

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED APRIL 22, 2018
THROUGH
April 23, 2018

106 04 23 2018 Hampshire CC HCZMC Comment memo

107 04 22 2018 Hampshire CC ARFIELD Public Comment with attachment

108 04 23 2018 Hampshire CC KIRWIN Public Comment

Village of
Mamaroneck HCZM
Commission

Memo

To: Chairman Verni and Members of the Planning Board
From: Cindy Goldstein, Chair, HCZMC
CC: Les Steinman & Anna Georgiou, Land Use Board's Counsel
Date: April 23, 2018
Re: HCZMC Comments – Hampshire DEIS

Attached please find the HCZMC's comments on the DEIS which were unanimously adopted at the April 18th Commission meeting. Also attached is the memo from our environmental consultant, Sven Hoeger.

**Hampshire Country Club Redevelopment
HCZMC Involved Agency Comments on DEIS**

1. a. Wetlands delineation is needed for the site. Jurisdiction clarification required from Army Corps and NYSDEC
b. Jurisdiction determinations required from Army Corps, NYSDEC, NYSDOS and NYSOGS.
2. More information is required regarding the location of and the effects of cutting and filling contaminated soils, during construction (airborne and under flooding conditions) and post construction/long term with regard to safety. Two metals, arsenic and lead are present on site. Greater detail re: the location and impacts of cut & fill activities for site redevelopment is needed, including impacts associated with steep slopes and areas prone to erosion (evaluate risk that contaminants will be exposed). Identify contaminated soils be remediated, used as fill and/or used to regrade the site.
3. Confirmation is needed that remediation of soils for the 55 to 60 acres to be disturbed and capping will meet all applicable regulatory requirements, including but not limited to New York State DEC regulations.
4. There are concerns that there is no remediation plan for proposed open space areas. There is concern that if open space areas are not subject to remediation, there still may be impacts to the 55 to 60 acres to be developed as well as to nearby properties.
5. The “natural area” should be defined. Does this refer solely to the open space area or other areas, proposed nine-hole golf course, other areas?
6. Additional information should be provided concerning impacts on all species of birds including shore birds and all other fish and wildlife (effects of loss of habitat and tree canopy).
7. The Commission is concerned that the proposed plans for redevelopment fragments open space to be preserved on the site. The space is not contiguous and that is not as beneficial to wildlife. Wildlife corridors are effectively eliminated. The Commission has concerns about impacts on all wildlife, not only endangered species. Additional studies are required.

8. It is proposed that the 432 trees to be cut down are to be replaced in kind. These replacement trees all need to grow to maturity to provide the benefits of the existing mature trees proposed to be removed. There are very detrimental impacts to the tree canopy and the proposed replacement in kind will not effectively address this loss. Trees also provide protection against flooding, prevent soil erosion, and increase water absorption into the ground. It is proposed that replacement trees be planted in multiples of three to four times what is currently proposed to be removed. See also Village Environmental Consultant Sven Hoeger's memorandum dated January 12, 2018 reviewing DEIS which is annexed hereto ("Hoeger Memo").
9. The Commission disagrees with the conclusion on impacts of leaving the site undeveloped. The resulting "wild area" will offer some benefits to wildlife and the environment. See Hoeger memo.
10. Integrated pest management should be implemented for the entire site. The applicant should address the least toxic alternatives for pest management. The EIS should address this issue in detail.
11. There are concerns regarding the regrading and creation of embankments and impacts on site and off site, in particular impacts to water flows and aquifers (ground water), and other site conditions such as steep slopes/erosion control.
12. There are concerns about the effect of elevating the portion of the site to be developed. In particular the effect on other low-lying properties in the vicinity should be studied. It appears the area to be developed and access roads will be elevated. The impacts associated with elevated roadways should be fully evaluated, including accessibility and how emergency services would be able to access residential structures during a storm event, post construction and into the future.
13. There needs to be further study concerning where water will travel to in storm events including events with wave action and high tides and flooding events due to rain. The Commission recommends that a hydrologist or hydrogeologist be retained to fully evaluate the potential for flooding on the developed site, including storm and wave action and impacts of rising sea levels. The data contained in the DEIS concerning wave action is incomplete and insufficient. It is also recommended that a hydrologist

or hydrogeologist identify the location (where it is and where it moves to) and depth of ground water and that ground water be tested.

14. The Commission has questions concerning the functioning of structural methods to control flooding; included is-- when do tidal flood gates operate? There is great concern about the deterioration and current condition of tidal flood gates and other structures including concrete deterioration and rust due to age of the gates and the overall functionality of the flood gates. It is recommended that this be investigated by an engineer, in particular whether tidal flood gates are operating properly and/or need to be replaced. Specifically, the condition/adequacy of the tidal flood gates currently and going forward into the future (30 years) should be evaluated. Also, the condition/adequacy of any other mechanisms used to control or protect against flooding such as gates, dams and/or trenches should be fully investigated and evaluated. See Village of Mamaroneck LWRP Natural Resource Inventory at p. 17.
15. The Commission has concerns regarding public access to the site. This is proposed to be a private development. The status of the access roads should be confirmed, i.e. whether they will be public (Village) roads or private roads maintained by the HOA.
16. The Commission recommends that there be public access to the site including the development of bike paths and walking paths. The Commission recommends that public access to the site be preserved to the maximum extent practicable.
17. The DEIS should contain a more robust discussion on non-structural measures to address flooding.
18. There should be additional information concerning tidal flooding, storm and wave action, and sea level rise impacts on site and off site.
19. The DEIS Appendix addressing LWRP does not contain an in-depth analysis of how the proposed project complies with applicable policies. Each applicable policy should be fully addressed.
20. The Coastal Assessment Form should be reviewed, updated and/or corrected.
21. It is impossible to adequately review alternative concepts for the site without having additional information and analyses for those alternatives.

Creative Habitat Corp.

133 Old Tarrytown Road, White Plains, NY 10603
T 914-948-0389 F 914-948-1390 www.creativehabitatcorp.com

From: Sven Hoeger, Environmental Consultant to the HCZMC

To: Members of the HCZM Commission

Date: January 12, 2018

RE: Hampshire Country Club DEIS

The above referenced DEIS is, in my opinion, **not addressing the environmental policies of the Village of Mamaroneck LWRP to the fullest extent possible**. The DEIS in its statements and discussions of alternatives asserts that the proposed action is the best possible for environmental and economic reasons. Supporting this assertion are documents listed in the appendices (CD attached to the DEIS), which, when examined in detail, can be interpreted differently from the statements made in the DEIS. My detailed commentary on the environmental policies of the LWRP is listed below following a series of numbered comments that explain how I arrived at my interpretation of the DEIS.

1) Throughout the DEIS various area measurements are repeated frequently. It took me a while to make sense of them in the context of the entire site. I am therefore giving a summary of my understanding of the property and its current and future allocations as I read the document. The DEIS states that the entire site measures 106.2 acres. The Planned Residential Development applies to a 94.5 acre portion of the site (R-20 zoning). MR zoning, 4.4 acres and 7.3 acres in the Town of Mamaroneck (R-30) zoning complete the 106.2 acres. Building lots and roads will occupy 29 acres (page 3A-1). Future conditions will retain 36.8 acres of newly reconfigured golf course and a 36 acres set-aside of open space that preserves existing water features, such as ponds and ditches, for a total of 72.8 acres of open space. This open space refers to the entire property of 106.2 acres. The open space remaining on the R-20 zone is 65.5 acres (94.5 minus 29). The discussion of development versus open space should therefore more clearly state that the 7.3 acre portion of the site situated in the Town will not be touched by the development but will be counted toward the open space set-aside. It may also be important to note that overall an estimated 55.6 acres of the site will be physically impacted, including some of the open space areas (Page 3A-15). That disturbance number could also be 57.9 acres as stated in the Preliminary SWPPP.

2) The wetland assessment was done according to the Magee-Hollands Method protocol, which does take hydric soils into account, but does not examine their presence by taking soil samples and examining the soil coloration. Hydric soils are a determinant of wetland status, as stated clearly in the Village code, chapter 192, under the definition of wetlands. While I do not expect a drastically different delineation, there are likely areas of hydric soils that may have been missed with the currently applied method. I would like to inspect the site in person after all frost has left the ground and snow cover is gone to assure myself that the delineation did not miss areas of hydric soils.

3) The phase II Environmental Assessment mentions that practically the entire site has some arsenic, lead, and pesticide contamination, but fails to propose remedies for the 72.8 acres that are left undeveloped and are proposed for ongoing use as a golf course (36.8 acres) and as open space accessible for passive recreation (restricted to members of the future homeowner's association and club members). Note: The sample plot location map on page 716 of the report in appendix P is missing the sample plot number designations for plots 8, 9, 18 and 19.

4) More importantly, the DEIS states repeatedly and in detail in section 3K-2 “*Existing and Proposed Cover Types*”, under point 4 on page 3K7, that “*no significant adverse impacts to ecological resources on or adjacent to the project site are anticipated*”. The clustering of the development and the “*preservation*” of 36 acres of “*natural vegetation*” are proposed as “*primary wildlife mitigation*”. The word “*preservation*” of natural vegetation must be a misnomer, since table 3K-2 (page 3K-5) lists only 8.8 acres of the existing site as “*meadows, grasslands, or brushlands*”. It therefore stands to reason that the 36 acres of “*natural vegetation*” will be created as part of the landscaping plan. These 36 acres however are not contiguous, rather split into three disjunct parcels of roughly equal size spaced at equal distances in three corners at the perimeter of the property. They are effectively isolated from each other. The map (Appendix C – Existing Conditions Plan) shows the proposed allocation of preserved recreational, natural space, and golf fairways as interwoven, making the proposed “*open*” space very similar to the existing conditions – only significantly reduced in size. It would be more exact to make a statement that a total of 72.8 acres will be preserved in a similar character and with some improvements in landscaping as currently existing on the site. A very important difference to existing conditions is the fact that these 72.8 acres are no longer a cohesive unit. Advocating for migratory birds, wading birds, grazers, amphibians, reptiles and small mammals, it is important to see these three wetland/natural complexes from an animal’s perspective where they are rather separate from one another— especially when floating on a pond, stalking for worms at the shore or perched in a shrub. The mass of buildings, the roads – not to mention increased numbers of humans, their pets (CATS and dogs), and their vehicles, will provide formidable barriers for creatures which are not wing-endowed, such as amphibians (toads, frogs, salamanders), reptiles (turtles, snakes) and small mammals (mice, muskrat, opossums, etc.). **A meaningful, much better conceived and ecologically viable mitigation proposal would create a single set-aside preservation area, enhanced by natural vegetation and water features, even at the cost of losing existing water features elsewhere on the site to construction.**

5) On page 3K-3 the DEIS makes a statement about 28 bird species listed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service as potentially using the site during migrations. The DEIS correctly states that none of these species are “*rare or endangered*”, but omits to mention that ALL are flagged as “*Conservation Concerns*”(see Appendix L). In other words, these species are on a federal watch list and are regarded as vulnerable to disturbance and habitat loss. Their survival and conservation IS an important concern when making decisions concerning the future development of the site.

6) The DEIS also mentions proposed native plantings at the perimeter of ponds. Judging from the photos of those ponds and their connecting ditches, many of these plantings would not be directly connected to the water, but rather sitting high and dry above stone walls that define several of the aquatic features of the golf course. To have a meaningful ecological effect, many of these stonewalls would have to be removed, the adjacent land regraded to slope gently toward the water and then planted/seeded with native vegetation in accordance with a prevailing moisture gradient. This recommendation applies to ponds as well as ditches. A local example of how this was done along the Sheldrake River exists at the Bonnie Briar Golf Club in the Town of Mamaroneck.

7) While the Village of Mamaroneck does not have a tree preservation/replacement ordinance, the proposed one-for-one replacement of trees does not go far enough. Since only trees greater than 8 inches in diameter at breast height have been counted toward replacement, it is inevitable that at least an equal number of trees smaller than that size will be removed without replacement. It is also understood that the replaced trees will be replaced at smaller sizes, reducing the initial future canopy coverage dramatically. As a rule of thumb, the canopy of a tree increases exponentially as the tree trunk diameter increases. For example, a 4-inch caliper tree (the typical landscaping size) would only have a quarter of the canopy size of an 8-inch caliper tree (the minimum tree size counted for removal). If the applicant were to replace the canopy of

those trees counted for removal (432), and all of those were measured at only 8 inches in diameter, then at the very minimum the planting of at least 4 times as many trees as proposed would be required to adequately replace the lost canopy. That would amount to 1,728 replacement trees at 4-inch caliper size. In reality several of those removed trees will be larger than 8 inches, so that an even larger number of replacements would be required to truly reflect an ecologically equivalent replacement effort. This is not a mere numbers game, but a significant factor when considering the ecological impact the removal of existing trees will have on the environment and when planning for the enhancement and development of natural areas (preserved or created) on site. Tree removal also affects the water budget.

