



MEMORANDUM

To: Ching Wah Chin, Chairman, and the Town of Ossining Planning Board Members

From: Valerie Monastra, AICP

Project: River Knoll Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Draft Scope Comments

Date: April 20, 2021

CC: Kathy Zalantis, Esq., Town of Ossining Planning Board Attorney
John Hamilton, Town of Ossining Building Inspector
Dan Ciarcia, PE, Town of Ossining Planning Board Engineer

The public comment period for the draft scoping document related to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) has concluded. The following letters were received and reviewed:

- James May, dated April 3, 2021
- Norma V. Drummond on behalf of Westchester County Planning Board, dated April 6, 2021
- Willie M. Pool Owens, dated April 6, 2021
- Lino J. Sciarretta, Esq. on behalf of Antonio Santucci and Marisa Caruso, dated April 7, 2021
- Lino J. Sciarretta, Esq. on behalf of Antonio Santucci and Marisa Caruso, dated April 8, 2021
- Comments from the Public Hearing dated April 7, 2021 translated through Zoom

The public comments received by the Town, both written and verbal, concerned the following topic areas and are summarized below:

- Community character and planning
- Vegetation, landscaping, wetlands, and soil
- Stormwater Management
- Traffic, transportation, and parking
- Waste and energy
- Housing
- Schools

Community Character and Planning

The public raised concerns regarding the impacts of the project on community character, and whether the use is compatible with the surrounding area. There were concerns regarding the project being a detriment to the community's aesthetic character and whether the previous master plan intended for the site to be redeveloped in this manner. There were also concerns expressed regarding the rezoning of the property and whether single-family homes would be a better fit for the neighborhood. The public also expressed concerns about how this project will align with the current Comprehensive Plan process. The issue of spot zoning was also raised by the public.

Vegetation, Wetlands, Soil and Landscaping

The public submitted comments expressing concerns regarding the impacts on the disturbance of land, specifically how the developer will manage a stand of Japanese Knotweed along Narragansett Avenue in a manner that does not spread that invasive plant to adjacent properties. There were also concerns expressed regarding the absence of a landscaping plan and the need for a tree inventory that shows existing trees and trees to be removed. Public comment was received that requested further soil sampling and testing to ensure that the bedrock and soil do not contain contaminants. The public also raised concerns about the wetlands on site and potential construction impacts.

Stormwater Management

The public asked for additional information and details on the stormwater measures being installed as part of the project. Several members of the public requested that undeveloped land be utilized for storm water management purposes. Comments from the public raised concerns that stormwater runoff from the project would potentially affect flooding on Grandview Avenue. A member of the public requested that a downstream analysis be conducted by the New York Department of Environmental Conservation.

Traffic, Transportation, and Parking

The public raised concerns over the project's impact on traffic to Narragansett Avenue and the immediate neighborhood. Members of the public were concerned regarding the number of trucks that the project would generate during the construction phase. Several public comments urged the Town and the developer to work together to reduce the total number of parking spaces and to include bicycle parking for future tenants. In addition, public comments inquired about where the parking area will be located on-site. Questions were also raised about a secondary means of access.

Waste and Energy

Public comments were received highlighting that the scope does not address solid waste or recycling. The public expressed concern regarding the increased flow to the Ossining Waste Resource Recovery Facility and questioned how the Applicant will mitigate these affects.

Housing

The public submitted comments expressing concern over the proposed development being age-restricted. Public comments expressed disappointment that fewer units would be offered and that no family units would be offered. Other public comments inquired about the meaning of 55 plus housing, and how the units would be marketed to the public. Public comments were received that questioned the economic viability of age-restricted housing for the site.

Schools

The public acknowledged that the proposed project will be for ages 55 and over, and they raised concerns about the calculations regarding projected school children. Specifically, they requested that the applicant provide comparisons of the number of school children residing in other 55 and older communities.

Response to Scoping Comments

Community Character and Planning

The draft scope requires that the applicant analyze the impacts on community character. It also requires that the applicant consider the current Comprehensive Plan and provide an analysis on the issue of spot zoning. The public comments the Town received with regards to community character and planning are already being addressed in the current scope and no proposed changes to the current draft are recommended.

Vegetation, Wetlands, Soil and Landscaping

The draft scope requires the applicant to identify all trees that are proposed to be removed and the project's compliance with the Town's Tree Law. It is recommended that the scope include a discussion on remediation of the invasive Japanese Knotweed problem, and information on a landscaping plan that will include a species list with scientific and common names. Those recommendation have been incorporated into the revisions to the draft scope.

Stormwater Management

The scope requires the applicant study both the pre and post development conditions. It also requires that the applicant provide a draft Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. On-site stormwater measures will be identified, and this project will ultimately need a permit from NYSDEC. The public comments the Town received with regards to stormwater are already being addressed in the current scope and no proposed changes to the current draft are recommended.

Traffic, Transportation, and Parking

The scope requires the applicant to provide an updated traffic study and a description of the traffic-related construction impacts related to the project. It is recommended that the scope provide a discussion of the internal vehicular movement and proposed ingress and egress for the site as well as a discussion of any proposed bicycle parking for future residents.

Waste and Energy

Public comments were received highlighting that the scope does not address solid waste or recycling. The draft scope focused on the environmental topic areas that, as a result of the revised site plan, would vary the greatest from the prior project proposed. This was not one of the topic areas identified. The Planning Board can decide if they would like to see this topic included in the final scope.

Housing

The public comments raised regarding housing are not relevant to the environmental analysis but comments on the overall development program. However, the scope does require a discussion on regional planning initiatives, including Westchester County's "Patterns" and "Westchester 2025," as well as the County's 2019 Housing Needs Assessment concerning the development of new "affordable housing" units. The scope also requires an analysis of the project's consistency with the Town's planning initiatives, including the 2015 Comprehensive Plan and to the extent that a Draft Vision, Goals, Objectives or Recommendations have been released by the Comprehensive Plan Committee. The public comments the Town received with regards to housing are already being addressed in the current scope and no proposed changes to the current draft are recommended.

Schools

The scope requires a school capacity analysis but does not specifically require the applicant to provide examples of student projections within comparable 55 and older communities. It is recommended that the scope include a discussion of the amount of school children generated from comparable 55 and older developments.