

October 21, 2024

Chris Brand, Chairman
Town of Marlborough Planning Board
21 Milton Turnpike
Milton, NY 12547

**Re: Review Comments for Marlborough Resort
Lattintown Road, Town of Marlborough, NY
CM Project #124-004.2, Town Project #23-2001pc**

Dear Chairman and Board Members:

This letter is in response to the following comments: MHE Engineering Technical Review/SWPPP Comments dated 9-25-24; Ulster County Planning Board Recommendations dated 10-2-24; MHE Engineering Technical Review Comments dated 10-16-24; and Creighton Manning Review Comments dated 10-20-24, regarding the Marlborough Resort Project. The comments are in the order received and our responses are in bold italics.

MHE ENGINEERING TECHNICAL REVIEW/SWPPP COMMENTS 9-25-24

1. Twelve existing drainage areas were identified and evaluated for pre-development flow rates. Post- development condition of the site divided the site into 14 drainage areas. The pre-development and post-development drainage areas each identify 154+/- acres.

Response: Acknowledged

2. Section 5.2 references Appendix K: Green infrastructure calculations. It states that shade green infrastructure, map below, which details the catchment areas that go to each GI practice. No map is incorporated below. Provide map or reference to Appendix containing map.

Response: The GI practice map has been added to Appendix K. Map is attached to the SWPPP as a full size sheet.

3. Section 6 identifies: See comparison table below for sites analysis points under existing and proposed conditions. Table #3 Stormwater Quantity Comparison is not incorporated into the plan.

Response: The comparison table has been added to the SWPPP.

4. A Soils Map is included as Appendix D. Description of the soils should be included in the SWPPP.

Response: A breakdown of soil types and hydrologic soil groups has been added to the SWPPP.

5. The document should discuss project phasing for construction activities.

Response: A Phasing Plan has been added to the plan set and Appendix M of the SWPPP showing how construction can be phased without requesting a 5-acre waiver.

6. Appendix N: Notice of Intent is missing.

Response: The Notice of Intent has been added to Appendix N of the SWPPP.

7. An analysis of the underlying soils for design of the pervious pavement should be provided. It is noted that 15 inches per hour of exfiltration over the pervious pavement surfaces are identified. Soil borings and permeability testing of the underlying subsoil should be provided to evaluate underlying soils that infiltrate.

Response: Test pit and infiltration test results have been added to the stormwater details.

8. Soil testing and permeability testing for infiltration basins is required.

Response: Test pit and infiltration test results have been added to the stormwater details.

9. Erosion and Sediment Control Phasing Plan should be provided to identify the limits of disturbance in each phase. SWPPP should identify if a 5 Acre Waiver is required, and, if required, additional conditions for the 5 Acre Waiver should be addressed in the SWPPP.

Response: A Phasing Plan has been added to the plan set showing phases that will not exceed the 5-acre limitation.

10. Soil testing and permeability for infiltration basin Pond 2 should be provided. It is noted 20 inch per hour infiltration rates are identified in the stormwater model. Location of all infiltration testing should be identified on the plans.

Response: Test pit and infiltration test results have been added to the stormwater details.

11. Check velocities from the discharge pipe of Bio-Retention Area #1. A 32.4% slope is identified.

Response: The discharge pipe from the bioretention has been revised to a slope of 2%.

12. Check stormwater model for Bio-Retention #1 outlet invert versus discharge. The discharge invert is labeled as 574 on the plans while it is labeled 575 in the model.

Response: The outlet invert has been coordinated on both plan and HydroCAD models.

13. The porous pavement detail should be revised to depict the underdrain identified on Sheet C-542. The discharge location for the underdrain system should be identified.

Response: The underdrain has been added to the detail and outlet (overflow) pipe is also shown.

14. The pervious parking areas appear to have underdrain design in them. The details identify that it is without underdrain.

Response: The underdrain has been added to the detail.

15. The SWPPP should address stormwater runoff for all improvements located along Road K from Ridge Road to the high point. A single infiltration basin is proposed, however, no system of conveying stormwater from all parking and building areas is identified on the plans.

