

I am currently opposed to the expansion of the Lake Osceola Overlay District to specifically encompass and enable the proposed Creative Living Hidden Valley development. The suggested new overlay configuration is disjointed and not contiguous and it may be analogous to spot zoning. The local and state roadway infrastructure is insufficient to sustain the additional traffic that may be created by this new mapping and possible subsequent development. There are significant other environmental issues that must be addressed. Existing Town and District resources are not sufficient to service additional possible development(s) without the expansion of Town and District resources.

The originally submitted Full Environmental Assessment Form was unsigned and undated and had significant errors and omissions. The updated Full Environmental Assessment Form is mostly blank.

The application before the Board is for the non-contiguous expansion of the Lake Osceola Overlay District to include just the area for the Creative Living Hidden Valley development and exclude the intervening areas. However, the applicant has inserted substantial portions of the proposed Creative Living Hidden Valley development in a manner that it is difficult to separate the expansion from the proposed development.

It appears to me that this proposal is in-lieu requesting a rezoning of the parcel. Is it possible that a rezoning would not have allowed the extent of development now proposed?

Is it possible that it was anticipated that a requested rezoning of the parcel would have been denied and the Overlay District expansion is a work around the possible denial?

The INSITE Engineering document has no analysis of the increased air pollution from both the temporary construction phases and the permanent residential phase of the proposed development.

If the Town Board acts favorably upon this request, the following is suggested to be included in any and all enabling legislative actions and resolutions:

All roofs to be equipped with functioning solar panels;

All heating, air conditioning and hot water appliances to be electric;

All appliances installed within residential units to be electric;

Oil, propane and natural gas be specifically prohibited for use in or for residential units.

No Temporary, Permanent or other type of Certificate(s) of Occupancy be granted or issued unless and until all required on or off-site mitigation is certified as being completed and approved by all relevant Town Departments as well as all interested local, county, state and federal agencies.

No Temporary, Permanent or other type of Certificate(s) of Occupancy be granted or issued unless and until all required on or off-site infrastructure construction, infrastructure installations and infrastructure improvements are certified as being completed and approved by all relevant Town Departments and all interested local, county, state and federal agencies and all necessary or required operating permits, licenses and certificates have been issued.

All posted bonds or sureties must be valued at actual cost and include an inflation escalator clause of sufficient time period to cover the entire project development and actual construction time period.

A schedule of “Liquidated Damage” penalties be written into all enabling legislative actions and resolutions to ensure that the cost of all enforcement and compliance actions taken by the Town or Districts against the developer, the developer’s contractors or sub-contractors are reimbursed at actual cost to the Town or Districts plus an additional five percent “Administrative Fee”.



February 3, 2025

Town of Yorktown Town Board  
363 Underhill Avenue  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

RE: Hidden Valleys  
3000 Navajo Street

Dear Town Supervisor Lachterman and Members of the Town Board:

Enclosed please find

- Figure 1 Westchester County Sewer District, dated January 31, 2025.
- Figure 2 Proposed Sewer Extension, dated January 31, 2025.
- Figure 3 Existing Lake Osceola PDDOZ, dated January 31, 2025.
- Figure 4 Proposed Lake Osceola ODDOZ, dated January 31, 2025.
- Comparison Plan of Town of Yorktown Sanitary Sewer District & Westchester County Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District Boundaries, dated January 27, 2025.
- Osceola Lake PDDOZ Soft Site Analysis, dated January 27, 2025.
- Concept Site Plan for Full Site Build-out Based on CR Zone *With Conceptual Hidden Valleys Site Plan Overlaid*, original plan prepared by Site Design Consultants, dated April 18, 2013.
- Exhibit A – Restoration and Mitigation Plan *With Conceptual Hidden Valleys Site Plan Overlaid*, original plan prepared by Site Design Consultants, dated October 11, 2019.
- Planning Board Town of Yorktown Resolution of Approval Approving a Site Plan, Lighting Plan, Wetland Permit, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan & Permit for Creative Living Development, Inc. AKA Navajo Fields, dated December 8, 2013.
- Drawing OP-1 Overall Concept Plan, dated September 26, 2024.
- Drawing S-1 Conceptual Offsite Sewer Plan, last revised January 27, 2025.

