Rockland County Department of Planning, was accepted.*

Comment 2.0-18 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The final section of the Executive Summary is incorrectly labeled, The Permits and Approvals section should be 1.6. The Municipal approvals by the Town of Ramapo Town Board should include the review of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Response 2.0-18: *Comment noted.*

Comment 2.0-19 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The nine parcels that make up the Patrick Farm site are listed on Page 2-2. Lot 32.11-1-15 is included in the minimum lot area calculation. This 12.1-acre parcel is located on the north side of Route 202 and is not contiguous to the larger site. NYSDEC wetlands comprise 8.46 acres or almost 70 percent of the smaller site. The DEIS must address whether including a non-contiguous parcel is permitted in the Town's Zoning Code.

Response 2.0-19: *The 12.1 acres of land on the north side of Route 202 was part of the original parcel, and was later isolated. It was never subdivided, however when Rockland County assigned new section block and lot numbers to this area, the parcel of land north of Route 202 was assigned a separate designation to this area. This area is adjacent open space in the ownership of the project applicant and will be left undisturbed as part of this project. There is no restriction in the Town Zoning code which prohibits a non-contiguous parcel from being included as part of the project site. The acreage in this parcel was not included in the calculations to meet the applicable zoning requirements.*

Comment 2.0-20 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): Table 2-1 on Page 2-4 should include a comparison of the proposed residential density based on the net lot area of the site. Given the environmental constraints and the utility easements on this parcel, the required lot area deductions are significant. Using the net lot area to determine the residential density allows for a more accurate evaluation of the impact of these encumbrances.

Response 2.0-20: *DEIS Table 2-1 on DEIS Page 2-4 provides gross density figures and is labeled accordingly. Net lot areas have been calculated in accordance with Town of Ramapo Zoning Law §376-42 which discounts 50% of land area based upon the presence of several environmental constraints including overhead utility easements. In addition, DEIS Figure 3.4-1 consists of an overall Site Environmental Encumbrance Map and indicates all environmental constraints and overhead utility easements which are subject to lot area deductions.*

Comment 2.0-21 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The reference to the Rockland County Department of Planning with respect to the coordination of a bus stop location is incorrect. The Rockland County Department of Public Transportation handles these matters. After reviewing the plans, the Rockland County Department of Public Transportation has determined that entering the

housing complex would not be feasible. While the TOR 95 bus route passes by the property on Route 306, entering the complex would add too much time to the route. It would also be dangerous for the bus to travel on such narrow roads. However, if a concrete pad were to be placed on Route 306 along the east side of the property, the Department of Public Transportation would provide a permanent bus shelter. A companion stop would also have to be located on the opposite side of Route 306.

Response 2.0-21: *The applicant will coordinate with the Rockland County Department of Transportation (RCDOT) in order to facilitate bus transportation to and from the project site. The applicant would be willing to install a concrete pad alongside Route 306 on the eastern boundary of the project site upon recommendation from the RCDOT.*

Comment 2.0-22 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009):

The Conceptual Landscape Plan is discussed on Page 2-6. It is stated that the perimeter of the site would be amply landscaped with a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees to screen the residential development from adjoining properties and roads. The location of the 61.3 acres to be rezoned in the central portion of the site is noted, as well as the fact that the surrounding single-family development and the proposed landscaped areas would visually insulate this area. A Construction Section Schedule is presented on Pages 2-6 and 2-7. Section 1 involves the construction of 49 percent of the multi-family units. Only 19 percent of the single-family residences will be constructed during this phase. The remaining 51 percent of the multi-family units will be constructed during Sections 2 and 3. Another 24 percent of the single-family residential lots will be constructed in Section 4. An additional four sections are proposed to complete construction of the remaining 57 percent of the single-family residences. The only overlap that may occur is grading and landscaping taking place on one portion of the site while construction is going on at another location. This construction section schedule raises a number of issues. How will the ring of single-family residences around the perimeter of the site buffer the view of the multi-family development if the majority of these residences are not constructed until the final phases of construction? Based on the five-year time frame, it is very likely that adjacent property owners will have a clear view of the multi-family housing for several years as clearing and grading precedes construction of the R-40 zoned area. Interim visual mitigation measures necessary to screen views of this construction activity and the multi-family residences from the adjacent properties must be addressed in the DEIS. In addition, future market conditions may make it economically infeasible to complete the final phases of this proposal, which is planned to provide the transition of multi-family residences to the rural residential areas in the surrounding villages.