8) In its assessment of alternatives, when reviewing the non-development option, the applicant conjures up a situation whereby the golf course could not be maintained due to economic stress. In this case the DEIS, under the heading of “wildlife habitat” (p. 3K-4), states: “Thus, without a custodian to manage these features of the Project Site, the existing habitat would become overgrown, and invasive species would be permitted to dominate the landscape, leading to an overall decrease in the quality of habitat”. This of course is only the worst of the potential trajectories of natural development if the golf course would be left unattended. There are several other potential trajectories, some of which might be desirable from an ecological and even from an aesthetic point of view. Considering the following statement from New York State, an orderly conversion of the golf course into salt marsh by allowing frequent flooding may be one potential scenario if the development should not go forward: “By 2100, scientists project sea levels 18 to 50 inches higher than today along New York's coastlines and estuaries, though a rise as high as 75 inches could occur.” (<http://www.dec.ny.gov/energy/45202.html>)

9) The proposed stormwater pollution prevention and water quality improvement features will indeed make a positive contribution to the waters of the Hommocks marshlands and of Long Island Sound. The amount of fertilizers and pesticides lavished on the average golf course in the course of one year alone is staggering. The proposed reduction (halving) of golf course alone will make a significant contribution to better water quality, given its location so close to these environmentally sensitive areas. I would however like to see the developer go one step further and consider committing the future operator of the 9-hole golf course to Integrated Pest Management (IPM) procedures in an even farther reaching water quality improvement goal.

In strictly commenting on the environmental aspects of the LWRP in detail, following are my remarks concerning the above referenced DEIS:

1) Policies 7 – 10 Fish and Wildlife Policies:

Policy #7 Significant coastal fish and wildlife habitats, as identified on the N.Y. Coastal Area Map (when finalized), shall be protected, preserved, and where practical, restored so as to maintain their viability as habitats.

Commentary: **This policy does not apply.**

Policy #7a. Significant coastal fish and wildlife habitats, as identified in the LWRP, shall be protected, preserved, and where practical, restored so as to maintain their viability as habitats.

Commentary: **Delancey Cove and Greacan Point Marsh** are the closest “Significant Fish and Wildlife Habitats” listed in the Village of Mamaroneck LWRP. The **Hommocks Saltmarsh Complex** is listed by the Town of Mamaroneck as a “Locally Important Fish and Wildlife Habitat”. The **Hampshire Country Club** is listed by both municipalities as a “Critical Environmental Area”, which requires special scrutiny when developmental action is proposed. While the proposed development does not directly impact on either of

the listed fish and wildlife habitat areas, its drainage into the Hommocks marshlands and into Delancey Cove does have a significant effect on fish and wildlife habitat surrounding the club. Additionally, the open landscape character of the golf course with its various water features, grasslands, lawns and miscellaneous landscaping (trees, shrubs) is an important habitat component to tie in with the surrounding protected areas. While only relatively few wildlife species will directly utilize the site, its open character will draw birds in and let them make use of the adjacent marshes and coves. In this respect it is a dual benefit bestowed to the general area that is derived from the existing character of the country club.

The proposed action has the potential to significantly improve the water quality discharged from the Hampshire CC property, but the clustering of the proposed development in the middle of the site will have a discouraging effect on migratory birds. The statement that 36 acres of natural area will be preserved is at best misleading, since only 8.8 acres of natural areas currently exist there. A more precise description of the proposed action would be the creation (and preservation) of three separate open space areas that each have water features, natural areas, and golf fairways and greens. These areas are not interconnected in an ecologically significant way. The mandate of Policy #7a to “*maintain their* (i.e Hommocks marshlands & Delancey Cove) *viability as habitats*” would be better served if the proposed 36 acres of natural areas and the 36.8 acres of golf course could be contiguous and bunched together near the Hommocks saltmarshes without a road intersecting them. **The proposed action is not fully compliant with this policy.**

Policy #8. Protect fish and wildlife resources in the coastal area from the introduction of hazardous wastes and other pollutants which bioaccumulate in the food chain or which cause significant sublethal or lethal effect on those resources.

Commentary: **This policy applies and the plans are in compliance.** The stormwater runoff from the proposed development has the potential to pollute the Hommocks marshlands and Long Island Sound. The water quality controls comply with current stormwater quality regulations and are likely going to remove whatever pollutants would be generated at the site. Furthermore, the reduction of golf course area will reduce the potential for pesticide and fertilizer runoff into the Hommocks marshlands and Long Island Sound. Improvements to future management procedures (yet to be agreed to by the applicant) can produce even better water quality (Integrated Pest Management). The plans as presented in the DEIS are however in compliance with this policy.

Other Improvements are possible, since most of the soil samples taken for a Phase II site investigation showed metal and pesticide contamination exceeding limits for unrestricted use. Habitat creation and miscellaneous site work for stormwater controls outside of the “development” cluster will occur. Additional soil remediation should be considered to further reduce the risk of off-site contamination in waters of the Hommocks marshlands and of Long Island Sound.

Policy # 9. Expand recreational use of fish and wildlife resources in coastal areas by increasing access to existing resources, supplementing existing stocks and developing new resources. Such efforts shall be made in a manner which ensures the protection of renewable fish and wildlife resources and considers other activities dependent on them.

Commentary: **This policy does not apply.**

***Policy # 10.** Further develop commercial finfish, shellfish and crustacean resources in the coastal area.*

Commentary: **This policy does not apply.**

2) Policies 11 – 17 Flooding & Erosion Hazard Policies:

***Policy # 11.** Buildings and other structures will be sited in the coastal area so as to minimize damage to property and the endangering of human lives caused by flooding.*

Commentary: The DEIS clearly states that the flooding risk has been taken into consideration and that significant amounts of soil will be imported into the site to raise buildings a minimum of 2 feet above the flood plain. **Unless deemed otherwise by the Village Engineer the plans presented in the DEIS are in compliance with this policy.**

***Policy # 12.** Activities or development in the coastal area will be undertaken so as to minimize damage to natural resources and property from flooding and erosion by protecting natural protective features.*

Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

***Policy # 13.** The construction or reconstruction of erosion protection structures shall be undertaken only if they have a reasonable probability of controlling erosion for at least thirty years.*

Commentary: **This policy does not apply.**

***Policy # 14.** Activities and development, including the construction or reconstruction of erosion protection structures, shall be undertaken so that there will be no measurable increase in erosion or flooding at the site of such activities or development or at other locations.*

Commentary: **This policy is covered by the SWPPP, which will be reviewed by the Village Engineer.**

***Policy #17.** (Policies #15 and 16 listed as are not applicable to the LWRP) Whenever possible, use nonstructural measures to minimize damage to natural resources and property from flooding and erosion. Such measures shall include: (i) the setback of buildings and structures; (ii) the planting of vegetation and the installation of sand fencing and draining; (iii) the reshaping of bluffs; and (iv) the floodproofing of buildings or their elevation above the base flood level.*

Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

3) Policies 30 – 44 Water & Air Resources policies:

***Policy #30.** Municipal, industrial, and commercial discharge of pollutants, including but not limited to toxic and hazardous substances, into coastal waters will conform to State and National water quality standards.*

Commentary: Currently the occasional discharge of stormwater from the golf course (commercial operation) is likely to contain pollutants (pesticides and fertilizers) flowing into coastal waters. The proposed action will reduce these discharges. Further improvements (yet to be agreed to by the applicants) to future reductions in pollutants

from stormwater discharges can be achieved if integrated pest management procedures were to be introduced at the remaining 9-hole golf course. **The plans presented in the DEIS are in compliance with this policy.**

Policy #31. State coastal area policies and the purposes of this local program will be considered while modifying water quality standards; however those waters already overburdened with contaminants will be recognized as being a development constraint.
Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

Policy # 32. Not applicable

Policy # 33. Best Management practices will be used to ensure the control of stormwater runoff and combined sewer overflows draining into coastal waters.

Commentary: The DEIS refers to a Preliminary Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in compliance with temporary sediment and erosion control requirements during construction and permanent stormwater controls after the site has been developed. Both DEIS and Preliminary SWPPP list permanent water quality controls, such as CDS units as pretreatment and two each infiltration and bioretention basins. There are no combined sewers at this site. The Preliminary SWPPP will be reviewed by the Village Engineer for compliance with this policy and other Village code. **Unless deemed otherwise by the Village Engineer the plans presented in the DEIS are in compliance with this policy.**

Policy #34. Discharge of waste materials from vessels into coastal waters will be limited so as to protect significant fish and wildlife habitats, recreational areas and water supply areas.

Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

Policy #35. Dredging and dredge spoil disposal in coastal waters will be undertaken in a manner that meets existing State and Federal dredging permit requirements, and protects significant fish and wildlife habitats, scenic resources, natural protective features, important agricultural lands, and wetlands.

Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

Policy #36. Activities to the shipment and storage of petroleum and other hazardous materials will be conducted in a manner that will prevent or at least minimize spills into coastal waters; all practicable efforts will be undertaken to expedite the cleanup of such discharges; and restitution for damages will be required when these spills occur.

Commentary: Chapter IX of the Preliminary SWPPP details a Spill Prevention and Response plan for contractors during construction to be used in case of fuel oil, lubricants or hydraulic oils that could be conveyed into the Hommocks marshlands or Delancey Cove by way of the stormwater discharge systems. Additional permanent measures to prevent similar escapes of heating oils from the proposed development during storm events should be proposed. **The DEIS does not cover this issue sufficiently to satisfy this policy.**

Policy #37. Best management practices will be utilized to minimize the nonpoint discharge of excess nutrients, organics, and eroded soil into coastal waters.

Commentary: The DEIS refers to maintaining an existing system of ponds and ditches that will be augmented with additional infiltration and bioretention basins as permanent

Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion and sediment control. In addition the Preliminary SWPPP addresses temporary BMPs to be installed for the duration of construction until all permanent controls are in place and fully functional. **Unless deemed otherwise by the Village Engineer the plans presented in the DEIS are in compliance with this policy.**

Policy #38. The quality and quantity of surface water and groundwater supplies will be conserved and protected, particularly where such waters constitute the primary or sole source of water supply.

Commentary: All existing aquatic features and drainage systems will be retained and additional stormwater quantity and quality controls for runoff from new impervious surfaces will be installed in accordance with all local and state regulations. The Village Engineer will comment on these features in more detail. **Unless deemed otherwise by the Village Engineer the plans presented in the DEIS are in compliance with this policy.**

Policy #39. The transport, storage treatment and disposal of solid wastes, particularly hazardous wastes, within coastal areas will be conducted in such a manner so as to protect groundwater and surface water supplies, significant fish and wildlife habitats, recreation areas, important agricultural land and scenic resources.

Commentary: **This policy does not apply**

Policies # 40 - #43. Not applicable

Policy #44. Preserve and protect tidal and freshwater wetlands and preserve the benefits derived from these areas.

Commentary: **The applicant can do more to comply with the spirit and intent of this policy.** While the DEIS addresses the special status of the site as a Critical Environmental Area, the proposed set-asides and landscaping plans leave ample room for improvement. The Hampshire Country Club does not only serve as a freshwater drainage for the Hommocks marshlands and Delancey Cove, but also as an important signaling site for migratory birds that “here” is a safe habitat that can serve them as a stop-over point for resting and feeding during their migration. It is the contiguous size of the 106 acres of open space in conjunction with the Hommocks marshlands that signals that message to migratory birds. A reduction of the site by 29 acres required for the proposed development alone would not be such a large loss of habitat, but the siting of the development smack in the middle of the property does render it no longer as effective as a signaling site for migratory birds. The proposed siting of the development further splits the existing and proposed natural areas and open space into three ecologically isolated pockets – which changes the character of the site dramatically. The proposed access roads, additional humans and their pets only add to the dramatic changes. The proposed planting of native vegetation and landscaping (especially tree replacement and lack of grading along water features) leave much room for improvements. Functionally the mandated “preservation and protection” of existing freshwater wetlands is not fully adhered to as presented in the DEIS.

End of commentary

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jeremy Arfield <arfieldj@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 22, 2018 5:19 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Formal submission of remarks from April 11 PB meeting
Attachments: Planning Board Meeting - April 11 2018 FINAL.docx

Hello Betty-Ann,

I spoke at the April 11 Planning Board meeting and attached are my remarks, which I would like to formally submit for the record.

Thank you,

Jeremy Arfield
1010 Cove Rd.
Mamaroneck

April 11, 2018

Presented to the Planning Board and submitted for the record by Jeremy Arfield, resident of 1010 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Good evening. My name is Jeremy Arfield. I live at 1010 Cove Road, which is one of the private roads being considered as an access road to the proposed development. I have lived on Orienta Point for 10 years and I appreciate the opportunity to address the Planning Board this evening.

I have attended nearly all of the public meetings on this topic for the last several years and I really only have one, simple question...Why?

Or, more specifically, why should this Village consider approving the current project or the condo alternative preferred by the developers? What benefits do these projects bring to all of the parties impacted?

For the owners of Hampshire, a private equity investment fund specializing in distressed real estate, and its real estate developer partners, the benefit is simple. They are seeking a positive return on investment for their institutional investors.

For the potential buyers of the new homes being proposed, the presumed benefit would be owning a nice home in a desirable community with excellent public schools. But, let's pause on that assumed benefit for a second. First, how nice would a home be when it is built on ground that is toxic? Second, would living in a flood plain be a nice place to have a home? And, really there is no question whether or not it will flood. The developers are already planning for evacuation routes for when it does. Damage to the properties is highly likely and would prospective homeowners be made aware that they were not only putting their homes, but also their lives at risk by living there? Third, I believe the desirability of our Village today would wane considerably as a result of the increased traffic in and out of the development and on the Boston Post Road, the further deterioration of the private roads that cannot handle the wear and tear of the limited amount of cars and trucks that travel on them today, and the strains this additional population will place on an already stretched infrastructure in our Village. And fourth, for these new homeowners, would the schools remain excellent? We have already heard from our schools' superintendent in the last public Planning Board meeting that when using correct assumptions for projected enrollment instead of flawed ones, this plan would add to overwhelming an already burdened school district. Class sizes would inevitably increase and the physical plant of our schools would strain under the additional number of students.