Responses to the below comments have been assembled by all members of the project team.

***In response to comments received from Supervisor Ed Lachterman comment email dated January 23, 2025, we offer the following updated responses:***

Comment:

- Escrow for fees – attorneys to work out

Response:

Escrow does not say paying for actual cost. The developer is willing to provide an escrow to guarantee the installation of the proposed sewer system. The amount and terms of the escrow will be fully addressed as part of the site plan submission. Also, the Developer will work with the Town and deposit into an escrow account, funds

---

3 Garrett Place, Carmel, New York 10512 (845) 225-9690 Fax (845) 225-9717  
[www.insite-eng.com](http://www.insite-eng.com)

February 3, 2025

Note not  
paying for  
actual cost.

to reimburse the Town's professionals who are reviewing the documents submitted in support of the required approvals. This will be done in accordance with past-practices, transparency and each professional's billable rates as required on other projects,

Comment:

- Sewer is a must-

Response:

As discussed at the previous Town Board meetings, documents on the drawings provided previously and attached, as well as the responses below, a municipal sanitary sewer system and the opportunity for parcel tie-ins are proposed to be provided at no cost to the Town.

Comment:

- Route with adequate Maps

Response:

The developer has previously submitted various proposed sewer plans to the Town with those submissions having incorporated revisions in accordance with multiple meetings, over several years, with Town officials from multiple departments. The Town's prior comments were incorporated into a sewer drawing dated August 1, 2022 which is titled "S-1" and which has been submitted to the Board as part of the instant application. All materials referenced herein have been resubmitted and available for the Town's review.

Comment:

- Pump Station Placement

Response:

Relocation has  
a cost! Who  
pays the  
actual cost?

The S-1 drawing was revised on 1-27-25 as per the Lead Agency comments for the purpose of relocating the proposed pump stations therein to Town owned property as discussed with the Town's engineer. The location of the pump stations are designated in text and the Town property on which each sits clearly delineated.

Comment:

- Preliminary design with depth – narrative on use of pumps vs. gravity

Response:

The proposed sewer extension is shown on S-1, and as the drawing indicates, by legend, those lengths of the proposed extension that are proposed as force main and those that are proposed as gravity are respectively delineated. The pump stations permit the sewer system to feed effluent, by pressure, to a higher elevation for those properties proposed to be in the district extension which sit at an elevation that make a full gravity sewer impossible. The sewer plan minimizes the linear footage of the system that will be pressurized. A gravity system is naturally preferable because it does not require a pump to move effluent but is not fully achievable in this corridor. Under the present design, the developer has minimized the size and number of required pumps to a minimum by utilizing a gravity system where possible.

It should be noted that the final sewer design will be the product of technical submission completed in the design stages of the proposed project as part by the Town's Engineering Department's approval process; however, the Developer has submitted robust information to satisfy review requirements for the purposes of the instant application.

Comment:

- Provision of stubs for ladders and branches (manhole?)

Response:

The S-1 drawing indicates the location of manholes in the sewer extension. The manholes will contain incorporated ladder rungs as required by code or as determined by the Town's Engineering department during the future design review process of the proposed Hidden Valleys project.

Comment:

- Offer of hookups for residents in writing with escrow (and who will administer) [Wood and Perry] – incentive to hook up

Response:

The developer is willing to provide an escrow for the installation of individual residential hookups to residential property owners along E. Main Street. The amount and terms of the escrow will be fully addressed as part of the site plan submission and subject to the Town Attorney approval. The future approval of the details of this concept shall be memorialized as a condition of approval. The financial incentive to be provided by the developer towards the cost will be a present dollar value to that which was acceptable to the Town under the Santucci project on the South side of Route 6 near Gomer Street as the Town Board had indicated that such amount is both appropriate and acceptable. The amount and terms of the escrow will be fully addressed as part of the site plan submission.

