

January 23, 2019

Mr. Ray Burger, Director of Planning  
Town of Dryden  
93 E. Main Street  
Dryden, NY 13053

**Re: Response to December 6, 2018 Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
Townhomes at Dryden project**

Dear Mr. Burger:

Below are the comments from the December 6, 2018 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. These are comments from the Planning Board that were discussed that evening. We have revised the SEQR form to reflect these comments and/or provided responses to those comments. Please note that the SEQR form has been updated to the 2019 form since that is now required as of January 1, 2019.

1A - Brief Description of Proposed Action – Does not list the number of stories. The number is important. Four story buildings are in conflict with the design guidelines for Varna. R Burger will check “stories” as defined in the building code.

**Response: Based on the Building Code, a basement is not defined as a story above a grade plane. For the lowest level to be considered a basement, the height from average grade around the building to the first floor above can be no more than 6’. Based on the grading plan, which will be submitted to the Town for review and final approval, all buildings with 4 levels will have an average grade around the building to be less than 6’ below the first level. Therefore, the lowest level of these building would be considered a basement and not a story above the grade plan, so all buildings are 3-stories with a maximum height less than 40’ based on the Zoning Code. Computations will be provided with the final grading plan when submitted to the Town.**

1B – Government Approvals – no comments

**Response: This comment has been noted.**

1C - Planning & Zoning –

1C.2(a) Is answered yes. Should a statement be added that identifies that the plan shows use of the location that is different and in conflict with the proposed use? The board decided the answer is sufficient because they must address it later.

**Response: This comment has been noted.**

1C.3(c) – Is a Zoning change requested as part of the proposed action? Applicant indicates no. The Planning Board questions the green space calculation and what is included in that calculation. The answer might be yes because of that.

**Response: This section has been revised to “yes” to add in the 15’ setback from the buffer per Section 909.B.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. Based on discussions with the Planning staff, we feel the green space calculations are correct.**

1C.3(c) – What police or other public protection forces serve the project site? – This should say NYS Police and Tompkins County Sheriff.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated.**

1C.3(d) -What parks serve the project site? Should state Cornell Botanic Garden, Monkey Run Natural Area, Ellis Hollow Nature Preserve and Dryden Rail Trail.

D.1 Project Details

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated.**

D.1(a) - parking garage should be added.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated.**

D.1(f) - 219 is listed under multiple family and indicates the number of dwelling units. Planning Board would like this broken down into the number of 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 bedroom units according to the Town Board resolution. Note: It is a decision of the Town Board whether to grant LEED or redevelopment bonus and these numbers take that into consideration.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated to show this additional information.**

D.1(g) – Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)? The number listed is 2. Planning Board believes this is incorrect and the whole section should be updated and corrected.

**Response:** The SEQR form has been updated.

D.1(h) – The source of water to be impounded is not just stormwater runoff. The Planning Board noted two streams on the site that should be listed. Any study should include offsite water from nearby creeks and other places and percolation/infiltration calculations need to be made correctly.

**Response:** The SWPPP will show the stormwater runoff coming to the pond from both offsite and on-site sources. The offsite sources will be routed through the pond and released at the same rate as it is existing. The on-site sources will be detained and released to pre-developments rates. Therefore, the rate of water released from the pond to the downstream channel, will not increase above the pre-development rate. Proposed Infiltration rates for the Green Infrastructure component of the SPDES Permit will be provided in the SWPPP when the infiltration rate is provided from the Geotechnical Engineer. At the time of this submission, the Geotechnical Engineer has not finalized their analysis. Updated SWPPP will be provided under a separate submission.

## D.2 Project Operations

D.2(a) Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both? Applicant answered no. The Planning Board notes this should potentially be yes. There appears to be a need for dredging of a pond and significant excavation on the site that needs to be elaborated in this section.

**Response:** This has been revised to “yes”. The pond will be drained, and reconstruction so there will not be a need for dredging. The existing soil on the bottom of the pond will be dried and reused. However, there will be a need to remove dirt from the site due to the site not balancing due the complexity of the site layout and existing topography.

D.2(b) Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area? Applicant has checked yes and talks about a .5-acre wetland area. Planning Board states because a wetland will be reconstructed to a size of .9 acres applicant should give more details on reconstruction of the wetland.

