

PUBLIC COMMENT  
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS  
SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL  
April 10, 2018  
THROUGH  
April 11, 2018

82 04 10 2018 Hampshire CC STEIN Public Comment

83 04 10 2018 Hampshire CC JACKSON FMAC Comments

83a 04 10 2018 Hampshire CC JACKSON FMAC attachment

84 04 10 2018 Hampshire CC BENNETT Public Comment

85 04 11 2018 Hampshire CC WOLFF Public Comment

86 04 11 2018 Hampshire CC GLINSKI Public Comment

87 04 11 2018 Hampshire CC FLAHERTY Public Comment

**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Stein, Kerry (New York) <Kerry.Stein@lbusa.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 2:42 PM  
**To:** Betty-Ann Sherer  
**Cc:** Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas  
**Subject:** Hampshire developement

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Classification:** Public

To the members of the village of Mamaroneck Planning Board

As I will be traveling on April 11<sup>th</sup> I am writing to register my strenuous opposition to the current plans for the development of Hampshire country club. I attended the Feb 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of your Board. I have followed this and attended countless meetings since 2012, when HHC first attempted to change the village Zoning laws. I am struck by the continued actions of this developer to distort the truth and by their complete contempt for the community they are trying to forever alter for the worst. In that light I would respectfully ask you to consider not only the arguments you have already heard against this development ( Negative environmental impact, overcrowding schools that are already at full capacity, safety, flooding and traffic to name a few) all of which are valid and more than enough cause to deny this application.

My concern, and I think it is one that the Planning Board should also take into account, is the past actions of this applicant. The best you could say is that they have been completely disingenuous in their dealing with the village and the community. It is more than fair to say they have been outright deceitful. From the onset, they had a plan to change our Zoning laws to maximize their profits for a condo development, it was NEVER their intent to run a golf course operation. The project is financially backed by a vulture hedge fund where the expected return for capital is 15-20%. This clearly would not be the expected return of a Golf course operation of any kind. The developer choose to overpay for the property with the expectation that they could just change our zoning laws to achieve the desired results. Sadly, their overpayment blocked a potential purchase by the village and town to operate the course in the same fashion as Rye golf. This fact is proven by their immediate grieving of their taxes, they knew from the start that they were overpaying for the property. Then they had the audacity to sight financial hardship as a reason to change our correct and protective zoning laws. With this dual plan they are in effect threatening a large scale development to once again try and pressure the board into granting changes to allow for the their profit maximization, none of which they are owed in any way, shape or form. This project was never more than a distressed real estate play and an attempt to take advantage of a "sleepy" little village for their pure profit. It is hard to envision any part of this project that serves or benefits our village in any way,. Please deny this applicant.

Sincerely,

*Kerry Stein*

25 year village resident

**Kerry Stein**  
Managing Director – Head of Credit Trading

**COMMERCIAL BANKING**

---

**D:** +1 212 827 3132 | **M:** +1 914 409 2411 | **E:** [kerry.stein@lbusa.com](mailto:kerry.stein@lbusa.com)  
[www.lbusa.com](http://www.lbusa.com)

Lloyds Bank, 1095 Avenue of the Americas, 34th Floor, New York, NY 10036

Reduce printing. Lloyds Banking Group is helping to build the low carbon economy.  
[Corporate Responsibility Report](#)

This message and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete the message and any attachments. Access, copying, dissemination or use of this e-mail or any attachment, or any information contained therein, by any other person is prohibited.

Lloyds Bank is a brand name of Lloyds Bank plc (Registered in England and Wales no. 2065) and Bank of Scotland plc (Registered in Scotland no. SC327000). Lloyds Bank plc and Bank of Scotland plc are authorized and regulated in the United Kingdom by the Financial Services Authority. Lloyds Securities Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Lloyds Bank plc.

FMAC points on the DEIS for the Hampshire Property Development

1) The FEMA flood maps show that most of the Hampshire Country Club property is in the AE zone, not the VE zone. The flooding on this property is caused by two factors: a) tidal surge and b) the height of the water table and the effects of heavy rains on the high water table. We do not feel your study adequately addresses the issues caused in heavy rains due to the high water table. There are many instances when this property floods and the flooding is not caused by tidal surge or a coastal flood event. In addition there are serious concerns relating to storm water runoff from the new construction and its effect on the berms. What engineering will be done in the berms to assure that runoff will not erode the structure and security of the berms? What additional piping will be installed to carry the runoff away from the site?

2) On page 3G-1 you cite costal flood incidents in Harbor Heights on both March 13,2010 and October 29,2012. Harbor Heights is located at least 1 mile from the coast and suffers from riverine flooding. The residents of Harbor Heights did not flood in either of these storms. A member of our committee lives in Harbor Heights and can attest to that fact.