For the Village of Mamaroneck and its residents, what will be the benefits?

Will it improve our schools? No, the expectation is that the quality of education would deteriorate.

Will it improve the existing traffic and road condition problems on Cove Road, Orienta Avenue, Eagle Knolls Road, Hommocks Road, Weaver Street, Boston Post Road, Old Boston Post Road,

and Cooper Avenue? Undoubtedly, no. It will only exacerbate the problems we are already living with today.

Will it improve our health and well-being? Churning up toxic soil, bringing in thousands of cubic tons of questionable landfill, and increasing the level of air pollutants as a result of more traffic and the diesel trucks coming in and out of our Village all during construction would lead one to conclude that the health and well-being of all Village residents would be put at risk.

Will it improve the property values for existing homeowners in the village? Unlikely, as a result of the overpopulated schools, increased traffic, the elimination of a vast tract of open space in a critical, coastal environmental area and an immediate increase in the single family housing stock in the area.

Will it bring increased tax revenue to the Village of Mamaroneck? It seems the estimates of the tax gains presented to-date are negligible at best, even when the questionable methods are accepted. But, think about what will eat into those slim increases even if believed. Additional policing as a result of the population influx and the increased traffic. The need to invest in additional emergency services to handle the required response when the area inevitably floods. There will be a need to increase the investments in our schools in the short term and to grow their operating budgets going forward. There will be greater demand for sanitation, recycling, and snow removal services. Will the estimated tax increases from these homes really cover these additional costs? I do not see how that math works and it would be detrimental to all Village residents to not be absolutely certain that it actually does work in our favor.

Will it improve the well-established, existing, flooding problems? The answer to this question is the one the Planning Board needs to most seriously and thoughtfully consider. Remember, someone died as a result of the flooding that occurs in the area of planned development. When Hurricane Sandy came through, the neighborhoods surrounding Hampshire were under water. I saw, first-hand that the Hampshire property was completely flooded and it took weeks for the water to be pumped back into the Sound as it did not naturally recede when the tide went back out. If the developers fill those naturally occurring basins on the Hampshire property with landfill, where will the water go the next time? The surrounding neighborhoods during that event likely benefitted from the buffer that the flood plain on Hampshire provided. What will happen when that flood plain is gone? Will this planned development reduce the flooding potential and the associated risks or only make the pre-existing, dangerous situation worse?

As I stated in my opening remarks, I moved to Orienta ten years ago. What attracted me to the area was the strong community, the fantastic schools, and the natural beauty of a coastal location with protected undeveloped lands. I have greatly enjoyed living and raising a family here. However, as a resident I feel the responsibility of stewardship to protect and maintain all that makes Mamaroneck great for future generations of residents. I believe your commitment to the Planning Board evidences the same thing.

In these public hearings, we have heard from older residents, community volunteers, and elected government officials. I am greatly appreciative of how they performed in their roles and for what they put in place. They established protections for our flood plains and our coastal areas for a reason. They enacted zoning law protections for a reason. They clearly understood that these were needed to make our community strong, to make it safe, and to protect all of the elements of this Village that make it a desirable place to live. I, as a current resident, am thankful for their foresight and their intelligent decision-making. I also understand that as a current resident, I have an obligation to ensure, just like they did, that future generations of residents, families, children, and retirees get to enjoy this special place as much as we all do today.

So, I return to my original question. Why? Are we really considering a proposal that flies in the face of the objectives and values articulated in our Comprehensive Plan and LWRP [Local Waterfront Revitalization Program]? And I would note that with respect to the developer's preferred condo plan alternative, would we really consider rezoning and going against what previous residents put in place to make Mamaroneck what it is today – running the risk of similar rezoning of all marine recreation and marine commercial districts and turning our harbor into a changed landscape of high-rise condo buildings? For the current plan, are we really considering the illegal action of allowing a flood plain to be rendered useless with thousands of cubic yards of fill so private equity fund managers, real estate developers and investors who do not even live here can profit? Are we really okay with a plan that provides nothing but downsides for all Village residents, not just those who live close to the property?

And lastly, I want to leave you with a final question. Who in our community, other than the developers, wants this? I did not hear one voice at the last meeting support the current proposal. Until tonight, not one unbiased, truly objective person had come forward to say this is something that will benefit us all in Mamaroneck, or even a few. I think that is the most telling part of these proceedings and is something that the Planning Board should thoughtfully consider. I respect that property owners have the right to use and develop their property as they wish – but only so long as the use is permitted by law and secures necessary approvals. The current proposal is not permitted by law and should not be approved by the Planning Board. The developers cannot achieve their economic objectives by developing the property simply in accordance with current zoning so they are coming to you, the Planning Board, for approval of a cluster development that is subject to your approval on the basis that it is better for the community than a development built in accordance with established zoning. That is not the case here.

So, what is the outcome that I would like to see? I would like to see Hampshire return to its purpose and to have true club operators, and not distressed real estate fund owners, invest in the club itself. As we heard tonight, there is a group ready to purchase the Club and do just that. So, notwithstanding the self-serving rhetoric of the developers, there is an alternative to the proposed development and that alternative would truly preserve open space and provide a recreational area that members and guests can enjoy. I would also like to see Hampshire truly become a good neighbor to all Village residents and

an active partner in making Mamaroneck a better place to live instead of a group of faceless investors only trying to turn a profit for themselves on the backs of the infrastructure, schooling, and positive community attributes that our taxes support. For me, the answer is clear. Mamaroneck will only be a better place, for us today and for the future generations that will inevitable come, if we uphold and protect all that makes this place so special...like others before us have done.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andrew Kirwin <akirwin@attglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 8:36 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Hampshire Development Project

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board, Trustees and Mayor Murphy:

I am writing as a concerned parent, Little League coach and resident of the Village of Mamaroneck and Orienta Point where the Hampshire Country Club is located. I have resided in Orienta Point for 12 years. I have a 13 year-old son who is in the 8th grade at Hommocks Middle School and a 9 year-old daughter in the 4th grade at Central Elementary School. I have coached in the Larchmont/Mamaroneck Little League ("LMLL") for the past 8 years. I am a trustee of the Orienta Point Association but would like to be clear that the statement I am making is my own.

As a parent of school age children, I am deeply concerned with the impact this large proposed project will have on our community. It seems clear to me that there is a great deal of focus being placed on the issues of how much landfill will be needed, how many trucks will be needed to haul the fill to the site, the noise/pollution from the trucks and the potentially dirty fill. Additionally, I appreciate the continued focus on the issue of the contaminated soil in the proposed work site. I am hopeful the Planning Board will be able to obtain the answers that are needed to these particularly troubling issues. My expectation is that if you cannot make a determination that the work can be done safely and pursuant to all laws that the project will be rejected outright.

One issue that seems to not be getting the focus that it should be getting is the impact this project will have on our sports fields. For 8 years now, I have struggled to find adequate baseball/softball fields to conduct practices. With the limited space we have in the Village and the Town of Mamaroneck, the priority has to go to using the fields for games. So as coaches, we struggle to find patches of grass that we can practice on and hope that we are not violating any permit rules. LMLL is able to secure some space for practices each week and has put together an elaborate system to allocate the space amongst the many teams at each level. If you are lucky enough to quickly reserve a space you are blocked from reserving space for the next week. As I say to new coaches, act fast or you are blocked out.

Prior to the two public hearings, I had the opportunity to read the portion of the DEIS related to "Open Space and Recreation." It is clear to me and as noted at the April 11th public hearing, the information about the impact of the proposed development on our recreational facilities, in particular use of fields, needs to be corrected.

I am particularly troubled by the disingenuous statement the developer made indicating that the youth leagues had been contacted and no responses had been delivered. We have since learned that our various youth sports leagues had not been contacted with statements to the Planning Board from youth baseball, lacrosse and soccer. The President for Fields for Kids spoke on April 11th and indicated they were not contacted as well. Thus, the statement as to outreach should be corrected.

The extreme pressure the community faces on available fields was not described and should be addressed. Oddly, the only information provided in the DEIS on sports league impact was based on the numbers of participants in youth ice hockey (a total of 140 children). Youth hockey (i) does not use fields and (ii) has very small numbers of participants compared with those youth leagues that use fields (i.e., little league baseball, soccer, football and lacrosse). Therefore, the extrapolation from hockey participation to calculate the number of children from the proposed development activity is inapt. Information on participation in field sports for each season should be used to extrapolate the number of additional children that would participate in field sports. I have no doubt that a proper investigation on the potential increase in the use of our fields will show that the development would generate much more than the 2-3 children estimated in the DEIS.

Bill Nachtigal, the president of LMLL has written that from their experience they would expect “25-30%” of the school age children in the development to participate in baseball or softball. He wrote that the “increased participation will no doubt put additional demand on our already overburdened field resources.” Similarly, the Board of the Larchmont Mamaroneck Football Club wrote that “certain members of the club's leadership have expressed serious reservations about the likely increase in traffic in and around the Hommocks grass fields, which are utilized extensively by the players, families and supporters of the LMFC in the fall and spring, as well as related considerations.”

Alarmingly, Christopher B. Glinski of Larchmont Mamaroneck Youth Lacrosse has written that with the expected influx of children, “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.”

It appears that the developer has attempted to mislead the Planning Board on the issue of field space. The Planning Board and the community need reliable information to evaluate the impact of the project in this regard.

I thank you in advance for your hard work on considering the DEIS and the true impact this development will have on our Community.

Very truly yours,

Andrew Kirwin
624 Forest Avenue
Mamaroneck

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED APRIL 27, 2018
THROUGH
NOON - May 9, 2018

- 109 04 27 2018 Hampshire CC WEEKS Public Comment
- 110 04 29 2018 Hampshire CC MONITTO Public Comment
- 111 05 01 2018 Hampshire CC WOLKOFF Public Comment
- 112 05 03 2018 Hampshire CC AULT Public Comment
- 113 05 03 2018 Hampshire CC VENICE Public Comment
- 114 05 03 2018 Hampshire CC PALMIOTTTO Public Comment
- 115 05 03 2018 Hampshire CC BERMUDEZ HALLSTROM Public Comment
- 116 05 03 2018 Hampshire CC SUTTON Public Comment
- 117 05 08 2018 Hampshire CC ALLEN Public Comment
- 118 05 08 2018 Hampshire CC FMAC Public Comment
- 119 05 08 2018 Hampshire CC FMAC Public Comment
- 120 05 08 2018 Hampshire CC GOLDBERGER Public Comment
- 121 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC PHILLIPS Public Comment
- 122 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC OFFER MOSRA LLC Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Kathy Weeks <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 7:45 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Kathy Weeks
101 Rockland Ave
Zip Code: 10543
Email: Daleskittykat@yahoo.com

Submitted from: 107.77.226.198
ID#: 57

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Gary Monitto <gmonitto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2018 9:12 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Concerns re: Hampshire development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing to express my opposition to the Hampshire Development proposal. The proposed development will negatively impact not only the character of our community, but also the environment. We are a small village and should stay that way.

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Claire Wolkoff <clwolkoff@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2018 11:12 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; lpotak@vomny.org; Keith Waitt
Subject: Concerns re: Hampshire development

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

I am a resident of the Village of Mamaroneck and reside in the Orienta Point neighborhood. (I live on Pirates Cove and thus am not in direct proximity of Hampshire.) I have been following the proposed development of Hampshire Country Club for a number of years and attended the two recent Planning Board meetings on February 14 and April 11. At this point I want to share my main thoughts and concerns with you; I do not intend to repeat the voluminous information already submitted by other parties, including Mamaroneck Coastal Environment Coalition (MCEC).

- The existing Comprehensive Plan (CP) already identifies Hampshire as a Critical Environmental Area (CEA). The 2012 Comprehensive Plan clearly states that the existing R-20 zoning designation was a default "holding zone" commonly used with older zoning codes in New York State. It was designed to create a low-density residential zone to apply to parks and other open spaces as golf courses. The CP goes on to suggest that consideration be given to changing the zoning for Hampshire from residential to a recreation/open space zone (similar to Bonnie Briar) or, at a minimum, an R-30 zone. The Village is now revisiting the CP. I hope that the Planning Board can consider likely desirable changes to the current Hampshire zoning as it addresses the developers' plans.
- I understand that a small part of Hampshire is actually deemed part of the marine MR zone. Mamaroneck Harbor and Harbor Island Park are an important and treasured resource of the Village. One of my top priorities is to maintain the Harbor area so that it is open to all residents to enjoy; there should be no development of condos or other high-rise buildings to block access. It is thus imperative that no changes be made to the MR zone part of Hampshire that could be used as precedents for development along Mamaroneck Harbor that is not consistent with its marine uses and recreation and open space for the Village.
- The developers' initial proposal was for a large condo development on top of the existing clubhouse. I was opposed to that as being totally out of character for the existing neighborhood. I will not address that further now since it is not under current consideration.
- We have lived in Orienta for over 33 years and are very familiar with the flooding that takes place on the Hampshire golf course (including of course the man who died in the flooding in the nor'easter of December 1992). I listened to the experts hired by both the developers and MCEC and honestly do not believe it is possible to build 105 homes (single and carriage homes) on that flood plain.
- While the proposed development is not subject to the recent building moratorium, no developer should be allowed to build homes that would significantly increase the public school population while the school district is already dealing with a growing enrollment and needs for additional classrooms. Any approval for a development should require the development to pay for the associated costs to the Village and school district; I do not believe the developers' statements that increased tax revenue will be a win for the Village. It will be a large loss.
- Other key issues already addressed by others include hazardous materials, environmental pollution, greatly increased traffic in an area with substandard roads and inadequate egress in case of emergency.