Response: This area has been regraded and a series of storm sewer pipes has been added to route the runoff to the infiltration basin at Ridge Road.

16. All existing buildings should be labeled as existing structures.

Response: The existing buildings have been labeled.

17. Based on a review of the Traffic Study, additional roadway width may be required for the access drive from Lattintown Road. Additional stormwater management would be required in this area.

Response: The grassed area along both sides of the entry road is within a NYSDEC 100' adjacent area and is generally flat. The entrance road has been widened to include a 3' wide gravel strip on each side of the existing paved drive. A vegetated buffer (GI Practice) is incorporated to each side of the drive with 8' of impervious contributing to a vegetated buffer of approximately 25'.

18. Numerous portions of the site are not addressed in the SWPPP. Roadway construction, cabins, recreational areas etc. are proposed.

Response: We have updated the SWPPP to ensure all areas are covered.

19. Pipe sizing for all proposed roadway crossings should be identified.

Response: Pipe labels have been added to the plan set.

20. The SWPPP identifies that roof leader disconnect will be utilized. Discharge locations for roof leaders should be provided.

Response: Once the building design has been completed, we can add roof leaders at the correct locations (limiting each roof leader to 500 s.f. of roof area per the NYSSWMDM). A note has been added to the Grading Plans.

21. Drainage at the intersection of Ridge Road should be further evaluated. A large section of proposed roadway runs to the east towards Ridge Road.

Response: As much drainage as allowed by grading is diverted into the infiltration basin. The remaining runoff from the proposed roadway does not exceed the existing discharge rate. A defined ditch on the west side of Ridge Road has been called for on the Grading Plans.

22. Erosion control matting is depicted on slopes of the bio-retention area, however, no other erosion control practices are depicted. On the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan soil and erosion control practices should be placed in accordance with appropriate separation distances from the NYSDEC Design Guidelines.

Response: Silt fence has been added to the toe of slope to protect against sediment migration into the adjacent orchard.

23. Additional erosion and sediment control should be evaluated on Sheet 165. Matting is proposed on fill areas; however, practices should be proposed in the interim prior to completion of grading.

Response: Additional erosion and sediment control practices have been added to protect against sediment laden runoff.

24. Sediment traps are depicted on the plan. Sizing of the sediment traps and grading for them should be provided. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should be included for the area of the solar farms and proposed landscape berms.

Response: Sediment traps are sized for 3,600 c.f. per acre of contributory area. Labels, contours, and capacities have been added to the Erosion & Sediment Control Plan.

25. The Geotech Report identifies that ground water was evidenced in multiple borings. Separation distances between stormwater practices and ground water should be evaluated.

Response: Test pit results including elevation of seasonal high groundwater have been added to the stormwater details.

26. Larger scale maps of the Appendix J should be provided. Maps provided are difficult to read on the format presented.

Response: Full size maps are provided with the updated report.

27. The area for the solar farm should be evaluated with regard to stormwater management. Plans consistent with NYSDEC standards for Solar Facilities should be documented.

Response: The solar array construction will be direct driven supports for the panels with minimal ground disturbance. The access road to the array will utilize the NYSDEC approved pervious road section and will not require stormwater management. The equipment pads will have adjacent grass filter strips as designated on the GI Plan.

28. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should be evaluated with regard to placement of additional stormwater management practices. An example being the area south of the Ridge Road access point. Numerous structures and parking lots are proposed without any soil or erosion control practices being proposed.

Response: The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been revised to show the appropriate erosion control practices.

ULSTER COUNTY PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS – 10-2-24

Water District – Required Modifications

The applicant proposes a water tower and an extension of the Marlboro Water District, including the resort. The applicant is already aware, but as a condition of approval, they would require the approval of the City of Newburgh and NYC DEP to obtain access to the water district. Absent this connection, well-testing results, and revised site plans will need to be provided to the Town as part of a re-referral package to the UCPB.

Response: We are aware and moving forward with the process of entering the water district. For clarity, we are proposing a low-profile at-grade storage tank.