3) Your study suggests that Cooper Road can be used as support for emergency vehicles during a flood event. At this point this road is substandard and cannot support this use. If it is determined this road cannot be made to support emergency vehicles, the only entrance/exit points will remain Cove Rd and Eagles Knoll Road. These roads are both inundated during flood events and will cause any new construction to become land locked. In 2007 during the Nor Easter, Harbor Heights became land locked due to flooded portions of Mamaroneck Avenue and there was a death due to the fact that emergency vehicles could not get to the home of the victim. This cannot be permitted again. In addition, Cooper is a private road and currently neither the club nor the Village have any right to work on this road. Also this road floods in heavy rains-not only in coastal storms. How will this be addressed? In addition, what will the height of the Cooper extension be? It will need to be above the 100 and 500 year flood levels.

4) The Draft EIS states two studies for the future of sea level rise in Mamaroneck. One study predicts a rise of 1 1/2 feet while the second study predicts a rise of 4 feet. If the project is developed at a BFE of 16'(the current level at Hampshire is 12'), and the second study is correct, then the homes will no longer be 2 feet above the base flood elevation and will be in **harm's** way during flood events.

5) On pg 3F-3 the report discusses tide gates not being sized for tidal storm events; given the significant proposed development of residences within the property, was there analysis of the potential to increase the size of these gates?

6) On pg 3G-2 there are four bullet points under Section (b) Village Regulations. It would be interesting to see more specific discussion of exactly how these regulations will be met. The bullets are as followed, copied here for easy reference:

Chapter 186 of the Village of Mamaroneck Code outlines the Village's Flood Damage Prevention regulations. The following is a summary of the regulations that will apply to the Proposed Action:

- §186-4. Administration: The full set of administrative regulations governing floodplains would apply to the Proposed Action. This section states that a floodplain development permit is required for all construction and other development to be undertaken in areas of special flood hazard (§186-4(B)(1)). A determination must be made whether a proposed development would result in physical damage to any other property (§186-4(D)(1)(c)).

- §186-5(A)(2). Subdivision Proposals: Subdivision proposals shall be consistent with the need to minimize flood damage; public utilities and facilities such as sewer, gas, electrical and water systems shall be located and constructed so as to minimize flood damage; and adequate drainage shall be provided to reduce exposure to flood damage.

- §186-5(B). Standards for all structures: New structures in areas of special flood hazard shall follow all relevant regulations governing anchoring, construction materials and methods, and utilities.

- §186-5(C)(1). Elevation of residential structures within zone AE: New construction and substantial improvements shall have the lowest floor elevated to or above two feet above the base flood level. Other zone regulations are not applicable for the Project Site.

**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Jackson, Peggy <Peggy.Jackson@coldwellbankermoves.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 3:21 PM  
**To:** Betty-Ann Sherer  
**Subject:** Revised FMAC memo  
**Attachments:** fmac DEIS notes.docx

Dear Ms. Sherer,

I just made a quick change to the FMAC memo to the Planning board. Please distribute this memo and not the one I sent approx. 20 mins ago. Please confirm.

Thank you for your help!

My Kindest Regards,

Peggy

Peggy Jackson/Co-Chair FMAC

**914-320-0268 cell**

[peggy.jackson@cbmoves.com](mailto:peggy.jackson@cbmoves.com)

[www.peggybjackson.com](http://www.peggybjackson.com)

**\*Wire Fraud is Real\*. Before wiring any money, call the intended recipient at a number you know is valid to confirm the instructions.** Additionally, please note that the sender does not have authority to bind a party to a real estate contract via written or verbal communication.

**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Christine Bennett <christinembennett88@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 5:38 PM  
**To:** Leon Potok; Betty-Ann Sherer; Keith Waitt; Nora Lucas; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur  
**Subject:** Hampshire Golf Club Development - Concerned Neighbor

Hello,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Orienta (630 Stiles Avenue) regarding the current plans for 105 single family homes or a 125 condominium complex at Hampshire Golf Club.

My family and I are AGAINST the development of these units as it will increase traffic, crowd schools and the construction will be a disturbance to the neighborhood; to name a few of the negative attributes. Please consider these matters and do not build these units in our neighborhood.

Thank you,  
Christine Bennett

**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Patricia Wolff <patty.wolff1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:38 AM  
**To:** Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt  
**Subject:** Opposition to Hampshire DEIS

Dear Mayor, Members of the Planning Board and Members of the Board of Trustees

My name is Patty Wolff and I live in Mamaroneck at 1045 Nautilus Lane. I am writing to express my opposition to the Hampshire DEIS. While there are many reasons that I do not support the proposal, there are two main reasons why I feel this would be extremely detrimental and in fact, illegal, for our community to proceed with.