**Response:** The area of the wetlands has been corrected. The previous form showed an estimate of the wetlands disturbed. The new amount of wetland disturbance is +/- 0.53

acres. While the pond will be larger than this, the expansion of the pond will be made outside the wetland boundaries. In addition, the stream crossing will utilize an open bottom culvert to avoid disturbing the wetlands at that crossing.

D.2(c) – Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water? Applicant answered yes. Planning Board disagrees with the computation (boarding school) used to reach listed figure of 47,250 gallons per day. The manual says it should be 110 gallons per person per day (not the 75 gallons per day used by the applicant. J Wilson suggested a range of use would be more appropriate.

Note: A population increase means an increase in town services and a burden on the rest of town to pay for this. The board should think about cumulative impacts.

**Response:** The amount has been revised to show a range, based on this comment and comments provide by the T.G. Miller. The lower range is the amount that T.G. Miller has been seeing from other apartments in the area and the upper range is the amount based on NYSDEC requirements.

D.2(d) – Planning Board has same concerns with sewage as with water above.

**Response:** See response above.

D.2(e) – Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff? Planning Board would like the applicant to justify the statement that it is minimizing impervious surfaces.

**Response:** A note has been added to SEQR form. The note states that the impervious area is being minimized by providing the necessary parking within a parking structure. Therefore, the footprint of the impervious surfaces is reduced.

Please note that this impervious area is not a direct correlation to the Green Open Space Computation. There are items defined in the Town's Zoning Ordinance that count toward Green Open Space that are also impervious (i.e. SWM Facilities, some sidewalks, etc.). Even though it counts toward Green Open Space, the impervious area will still need to be counted for the SPDES Permit.

D.2(f) – Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations? Is marked No. Kimberly Hansen of Trinitas stated there will be no gas and they will be using heat pumps (model has been supplied to the Planning Department).

**Response: This comment has been noted and no gas will be brought to the site.**

D.2(j) – Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services? Is marked No. The Planning Board questions this response and recommends an independent study or mark it Yes. Any traffic study should include the intersections of Freese Road/Route 366, Game Farm Road/Route 366, Turkey Hill Road/Mt Pleasant Road, Turkey Hill Road/Stevenson Road, Stevenson Road/Game Farm Road, Turkey Hill Road/Route 366 and the exit from the development and address shift times.

**Response: The SEQR form has been revised to mark this answer as “yes”. A revised traffic study will be submitted under a separate submission.**

D.2(k)(i) – Estimate annual electricity demand during the operation of the proposed action. Planning Board would like this item completed.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated with an estimate. The Electrical Engineer will supply a closer estimate after calculations are completed.**

D.2(l) - Hours of operation. This appears to be office hours. Planning Board believes this should be 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. People come and go all the time in an apartment complex.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated to show hours of operations for all uses.**

D.2(n)(i) – Outdoor Lighting – It was noted that the Conservation Board has suggested yellow lighting.

**Response: The applicant is proposing energy efficient LED lighting and will be designated to prevent light pollution by shielding the light sources and directing light downwards, away from the night sky, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. A Photometric Analysis has been provided on the previous submission.**

D.2(n)(ii) – Applicant says minimum tree removal, but it has been stated all trees would be removed. A landscaping plan is being submitted by the applicant.

**Response:** Tree removal is being minimized to the furthest extent possible through the use of retaining walls. A landscaping plan has been provided on the previous submission to show the use of existing trees within the buffers.

D.2(r) – Again there was some confusion about whether the project qualifies as commercial. The Planning Board would like the questions in D.2(r) i, ii, and iii answered because it is a large project.

**Response:** The SEQR form has been updated to provide this information.

E.1 – Land Uses on and surrounding the project site

E.1(d) – Facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities – Planning Board believes the daycare facility at the Varna Community Association should be noted.

**Response:** The SEQR form has been updated to add this information.

E.2 – Natural Resources on or Near Project Site

E.2(e) – Drainage status of project site soils. Planning Board notes that nearly 50% of the project site being poorly drained is a red flag for potential flooding and management of stormwater and is a concern.

**Response:** The SWPPP addresses the existing and proposed soils. The routing of the existing site and the proposed site considers the poorly drained soils. There will be no net increase in the water leaving the site. The proposed plan will divert water from disturbed areas to proposed Stormwater Management Facilities, which will have outfalls to a defined channel or a closed conduit system. Currently, some water leaving the site, sheet flows off the property to adjacent properties. This plan will help reduce that water impacting adjacent properties.