Comment:

- Written confirmation of developer paying buy in costs

Response:

The developer is willing to commit in writing to paying the Westchester County Surcharge Calculation ("buy in") cost of the proposed sewer district extension. The amount and terms of the payment will be fully addressed as part of the site plan submission.

Comment:

- Traffic
  - Our consultant needs to look at AMS accuracy of current conditions

Response:

This appears to be an internal note from the Board to itself. It is the understanding of the developer that the AMS impact was reviewed in the approval process of the Town Board's approval of the AMS zoning change. The Developer has caused its traffic consultant to have the Hidden Valley traffic study supplemented to address the traffic AMS reported in its traffic study as submitted in the AMS re-zoning application. Same is submitted herewith.

Developer's traffic study submitted here has also been amended to remove consideration for the transfer station as the Board has directed.

Comment:

- Is Navajo a secondary?

Response:

As directed by the Director of Planning earlier in this application, the developer has planned to direct all residential traffic generated in the proposed development to enter / exit through Route 6N also known as Mahopac Street. For that reason, the Developer's original EAF's traffic study and site plan were revised to respectively study and control residential traffic egressing solely from Route 6N. Navajo Street will serve only the commercial traffic from the project and only emergency vehicle access to the residential portions of the proposed project. The proposed plan will be fully discussed at the site plan submission and independent SEQRA review undertaken by the Town Planning Board.

Comment:

- 6N anticipated improvements and a commitment to pay for them

Response:

Escrow must be actual cost!

The anticipated improvements to Route 6N are delineated in the developer's submitted traffic study. Those improvements will be paid for by the developer. The amount and terms of the escrow will be fully addressed as part of the site plan submission, and the final improvements and necessary mitigation measures associated with the site plan will be reviewed as part of the SEQRA analysis associated with the site plan.

Comment:

- Add in traffic from AMS and proposer, Strawberry, Barger

Response:

Developer's previously submitted traffic study fully evaluates its own anticipated proposed development traffic as well as that of Strawberry and Barger, consistent with the soft site analysis prepared as part of the PDDOZ establishment. The Developer has caused its traffic consultant to have the Hidden Valley traffic study supplemented to address the traffic AMS reported in its traffic study as submitted in the AMS re-zoning application. Same is submitted herewith.

Comment:

- Topography
  - Wetland maps- Descriptions of Wetlands and Quantities- square footage. Please submit maps with delineation of the buffers and Wetlands
  - Floodplain Descriptions Updated
  - Mitigation Plan Overview (where)

- Steep Slope Map (include % slope)
- Soils From County

Response:

The above information has been provided for the property as part of the previous Negative Declaration and approval issued for a related project. As shown on the overlay maps contained herein, the proposed extents of the Hidden Valleys Development is consistent with the limits of disturbance previously proposed and as such the potential impacts are similar.

Notwithstanding the above, and previous environmental reviews on the Hidden Valleys property, the documents and environmental assessment provided as part of the PDDOZ extension request are consistent with the soft site analyses previously performed as part of the PDDOZ establishment.

Comment:

- Discuss FAR in relation to project and **overlay law**

Response:

The developer has provided this information in prior submissions. In an attempt to consolidate the materials and provide the requested information in a visually comprehensible manner, the developer has created overlay drawings that superimpose the proposed development over existing approvals and approved mitigation drawings. Those drawings titled respectively: (i) Proposed Site Plan; (ii) Exhibit A Restoration and Mitigation Plan Overlay; (iii) Overlay of proposed Project over approved 2013 Site Plan and (iv) Proposed Site Plan Lots, each of which are submitted herewith. The FAR that is applicable under the flexibility statute is .55 of the gross project land area. For Hidden Valleys the FAR for the entire project over the entire site is 0.14 as a whole; 0.26 for the residential as a whole; 0.06 for the recreational commercial as a whole; 0.05 for Lot 1. The following table summarizes the project FAR Calculations:

Lot Number	Lot Area	Floor Area (Assumed)	FAR
1	10.1 acres	23,000 s.f.	0.05
2	25.8 acres	289,000 s.f.	0.26
3	13.7 acres	5,200 s.f.	0.01
Total Site	49.6 acres	296,500 s.f.	0.14



Comment:

- Stormwater
  - Description of needs for stormwater where intended placement (Dan)

Response:

It is noted that the analysis of soft sites as part of the environmental review associated with the original PDDOZ did not analyze stormwater relative to the theoretical development potential of each site.

A conceptual site plan, Drawing OP-1, was submitted for the Hidden Valleys project which is attached and illustrates areas generally allocated for stormwater based on initial stormwater testing. During the site plan process and associated environmental review for Hidden Valleys, the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is required and shall be submitted to and must be accepted by the Town.

This is similar to other soft sites identified in the PDDOZ whereby the PDDOZ was established recognizing many needs, but one being to revitalize the Lake Osceola area, and as part of the establishment of the PDDOZ soft sites were generally identified and then expected to be subject to a site-specific environmental review and site plan approval as specific projects were proposed. This would allow the Town and other involved / interested agencies to balance the benefits the PDDOZ zoning could bring to the Lake Osceola community with the specific environmental constraints of each soft site.

Comment:

- School Children Impact – Rutgers Study

Response:

Each of the fiscal studies submitted by the developer in this application employ the oft-accepted Rutgers study in the evaluation of school enrollment impact.

Comment:

- Athletic Facilities

Response:

The change in outdoor facilities is delineated in the proposed site plan and subject to further study during site plan approval. The indoor facility will be increased from 12,000 sq ft to 23,000 square feet and the outdoor fields as proposed will be 4.2 acres +/- where they currently are 8.8 acres +/- . The substantial increase in the quality of the proposed new fields will increase the functional usability of the outdoor athletic areas; a great benefit to the Town. This will be more particularly addressed in the site plan application process. Refer to OP-1 wherein the proposed fields and proposed athletic fieldhouse are overlayed on existing improvements.

Comment:

- Project description with land use, now vs. comp plan and zoning

Response:

The Hidden Valley project, as proposed, comports with the express intent of both the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the recent creation and adoption of the Lake Osceola PDDOZ. The inclusion of the additional properties along East Main Street & Mahopac Street is also consistent with the goals of each the Comprehensive Plan and the Lake Osceola PDDOZ.

The Comprehensive Plan states:

- “Establish new zoning districts and update existing zoning districts in the Town's zoning code, consistent with the Proposed Land Use Plan. These new districts are intended to help implement proposals in the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The commercial zoning districts, in particular, have been significantly updated”
- “To the greatest extent possible, maintain views of the water from the East Main Street-Hill Boulevard intersection. Through the stie plan review process, encourage any new structures to be sited outside this view corridor, or that buildings be built low enough to maintain views over them.”
  - This may affect the achievable density of the soft sites located along Lake Osceola which was based on 2 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> stories.
- “Implementation of some of these concepts is dependent upon the extension of sewers to these areas. There are plans to extend sewer infrastructure through Jefferson Valley along East main Street.”
  - It is noted that Figure 4-5 of the Jefferson Valley Conceptual Design does not establish the ultimate boundaries of the future PDDOZ. It does identify two hamlet centers, one along Hill Boulevard and one along East Main Street and Route 6N which are proximate to the Hidden Valley Site and other sites proposed to be included in the PDDOZ.
    - The sites proposed to be included in the PDDOZ would directly support and be within walking distance to the hamlet center identified in the Comprehensive Plan located at the intersection of Route 6N and East Main Street.
    - There is a boundary shown in Figure 2-1 for a Jefferson Valley Overlay Zone that does not compare with the hamlet centers and descriptions of Jefferson Valley in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan. Chapter 4 discusses the Jefferson Valley Mall and Business District that extends from Par 3 Golf Course to the County and Town Line as depicted on Figure 4-5 and specifically identifies the East Main Street-Mahopac Steet Intersection as a “hamlet center.”
    - It is noted that the ultimate PDDOZ boundary was drawn closer to Figure 4-5 in that it included areas west of Hill Boulevard, although these areas were acknowledged as already having a