Wastewater – Required Modification

The applicant will require the NYS Department of Health's approval of the proposed WWTP/package plant.

Response: Comment noted. Comment noted. Permits will be obtained.

Phasing and Traffic Improvements – Required Modification

The UCPB has reviewed the traffic analysis and recommends that any proposed traffic improvements indicated in the traffic analysis (turning lanes, etc.) occur during the project's first phase before proceeding to subsequent phases to avoid adding additional traffic to the State highway system without first mitigating the issue.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) identifies potential off-site improvements to address existing issues, noting that these pre-existing conditions should not be the sole responsibility of the applicant. The Town's consulting engineer, Creighton Manning, has assessed the project's impact as minor and recommends that the Town consider reviewing these improvement options and engage in discussions with the applicant regarding a fair-share contribution towards a selected improvement. The applicant is open to negotiating a fair-share agreement to support the advancement of this improvement.

Relative to project fair share for possible roadway improvements, three of the four study intersections along US 9W highlighted by Creighton Manning were Old Orchard Road, King Street, and Lattintown Road. Under Full Build conditions, the Traffic Impact Report only identified possible project-related improvements at Lattintown Road. This is largely due to three nominal aspects at Old Orchard Road and King Street leading to no requirement for substantive improvements.

1. *The proposed action constitutes 1.4% or less of the total peak hour traffic at Old Orchard Road and 1.8% or less of the total peak hour traffic at King Street.*
2. *There are no project-related changes in the Level of Service at Old Orchard Street nor King Street.*
3. *Project-related changes in delay for any movements are 4.2 seconds or less at Old Orchard Street and 6.3 seconds or less at King Street. Creighton Manning reiterated these conditions and did not find significant concerns with these delay increases.*

Pursuant to improvements at Lattintown Road, Creighton Manning noted that, "The Lattintown results will be very dependent on the volume split between this road and Carter Road. Out of town guests will follow the GPS directions while local guests, with an awareness of Route 9W traffic, may use the traffic signal at Carter/Route 9W."

The Traffic Impact Report projects that the development will contribute up to 4.63% of total traffic during the PM peak hour and up to 7.28% during the Saturday peak hour. A fair-share contribution could average these to 5.95%, with the applicant providing a sketch and estimate, or an equivalent arrangement and structure.

Staff Housing and Phasing – Required Modification

Housing availability for staff in the site's development should be required in the first or second phase. Not only will this help the resort hire and place staff, but it will also reduce the competition for affordable housing elsewhere in the Town and surrounding area and reduce commuting traffic to the site.

Response: Staff dorms will be included in the first phase.

Special Events – Required Modification

A special events traffic and parking plan and an emergency response plan for special events are recommended as a condition of approval. These plans should be shared with local law enforcement and emergency responders for their review.

Response: Comment noted. This can be addressed as a condition of approval.

Lighting – Required Modification

A more detailed photometric plan should be provided for each section of the site plan. All luminaires should be LED and must meet the “fully shielded” definition adopted by the International Dark-Sky Association (IDSA) or be an approved fixture of IDSA with cut sheets provided. An average lighting level for each section of the site plan should be identified, and trespassing on the adjacent roadways and properties should be avoided. Lighting cut sheets of proposed fixtures will need to be provided. Using lighted bollards along walking paths rather than pole-mounted fixtures where practicable is recommended. Any pole-mounted fixtures should be limited to a height of 15' or less.

Response: Sheets L100 and L101 have been revised to show a more detailed lighting planning including lighting contours and foot candles. While L100 displays the entirety of the project site, sheet L101 shows a more detailed look at the areas of interest. A table displaying the average lighting statistics has also been included on sheet L100, which shows information for the entire site along with each of the areas of interest. In addition, all the light poles have been adjusted to a 15-foot maximum as requested and are dark sky compliant.