E.2(f) – Slopes – Planning Board notes that 30% of the site being greater than a 10% slope is a red flag.

**Response:** This comment has been noted.

E.2(h)(i) and (iv)– Does the project site contain wetlands? Should be Yes. It was noted the Conservation Board commented about the stream on the property. Planning Board noted there are two streams and a wetland on the property.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated to correct his information.**

E.2(m) – Identify predominant wildlife species that occupy the property. There is more than those listed. Applicant has submitted a report.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated based on information from the wetland consultant.**

E.3 – Designated Public Resources on or Near Project Site

E.3(f) Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory? This was left blank and should be marked No.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated. It is marked “no” as commented and as researched through SHPO.**

E.3(h) – correct (i) to read Cornell Botanic Gardens. Planning Board would like the following also listed: Fall Creek Corridor Unique Natural Area, Monkey Run Unique Natural Area, Federally designated Fall Creek Wetland, Cayuga Trail, Federally designated Freese Road Bridge (eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Structures).

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated to add this additional information.**

Additional Information – Requested by Planning Board

Detailed information about the anticipated use of energy and emissions.

**Response: The SEQR form has been updated to show this additional information.**

It would be helpful to have the applicant's responses to the County's 239 with respect to energy and D.2(f) would be an appropriate place to put that information.

**Response: This comment has been noted and the applicant will supply this information under a separate submission.**

D.2(e)(i) - Conservation Board notes that impervious surface is too high; maximum permitted in town zoning is 6.5 acres. Ray Burger will investigate that and respond to the Conservation Board.

**Response: This comment has been noted and awaiting further information from the Town.**

Site Plan comments by Planning Board:

1. Title of drawing, including name and address of applicant and person responsible for preparation of the drawing. *No comment.*
2. Boundaries of the property, plotted to scale, and including north arrow, scale and date. *No comment.*
3. Identification of public highways. *No comment.*
4. Existing watercourses and wetlands. *No comment.*
5. Grading and drainage plan showing existing and proposed contours. *Drainage is a concern and may be addressed in the SWPPP.*

**Response: The finalized SWPPP will address drainage and will be submitted to T.G. Miller as part of the final site plan.**

6. Location, design and type of construction, proposed use and exterior dimensions of all buildings. No comment. Planning Board would like more detail and dimensions in the renderings, the view from Mt Pleasant Road and more detail on construction of the buildings.

**Response: Additional renderings have been submitted with this submission, as requested by T.G. Millers comment letter.**



7. Location, design and type of construction of all parking and truck loading areas showing ingress and egress to the public highway. *There should be sight lines at points of egress.*

**Response:** Sight Distance Plan and profiles have been provided with the previous submission. The location provided are along Mt. Pleasant Road since those are the most critical locations based on topography. Sight Lines have been provided along Rte. 366 on the site layout. Profiles for that area are not needed due to the flat topography on that road.

8. Provisions for pedestrian access including sidewalks along public highways. *The only sidewalk on Mt Pleasant Road is along the property edge. There should be a sidewalk with designated entrance for pedestrians to the parking garage. Planning Board would like detailed drawings for the inside of the garage with respect to pedestrians. There is a parking area for the garden and applicant should be responsible for connecting to the sidewalk at that location. Sidewalk construction should be coordinated with DOT and their plan for sidewalks along Route 366. There should be benches along the sidewalks and in the garden area in accordance with the design guidelines for Varna.*

**Response:** A sidewalk has been provided along the road frontage along Rte. 366, including the parcel between the entrance and the Community Garden. That sidewalk is within the Right-of-way so it can be installed. A sidewalk has also been provided from Mt. Pleasant to the garage. These sidewalks will be coordinated with NYS DOT. Garage plans were provided on the previous submission and further designs have not progressed further until the SEQR has had a declaration on it.

9. Pedestrian facilities shall be ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant. *No comment.*

10. Sidewalks must be constructed continuously across all driveways. *No comment.*

11. Provisions for bicycle parking, such as bicycle racks or bicycle lockers as appropriate. All bicycle parking devices shall be provided in accordance with guidelines published by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professions (APBP). Some portion of the bicycle parking should be provided in a covered area protected from the weather. *Applicant states there is designated bicycle parking in the parking garage. There are several bicycle racks around the property.*

**Response:** As part of the additional density, through the Green Neighborhood Development section of the Zoning Ordinance (Section 706), the applicant will need to provide 40 LEED points. Some of those points will be coming from providing bicycle storage areas in the forms of racks. In order to achieve the credit, the applicant will be providing 1 space per unit (219\*1=219 spaces), 1 space for every 10 dwelling units

( $219/10=22$  spaces) and 30% of the planned occupancy ( $30\%*219=166$ ) for a total of 407 bike parking spaces. The plan is to provide 10 spaces next to each building and the remainder inside the garage.