development proposal that would not utilize the PDDOZ zone (the solar farm site). However, areas north and east of the East Main Street / Mahopac Street intersection were not included.

- “Infrastructure improvements must be provided before or concurrent with any significant development.”
  - As evidenced by the number of years since the enactment of the PDDOZ, the soft sites analyzed do yield sufficient density to justify the cost of infrastructure needed. The inclusion of additional parcels within the instant application within the Lake Osceola Corridor, and adjacent to the Comprehensive Plans identified East Main Street Hamlet Center, propose to yield the necessary density to justify the infrastructure cost, as well as justify the redevelopment of the underutilized parcels adjacent to the lake. This is needed to fulfill the vision established in the Comprehensive Plan and PDDOZ EAF.
- “West of Hill Boulevard, maintain the north side of East Main Street as primarily residential in use,”
  - It is noted that the parcels west of hill boulevard consist of the currently constructed solar farm and will not act as a residential use nor benefit from the PDDOZ zone as constructed.
- “Continue to protect the scenic, woodland quality of Route 6 and East Main Street Corridors.”
  - To be studied in the environmental review during the site plan review process for Hidden Valleys, it is noteworthy to mention the proposed Hidden Valleys site plan respects this ideal by preserving the athletic field use on the western portion of the site along the East main Street Corridor.

Lake Osceola Overlay District EAF states:

- “The Town of Yorktown supports development of a sewer line in this area, and construction of a sewer, combined with the proposed overlay zoning district will incentivize development.”
- “Soft sites were identified through discussions with the Town of Yorktown Planning Department, who have an understanding of local development trends and building ownership, or by looking at sites within the overlay boundary that are under common ownership, or **would be underbuilt (have significantly less building area than permitted) under the proposed overlay zoning.**” (emphasis added)

***In response to comments received from Supervisor Ed Lachterman comment email dated January 16, 2025, we offer the following updated responses:***

*1. What effect will the project have on the wetland, wetland buffer and the flood plain*

The action requested of the Town Board is for the expansion of the PDDOZ and sewer district to include several parcels, of which one is 3000 Navajo Street. As part of the expansion of the district the applicant, Creative Living Development has provided a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) and supplemental reports consistent with the documents previously used to establish the PDDOZ. Consistent with the analysis of soft sites in the original PDDOZ adoption the site at 3000 Navajo Street was studied in the FEAF provided with the application to expand the district.

As outlined by our project attorney, Mr. Mark Blanchard, Esq., following the expansion of the district the owner of 3000 Navajo Street may submit for a site plan application on that property which would undergo its own separate SEQRA review. This segmented process has been challenged in court, with the New York State Supreme Court upholding the validity of the independent Planning Board review to follow the zoning text and map amendment process. However, please note at the request of the Town that a theoretical site plan for the Hidden Valleys site was submitted in support of the number of units proposed in the soft site analysis. The theoretical site plan submitted is consistent with the limits of disturbance contemplated in the previous site plan approval and Negative Declaration for this project as evidenced through the overlay of the Hidden Valleys Site Plan with the previously approved site plan prepared by Site Design Consultants. Further study on this issue will be required prior to site plan approval.

*2. Where are the pump stations located and do we have proposed alternate sites if they are not on a town easement or our own property?*

Drawing S-1 has been revised and enclosed herewith and shows the proposed pump stations located on Town properties.