In conclusion, please do not approve the developers' proposal for 105 homes on the property. While they presumably developed the proposal on a "as of right" basis, no one has a right to build a development that is detrimental to the Village and local residents.

Thank you for your consideration and thank you for all the hard work you do on behalf of the Village.

Sincerely,
Claire Wolkoff
890 Pirates Cove
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Stewart Ault <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 10:51 AM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Stewart Ault
20 layfayette road
Zip Code: 10538
Email: aultstewart@gmail.com

Submitted from: 71.234.64.248
ID#: 59

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Nicholas Venice <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 8:09 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Venice
36 Truman ave
Zip Code: 10703
Email: Nvenice3321@gmail.com

Submitted from: 107.77.76.20
ID#: 60

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Steven Palmiottto <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 8:33 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Steven Palmiottto
420 south riverside Ave croton On Hudson ny 10520
Zip Code: 10520
Email: tmi82demolition@gmail.com

Submitted from: 68.193.62.152
ID#: 61

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andres Bermudez Hallstrom <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Andres Bermudez Hallstrom
650 Halstead Ave Suite 201B-1
Zip Code: 10543
Email: andres@AJBHLaw.com

Submitted from: 71.183.64.12
ID#: 62

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Rob Sutton <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 4:54 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Rob Sutton
1025 cove road
Zip Code: 10543
Email: Rgsgolf72@yahoo.com

Submitted from: 107.77.68.86
ID#: 63

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Michael Allen <mallen@vateragroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:09 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; 'cfelsher@reservoircap.com'
Subject: Hampshire development

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi

I was at the Planning Board meeting in April. One of the points made by one the project consultants is that the required landfill would be partially met by excavation required for the basements of the housing development. However my understanding is that, as this development is in a flood zone, basements would not be permitted. If that is correct then it all required landfill will have to brought in from offsite and the project consultant's estimate of required fill and transport requirements are materially underestimated. Is my understanding correct?

Best regards,

Mike

Michael Allen
930 Greacen Lane
Mamaroneck NY
10543
H 914 698 0866
W 212 590 2950
C 646 894 7151

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Christine Hofstedt <c2hofstedt@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:36 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Hampshire Development Plan

Dear Planning Board,

I am writing regarding the proposed redevelopment of Hampshire Country Club. The proposed development is as of right. I do not want the Village of Mamaroneck wasting my tax dollars fighting a development that the owner is legally allowed to build, just like happened with the Westchester Day School. According to the NY Times, the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found that the village had shown "an arbitrary blindness to the facts" when it denied permission for the construction. As a result, taxpayers were left holding the bag for a \$4.75 million settlement plus legal fees. Let's not go down that road again.

In addition, the redevelopment at Hampshire will actually funnel taxes into the town/school district. This is a very good thing, especially in light of the new federal tax reforms.

Ideally, I would have liked the Planning Board to have considered the original redevelopment plan that preserved more open space, constructing an age-restricted multifamily building. That plan addresses many of the opponents' concerns. It preserves more of the golf course and it minimizes the number of children added to the schools. The noise surrounding soil quality/contamination will be addressed in any development as a lender would not allow construction to proceed if environmental testing if not cleared.

If you are not willing to allow the owners to construct the multifamily building that they had originally proposed, I do not see how you can deny their as of right plan as by its definition, it complies with existing zoning ordinances.

Please keep all the taxpayers in mind as you are making your decision.

Regards,

Christine Hofstedt
292 Murray Avenue
Larchmont, NY 10538
C2hofstedt@outlook.com

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

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 level of the already 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. It is unclear from the DEIS how the berms will be constructed, the composition of the berms and how they will be maintained in perpetuity. What engineering will be done in and about the berms to assure that runoff and normal exposure to the elements will not erode the structure and security of the berms? What additional piping will be installed to carry the runoff away from the site? What was the methodology used to determine that significant rainfall events alone do not effect flooding in this area?

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. Both Cove Rd and Hommocks Rd as they exist currently are inundated in significant storm events. You are proposing using Cooper as an emergency route for the residents to use in the event that these two roads are impassible. We are concerned that this is only a one way street that it will become a choke point. Further if a tree falls in a storm or other obstacles arise blocking this road, what alternatives do you have in place to provide a secondary means of egress in a storm? Additionally, what will the emergency protocol be for unlocking the gate, which will normally close Cooper Rd to traffic? 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. What is the scope of the easement permitting the use of Cooper Road and does it provide for emergency vehicle ingress and egress as one of those uses?

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. How do you propose to address this?

5) What pervious surfaces do you plan on using in this project, how will they be utilized to assure compliance with storm water management codes set forth by the Federal, State and Village requirements, and where?

6) What is the current and what are the planned maintenance procedures for the flood gates, and what are the emergency back up plans, especially in light of the previous failure?

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Gretel Goldberger <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 2:45 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Gretel Goldberger
4300 Theall Road
Zip Code: 10580
Email: gold4300@optonline.net

Submitted from: 69.112.77.2
ID#: 64

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Philip Phillips <philippPhillips2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 5:28 AM
To: cfelsher@reservoircap.com; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire development

Dear Mamaroneck Planning Board,

My family has lived in Orienta since 1980 and my children and grandchildren have grown up benefiting from the open space and clean air of living near the Hampshire golf course. We lived through storms that flooded the golf course, including hurricanes that even resulted in a death from flooding. Now, upon hearing this mercenary plan for 105-home development on a well-known swamp and low-tide coastal area, we are confounded that this proposal is being taken seriously. The amount of congestion, traffic, environmental impact, and pollution that will result from this proposal makes no sense for our town, village and community. Please stop this nonsense.

Sincerely,
Philip Phillips
930 Fairway Lane
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

PAUL B. BERGINS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
124 COURT STREET
WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10601
(914) 681-0007

FAX: (914) 949-7321

EMAIL: PBERGINS@BERGINSLEGAL.COM

Via email and FedEx

May 9, 2018

Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board
169 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Third Floor
Mamaroneck, New York 10543

RE: Hampshire Recreation LLC

Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the continued DEIS Public Hearing on April 11, 2018 regarding Hampshire Recreation LLC, I advised the Board that my client, Mamaroneck Open Space Recreation Associates LLC ("Open Space Recreation Associates") was prepared to present an offer to purchase the Hampshire Country Club Property.

I am writing to now advise the Board that Open Space Recreation Associates has transmitted to Hampshire Recreation LLC a formal proposal to purchase the entire approximately 106-acre parcel with all improvements thereon, including the Hampshire Country Club Clubhouse and all associated structures and amenities. The offer is at a fair price consistent with Hampshire Recreation's own conclusion of the value of the Property in its current condition and use.

If the Property is acquired by Open Space Recreation Associates, it intends by appropriate legal and other arrangements, to preserve the Property's current use for open space recreational purposes.

I respectfully request that the Board include this letter in the Record of the DEIS Hearing.

Yours very truly,


PAUL B. BERGINS

PBB:bcl

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 9, 2018
THROUGH
May 9, 2018

123 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC NEWMAN Public Comment

124 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC MARCUS Public Comment

125 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC FINSTAD Public Comment

126 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC SAMUEL Public Comment

127 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC MSAMUEL Public Comment

128 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC WENSTRUP Public Comment

129 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC LEVIN Public Comment

130 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC AULT Public Comment

131 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC KRONICK Public Comment

132 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC SKRILOW Public Comment

133 05 09 2018 Hampshire CC ZEIDNER Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andrew Newman <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 12:33 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Andrew Newman
611 WEBSTER AVE
Zip Code: 10801-1514
Email: andrewnewman499@gmail.com

Submitted from: 157.130.19.110
ID#: 65

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Eric Marcus <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 12:44 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Eric Marcus
3 Beresford Lane
Zip Code: 10538
Email: epmarcusny@gmail.com

Submitted from: 108.171.130.179
ID#: 66

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Dave Finstad <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Dave Finstad
18 Vanderburgh Ave., Larchmont
Zip Code: 10538
Email: dave.finstad@yahoo.com

Submitted from: 72.142.92.173
ID#: 67

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Donna Samuel <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 3:22 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Donna Samuel
817 fenimore Road
Zip Code: 10543
Email: DONSELENA@AOL.COM

Submitted from: 68.129.151.83
ID#: 68

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Mark Samuel <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 3:23 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Mark Samuel
817 fenimore Road
Zip Code: 10543
Email: Dcrehab@aol.com

Submitted from: 68.129.151.83
ID#: 69

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Kelly WENSTRUP <kwenstrup@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 5:00 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Please Forward to the Planning Board re: Hampshire

Dear Chairperson and Members of the Planning Board:

Today Hampshire once again urged its members to sign a new petition and email you in support of its development plan. The email (screenshot below) contained incorrect (if not outright false) assertions and a not-so-veiled threat of litigation. This campaign of misinformation is another attempt to divide the community and drive false support for development.

Significantly, Hampshire writes “The Village of Mamaroneck has lost millions of taxpayer dollars in unsuccessful battles to fight development. That’s a lot of money that could have been put to better use towards schools, infrastructure and programs for our seniors.” Same on them.

If you receive a new petition of support or a slurry of emails citing these concerns, you should be aware of their impetus.

Thank you again for your careful attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Kelly Wenstrup
1058 Cove Road
Mamaroneck

Reply-To: info@hampshireclub.com

[Click here to view it on the web!](#) (Having trouble viewing this email?)

You're receiving this email because you are a Member at Hampshire Country Club. Don't forget to add info@hampshireclub.com to your address book so we'll be sure to land in your inbox!

You may [unsubscribe](#) if you no longer wish to receive our emails.



1025 Cove Road | Mamaroneck, NY 10543
Phone: (914) 698-4610 | www.hampshireclub.com

Dear Members,

The deadline to submit letters of support is May 9, 2018. The Residences at Hampshire Proposal which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. The Village of Mamaroneck has lost millions of taxpayer dollars in unsuccessful battles to fight development. That's a lot of money that could have been put to better use towards schools, infrastructure and programs for our seniors.

Please [click here](#) to sign a letter of support to help generate significant tax revenue and maintain a cornerstone of the #Mamaroneck community. Your voice is important! For more information, please feel free to contact the Club at (914) 698-4610.

Thank you,

Hampshire Country Club

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Don Levin <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 5:23 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Don Levin
147 Rockland Av, Larchmont
Zip Code: 10538
Email: donaldlevin@gmail.com

Submitted from: 68.129.154.186
ID#: 70

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Rachel Ault <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 5:25 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Rachel Ault
20 Lafayette Road
Zip Code: 10538
Email: rachel.a.ault@gmail.com

Submitted from: 69.112.77.2
ID#: 71

1020 Cove Road

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

May 8, 2018

Dear Members of the Planning Board and the Board of Trustees:

We write regarding the proposal of the real estate developer who purchased Hampshire. One of us spoke during the public hearing. This letter attempts to summarize those comments and include some additional information, yet minimize duplication of other comments.

- **The Village Should Rezone to Accurately Reflect Zoning Intent:** The Village should take the same action taken by the Town of Mamaroneck with respect to Bonnie Briar Country Club, which is mentioned in the Village Comprehensive Plan: **rezone the property from what was considered a “holding zone” (before the time of “open space” zoning) to Open Space/recreation zoning.** The Comprehensive Plan states that the zoning of open space as a “residential zone” is a common circumstance with many older codes in New York State. The original code writers created a low-density residential zone to apply to parks and other open spaces as a default provision, because there was no “open space” zoning. The intent when zoned was NOT to build over 100 houses on the land, or even to build 100 condos, multiplying the current clubhouse size by approximately NINE TIMES. The intent as drafted was to keep it as open space, as described in the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan states that the zoning in environmentally sensitive areas should be amended to reflect existing land use at that time. This Planning Board should not be limited by history’s inartful drafting constraints. **This Board can and should recognize and solve the limitations of history and recommend rezoning now.**
- **Limit Density on Property:** However, if for some reason the property is not rezoned, the Planning Board can and should take actions to limit density on the property. If the Planning Board were to permit clustered development, the number of clustered units should be limited to the number of units that actually would be buildable under current law, which is a much lower number than the developer claims (more like 20 units rather than 100+ units).
- **Unique and Critical Environmental Area:** Hampshire is private property and borders private roads, but it was designated a Critical Environmental Area in the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, and its open space vistas are viewed from roads accessed by the public for walking, biking, driving and accessed by various students and sports teams at Hommocks. The impact of construction and residential pollution on the water quality of Delancey Cove and Long Island Sound, the Hommocks and Delancey Cove marshes, and Flint Park would be significant. Hampshire also may include intertidal wetlands and upland fringe that provide

an important natural and valuable area for wildlife (birds, turkeys, hawk, fish, mussels, deer, coyotes), which must be protected.