Limits of Disturbance and Conservation Easement – Required Modification

The Town recently reviewed the proposed expansion of Buttermilk Falls, where the applicant kept the limits of disturbance as close as possible to the proposed cabins while limiting the removal of existing trees and vegetation to preserve privacy and limit visual impacts. The UCPB recommends a similar treatment whereby the limits of disturbance are similarly handled on the site plans and marked in the field. A typical site/landscaping plan for the proposed cabins and homes should also be provided to the Town Planning Board for review. The UCPB also recommends that the remaining existing vegetation be noted on the plans as not to be removed and a conservation easement to ensure it should be considered.

Response: The cabins are designed to be in a natural, unlandscaped setting, so detailed landscaping plans are not required. The layout minimizes disturbance by utilizing existing shale roads, and trees were surveyed to ensure careful placement of the cabins, limiting clearing to only small, select areas.

Sustainability Features – Required Modification

Electric heating and cooling are recommended, and sustainable materials are used during construction. EV-charging stations and infrastructure are also recommended for guest and employee use. Where practicable, the Board recommends the development of

solar arrays to make the resort as self-sufficient as possible to handle its energy consumption needs.

Response: EV charging stations are planned for the main campus, where guests can park and then use electric golf carts to travel within the site. Additionally, a solar array is proposed to support sustainable energy needs.

Distillery – Required Modification

Given the proximity of the existing structure for this part of the proposal to the residential neighborhood on Ridge Road and the availability of land in the proposed project, on the project in total, the UCPB recommends that the existing structure be renovated for storage use only and that the Distillery and Tasting Room be established elsewhere in a location that is more integrated and walkable to access within the resort complex. Truck traffic associated with the Distillery should access the site only from the County Route on Lattintown Road, not the residential roadway.

Response: The distillery has been repositioned centrally within the site, adjacent to Clubhouse Dining Area 2. Given its small-batch production, truck traffic will be minimal, primarily supporting on-site use. The roadways will be designed to accommodate deliveries via Lattintown Road as needed.

MHE ENGINEERING TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMENTS 10-16-24

1. The applicant's have addressed previous SWPPP comments in a narrative response. A revised SWPPP addressing the comments must be submitted for further review.

Response: A revised SWPPP is included with the 10/25/24 submission.

2. Detailed plans showing all revisions must be provided.

Response: Revised plans are provided with the 10/25/24 submission.

3. The project access road has been revised to provide for turn outs/ passing lanes. This should be reviewed by the Towns Traffic Consultant with regard to single lane access to the site. Creighton Mannings traffic comments in general should also be received by the Board.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and worked with Creighton Manning to find a viable design solution for the Lattintown Road access road. The entrance road has been modified to add a 3' wide gravel/stone strip to each side of the existing asphalt drive to provide for two-way traffic.

4. The proposed distillery use previously identified in the vicinity of Ridge Road has been relocated on the site to the vicinity of the proposed water tank. It is noted, that Ulster County Planning Department concerns regarding use and traffic to the previous distillery location were received.

Response: This comment has been addressed. See above response to County Planning comment.

5. Status of the water system design including the size of the proposed water tank should be addressed. Outside agency approvals for the water district extension may be required including, but not limiting the potential Town of Newburgh and NYCDEP. Water Taking/Water Conservation Program approval through NYSDEC is also required for water district extensions. Water main extension plans require Department of Health approval.

Response: The final details of the agreement to enter the water district are underway, and all applicable approvals will be obtained.

6. The project is proposed to be served by an on-site packaged sewer treatment plant. This facility will require approval from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the New York State Health Department.

Response: Comment noted. All required approvals will be obtained.

7. Ulster County Planning identify the requirement for additional detail plan for site lighting. Lighting plan in compliance with the Ulster County Planning comments should be provided.

Response: This comment has been addressed. See above response to County Planning comment.

8. Limits of disturbance should be added to the plans.

Response: Limits of disturbance are provided on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plans.

9. 8 one-bedroom cabins associated infrastructure have been removed and replaced by 2 four-bedroom guest cabins. The relocated cabins are grouped in an area with other cabins proposed.

Response: Acknowledged.

10. The applicant's representative should review with the Planning Board the changes to the project since the previous appearance.