*3. What are we giving existing residence towards sewer hook costs?*

As discussed at the previous Town Board meeting and in the comments above, Creative Living Development is willing to facilitate the installation of sewer services to individual property lines and is willing to make a financial contribution towards individual hookups. The final amount needs to be discussed and coordinated with the Town Board.

As mentioned at the last Planning Board meeting the intent is for the developer to fund the infrastructure cost such that existing and added properties to the sewer district will not have to pay for or bond the infrastructure. Effectively a "No Cost" sewer extension.

***In response to comments received from Councilwoman Susan Siegel comment memorandum dated January 16, 2025, we offer the following updated responses:***

***New Sewer District***

*1. Provide a boundary map.*

Enclosed please find a copy of the Osceola Lake PDDDOZ and Westchester County Peekskill Sewer District Expansion drawing prepared by this office. In addition, please also find enclosed the Comparison Plan of the Town of Yorktown Sewer District and the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District Boundaries as it exists north of Route 6.

The proposed PDDOZ Boundary and expanded sewer district boundary are based on discussions and input received during Town Board meetings and is believed to reflect the latest desired boundaries. In addition, the Comparison Plan was provided to help illustrate the discrepancies between the current County Sewer District mapping and those parcels within and not within the county sewer district mapping based on tax records. We look forward to coordinating the final district boundaries with the Town Board.

2. *Using town assessment records, identify which parcels are currently in or out of the county sewer district.*

The requested information is illustrated on the enclosed drawing Comparison Plan of the Town of Yorktown Sewer District and the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District Boundaries.

3. *Preliminary assessment of whether, based on depth of truck line and topography, some individual hook ups may require low pressure pumps.*

Based on discussions with the town a low-pressure sewer system is not proposed. Some existing buildings, depending on where there existing internal plumbing is located may need to relocate interior plumbing, install an internal ejector pump, or install an individual pump pit to connect to the sewer, the feasibility of same shall be determined by the individual property owner. This is not uncommon when sewer existing areas. In addition, consistent with the establishment of the PDDOZ it appears the Town is hopeful many of the existing properties will be able to be redeveloped allowing for the relocation of existing plumbing to comport with the proposed sewers.

4. *Evidence - in writing - from property owners that they will hook up to sewers, at estimated cost to them.*

We do not believe evidence in writing from property owners that they will hook up to the sewers is necessary based on how this sewer district is being established and provided. This requested information is also premature and would not be binding on the owner, therefore would be of little probative value to this review. As discussed at the last meeting Creative Living Development is installing the proposed sewer at their sole expense. Owners within the sewer district will have an option to connect. If an owner chooses not to connect, they would continue to operate on their existing septic system. If an owner chooses to connect, they would be charged whatever current Yorktown fees are, less the financial contribution proposed to be provided by Creative Living Development.

5. *Current estimate, per foot, for plumbing cost to hook up from stub in street.*

Our opinion of the probable cost to install a 4-inch gravity sewer line to a stub at the property line would be between \$20 to \$30 per foot, less the financial contribution to be coordinated between the Creative Living Development and the Town Board.

6. *Written commitment from developer that he will contribute X dollars for the parcel hook up.*

Escrow should be determined on actual cost and not the cost of an older development.

As discussed at the last Town Board meeting the owner is willing to contribute financially to each parcel hook up in addition to running the sewer service to the property line. The final amount will need to be coordinated between the Town Board and the Owner at a future date. Developer proposes an incentive of a present-day dollar amount equal to what the Santucci development south of route 6 near Gomer Street provided when that portion of the sewer was approved.

7. *Written commitment from developer that he will pay the full amount of the county "buy in" cost for any parcels currently NOT in the district.*

As discussed, the applicant has committed to pay the surcharge calculation for the parcels not currently within the county sewer district.