12. Location, type and screening details of waste disposal containers and outdoor storage areas. *They are located on the plan, but no details. Design guidelines call for them to be similar in design of the structures.*

**Response:** Details will be provided with final plans and they will match the building designs and called out for in the design guidelines.

13. Location, design and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements, including drains, culverts, retaining walls and fences. *Culverts and drains need to be clearly shown on the plan.*

**Response:** Culverts and drains will be provided with the final engineering plans. Please note that the stream crossing will utilize an open bottom structure to avoid disturbance of the wetlands.

14. Description of the method of sewage disposal and location. *Sewage from this project will join with sewage from the Cornell facility through a valve that engineers at the Ithaca Area Wastewater Treatment Plant say isn't adequate to handle it. That needs to be looked into.*

15. Description of the method of securing potable water and location, design and construction materials of such facilities. *No comment.*

16. Location of fire and other emergency zones, including the location of fire hydrants. *Fire Chief should approve the plan.*

17. Location, design, and construction materials of all energy distribution facilities, including electrical, gas and solar energy. *There is no central distribution on site. Applicant should confirm there is sufficient electrical supply.*

**Response:** We are currently working with NYSEG to get a Will Serve Letter.

18. Location, height, size, materials, and design of all proposed signage. *No comment.*

19. Identification of street numbers(s) in accordance with any applicable 911 numbering system, and method for ensuring that building identification numbers are installed in a manner that will be visible to emergency responders during the day and night. *Not until final design.*

20. Location and proposed development of all buffer areas, including existing vegetation cover. *There is a landscape drawing. Planning Board believes it is under-planted and recommends they meet the landscape design guidelines.*

**Response: This comment has been noted and final landscaping plans will meet the landscape design guidelines.**

21. Location and design of outdoor lighting facilities. *Planning Board would like a detailed lighting plan.*

**Response: A photometric plan was submitted previously.**

22. Location, height, intensity, and bulb type of all external lighting fixtures. *See 21 above.*

23. Direction of illumination and methods to eliminate glare onto adjoining properties. *See 21 above.*

24. Identification and the location and amount of building area proposed for retail sales or similar commercial activity. *No comment.*

25. Proposed limit of clearing showing existing vegetation. Individual trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 12 inches or greater within the clearing line shall also be shown, if the Board finds that there are uniquely beneficial species on the site and/or exceptionally mature trees. *We have that.*

26. Landscaping plan and planting schedule. *Has been addressed.*

27. Estimated project construction schedule. *Schedule needs to coordinate with NYS DOT construction to avoid traffic complications in the area.*

**Response: This comment has been noted and the applicant will coordinate with NYSDOT.**

28. Record of application for and approval status of all necessary permits from state and county agencies. *This is missing.*

**Response: This will be provided with the final site plan. We cannot submit to NYSDDES for wetland permits until a Negative Declaration has been done on the SEQR.**

29. Identification of any state or county permits required for the project. We have that.
30. Other elements integral to the proposed development as considered necessary by the Board. Consideration of design guidelines for the Varna Hamlet.
31. Stormwater Management Plan as required by local law. *Applicant will prepare and submit an approved Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan for approval by the Town Engineer.*

**Response: This comment has been noted.**

32. Full Environmental Assessment Form or draft Environmental Impact Statement as determined by the Board at the sketch plan conference. *This is a Type 1 action because it exceeds 25% of the threshold of constructing 250 new residential units.*

**Response: This comment has been noted.**

The board discussed the redevelopment bonuses potentially available under LEED. They will need to review that criteria.

**Response: This comment has been noted.**

Sincerely,

HUNT ENGINEERS, ARCHITECTS, LAND SURVEYORS & LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT, DPC



Michael B. Keith, P.E.  
Civil Manager - Rochester

enc.

cc: John Shields, P.E.; HUNT  
Kimberly Hansen, Trinitas