1) The project is illegal and inconsistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan. One of the things that makes our community what it is is the fact that we protect and preserve it's natural resources.. As you know, Hampshire is a designed flood plain. It is also a Crticial Environmental Area in our Village. We MUST do everything we can to protect our open spaces.

2) One of the reasons many people move to our area is the quality of our schools and our ability to maintain reasonable class sizes, offer community schools and outstanding programs. Our schools are already overcrowded. As you know, the district is currently conducting a community wide study of this issue. Development of Hampshire would exacerbate this situation. I believe 105 more homes would put an additional, unreasonable burden on our school and significantly impact our school system in a negative way.

I hope you will consider by views as you review the Hampshire DEIS and strongly urge you to protect the Hampshire land as an community open space and protect this key asset in our environment

Best  
Patty Wolff



**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Chris Glinski <glinskic@colonnadeproperties.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 11, 2018 9:55 AM  
**To:** Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt  
**Subject:** Hampshire Development - Field Issues

Dear Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board,

My name is Christopher B. Glinski and I am the President of Larchmont Mamaroneck Youth Lacrosse ("LMYL"). I have also been a resident of Larchmont for approximately 17 years. LMYL was founded almost 20 years ago and has grown into one of the largest youth lacrosse programs in the country. We have roughly 800 boys and girls involved in our recreational league and travel program. LMYL, which is primarily a volunteer program, has over 100 parent coaches and serves kids in our community from kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Field space continues to be our biggest challenge. In order to run our program, we have needed to procure field time in other neighboring municipalities on both town fields and private school fields. In fact, roughly 25% of our field time is located outside of the Town of Mamaroneck. Within our own town, we have access to five fields, some on relatively limited basis. We share these fields with both modified and high school teams as well as other youth and adult sports such as soccer, football and baseball.

Youth lacrosse programs in other neighboring communities face similar field challenges. Unfortunately, many of those communities have been forced to eliminate their recreational programs for kids beyond 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> grade. Some communities have eliminated their programs altogether. LMYL's recreational program is the foundation of our league and we are firmly committed to continue offering this to kids in our community. This is a fun and developmental league that offers children of all ages and abilities the opportunity to learn the game of lacrosse, participate on a team and be taught some valuable life lessons.

The proposed development of 105 homes at the Hampshire Country Club will unquestionably compound the field challenges we face. With most young families in our community seeming to have no fewer than 2 kids, it is totally within reason that this development could bring 100 – 200 additional kids to our town. If this occurs, there is the very real possibility that we will not be able to accommodate all of the kids interested in playing lacrosse. It's also possible that we will need to eliminate portions of our program due to losing our current allocation of field time as overall field demand from various sports programs increases. Given our community's inability to serve our current field demand, increasing the demand on our fields without creating new ones seems unwise. Unfortunately, other than the 100 acres of greenspace at Hampshire, there really isn't any additional land on which our community can create the necessary field space.

I appreciate your time and hope you consider the impact of this proposed development on our youth sports programs.

Sincerely,

Christopher B. Glinski  
President  
Larchmont Mamaroneck Youth Lacrosse



**Betty-Ann Sherer**

---

**From:** Joan Vollero Flaherty <[joan.vollero@gmail.com](mailto:joan.vollero@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 11, 2018 11:41 AM  
**To:** Mayor Tom Murphy; Betty-Ann Sherer; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt  
**Subject:** Fwd: opposition to Hampshire development

Good Morning:

I received a bounceback from the below address late yesterday. Please reply to confirm receipt, thank you!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Joan Vollero Flaherty** <[joan.vollero@gmail.com](mailto:joan.vollero@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Apr 9, 2018 at 12:37 PM  
Subject: opposition to Hampshire development  
To: [BSherer@vomny.com](mailto:BSherer@vomny.com)

Ms. Sherer:

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting but wanted to voice my opposition to the proposed development at Hampshire. There are several reasons for this -- and I am sure you have heard them all -- but my biggest concern is school overcrowding. Our district is already in crisis: we simply do not have the capacity for another hundred or so families without a new elementary school being built. The marketing materials and tactics being used by the Hampshire developers have been deceptive and misleading. The community was told that this was envisioned as a "senior living" community, but there is absolutely nothing preventing these homes from being occupied by people and families of all ages, and I am certain that many young families would jump at the chance to move into newly construction homes in our community. This isn't an issue of desirability, but of capacity. Our town, schools, roads, and environment cannot handle this development as currently envisioned.

Sincerely,  
Joan Vollero  
46 Maple Hill Drive  
Larchmont, NY 10538