#### **Traffic**

1. *Additional study for Route 6 and Route 6N that factors in proposed AMS development – and subtracts out the recycling facility.*

Provided herewith is an addendum to the developer's traffic study addressing the traffic volume identified in the AMS application for a zoning change and deleting the considerations previously made for the previously proposed transfer station.

2. *Clarify what years the "current" traffic figures are for.*

The developers traffic study dates are set forth expressly in the respective studies themselves.

3. *Impact on additional key intersections e.g., East Main St/Mahopac Street intersection, Lee and Hill Boulevards.*

The developers traffic report as submitted addresses same.

4. *More information, e.g., business plan, for athletic facilities, and how those uses match the peak hour generation guidelines used in the report.*

The information in the studies reflects the historic traffic record of a decade and a half long operation of the existing athletic facility whose use will continue in the same manner and frequency. Additional information on this comment will be provided at the more appropriate time, which is site-plan review.

5. *More details about needed improvements at Route 6 and Navajo Street, including potential cost and who would pay for them.*

No improvements at Route 6 and Navajo are necessary as indicated in the previously submitted traffic study specifically because all residential traffic arising from the proposed residential development egress through Route 6N and not Navajo Street. Consistent with comments above, this issue will be studied in greater detail during the site plan approval process.

6. *More details about needed improvements at Route 6N access point, including potential cost and who would pay for them.*

The proposed improvements to Route 6N are set forth in the prior traffic study submission and as previously stated, the developer would pay for all proposed improvements.

7. *More details about potential traffic calming devices along Route 6N from project site to intersection of East Main St with Route 6, including potential cost and who would pay for them.*

The proposed improvements to Route 6N are set forth in the prior traffic study submission and as previously stated, the developer would pay for all proposed improvements.

It has been discussed with Town officials that the developer is willing to engage in a public/private partnership to establish a "street-scaped" corridor to calm traffic throughout the corridor from the Putnam County line to Hill Boulevard where the proposed sewer extension would terminate.

The developer to pay for improvements then says public/private partner ship.

Developer is willing to make significant financial contribution to the cost. The specifics of the agreement would be properly addressed in the site plan application process.

***Environmental constraints of developing 3 "soft sites" in existing LOOD***

1. *Given soils, wetlands, flood plain, etc., how much of these sites can be developed.*
  - a. *Roberta parcel.*
  - b. *Two other sites at eastern end of current LOOD.*
- Please see attached our Lake Oscela PDDOZ Soft Site Analysis, dated January 27, 2025. This analysis is intended to account for environmental constraints and is intended to be compared to the Development Potential analysis in the original PDDOZ EAF. The original analysis indicated a development potential of 348 additional units, but then discounted the unit count to 139 based on a 10-year projection, compared to the 160 shown in the attached. The original EAF further indicated that only 40% of the development projection would be developed over the next ten years if the area had sewers (20% if sewers are never constructed). Using the same methodology that would yield:

	Full Development Potential	10-year Adjusted Projection
Original PDDOZ EAF	348	139
2025 Insite Soft Site Analysis with Environmental Constraints as noted	160	64

***Wetlands, flood plains & steep slopes***

1. *Need for updated wetlands delineation.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman's comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ. Please note the NYSDEC delineation was recently completed, and will be updated as necessary at such time as a site plan is submitted for Hidden Valleys.

2. *Maps showing flood plains and slopes>L5% on site.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman's comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ. Any site plan submitted for Hidden Valley will undergo its own Environmental Review and will need to comply with the relevant Floodplain and Steep Slopes ordinances of the Town of Yorktown.

3. *Mitigation plan as needed.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman's comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ. A wetland mitigation plan will be prepared at such time as a site plan is submitted for Hidden Valleys.

However, please note a theoretical site plan for Hidden Valleys was submitted as part of its analysis as a “soft site” in the PDDOZ extension. The theoretical site plan remained consistent with the previous limits of approved development.

#### ***FAR calculation***

*1. Details of FAR calculation for each proposed use.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman’s comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ.