- **Hydraulically Equivalent Volume:** The residence proposal requires the developer to put fill (dirt) below the flood plain in order to build the houses. Village law section 186-5 clearly prohibits this unless the fill placed below the base flood elevation is compensated for and balanced by a hydraulically equivalent volume of excavation taken from below the base flood elevation at or adjacent to the development site. My understanding is that basically, they need to take out (in terms of space volume/dirt) an amount equal to the fill that they add in, so that water has the same amount of space to go/so that the open space still has the same volume available to hold water. We all see huge amounts of water pooled in a couple of different areas of Hampshire (like bathtubs) during rainstorms, and this water still needs a place to go if those lower areas are filled in with fill. The developer's plans don't provide for that balance. The law also provides for other limits on this fill as well. Also, please remember the environmental and contamination concerns that have been raised by others, even if the developer were to excavate/dig on the site to balance the fill they intend to add.
- **Storm Water Drainage:** The developer's proposal does not adequately address drainage of stormwater and storm drains. Orienta's storm drains tie into a few central locations and are already overburdened. Adding more impervious surfaces will further burden the system.
- **Limited Easement to Use Cove Road:** The developer's proposal does not address the fact that Hampshire's right to use Cove Road is based on a limited easement contained in the property deeds of at least some homeowners of Cove Road (including ours). Revising the use of the property to residential use likely would extinguish any rights that Hampshire and its guests may have to use Cove Road, and they may not use the road, preventing access to the development.
- **Developer's False Claims About Its Rights:** The real estate developer who purchased Hampshire as an investment claims it has "a right" to build residential homes on the land. As has been discussed by many individuals, this is not correct: although the land may be *zoned* for residential use, that zoning does **not** give a developer a right of free rein to build as it wants (even if the zoning were not controversial), particularly when this land encompasses a critical environmental area and has flooded during large rain storms, may have toxic soil if disturbed, and when the proposal would significantly increase traffic and infrastructure needs, and does not offset such costs. (Even if it did offset costs, it should still be prohibited from burdening the Village in these ways.)
- **Developer's False Claims About a Choice:** As I explained during the hearing, I fear this is all a massive waste of time and resources in response to a threat that aims to convince people and government entities to make a false choice: to choose between two choices, Hampshire's housing plan or Hampshire's 121 unit condo plan. We have heard – during the public hearing and or via the investor's well-funded yet not credible public relations outreach – that the investor "prefers" to build a 121-unit condo development, and that the developer considers this condo development to be a "compromise" to its supposed right to

build a massive housing development under current zoning (which is false – especially on land that floods and is designated to be a critical environmental area). However, this is not a case of choosing one of the two options the developer proposes.

- **Developer’s True Goal and Motivation:** As you also have heard, the developer has a legal obligation to its investors to pursue the most profits. Its claims that it cares about what is best for our Village – for you, for me, for our neighbors, for our families, even for its own club members – could be contrary to its obligation to its investors. So please do not be fooled by the claim that the developer cares about or will prioritize any *supposed* benefits to the Village. Taking steps other than maximizing profits could subject the developer to significant liability from its investors.
- **Developer’s False Claims about “the Better Option ... for the entire Village of Mamaroneck”:** Despite this obligation to its investors and its proposal tonight, the developer has written this direct quote from one of its emails to Hampshire club members: the “condo development proposal is not only the far better option for our Members, but also for the entire Village of Mamaroneck. In fact, the positives of this development proposal so far outweigh the negatives, it is quite difficult to understand how one can argue against this option” of the condo development. As a reminder, there also are several reasons why the 100+ unit condo development is not preferable for the village relative to the housing plan, and many of these considerations relate to both proposals:
 - Building a massive 5-story, 300,000 square foot building, with over 100 2-3 bedroom apartments and approx. 246 underground parking spots, an indoor theater room, an indoor pool, a business center, fitness center, restaurants, valet parking, is not environmentally sensitive. It sounds like a shopping mall and certainly not a responsible development.
 - For perspective, the current clubhouse (according to the Hampshire website in February 2018) is 35,000 square feet. The supposedly less disruptive condo proposal would actually expand the current building by almost **9 times**.
 - It would result in significant disruption to soil, move roads, change elevations of the road, disrupt Delancey Cove and Hommocks and cove wetlands. It would result in massive change of stormwater drainage patterns that would adversely impact and likely cause flooding to surrounding homes, neighborhoods and schools.
 - Condos “targeted” to “empty-nesters but not required to be sold to them would still result in a significant increase of school age children and overcrowding. We already have an overcrowding problem in the district and do not need more. Many of us purposely purchased homes in the amazing and intimate Central school community. Adding 100 condos would certainly impact that.
 - Traffic: Over 100 condos would result in at least 100 or even 200 extra cars, plus friends/visitors/deliveries, etc. in and out of our narrow local streets. The streets are not built or maintained with the expectation of such a significant increase in traffic.

- **Infrastructure:** The proposed residences would represent an approximately 15% increase in Orienta residences. From approximately 700 residences to over 800. Traveling on the same streets most of us do: Orienta Avenue, Old Boston Post Rd, Eagle Knolls Road, Hommocks Road. Think of the 8 am Hommocks congestion that would be increased on Boston Post Rd by Orienta Avenue, and on Boston Post Road and Hommocks Rd, and on Cove Road. Think of the additional water pipes, sewer drains, stormwater drains, road maintenance, garbage and recycling pick up, etc. – all of which would not be supported by the lower tax rates of a condo development. This is not responsible development and it would not be responsible for it to be approved.
- **Environmental considerations:** Whether a condo development or a housing development, critically environmentally sensitive land would still be disturbed. Trees would come down, light pollution would increase. There is no way you can build a massive building, 9 times the size of the current building, plus almost 250 parking spots underground, with 100 1-3 bedroom condos without disturbing the land around it. It also is so close to the Long Island Sound, Delancey Cove, and the wetlands that these critical environmental areas would be disturbed. Could result in toxic soil being disturbed, and in close proximity to Hommocks. Wildlife would be scared away from Hampshire and further into our yards.
- **Investor public relations materials state that the condo development will “help secure the future of Hampshire Country Club.”** If securing its future is the goal, there are so many other ways to achieve that goal. The condo association would not secure that goal: There would be no financial guarantees, and the investor could just walk away. And of course, its members would have to make do without the club during the years of construction.
- **Developer’s Public Relations Campaign and Tactics Call Into Question the Developer’s and its Experts’ Credibility, and Any Support They May Have From Village Residents:** The huge public relations campaign (mail, email, social media, etc.) and tactics being used by the developer undermines some of the developer’s arguments, some of its turnout, any supporters (whose views may be based on the developer’s false assertions), and certainly some of the developer’s commitments. At least one representative of the developer (who does not live in the Village) has posted on the neighborhood social media application Next Door Neighbor without identifying herself as an agent of the developer. She also spoke in front of the Planning Board and initially failed to identify herself as an agent of the developer, so please be careful to whom you listen, upon whom you rely, and whom you trust.
- **Community Members Involved in and Supportive of the Village of Mamaroneck In Many Ways and for Many Years Are Against the Developer’s Proposals:** In emails to its members, the developer has gotten nasty and accused longstanding community members of only caring about their homes and their own backyards when in fact community members who have spoken out against or otherwise supported efforts against the

development proposals have been of incredible service to the community, including by serving on the School Board, village committees/land use boards, the board of at least one religious organization, and in leadership roles in charitable organizations, neighborhood organizations, the Central School and Mamaroneck District Parent-Teacher Associations, and various other nonprofit organizations. This is most certainly not a case of people saying “not in MY backyard” as the developer stated in a recent email to its members. This development is NOT in my backyard and not in the backyard of many supporters. It is in our neighborhood and our Village. To the contrary, many of the developer’s supporters do not live in the Village.

- **The Planning Board and the Board of Trustees’ Choice and Legacy:** This choice is up to you, my fellow community members. Will we be fooled by a for profit company’s attempts to make this an “either or” situation and rely on its claimed “right” to build something that actually was never its right? Will we need to carry on indefinitely without getting to see the outcome because the developer’s pockets and its investors’ pockets are deeper than ours? (Though we WILL carry on.) **Please do what the Town of Mamaroneck did for Bonnie Briar and rezone the land to reflect the documented intent when it was zoned.** Or, at a minimum, use the rational and true number of approximately 20 units if you don’t care about the critical environmental area. But do not let the developer get its way because it has more to win and deeper pockets than the community members. The land use boards and Board of Trustees of the Village of Mamaroneck are being asked to believe the false claims of a developer whose only responsibility is to its investors. Some residents and non-residents believe the developer. Its claims about what is best for our community, what is permitted in our community, and what was intended for the community by the zoning guidelines, are false and ignorant of – and seek to destroy – the wonderful community we already have and which our predecessors sought to create and protect.

We cannot thank you enough for your time and consideration of these critical issues at stake in our community, and for all of your other work on other critical (and not as critical) issues as well.

Best regards,

Jenn Kronick and Jason Shapiro

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Maureen Skrilow <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 8:13 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Maureen Skrilow
122 Osborn Road, Harrison, NY
Zip Code: 10528
Email: mskrilow@yahoo.com

Submitted from: 47.22.166.30
ID#: 72

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Gerald Zeidner <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 9:03 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Gerald Zeidner
51 East 90 New York, N.y.
Zip Code: 10128
Email: jlzeid@aol.com

Submitted from: 74.71.100.168
ID#: 73

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 10, 2018
THROUGH
May 10, 2018

- 134 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC HERZOG Public Comment
- 135 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC ZINGESSER Public Comment
- 136 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC GORDON Public Comment
- 137 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC McLARNON Public Comment
- 138 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC KATEN Public Comment
- 139 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC A CUTLER Public Comment
- 140 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC BIBLOWITZ Public Comment
- 141 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC S KATEN Public Comment
- 142 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC SIGALOW Public Comment
- 143 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC POPOLI Public Comment
- 144 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC KALT Public Comment
- 145 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC B RUDICH Public Comment
- 146 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC E RUDICH Public Comment
- 147 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC SILVER Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jane E Herzog <jeh2@nyu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Celia Felsher; Jack Lusk
Subject: Hampshire

Please confirm receipt of this. Thank you.

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning Board,

My husband and I attended your meeting last night. During the work session pertaining to the proposed development at Hampshire, Mr. Mendes asked an important question about flooding of neighboring homes during Sandy from water on the golf course.

As residents of Cove Road, we can agree with Mr. Mendes' comment that there is really no longer such thing as a 100 year storm. Indeed, over the 26 years that we have lived in our home, we have lived through multiple storms, both from hurricane level rain as well as from tidal surge.

As you will recall, the major problem during Sandy was tidal surge. There was not an extraordinary amount of rainfall. You have seen the photos of the flooding during that storm which was similar to the Nor'Easter of 1992 when our friend and neighbor, David Fagin was drowned. The golf course was fully under water and was surging like a raging river. The water passed over the golf course at multiple locations. Cove Road was one of those where the water came across and fully flooded Cove Road North and South. All the homes suffered substantial flooding. Please note that the flood water was sea water, not rain water. All residents were in harm's way which included the elderly, children, adults and pets. Evacuation was required and emergency vehicles were not able to get through.

We beg you to reject all plans for development on the golf course. The condo proposal is not a good alternative as it will equally contribute to damage during a storm.

The proposed development will severely exacerbate the flooding. Homes and lives will be in jeopardy as Long Island Sound cannot be held back by some berms. It is foolish and naive thinking to believe that the developer's plan will do anything at all to control flooding.

Respectfully,

Jane Herzog and Jack Lusk
1002 Cove Road

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Lawrence Zingesser <lzing@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:28 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Lawrence Zingesser, MD
752 Cove Road
Mamaroneck, NY

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: jamie gordon <jbgorienta@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:29 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Jamie gordon
628 oriental avenue
Mamk, ny 10543

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Lawrence Zingesser <lzing@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:30 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Mary McLarnon MD
752 Cove Road
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: lorraine katen <lorrainekaten@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:40 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Tom Murphy
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

We are a residents of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

MR. & MRS. SAM KATEN 626 BROOK ST, VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Adam Cutler <cutleradam@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: murphy@vomny.org; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Adam Cutler
845 Claflin Ave. Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: LN bib <lnbib50@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:45 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

[name and address]

Ellen Biblowitz

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: lorraine katen <lorrainekaten@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:52 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: vafur@vomny.org
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

lorraine katen 626 brook st mamaroneck ny 10543

sam katen 626 brook st mamaroneck ny 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Ian Sigalow <idsigs@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 8:56 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be bad for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Ian Sigalow
886 Orienta Avenue

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Matt Popoli <mattpop4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 9:21 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be absolutely terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. I cannot believe that the Village is still entertaining this absurd development.

Sincerely,

Matt Popoli
1045 Seahaven Drive
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Steve <irisnsteve@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 9:23 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. The only responsible alternatives are the Town or Hampshire members buying the Club.

Sincerely,
Steve Kalt
1077 Constable Drive
Mamaroneck, NY

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Beth Rudich <brudich@jbilibrary.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 9:27 PM
To: Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire DEIS

Dear Neighbors,

I am writing today in opposition to Hampshire Country Club's proposed development. The project is totally inconsistent with the village's comprehensive plan. If this is a critical environmental area, the land should be rezoned as open/recreational space. And if that is not possible this goes against any attempt to reduce density. This will eliminate what little open space is left in the village and produce an onslaught of students that our school system cannot possibly accommodate.