Response 2.0-22: *Construction of the multifamily housing is proposed for the interior of the site. On three sides of this proposed multifamily, areas zoned for single family housing which are significant vegetative buffers, and the intervening view will be of undisturbed forest or open space until such time as the single family homes are constructed. The proposed multifamily development will be most visible from the location of the proposed access on US Route 202. Figure 2-7 in the DEIS provides a photo simulation of the entrance area, which illustrates the moderate view of the multifamily units from NYS Route 202. Although the units will be somewhat visible during off-leaf conditions, the remaining 100 foot undisturbed area provides significant screening of this view. There is more than 800 feet of intervening topography and vegetation between Scenic Road and the nearest point of the zone change area. Construction related impacts, including clearing and replanting of vegetated areas are considered unavoidable and are temporary in nature.*

Comment 2.0-23 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The Ramapo Commons Market Analysis is discussed on Page 2-11. It notes that there is a critical need for market and affordable multi-family units to service the region. The Terrace View project is also mentioned. The DEIS implies that sales activity for this development is brisk. The numbers presented in the DEIS indicate that less than one-third of the 140 units actually built have been sold. It is not clearly demonstrated in the DEIS that housing for a wider range of income levels will be provided. Of the 497 proposed units, 19 percent can be considered affordable. Page 2-12 states that "the applicant is not proposing housing wherein the residents must meet affordability criteria set by the Rockland County Housing Coalition or other similar agency." It is therefore not clear how eligibility for the 72 workforce condominium flats or the 24 rental apartments will be determined.

Response 2.0-23: The Market Demand Housing Analysis, which is included in this FEIS as Appendix D, provides further information on the continued sales at Terrace View. The 72 units of proposed workforce housing are proposed to be sold below market value and will include deed restrictions to stipulate the amount of time they must be held prior to resale and to limit the amount of profit which can be made upon resale. Eligibility for the 24 units of community service worker apartments will be managed by a municipal housing authority or a not for profit housing agency.

Comment 2.0-24 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): In referencing the Rockland County Comprehensive Plan, the DEIS incorrectly states on page 2-12 that the River to Ridge Land Use Plan specifically designated Route 202 adjacent to the project site as a limited business corridor and that the County Plan envisioned potential light industrial uses at this site. River to Ridge very clearly recommended a rural density zoning district designation for this parcel. A minimum lot area requirement of 80,000 SF was specified. The light industrial zoning was proposed on Route 202 east of Camp Hill Road, almost a mile east of Patrick Farm.

Response 2.0-24: The River Ridge Plan was never formally adopted by the Rockland County Government and must be used only as a general guideline.

Comment 2.0-25 (Letter #16, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): While the proposed groundwater recharge system honors the intent of the Special Resources Overlay Zoning, the proposed development is not the best alternative in terms of minimizing impacts to the on-site environmental resources. The proposed mixed density project consisting of 497-units would disturb almost 33 more acres of this site than the 136 single-family residences permitted as of right under the existing R-40 zoning. The proposed construction disturbance would consist of woodlands and areas of steep slopes in excess of 25 percent.

Response 2.0-25: The project as proposed does its best to strike a balance between meeting the need, as described in the Comprehensive Plan, for diversified housing and reducing the environmental impacts to the greatest extent practical. As is acknowledged, the proposed groundwater recharge system honors the intent of the Special Resources Overlay Zoning, and the project has been designed to insure that following development there will be zero net loss in groundwater recharge at the site.

Comment 2.0-26 (Letter #16, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The Villages of Pomona and Wesley Hills have raised objections to this proposal based on community character issues and Infrastructure capacity concerns related to traffic, water quantity and quality, drainage, stormwater runoff and sanitary sewer service. The areas of countywide concern noted above that directly impact the Villages of Pomona and Wesley Hills must be considered and satisfactorily addressed, as well as any additional concerns about the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Map.

Response 2.0-26: The applicant has conducted detailed studies which address the Infrastructure capacity concerns noted above including, traffic, water quantity and quality, drainage, stormwater runoff and sanitary sewer service. With regard to community character, the project as proposed provides a transitional area to buffer existing single family land use with similar development. The need for diversity of housing in this area, as described in the Comprehensive Plan, is a regional need in light of the fact that there are no multifamily housing opportunities in either the Village of Pomona or the Village of Wesley Hills.

Comment 2.0-27 (Letter #19, John F. Lange, Senior Associate for Planning, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.): The Comprehensive Plan recommended clustering for this parcel. Is there a way to cluster to preserve additional open space on the single family homes?