However, please note a theoretical site plan for Hidden Valleys was submitted as part of its analysis as a “soft site” in the PDDOZ extension. The FAR for the residential portion of the theoretical site plan is anticipated to be between 0.25 and 0.30 (currently shown at 0.26) based on the final architectural design. Note that the PDDOZ provides for an FAR of 0.55.

#### ***Stormwater***

*1. October 2024 EAF from Ecological has NOTHING about stormwater.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman’s comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ.

Consistent with the individual PDDOZ establishment and associated EAF, stormwater was not analyzed and is premature at this stage of the approval process.

As part of any Hidden Valleys Site Plan Application and individual Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will need to be prepared that complies with the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity, GP-0-25-001.

*2. Impact on surrounding properties, including Lake Osceola.*

See the previous response. Individual project SWPPP’s will be provided for each site plan application in the PDDOZ and for redevelopment sites will offer the opportunity to provide stormwater treatment where currently none exist.

The installation of the proposed sewer would provide the mechanics for the natural decontamination of fecal matter presently in Lake Osceola. This benefit to the Town and environment is critical.

*3. How providing sewers along Route 6N will impact stormwater and how will this be addressed.*

At the last Town Board meeting it was asked if the applicant would consider stormwater improvements on the existing collection systems discharging into Lake Osceola. The applicant is willing to work with the Town Board in a public/private partnership to address existing conditions in the corridor and other related community benefits but same are technically specific matters that are appropriately addressed in the site plan submission process.



### ***School children impact***

1. *More information about current and projected enrollment in Lakeland School District, including recent district enrollment studies and how they compare to Rutgers projections in Ecological document.*

The school children analysis contained in the recently submitted EAF prepared by Ecological Analysis is consistent with analysis used in the original EAF for the PDDOZ and references the same standard studies and coincides with accepted practice on the study and approval of development projects. It is maintained that this level of analysis is consistent with the industry accepted standards and is appropriate for the PDDOZ expansion. More refined school age children information can be obtained as environmental reviews for specific projects are conducted if same are deemed necessary in that technically specific process.

### ***Boundary of extending LOOD***

1. *Explain rationale for adding an isolated site in the LOOD.*

Based on the Osceola Lake PDDOZ & Westchester County Peekskill Sewer District Expansion, dated December 20, 2024, it is not proposed to add an isolated site, but extend the district such that a contiguous district is formed. The current boundary is based on discussions with the Town Board.

The initial Town Tri-Board Meeting held January 2021 established that sewers were a "initial must" for the corridor and that the means to obtain same without blocking public view of Osceola was from off-lake large residential properties in the corridor that could provide multi-family housing of sufficient density to economically provide for the cost of the required sewers. This would permit the intended recreational revitalization of the lake for public use that would in turn generate customers for the commercial businesses already in the corridor including the Jefferson Valley Mall. Given that the only other large residential property in the corridor and present PDDOZ map, Old Hill Farm, has subsequently been developed as a solar farm, Hidden Valleys 50 acre site is logical donor to meet Lake Osceola PDDOZ intent.

The Board has been provided with a thumb drive of the aforementioned meeting but same can be played at a public meeting to re-fresh the express intent in passing the PDDOZ law and in forming a Lake Osceola PDDOZ map.

2. *Explain why other properties in Route 6N corridor abutting Navajo site should/should not be included in the LOOD in order to make a contiguous district.*
  - a. *What would environmental impacts be of including these additional parcels.*

See previous response. The documents provided in the PDDOZ are consistent with the original PDDOZ environmental review in that the Hidden Valley was analyzed as a potential soft site and included in the environmental reports provided by the Town.

### ***Explore alternative Navajo development plan***

1. *Subdivide parcel into R-3i and an appropriate commercial zone for athletic facilities.*

See response #1 to Supervisor Ed Lachterman's comments as it relates to the previous environmental studies on the 3000 Navajo Street site. This current application is only for the extension of the PDDOZ.