Beth Rudich
400 orienta Avenue

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Eric Rudich <erudich@blueprinttrial.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 9:47 PM
To: Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire DEIS

Dear Planning Board,

I writing as I hope you reject Hampshire Country Club's proposed development. We live in a beautiful community with wonderful schools and parks. There is absolutely no need to overdevelop our community particularly and build homes in a known flood zone. Such a development will only cause school crowding, increase traffic, and strain resources. The impact on our community during such a large construction project would be enormous bringing thousands of trucks near our schools and by our homes. We are ranked by US News as one of the top 100 cities to live for good reason. Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Eric Rudich
400 Orienta Ave.
Mamaroneck, NY

Eric Rudich, Ph.D.
Partner / Senior Litigation Consultant



646-729-3277 - ERudich@Blueprinttrial.com

110 East 30th Street, New York, NY 10016

Blueprinttrial.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This e-mail, and any attachments, are confidential and may contain privileged information. This message is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, please be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this e-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please call the sender at 646-729-3277 and delete this message from your system.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: phil silver <phlup@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 9:57 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. THIS IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN.

Sincerely,
[name and address]
Phillip Silver
511 Rushmore Avenue
Sent from my iPad

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECEIVED May 10, 2018

THROUGH

May 11, 2018

148 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC CANTWELL Public Comment

149 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC FARRIS Public Comment

150 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC PARRY Public Comment

151 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC HINERFELD Public Comment

152 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC MONITTO Public Comment

153 05 10 2018 Hampshire CC J SIGALOW Public Comment

154 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC GRANT Public Comment

155 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC SHAPIRO Public Comment

156 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC BEER Public Comment

157 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC FALK Public Comment

158 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC SAWYER Public Comment

159 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KELLY Public Comment

160 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC SANTAMARIA Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Paul Cantwell <paul.cantwell@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:13 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Sally Cantwell; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: I want to register my opposition to the Hampshire development

I live opposite the 10th hole and so have a ring side view of the frequent flooding. It is comical to think that someone would build on there. No responsible adult could think it is a sensible strategy. It will inevitably lead to people being stranded or even worse.

Sent from my iPad

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: John Farris <atfarris@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:19 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor and Board
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

John FARRIS

John@atfarris.com

John Farris
Cell 914 649 0103
Sent from my iPad

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: jill parry <jillparry8@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:25 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Jill Parry

405 Toni lane, mamaroneck 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Norman Hinerfeld <norcomp@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:44 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Ipotok@vomny.org
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

[

Norman and Ruth Hinerfeld

11 Oak Lane

Larchmont, NY 10538

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Gary Monitto <gmonitto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 10:48 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

We are a small village and we want to stay that way.

Sincerely,

Gary Monitto

314 Livingston Ave.

Apt. 301W

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jessica Sigalow <jessica.sigalow@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 11:43 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: murphy@vomny.org; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Jessica Sigalow
886 Orienta Avenue
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: AJ Grant <ajgrant@teameca.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:01 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; AJ Grant
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I DO NOT support the plan to develop Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. In fact, it is one of the worst plans we've seen in 40 years.

1. To begin, the known flood history of the proposed site and future flood risks make this potentially a hazardous development and poor choice for residences. It also adds a high degree of risk to the rest of us living on Orienta as it will overload our delicate roads during emergencies. There are two insufficient egresses from Hampshire; Hommocks and Orienta. Orienta can not carry the number of people in an evacuation situation in an efficient manner. The developer should also have a \$15 Million contingency to pay for potential flood damages so public tax dollars that fund FEMA don't have to pay for damages that will likely be incurred in the future from flooding at Hampshire.

It was our neighbor, Mr. Fagan who drowned many years ago while driving through Hampshire during a storm surge.

2. The dense development plan threatens the very character of the surrounding Orienta area and sets a bad precedent for other similar neighborhoods. It will surely negatively affect home values and quality of life. And, the increased traffic congestion will lead to many unintended consequences.

3. The developer claims it will bring considerable economic development. That is yet to be seen.

4. This development is out of alignment with the Planning Board's Comprehensive Plan for the Village.

5. Bottom line, there is no place for this kind of development in Hampshire. It is dangerous, inappropriate, against all FEMA advice and jeopardizes our neighborhoods. There was a proposal put forth to purchase the property from the developers and that would be best. It is too bad that the developers poured so much money into the plan.

6. There were many other thoughtful and poignant environmental reasons why this project should not be granted, but they are better said by those experts who spoke.

I respectfully urge you to deny this proposal and project.

Thank You,
Andrea J. Grant

AJ Grant (co-owner)
1016 Orienta Avenue
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
303-817-3373 (mobile)
ajgrant@teameca.com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jason Shapiro <jasonshapiro@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:39 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Jason Shapiro
1020 Cove Road
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Joachim Beer <joachim.beer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:51 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: New Hampshire Condo Development / Mamaroneck

Dear Planning Board,

I want to express my deepest concerns over the project of the private new Hampshire beach & yacht club development of private condominiums at the coast line of Mamaroneck.

it is environmental more then critical project, it destroys the a huge part of our coastline forever and it creates unnecessary traffic in a quiet neighborhood with a lot of family with there kids.

the New Hampshire Beach & Yacht club wants to make a money on behave and a financial interest should not be allowed to ruin an important part of our nature and coastline, for the benefit of only a few people.

Sincerly

Joachim Beer
945 The Pkwy
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
Phone: +16462035689
Mail: jbeer1@optonline.net

Jeffrey C. Falk
612 Brook Street
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

May 9, 2018

Re: Hampshire Club

Dear Chairman and Members of the Planning Board,

Continuing to allow development in areas prone to flooding and in environmentally sensitive areas runs contrary to the expressed intent of both our Village Comprehensive Plan and our Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan.

We homeowners (taxpayers) are more than tired of seeing monied interests given priority over the greater good of our community and our planet. The green space currently at the Hampshire club is among the very last of our open spaces and all of our efforts should be directed toward maintaining that aspect of the property. Many reasons for severely limiting residential development have been offered in your meetings and I agree with those positions.

As a 34 year homeowner (40 year resident) in the Village, I have observed time and again the Planning Board and Board of Appeals following advice of various 'professionals' claiming that one project or another will have "no impact" on issues like traffic, parking, burden on school system, water and waste water infrastructure and general environment. The cumulative effects on all of these issues, however, cannot be denied by reasonable people.

We do have more traffic issues; Mayor Murphy is suggesting "speed bumps" all over the Village. Our previous mayor advocated new multi-level parking structures, the mere existence of which would impact the overall nature and feel of our small village.

Our schools are overburdened. The Rye Neck system recently passed a bond issue in the tens of millions of dollars and my taxes are going up.

The entire area around Hampshire is well known historically for epic flooding. We're all aware that a man drowned there, in a spot 'normally' dry land. Building dykes or levies is not an acceptable solution.

The entire area is adjacent to and sheds into the L.I. Sound and wetlands that act as natural filters to the waters of the Sound. Wildlife issues have also been raised.

How many reasons do we need to repel the profit-based plans proposed by the would-be developers of the Hampshire Club?

I beg the Planning Board to fully discourage any plan that would consider residential development of any kind on the club grounds, and encourage any plan that would preserve the green space. Two options are obvious; continued use as a golf course or conversion to park/preserved land.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeffrey Falk

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Benjamin Sawyer <bensawyer9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 7:36 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Hi,

I am a resident of the Village, and I am writing to voice my opposition to developing housing or a condominium on Hampshire Golf Course. My house abuts the 6th tee box, and the area around the lake that sits just beyond the tees floods about 4-8 times per year. Note that it doesn't only flood when there is a hurricane or "100 year storm," but that it floods whenever we have significant rainfall (or snow melting). My fear is that with development, that water will have to find new places to go. While I realize that not wanting my property to flood is somewhat selfish, it would also be narrow-minded to allow Hampshire to develop without recognizing the deleterious effects on the surrounding community.

I am similarly concerned about how development would affect our schools in Mamaroneck and our roads in Orienta, but I assume you have already looked into those issues at length.

I appreciate everything you all do for our Village--please accept my sincere thanks.

Sincerely,
Ben Sawyer
912 Sylvan Lane
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Mcmichael <joank@mcm yacht.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 7:33 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

For so many reasons except for \$\$ for someone this is a horrendous hard to believe concept. Traffic, over loading our schools, not to mention danger to the kids why the construction is in progress. How could anyone in the village support this! We are gradually ruining the character of the village.

Sincerely,

Bill and Joan Kelly

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Judy Santamaria <judy.santamaria88@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 7:39 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. It will overcrowd our schools and our fields, the roads cannot handle the traffic, and it will flood surrounding areas. And the argument that was made at the Planning board — that it will provide jobs -- is ridiculous. A couple of months of construction jobs will not make up for the many year-round jobs lost when the golf course is eliminated.

Sincerely,
Judy Santamaria
415 Toni Ln, Mamaroneck

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 11, 2018
THROUGH
May 11, 2018

161 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC METCALFE Public Comment
162 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC DePIETRO Public Comment
163 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC FREMONT Public Comment
164 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC WALKER Public Comment
165 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC GESSLER Public Comment
166 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC GREENHAUS Public Comment
167 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC WALKER Public Comment
168 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC FELSHER Public Comment
169 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC MILBURN Public Comment
170 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KRONICK Public Comment
171 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC FRIEDMAN Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Carol Metcalfe <cametcalfe@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; 'kwaitt@vomny.org.'
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Carol Metcalfe
416 Rushmore Ave
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Joe DePietro <jbdepietro@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 9:12 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; 'kwaitt@vomny.org.'
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Joe DePietro

416 Rushmore Ave

Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Harry Fremont <harryfremont@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 9:58 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Harry Fremont

920 Fairway Lane Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Don Walker <DonW@harrywalker.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:10 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Ellen Walker; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: my vehement opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village and have been for close to 20 years. I strongly believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be disastrous for the Village and should be absolutely and completely rejected. I believe it would do enormous harm to our community.

Sincerely,

Don Walker
747 Orienta Ave.
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
914-670-5726

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Barbara Gessler <forshopdrop@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:12 AM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: PLEASE - No real estate development at Hampshire Golf Course

To whom it may concern:

My name is Barbara Gessler and I reside in the Town of Mamaroneck.

I remember very well that in June 2010 Mr. Pfeffer, one of the owners, had this to say about development: *Asked about plans for housing development at Hampshire, Mr. Pfeffer said a lot of people are speculating, but “at the current time” there are no such plans. “We are going to have a great club,” he said.* (Larchmont Gazette, June 17, 2010)

I also remember very well that the village and the town would have loved to buy the club! But Mr Pfeffer and his partners offered more money and the promise of no development, and prevailed.

Let's keep them to their word: no development.

NO development is good for our environment, and for our already overfull schools.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gessler

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Carol Greenhaus <carolgreenhaus@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; nlucucas@vomny.org; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Carol and Edwin Greenhaus

[name and address]

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Ellen Walker <EllenW@harrywalker.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:37 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Cc: DonW@harrywalker.com
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a 20 year resident of the Village residing at 747 Orienta Avenue. I strongly believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Ellen Walker
747 Orienta Ave.
Mamaroneck, NY
10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Celia Felsher <cfelsher@reservoircap.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 11:06 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; vpotok@vomny.org; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear Planning Board,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Celia A.

This message (including any attachments) may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual or individuals named. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited. If you received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Robert Milburn <milburn490@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; fhm-rem@verizon.net
Subject: Support of Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be best for the Village and should be considered as a viable alternative.

Since the waterway adjacent to the club is dry twice a day at low tide, it would have to be dredged to provide a true marine facility. I do not believe the village would ever agree to that. A zoning change would not set a precedent for other clubs which are on navigable waters..

Sincerely,

Robert E Milburn
490 Bleeker Ave
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jenn Kronick <jennkronick@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:10 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Jenn Kronick

1020 Cove Road, Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Friedman, Ellen <efriedman@nixonpeabody.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:20 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Ellen Friedman
1050 Seven Oaks Lane
Mamaroneck

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 11, 2018
THROUGH
May 11, 2018

172 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KAUFFMAN Public Comment
173 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KALT Public Comment
174 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC CUTLER Public Comment
175 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC SOTO PINTO Public Comment
176 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KIRWIN Public Comment
177 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KEARNEY Public Comment
178 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC SHIFRIN Public Comment
179 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KASS Public Comment
180 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC J DESMOND Public Comment
181 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KUHNS COOK Public Comment
182 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC THAUL Public Comment
183 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC KENT Public Comment
184 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC R SPATZ Public Comment
185 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC POTASH Public Comment
186 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC T KENT Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Geoffrey Kauffman <geoffreykauffman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:48 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Hampshire condo development - Strongly Oppose

Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board -

I am a resident of the Village of Mamaroneck. I strongly believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Similarly, the housing development should also be rejected.

It is important to note that, as a member of your Board pointed out at a recent meeting, virtually all of the comments presented were form letters sent in through the Hampshire website, in response to their own aggressive / misleading public relations campaign. These letters are mostly from individuals who reside outside of the Village of Mamaroneck, and would not be impacted by the development, and from Club employees, who would profit in the event of a development.

We live in the neighborhood and have been living with the threat of some form of development at Hampshire for some time now. The impact that such a development would have on local environment, roads, traffic patterns, school crowding... are huge. It is long past time to put this question to rest.