Response: Changes were presented to the Planning Board at the Public Hearing on October 21, 2024.

11. NYSDEC wetland permits are required for activities on the site which impact the wetlands and associated buffers. Status of any outside agency approvals should be addressed with the Board.

Response: Comment noted. We presented updates to the Planning Board at the October 21, 2024 public hearing. We plan to seek all outside agency approvals upon completion of SEQR.

CREIGHTON MANNING COMMENTS – 10-20-24

Traffic Study

1. The study provides a crash analysis and reports the Potential Safety Improvement and Performance Function. It appears the results for the Route 9W/Lattintown Road intersection are provided, but were any other intersections studied and reported?

Response: The Traffic Impact Report reviewed the 2023 Ulster County Road Safety Plan and found that no study intersections were identified as requiring further review. Passero assessed the crash history at the US 9W and Lattintown Road intersection separately and provided such results in the Traffic Impact Report.

2. The Traffic Impact Report (TIR) included the Hudson West and Dock Road residential projects, along with several other unnamed projects under consideration by the town. We suggest citing which projects these are and defer to the Planning Board if this is an accurate list.

Response: Passero identified the following projects and either included specific trip generation and associated assignments or assumed trip generation as part of the ambient growth factor. Birdsall Avenue condos, Dock Road apartments, Marlboro on Hudson, Buttermilk Falls Resort, and Willow Tree Resort.

3. NYSDOT traffic counts collected on Lattintown Road in September 2011 (1,780 vpd ADT) compared to July 2024 (1,715 vpd ADT) suggest a flat to slight downward trend. Similarly, volumes on Route 9W from May 2014 (22,781 vpd ADT) to August 2024 (18,037 vpd ADT) suggest a downward trend. We concur with the conservative positive growth rate of 0.75% per year.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the growth rate.

4. The project has a unique set of land use offerings and amenities which results in a complicated trip generation estimate but the applicant approached it from a logical perspective. Each major use was estimated followed by an assumption about internal credits. The internal trip credits reduced the baseline traffic for the dining uses by about 38% and spa by 50%. In other words, it assumes that 38% of the dining guests come from the resort while 62% come from off-site guests, and 50% of the spa users are from the resort while the other 50% is from the public. The resulting non-event trips are estimated at 150 total trips in the PM peak hour and 205 trips in the Saturday peak hour, which equates to a trip rate of 1.61 trips per room in the PM peak hour and 2.2 trips per room in the Saturday peak hour. In comparison, the Mirbeau Spa cited generated traffic at a rate of 1.17 trips per room and 1.5 trips per room in the PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively. We concur with the approach and trip generation estimates, noting that the October 11, 2024 Response to Comment letter made several adjustments lowering the trip generation as a result of decreases in land use sizes.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the methodology.

5. The regional trip distribution appears reasonable, however, there may be a shift in traffic coming from the south. GPS may route arriving traffic from Route 9W onto Carter Avenue, where a signal and left turn lane exist, rather than a left turn onto Lattintown Road in Newburgh. This may depend on traffic conditions and the driver's GPS program.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and concurs with the potential for new trips to alter their patterns depending on time of day or driver's GPS program.

6. The trip distribution assumed that 20% of trips would use the Ridge Road entrance. In the October update, the distillery and tasting room was moved off Ridge Road to the center of the site. With a gate provided just west of the staff quarters, will any guests be using the Ridge Road driveway? The trip assignment indicates that the volume

entering/exiting this driveway is around 20 trips in each direction. We don't expect that moving this low volume to the Lattintown Road driveway will have a significant effect on intersection operations.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and refers to the reviewer the response to Comment 7. In addition, traffic in that area will be minimal, likely limited to guests visiting Clubhouse Dining Area 2.

7. If the gate near the staff quarters is to restrict through access, then all guests will use the Lattintown Road driveway adding more two-way volume on what is otherwise an 825-foot one lane road. CM asked Passero to model the driveway as a two-lane road with the projected traffic volumes and observe the number of potential conflicts between cars passing each other. This exercise suggested that the conflicts were enough to consider additional modifications to the site driveway. We anticipate that the applicant will offer additional widening of the Lattintown driveway to improve two-way operations and agree this will offer better condition than a one-lane road with pull offs.