Response 2.0-27: Clustering allows design flexibility in order to preserve open space, to allow development to occur on the less sensitive areas of the site and enable preservation of the most sensitive areas of the site. The Patrick Farm project has in effect clustered the more intensive development on the multifamily portion of the site and left the areas of wetlands and steep slopes undisturbed, thereby achieving the goals of clustering. No further clustering of the single family portion of the project is proposed.

Comment 2.0-28 (Letter #19, John F. Lange, Senior Associate for Planning, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.): The applicant indicates that the proposed use fits into the character of the neighborhood. Additional background information should be provided to support this contention.

Response 2.0-28: Of the total 208.5 acre project site, less than 30 percent is included in the zone change application, the remaining 70 percent will remain zoned for single family residential. The project design included a transitional buffer of single family lots in order to remain consistent with the surrounding land uses. Upon approval of the request for a zone change the entire parcel will remain as a residential use which is consistent with the existing community character.

Comment 2.0-29 (Letter #19, John F. Lange, Senior Associate for Planning, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.): The design of the project should be refined to the extent practicable to more closely reflect the sensitive nature of the land of Patrick Farms capitalizing on the site's natural assets and overcoming its liabilities. The assets of this site to focus the design on are:

- Water features including ponds, streams and wetlands
- Slope changes and elevation changes and ridgelines
- Significant forested areas
- Natural vistas
- Archaeological assets

The liabilities that must be overcome are:

- High pressure gas main
- Overhead utility lines
- Slopes in excess of 25%

Response 2.0-29: *The project as proposed preserves all Archaeological assets. Both the Conklin Family cemetery and the Mather Farmstead sites have been preserved intact and will be made available as cultural resources to the community. The project was modified during the course of environmental review to enhance preservation of the significant ridgeline along US Route 202 in the western portion of the property. The total area of disturbance is 113.7 acres out of 208.5, thus 94.8 acres or 45 percent of the project site remains undisturbed. The majority of the undisturbed area is heavily forested, and includes the areas of steep slopes and wetlands. Only 6.4 percent of the site consists of slopes greater than 25 percent and there is minimal development proposed in these areas. Columbia Gas has reviewed the proposed site plan and has indicated preliminary approval upon compliance with their established safety guidelines, which the applicant has committed to. There is no development proposed within the overhead utility easement.*

The Patrick Farm site design has been prepared to focus on the natural assets of the site as follows:

- *Water features will be featured at 9 proposed ponds. Streams and wetlands will not be disturbed.*
- *Site grading and layout has been designed to complement slope and elevation changes. Ridgelines are either avoided or treated with design sensitivity. Single-family lots 1, 2, & 3 are situated near to a ridge and a common driveway was used to access the lots in order to avoid a greater amount of disturbance that would have been associated with a typical Town road. The type of design approach is recommended by the Town Scenic Road District Law.*
- *The existing farm pond is a vista that will be enhanced as part of the Patrick Farm development. A proposed promenade around the pond will provide pedestrian access to the pond vista. Also, existing wetlands and watercourses will be preserved and will provide vistas under the proposed development plan.*

- *As discussed above the two existing archeological sites, the Conklin Family Cemetery and the J. Mather Farmstead will be preserved and public access to both will be provided.*

The Patrick Farm site design has been prepared to avoid existing site constraints as follows:

- *Gas main crossings will be performed in compliance with Columbia Gas guidelines.*
- *Crossings below Orange & Rockland (O&R) overhead electric lines will be performed in compliance with O&R guidelines.*
- *Steep slopes will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Figure 3.1-6 of the DEIS is a Slope Disturbance Map and indicates that 3.4% of the site disturbance is proposed at areas with slopes of 25% or greater.*

Comment 2.0-30 (Letter #19, John F. Lange, Senior Associate for Planning, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.): The DEIS should describe how the proposed open space areas provide balance to the developed areas of the site. Effective open spaces provide paths, (other than roads) to link different areas, lead to scenic vistas, and recreation areas as well as vegetated areas to buffer residential developments. The applicant may wish to consider providing community recreation facilities such as a club house, tennis courts, basketball courts, and meeting rooms.

Response 2.0-30: *As shown on Figure 2-5 the applicant has provided a walking trail around the recreational farm pond located in the center of the project site. The pedestrian facilities also link the residential areas of the site with NYS Route 202 where access to Harriman State Park is available. Refer to Response 2.0-29 for additional detail on pedestrian vistas.*

Preliminary site plans depict several playgrounds with a combined area well in excess of the minimum requirement for recreation area. In addition, the Applicant is committed to adding other recreational features as determined by the Planning Board throughout the MR-8 portion of the site. Additional playground areas will be added as the Site Plan becomes more fully designed for the Site Plan Application.