Respectfully submitted

- Geoffrey Kauffman

GEOFFREY KAUFFMAN
825 PIRATES COVE
MAMARONECK, NY 10543
914-777-7696 - **Home**
917-838-0872 - **Mobile**
GeoffreyKauffman@Hotmail.Com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Steve <irisnsteve@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely

Iris Kalt

1077 Constable Drive

Mamaroneck

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Nova Cutler <nova.cutler@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 1:23 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Cc: CUTLERADAM@HOTMAIL.COM
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Nova Cutler
845 Claflin Ave
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann ShererPublic Comment

From: valentina soto pinto <valsoto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 1:40 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I find it completely irresponsible that this is even being considered, not only because of the impact in the environment and the character of the village, but specially given the current situation with the school district's enrollment. We have been let down by our city officials already as there seems to have been a complete lack of communication between school and town officials that led to this being the issue that it is now. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Valentina SotoPinto
531 Rushmore Ave
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andrew Kirwin <akirwin@attglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 2:00 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: RE: Hampshire Development Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board, Trustees and Mayor Murphy:

I am writing to follow up to my previous email sent to you on April 25th which is below. I am a 12 year resident of the Village. While I am a trustee of the Orienta Point Association, I am sending this email as an individual concerned resident. As an active member of our Village Community who speaks regularly with fellow residents living all over our Village, I have not come across one resident who is in favor of the proposed development at Hampshire Country Club. The residents I have spoken to have very deep concerns. I believe that both the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development and the current proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected.

As mentioned previously, it is important to consider the true impact this development will have on our community. It appears the developer has attempted to mislead the Planning Board on a number of fronts and that should not be tolerated.

I urge you to reject the proposals.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Very truly yours;
Andrew Kirwin
624 Forest Avenue
Mamaroneck

ANDREW KIRWIN, ESQ.
501 Fifth Avenue
15th Floor
New York, New York 10017
(212) 869-8220
FAX (212) 840-2540

This E-mail is not an agreement to conduct transactions by electronic means. The preceding E-mail message contains information that is confidential, may be protected by the attorney/client or other applicable privileges, and may constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) of the message. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender at (212) 869-8220. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Disclosure Required by Internal Revenue Service Circular 230: This communication is not a tax opinion. To the extent it contains tax advice, it is not intended or written by the practitioner to be used, and it cannot be used by the taxpayer, for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service.

From: Betty-Ann Sherer [mailto:bsherer@vomny.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 10:09 AM
To: Andrew Kirwin
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: RE: Hampshire Development Project

Hello,
Your letter regarding Hampshire Country Club will be distributed to the Planning Board and has been made part of the record.
Have a pleasant day.

Betty-Ann

Betty-Ann Sherer
Land Use Coordinator
Planning, Zoning & HCZMC
Village Of Mamaroneck
169 Mt.Pleasant Avenue
Mamaroneck, NY 10543
(914)825-8758 * Phone
(914)777-7792 * Fax

From: Andrew Kirwin [mailto:akirwin@attglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 8:36 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer <bsherer@vomny.org>
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy <tmurphy@vomny.org>; Victor Tafur <vtafur@vomny.org>; Nora Lucas <nlucas@vomny.org>; Leon Potok <LPotok@vomny.org>; Keith Waitt <kwaitt@vomny.org>
Subject: Hampshire Development Project

Dear Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board, Trustees and Mayor Murphy:

I am writing as a concerned parent, Little League coach and resident of the Village of Mamaroneck and Orienta Point where the Hampshire Country Club is located. I have resided in Orienta Point for 12 years. I have a 13 year-old son who is in the 8th grade at Hommocks Middle School and a 9 year-old daughter in the 4th grade at Central Elementary School. I have coached in the Larchmont/Mamaroneck Little League ("LMLL") for the past 8 years. I am a trustee of the Orienta Point Association but would like to be clear that the statement I am making is my own.

As a parent of school age children, I am deeply concerned with the impact this large proposed project will have on our community. It seems clear to me that there is a great deal of focus being placed on the issues of how much landfill will be needed, how many trucks will be needed to haul the fill to the site, the noise/pollution from the trucks and the potentially dirty fill. Additionally, I appreciate the continued focus on the issue of the contaminated soil in the proposed work site. I am hopeful the Planning Board will be able to obtain the answers that are needed to these particularly troubling issues. My expectation is that if you cannot

make a determination that the work can be done safely and pursuant to all laws that the project will be rejected outright.

One issue that seems to not be getting the focus that it should be getting is the impact this project will have on our sports fields. For 8 years now, I have struggled to find adequate baseball/softball fields to conduct practices. With the limited space we have in the Village and the Town of Mamaroneck, the priority has to go to using the fields for games. So as coaches, we struggle to find patches of grass that we can practice on and hope that we are not violating any permit rules. LMLL is able to secure some space for practices each week and has put together an elaborate system to allocate the space amongst the many teams at each level. If you are lucky enough to quickly reserve a space you are blocked from reserving space for the next week. As I say to new coaches, act fast or you are blocked out.

Prior to the two public hearings, I had the opportunity to read the portion of the DEIS related to “Open Space and Recreation.” It is clear to me and as noted at the April 11th public hearing, the information about the impact of the proposed development on our recreational facilities, in particular use of fields, needs to be corrected.

I am particularly troubled by the disingenuous statement the developer made indicating that the youth leagues had been contacted and no responses had been delivered. We have since learned that our various youth sports leagues had not been contacted with statements to the Planning Board from youth baseball, lacrosse and soccer. The President for Fields for Kids spoke on April 11th and indicated they were not contacted as well. Thus, the statement as to outreach should be corrected.

The extreme pressure the community faces on available fields was not described and should be addressed. Oddly, the only information provided in the DEIS on sports league impact was based on the numbers of participants in youth ice hockey (a total of 140 children). Youth hockey (i) does not use fields and (ii) has very small numbers of participants compared with those youth leagues that use fields (i.e., little league baseball, soccer, football and lacrosse). Therefore, the extrapolation from hockey participation to calculate the number of children from the proposed development activity is inapt. Information on participation in field sports for each season should be used to extrapolate the number of additional children that would participate in field sports. I have no doubt that a proper investigation on the potential increase in the use of our fields will show that the development would generate much more than the 2-3 children estimated in the DEIS.

Bill Nachtigal, the president of LMLL has written that from their experience they would expect “25-30%” of the school age children in the development to participate in baseball or softball. He wrote that the “increased participation will no doubt put additional demand on our already overburdened field resources.” Similarly, the Board of the Larchmont Mamaroneck Football Club wrote that “certain members of the club's leadership have expressed serious reservations about the likely increase in traffic in and around the Hommocks grass fields, which are utilized extensively by the players, families and supporters of the LMFC in the fall and spring, as well as related considerations.”

Alarming, Christopher B. Glinski of Larchmont Mamaroneck Youth Lacrosse has written that with the expected influx of children, “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.”

It appears that the developer has attempted to mislead the Planning Board on the issue of field space. The Planning Board and the community need reliable information to evaluate the impact of the project in this regard.

I thank you in advance for your hard work on considering the DEIS and the true impact this development will have on our Community.

Very truly yours,

Andrew Kirwin
624 Forest Avenue
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: colleen.kearney21@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 2:20 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Colleen Kearney
860 Rushmore Avenue
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Colleen Kearney
917.754.0751

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: LESLIE SHIFRIN <leslie.shifrin@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:10 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; kwait@vomny.org; vafur@vomny.org
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please note the below statement that I am a resident of the Village. I am aware that Hampshire is trying to “stack the deck” on these emails with non village residents and hamphire “friends and family”—like they did at the planning meeting which is a despicable practice, but I’m sure you will not nor will the planning board be taken in by their inflated number of emails.

The development either of the two ways presented would be a disaster waiting to happen. If you have seen the area after a heavy rain its flooded. The water will have to go someone. Our neighbor on Cove Rd drowned on “high ground” on the club driving through during a nor’easter. All of the other issues related to congestion, toxins etc etc are important as well. Please require the opportunistic and greedy developers to come up with a plan appropriate and safe for this spot.

They claim to have been a good neighbor — those living close by Know this isn't true.

Futhermore, searches for this developer —under different incorporations show them leaving jobs with workers unpaid, “middle of the night blitzkrieg practices (removing trees before approvals were granted in one instance) and they will not be around to pick up the pieces. I do want something developed there. I think the owner has a right to build...but it needs to be in the parameters of civic responsibility and safety.

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Leslie Shifrin
1031 Cove Rd S
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Sent by mobile device

Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP

Memorandum

To: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board
From: Stephen L. Kass
Cc: Lester D. Steinman
 Stuart Mesinger
Subject: Supplemental Comments on Hampshire DEIS
Date: May 10, 2018

We appreciate this opportunity to submit further comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) submitted by Hampshire Recreation, LLC (“Applicant”) in furtherance of its planned residential development on a portion of the Hampshire Country Club golf course. These comments respond to the various post-DEIS submissions and statements made by the Applicant and its consultants at the continued public hearing on April 11, 2018 and supplement our earlier written and oral comments at and following the February 11 initial public hearing on the DEIS.

As explained below, the Applicant’s April 11 comments as well as further review of the DEIS make clear the gross inadequacy of that document under the State Environmental Quality Review Act and the need for either a supplemental or a revised DEIS so that the Planning Board, other involved agencies and the public can have an accurate and informed understanding of the proposed project’s components, its environmental impacts and the impacts of a reasonable range of feasible and lawful alternatives to the proposed project. For the reasons indicated in our submissions at the February 11 hearing (and the written materials we submitted following that hearing), the need for such a revised or supplemented DEIS and a public hearing on the new document was already clear before April 11. The additional flaws, disclosures and contradictions in the Applicant’s April 11 presentation make that need indisputable.

1. Project Phasing: At the April 11 continued hearing, the Applicant made clear what had only been implied in the DEIS: people would be living on the project site at the end of the project’s initial phase, even while subsequent phases are under construction. While this is understandable from the Applicant’s cash flow perspective, it means that those families will be exposed to the noise, air quality, soil contamination and traffic from truck and earth-moving equipment during the construction of subsequent project phases. These on-site impacts to phase one residents, which are likely to be significant, have simply not been analyzed in the DEIS. Nor have projected traffic impacts from the combined volumes of construction vehicles and residential trips been assessed. Nor, most significantly, have the potential flood and contamination risks for phase one residents been analyzed, a critical omission in view of the need to excavate, store, and manage contaminated and imported soil during the period when residents share the site with construction activities and when both coastal and storm water flooding remain recurring threats. As past storms have demonstrated, the golf course effectively functions as a large “bath tub” to capture and retain both coastal flood water and, even more frequently, storm

water runoff from a large catchment area, water that remains on the site for many days and often needs to be pumped out. The DEIS contains no assessment of the site's ability to dissipate those collected waters, an omission that also needs to be corrected since the phase one residents could be exposed to this flooded condition for extended periods. Nor is there any indication who, if anyone, would be responsible for pumping the collected water once the developer leaves the site.

2. Project Abandonment: The DEIS also fails to assess the impacts of the Applicant's potential abandonment of the project midway through its construction, including the completion of phase one of the project. Neither of the Application's joint venture partners (Westport Capital and New World Realty) has meaningful experience with complex single-family residential construction, making the withdrawal of Toll Brothers from the project all the more significant. What will happen if the Applicant, after destroying the site's extensive vegetation and rock outcroppings, leveling the site's topography, exposing its topsoil and altering its drainage pattern as part of its phase one work, discovers that its homes are not selling as fast or for as much as projected (or that construction costs have soared or that 250,000 cubic yards of "clean fill" are more difficult to obtain than planned or that a regularly flooded site simply cannot be controlled or managed economically, simply withdraws after phase one and surrenders its partially-built site to the Village or its lenders? While completion bonds might, if available, protect the Village against incomplete streets and sewers, they cannot restore the site's trees, topography or hydraulic storage capacity. Any such abandonment by the Applicant would therefore leave the Village with both environmental and fiscal conditions that it will be hard pressed to remedy on its own while trying to meet the needs of any families already residing on the phase one portion of the site. This risk is made worse by the Applicant's belated disclosure at the April 11 hearing that its planned homes are to be constructed with their basements in, not on top of, the site's flood plan, subjecting residents to continuing risks of flooding and commensurate costs of trying to keep water from flooding their basements.

3. No Action Alternative: In its DEIS and public comments, the Applicant has continually dismissed Alternative A (the "No Action" alternative) as infeasible on the disingenuous ground that its existing 18-hole golf course and club are no longer financially feasible. However, as Mr. Krekorian has shown, that is simply not the case (unless one burdens the club with an \$800,000 annual "ground rent"). Moreover, the Applicant's claim is inconsistent with its own proposed 9-hole golf course since it is clear that free-standing 9-hole courses fare far worse than 18-hole courses. At the April 11 hearing, it became clear that at least one group of concerned residents believes the current 18-hole course remains viable and has offered to purchase the Hampshire property from the Applicant for a price consistent with the property's current use as a golf club and to continue that use in the future. Rather than treat this purchase option as a separate reasonable alternative to the proposed project (as the Planning Board could certainly do), the Board could, and should, simply require the Applicant to revise its current discussion of the No-Action Alternative to reflect both Mr. Krekorian's facts and the new purchase offer.