Response: The security office will monitor and control specific deliveries, staff access, and emergency access. Additionally, a Knox Box or similar feature can be provided for emergency responders. During restaurant operating hours, the gate will generally remain open, though access controls may be adjusted as we gather operational data. Internal traffic will primarily consist of bicycles, walking, and electric vehicles/golf carts.

8. We concur that the project volumes won't warrant left turn lanes on Lattintown Road or Ridge Road.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the methodology.

9. The intersection operations analysis does not offer any surprising results. The unsignalized approaches of Old Indian Road, King Street, and Lattintown Road to Route 9W operate with the longest delays. With the conservative trip generation volumes used in the July 2024 TIR, the unsignalized approaches increase by 4 seconds or less at Old Indian Road, 2 to 6 seconds at King Street, and about 7 seconds (Saturday peak hour) to over 100 seconds (PM peak hour) at Lattintown Road. The Lattintown results will be very dependent on the volume split between this road and Carter Avenue. Out of town guests will follow the GPS directions while local guests, with an awareness of Route 9W traffic, may use the traffic signal at Carter/Route 9W.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the findings.

10. The rest of the study area intersections all operate a very good conditions will little to no effect on capacity from the proposed project.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the findings.

11. The TIR acknowledges the couple of intersections with longer delays but generally attributes the conditions to existing/background traffic volumes with little contribution from the project, and that the improvements noted in the Route 9W Corridor Study, if programmed and completed, would provide relief from some of the longer delays. We generally agree with this conclusion, but unless these improvements are programmed by the county or NYSDOT, there will be no relief. The Corridor Study has a number of recommendations ranging from sidewalk and pedestrian oriented improvements in the Marlborough hamlet to widening, turn lane, and traffic control improvements along the corridor. The Town may wish to review/refresh themselves with these improvements and discuss a fair-share contribution with the applicant to progress a selected improvement. While the traffic impacts of the Marlborough Resort project may be minor and dispersed to various intersections, their contribution to improvements could be focused in one area of greatest need or benefit.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the fair-share approach. See response to County comment above.

12. The sight distance analysis on Lattintown Road generally indicate adequate conditions. However, does the distance looking right account for existing vegetation or assume it's been cleared? Field observations (image below, left) suggest the sight distance is limited to around 200 feet given the low approach of the driveway and the existing vegetation. Looking left appears adequate, but if the roadside grass/weeds are allowed to grow taller, sight distance will be reduced (image below, right). Routine maintenance may correct this condition.

Response: Passero acknowledges this comment and recognizes the concurrence of the findings.

13. Similarly, the sight distance onto Ridge Road appears excellent looking to the right but limited to less than 200 feet due to vegetation immediately north of the driveway (image, below, left). A southbound driver may only see a cars front bumper pulling out

due to the vegetation (image below, right). Although the applicant recommends an intersection warning sign, additional effort should be provided to mitigate this condition.

Response: We will review sight lines and cut back as necessary.

Site Plan

14. Sheet C131 - The main entrance from Lattintown Road has additional pull-offs added to allow vehicles to yield to each other along this +/-825-foot driveway. Each of capable of holding one standard vehicle or two compact vehicles. The sight lines appear adequate to see an approaching vehicle between pull-offs, the longest stretch of which is 200 ft, however the frequency of conflicts may exceed the capacity of this layout under peak conditions.

Response: The pulloffs have been removed. The road is now proposed as 16-foot width to accommodate two-way travel.

15. Sheet C132 - Porous pavement is proposed for several of the parking areas. We presume this will be porous asphalt and parking will be striped. If the parking area is gravel or structural pavers, we recommend that some type of parking space demarcation be provided. What's the Road A width immediately north of the Clubhouse Dining Room 1? Are any deliveries (truck movements) expected to the dining room?

