

TOWN OF YORKTOWN PLANNING BOARD

Albert A. Capellini Community and Cultural Center, 1974 Commerce Street, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, Phone (914) 962-6565, Fax (914) 962-3986

To: Town Board
From: Planning Board
Date: January 23, 2024
Subject: Toll Brothers at Catherine Street
SBL: 35.12-1-2 & 45

At its meeting on December 5, 2023, the Planning Board discussed the application for a rezone on the subject property. The Board had the following comments:

1. The previous approval for this site included a conservation easement on the eastern portion of the property. The Planning Board proposed that the conservation easement be included in this proposal in order to protect the wetlands along Field Street in perpetuity. The Applicant had no issues with this and is proposing to include the easement in their proposal going forward.
2. The proposed project requires excavation and regrading of soils for the new buildings and associated foundations and utility infrastructure. The proposed grading exceeds 40% in some cases. These slopes are extreme and require further analysis. Cross sections of the proposed grading should be submitted.
3. In regards to the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, the Applicant should state intended methods of removal and/or reuse of this material. Both the Town Consultant and Town Engineer should evaluate these methods. Referral to the DEC is also recommended.
4. There is a proposed drainage basin encroaching on the wetland and its buffer that was not reflected in the EAF. This can create many issues for the health of the wetland and should be reviewed in greater detail for potential alternatives, mitigation measures, etc.
5. A view analysis, cross sections, and a concept landscaping plan should be provided in order to determine the necessary mitigation techniques required to reduce the impact this development will have on the surrounding recreational resources. The proposed project would result in changes of existing views of the project site from the surrounding area, including but not limited to, the Sylvan Glen Nature Preserve and Catskill Aqueduct Trail.
6. The Catskill Aqueduct Trail is not identified in the submitted documents as a recreational resource. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes it as a recreational greenway location, thus potential impacts to the resource should be identified and evaluated. The viewshed from the resource may be impacted by this development as stated above.
7. According to the 2006 Yorktown Reconnaissance-Level Historic Resource Survey, the Field Home mansion is considered a “notable example of architecture” and is identified therein as a potential candidate for local/National Register designation. The Comprehensive Plan also recommends the mansion be considered for local/National Register designation and encourages public access to these types of structures that are important to and have contributed to the history of Yorktown. This should receive appropriate attention as a resource that is representative of Yorktown history, as well as the

TOWN OF YORKTOWN PLANNING BOARD

Albert A. Capellini Community and Cultural Center, 1974 Commerce Street, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, Phone (914) 962-6565, Fax (914) 962-3986

namesake structure of the immediate developed area and the inspiration for its age-related facilities. The Planning Board also recommends that it be referred to the town's historical consultant for review.

8. Impacts to recreational resources must be evaluated in order to determine the impact of the proposed development. Renovations to the upper field at Hunterbrook Field are proposed as mitigation for the loss of the Field Home field. The Planning Board feels that the current usage of Hunterbrook Field should be included in the Recreation Impact Analysis, as well as its potential increase in usage once it is upgraded to "gameplay" condition. The proposed population demand and the ramifications of the loss of a practice field should be evaluated in regards to the Town's ability to provide ample recreation services.
9. The Town Engineer expressed concern with capacity at the pump station. This should be evaluated as soon as possible to ascertain whether the project is feasible and whether measures are necessary to advance the project.
10. Goal 2-E of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan states "...Where adequate infrastructure is not present, or sensitive environmental features are present, development should be restricted..." The Board believes it is inadvisable to advance a project where appropriate infrastructure is not available.

In addition, the Planning Department recommends that the applicant revise the following reports as noted below:

EAF

Part 1

1. Page 2: This project will require a Tree Permit.
2. Page 2: May require approval from the Army Corps of Engineers.
3. Page 3 (C.4.)(c): The site is located in the Mohegan F.D. district.
4. Page 3 (D.1.)(c): This should be yes, this is an expansion of an existing project or use. That being the Field House project.
5. Page 4 (D.2.): This was answered as no, however, there will be cutting and filling. This section should be filled out.
6. Page 6 (d)(iii): The Town Engineer has disputed the claim that the sewer lines servicing the project site can handle the wastewater generated by this development.
7. Page 8 (n): Must comply with Chapter 200: Lighting
8. Page 9 (E)(b): If current acreage of meadows, grasslands, or brushlands is 12.07, how will there be 11.15 after developing 74% of the site? Yards and open grass areas should not necessarily count.
9. Page 11(E)(a): If average depth to bedrock is 1.6-3.5 feet, blasting would be required. D.2.(a) states none will be required.
10. Page 11 (h)(iv): Wetlands are listed as 1.8 acres. Preliminary Improvement Plan states 0.06 wetland and 1.84 buffer. This would be 1.9 acres.
11. Page 12 (E.2.) (m): The presence of bats should be confirmed.
12. Missing Page 13 on revised EAF from 9/6/23.
13. Page 13 on EAF from 8/13/23 (h): Within 5 miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource? Should be yes, Aqueduct Trail, Tachonic Parkway, Old Crompond Road.

TOWN OF YORKTOWN PLANNING BOARD

Albert A. Capellini Community and Cultural Center, 1974 Commerce Street, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, Phone (914) 962-6565, Fax (914) 962-3986

Part 2

1. Page 1 (1.a.): Depth to water Table is less than 3 feet states not applicable. In part 1 it was stated as being between 2-3 feet. Needs to be corrected.
2. Page 1 (1c.) Depth to bedrock generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface, states no and not applicable. In part 1 it is listed as being between 1.6-3.5 feet. Needs to be corrected.
3. Page 4 (7): Provide impacts on plants and animals.
4. Page 6 (9): Provide answers for impacts on Aesthetic Resources. (a.) Proposed action will be visible from Aqueduct trail.
5. Page 6 (10): The impact on historical and archeological resources should be confirmed.
6. Page 7 (11): Impact on Open Space and Recreation should be yes, the proposal states that the field at the site will be removed and a recreation impact analysis was submitted.
7. Page 10 (17): No or Not applicable? Cannot be both. (e.) is being disputed by Town Engineer.

Narrative

1. Page 3: The cut/fill difference of 590 be added to the excess 1,068 cubic yards of topsoil.
2. Page 3: Item 3, Impacts on Surface Water, seems to still contain writing from the previous plan. There is now a basin being proposed in the wetland.
3. Page 4 Item 7: This section states that a letter from the NY Natural Heritage Program will submit a letter of determination during December 2022. This date cannot be correct.
4. Page 5 Item 13: This first paragraph is a major overstatement. The impact has only been decreased by 2 units.
5. Page 8 Item 15: Nothing is stated in regards to lighting.
6. Page 8 Item 17: This section is inadequate.
7. Page 8 Item 18: This section is also inadequate. There is no answer to the question of Consistency with Community Character.

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

1. REC 3 advised a GPR survey to identify the septic. Has this been conducted? If not please explain why.
2. REC 2 states “proper characterization of materials should be completed prior to removal.” We did not find such elaborations.
3. No chain of custody info from TP-1 or TP-3 have been provided.
4. The testing for TP-2 and TP-4 have a “hold,” please explain.
5. Applicant should state intended methods of removal and/or reuse of this material.
6. Town Consultant and Town Engineer should evaluate. Referral to DEC is also recommended.