Response: The porous pavement area will be asphalt and striped. There is a dedicated delivery area for Clubhouse Dining Room 1.

16. General - Will each guest/guest cabin have access to club carts (carts)? Are guests expected to use these carts to navigate the property, leaving their car in the main parking lot? Is there cart parking at each cabin or the tennis courts, main lodge, etc.?

Response: Yes, guests will have access to carts after parking at the main lodge. Additional cart parking areas have also been added throughout the site for convenience.

17. General – Guest house and general wayfinding signs will be necessary. “Carts Only” signing may be needed where cart access is allowed but not vehicles. Any internal traffic control (stop, curve, steep grade, etc.) will need to be considered.

Response: A comprehensive branded signage package will be developed for wayfinding throughout the site. Internal traffic control signage will also be

designed and finalized before receiving final approval. Each guest house will be labeled with illuminated bollards at each unit for clear identification.

18. Sheet C133 – Label the roads. Road M on this sheet is labeled as Road N in the fire access sheets. Is any cart parking necessary at the tennis/pickleball courts?

Response: Labels have been updated, and cart parking has been added at the tennis/pickleball courts as well as other key amenities.

19. Sheet C135 – Label roads.

Response: Labels have been updated.

20. Sheet C137 – Label roads. There is a gate proposed on the west leg of the road. Who has access? How will it be open? Can carts drive or people walk around it? When is Dining 2 used and by whom? The tasting room moved to this location with parking provided. Are guests allowed to drive here? Arriving from the Ridge Road or Lattintown Road driveways?

Response: Outside guests will come from Ridge Road. Internally the golf carts will have the ability to open gates. During service hours the gates may be left open.

21. Sheet C138 – An “employees only” sign may be necessary. Will garbage service/dumpster be provided at the staff quarters? We assume staff may get deliveries (mail, parcels, etc.) – will the staff dorm have its own address? There is a gate proposed on the west leg of the road. Who has access? How will it be open? Can carts drive or people walk around it?

Response: Employees Only' signs will be installed as needed. The security office will be located within the staff dorms, and designated golf carts will have gate access capability, though pedestrian access will remain available around the gate. The dumpster will be housed in an indoor garbage room within the building.

22. General – We expect Google, Apple, Waze, etc., may eventually identify the project roads as having access from Lattintown Road to Ridge Road. It will be important to follow up with those mapping services to identify the road is “private” so that drivers aren’t accidentally routed through the site.

Response: Comment noted. We will follow up with the mapping services.

23. General – there may be a missing sheet between C136 and C138 showing the end of Road A and the intersection with Road K.

Response: A few sheets have been removed from the set as the 8 standalone cabins were removed from the project scope. Viewports have been updated to provide better coverage.

24. Vehicle Maneuvering Plans –

- a. General – if cabins anticipate providing space for cart parking, consider enough room away from the sections of roads with steep grades to allow for maintenance and cleaning service vehicles to park on a less steep grade. Will any of the carts struggle to climb the steep grade sections?

Response: We have added cart parking spaces at all cabin locations.

- b. General – It appears that fire and ambulance access can be provided in all areas and that there are alternative routes for most of the steep sections. The Removal of Road A (E-04, PR-03, -20) will leave one section of Road G with a 9% to 22% grade that may need to be used depending on the location of the emergency and the location of the responding department/vehicle.

Response: This route is not one of the primary fire access paths. Our design includes two main access points—one at Lattintown Road and another at Ridge Road. From these entry points, all buildings are accessible via pathways (marked in green) that maintain slopes of less than 10%, ensuring safe and manageable access.

- c. E-02 – confirm North direction.

Response: This has been corrected. Given the minor changes to these sheets, they will be resubmitted in a future submission.

Summary

25. Our overall summary of the project is that we don't foresee any significant SEQR issues relative to traffic. The projects off-site impacts are generally minor, but additional review and site plan modifications are suggested.

Response: Comment noted.

Please contact me directly with questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher J LaPorta

Chris LaPorta, P.E.

CL:kf

CC: File