In addition to these corrections to the DEIS, it is important to correct a number of other misstatements made by the Applicant and its consultants on April 11. Please see, in this regard, the attached statements from:

1. Gene Krekorian, MCEC's golf course consultant, responding to the

Applicant's contention that its proposed nine-hole golf course is viable even though its existing 18-hole course is, in the Applicant's opinion, not viable;

2. Neil Porto of T.Y. Linn International, pointing out the continuing flaws in the Applicant's fill analysis and noting that the underground parking garage for Alternative G (the condominium proposal) would be continually exposed to groundwater intrusion and flooding because of its location and depth well below the flood plain;
3. Charles Rich of C.A. Rich, Inc, responding to the Applicant's mischaracterization of his earlier comments and noting additional concerns with respect to with rock removal required for the condominium's proposed garage;
4. My colleague Karen Meara with respect to the appropriate zoning and land-use controls applicable to the proposed project; and
5. Celia Felsher, President of MCEC, with respect to Alternative G's failure to analyze that Alternative's access and operating problems and, through photographs, recent flooding events on the Hampshire site.

We are also enclosing a report by Ariella Maron of Lion Advisors, a firm specializing in coastal zone planning, summarizing recent efforts by other coastal communities in the U.S. and Europe to protect flood plains from inappropriate development, protection that the Village has already wisely implemented through, among other things, its LWRP and restrictions on the placement of fill in flood plains..

With respect to procedure, I note that the Planning Board recently authorized its consultant to forward comments on the DEIS to the Applicant even before the close of the DEIS comment period on May 11. While that action was presumably intended to assist the Applicant in preparing its responses to those comments received at and after the initial hearing on February 14, additional comments will undoubtedly be received by the Planning Board on or before May 11, and should also be considered by the Planning Board in its future directions to the Applicant.

Finally, I respectfully suggest that future communications from the Applicant to the Planning Board or its consultants, and from the Board or its consultants to the Applicant, be posted in an appropriate place on the Village website so that the public can be fully informed as this matter goes forward.

Thank you for your consideration of these views.



To: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board
From: Pro Forma Advisors LLC
Date: May 7, 2018
Subject: Hampshire Country Club 9-Hole Option

The following presents Pro Forma Advisors' response to the oral presentation of Hampshire Country Club's current operator regarding the viability of reducing the Country Club from an 18- to 9-hole facility. At the outset, it is very difficult to respond to the verbally communicated information without any written documentation.

18-Hole Golf Course Viability

The Hampshire Country Club Applicant previously advised the Planning Board that Hampshire Country Club, with an 18-hole golf course, is not economically viable. Yet Hampton Golf, the current Club management firm, now indicates that the Club with a 9-hole golf course would be economically viable, based in part on the assertion that expenses for both the 9-hole and 18-hole golf course options were overstated by Pro Forma Advisors. It is unclear whether Hampton Golf is also suggesting that the 18-hole course is now, or could be, viable. If the Applicant is suggesting the 18-hole course is viable, we fully concur, and our analysis confirms such a finding. If the Applicant is suggesting the 18-hole course is not viable, we reiterate that an 18-hole facility will always outperform the same facility with a 9-hole course, and find it inconsistent and unsupported that the Applicant claims otherwise.

Pro Forma Advisors acknowledges that its projected Hampshire Country Club expenses exceed current levels expressed in the Club's IRS 990 filings. Importantly, Pro Forma Advisors' stabilized operating income estimates are based on the actual performance of similar regional private clubs (Knollwood Country Club, Westchester Hills Country Club, Elmwood Country Club, and Pelham Country Club), which do not necessarily comport with how Hampshire Country Club currently is operated. Revenue and expense levels projected for Hampshire Country Club at stabilization exceed current operating performance levels, but compare with the actual experience observed at these comparable regional clubs, and reasonably could be achieved at the Club.

9-Hole Golf Course Design

Hampton Golf defends the proposed 9-hole golf course routing plan where there are substantial distances between a number of greens and the tees of the following hole, citing that this is not unusual for development-oriented golf courses. It is acknowledged that this design feature is often observed for 18-hole golf courses where golf cart utilization is virtually 100 percent. However, this is highly unusual for 9-hole golf courses, where one of the major desirable features of such courses is the ability to comfortably walk the golf course. The proposed 9-hole golf course design does not enable golfers to easily walk the course.

9-Hole Golf Course Statistics

The primary basis offered by Hampton Golf in support of the viability of a 9-hole golf course at Hampshire Country Club is selective statistics regarding the inventory of 9-hole golf courses. There are about 16,000 total golf courses in the United States. Based on National Golf Foundation statistics, Hampton Golf cites there are 576 private 9-hole clubs in the country, of which 140 are located within residential developments. Indeed, these 140 nine-hole clubs are extremely rare, representing less than 1 percent of the country's inventory. It is unlikely that any of these 9-hole private clubs have been developed within the last 25 years.

Further, Hampton Golf notes that over the past five years, there have been 22 golf courses in the country which have been converted from 18-holes to 9-holes. This represents an average of roughly 4 golf courses per year over the 5-year period, out of a total inventory of 16,000 golf courses across the U.S. Moreover, there is no information provided regarding this average of 4 converted golf courses annually--that is, are they public or private courses, regulation length or short courses, in seasonal or 4-season markets, and the like.

In contrast to this nominal number of golf courses converted from 18- to 9-holes is the fact that while 9-hole golf courses represent about 25 percent of the total U.S. inventory of golf courses, 54 percent of the golf courses closed in 2016 were 9-hole facilities. Thus, there are over 100 nine-hole courses closed annually across the country compared with the average of four 18-hole courses converted to 9-holes.

Lastly, Hampton Golf represents that a survey conducted by the National Golf Foundation illustrates that a 9-hole private country club can be successful. The survey included only nine private 9-hole golf courses out of the 576 total private 9-hole courses in the U.S. Without specific information on these courses, including age of the club, annual revenues and expenses, membership characteristics and the like, it is not possible to draw any reliable information from these survey results relative to Hampshire Country Club.

Conclusion

Pro Forma Advisors' analysis indicates that operation of Hampshire Country Club with an 18-hole golf course is economically sustainable, which does not appear to be disputed by Hampton Golf. In fact, if Hampton Golf's assertion that the 9-hole facility is viable, then the Club with an 18-hole golf course also is viable, since a facility with an 18-hole golf course will always outperform one with a 9-hole course.

Hampton Golf states that the Club with a 9-hole golf course is sustainable, although there is no reliable support for this assertion. Pro Forma Advisors' analysis illustrates that the 9-hole facility will substantially underperform the 18-hole facility, and is not economically viable. Further trends in the golf industry (e.g. number of 9-hole golf courses closed), the basic economics of 9-hole versus 18-hole golf courses, and the proposed design of the 9-hole Hampshire Country Club course, suggest that converting Hampshire Country Club's 18-hole golf course to a 9-hole routing is not justified, and would almost certainly not be viable.

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM

To: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board

From: Neil Porto, P.E., TY Lin International

Date: May 10, 2018

Re: Hampshire County Club Planned Residential Development
Supplemental comments on 12/13/17 DEIS

In our DEIS Analysis memo dated 2/14/2018, we noted certain inconsistencies in the Applicants' construction truck traffic estimates associated with the importation of fill. Specifically, the Applicant asserted in the DEIS and at the Planning Board hearings that there would be 24 truck loads (48 trips in and out) per day on a 5-day a week schedule for 9 months. We noted that this number of trucks over this time period would only convey 47,000 to 70,000 CY of fill, not the 84,000 CY projected by the Applicant. We further noted that no study was made on the effect of soil compaction on the effective soil volumes, and suggested that the developer recalculate the number of truck trips based on "effective" cubic yards per truck or by recalculating the required fill.

At the April 11, 2018 Planning Board meeting, the Applicant's engineer acknowledged that the required "trucked-in" volume would increase due to on-site compaction, with an example of 16 cubic yards of fill in a truck providing only 12 cubic yards of fill in place. Thus, using the Applicant's numbers, to achieve 84,000 CY of fill compacted on site, one would have to transport 112,000 CY of fill. To do so requires 7000 truck loads, or 14,000 truck trips. The Applicant's projection of 24 truck loads on a 5 day a week schedule over 9 months would amount to only 4680 truck loads and 9360 truck trips. That number of trips would convey only 74,880 CY of uncompacted fill, the equivalent of 56,160 CY compacted. By our calculations, to import 84,000 CY in 9 months of 5-day weeks would require 72 truck trips per day, and note that this is within the range

of our original estimate of 60 to 86 truck trips per day for the Applicant's estimated fill in our February 14, 2018 memo.

However, as previously noted, by our calculations, which have been independently verified by several different engineers, the proposed project would require 273,900 CY of imported fill, substantially more than the DEIS indicates. At the April 11, 2018 Planning Board hearing, the Applicant stated that TYLI's estimate most likely included fill for the proposed basements, and that this difference may explain why the Applicant's estimates were substantially below those projected by TYLI. However, we have rerun our projections after adjusting for the basement exclusion identified by the Applicant on April 11 and determined that, at most, these basements would obviate the need of only 45,000 CY of fill, which is only about 25% of the difference in fill calculations.

Finally, we reiterate that all of these numbers likely substantially underestimate the amount of fill that would be required, as both our estimates and the Applicant's estimates assume 100% reuse of soil from "cut" portions of the site. This assumption is unrealistic in light of

1. The Applicant's indication at the April 11 Hearing that it expects to place 4 feet of clean fill in disturbed areas (rather than 2 feet as indicated in the DEIS)
2. The structural unsuitability of at least 80 percent of onsite soils for the proposed use, as is clearly indicated in the DEIS at Section 3C and Appendix F.

We have also evaluated the proposed parking garage included in Alternative G which would be constructed below the proposed condominium building to be built on the site of the Golf Clubhouse. The garage would be reached by a sloped ramp, with entrance to the garage shown at elevation 1.0' in Exhibit 4-8 of the DEIS. Such a configuration presents several various problems:

- The entrance would be right at the level of the water table, listed in Appendix G of the DEIS as 0.4' to 1.6' and thus would require an extensive waterproofing system to avoid moisture penetration
- The entrance would be 11' below the current Base Flood Elevation of 12.0' and 12' below the Base Flood Elevation of 13.0', flood waters would increase water pressure at the perimeter of the structure. These BFE levels are also above the top of the driveway (elevation 10.0' to 11.0') so there would be a significant flow of water down to the entrance level during a flood event.
- The entrance to the garage at elevation 1.0' would need to have flood proof doors or stop logs for the full depth of opening. Such a system would need to be carefully designed. The upward slope of the driveway would prevent a swinging door system since it would not be operable to swing out. An inward swing is not advisable since it would need to counteract 12' of water head. A roll down door with proper fixation at the door saddle or a stop-log system with channels on both sides of the door are advisable.
- Should flood doors be installed, the facility operator would need to advise residents to remove their cars before a storm's arrival, for either use for evacuation or to get their cars to higher ground.

Hampshire Country Club Planned Residential Development DEIS Mamaroneck, NY

Supplemental Statement CA RICH Consultants, Inc., Plainview, NY 5/10/2018

The following is provided to respond to the Applicant's and its consultant's comments recently presented at the Village of Mamaroneck's Planning Board Hearing of 4/11/18 in connection with the Hampshire Country Club DEIS of December 2017. I should note that the Applicant and its consultant did not actually comment on the DEIS but on CA RICH's own earlier DEIS comments at the February 14 hearing.

These CA RICH comments also supplement the earlier written Memorandum dated 2/14/18 prepared by CA RICH Consultants, Inc. regarding certain environmental contamination, geology & ground water issues resulting from the Proposed Action. Chiefly, this Memo responds to the Applicant's consultant GZA's effort to refute the human health & safety exposure pathways attributable to the arsenic contamination revealed in the site's soil.

At the April 11th hearing, the Applicant's attorney and its environmental consultant GZA charged that CA RICH (1) was employing '*scare tactics*' by characterizing the entire site as "*hazardous*", (2) intimidated that during construction-related excavation activities the arsenic-laden dust particulate might be disbursed for "*miles at a time*" as an inhalation hazard, and (3) implied that "*no clean soil fill is available*". All three of these accusations are fabricated and none of them are true. Nowhere in our 2/14/18 Memorandum are there any of the aforementioned statements or any other statement not based on responsible professional judgment with respect to protection of public health and the environment.

1. The arsenic-contaminated soil found at the Hampshire Country Club has not been thoroughly investigated. GZA acknowledges that it conducted a '*Limited Phase II Environmental Site Investigation*' two years ago, and that that scope of testing had been developed by their Client. CA RICH finds that further testing of this large site is needed and appropriate. CA RICH did not and does not question the Applicant's soil sampling methodology or that the number of samples comprising the initial soil screening are helpful; however such testing in the environmental industry is typically considered an initial informative screening and nothing more. And because the scope of soil testing was limited, the resulting test results showing various high arsenic levels compel the need for further testing to delineate the nature and extent of that contamination.

This is particularly important because the outcome of the testing will determine how best to manage the contaminated soil residue that is proposed to be excavated, reworked, stored and then reburied permanently on-site beneath a residential subdivision.

To date, only very shallow surficial soils have been tested (0-6" & 18-24"), and from only 21 small-diameter soil auger sampling locations spread across the entire 106-acre golf course. Surficial soils were found to be degraded with arsenic. This same limited testing also showed that slightly deeper (2') soils: specifically at Soil Sample Nos. SS-6, SS-12, SS-14, & SS-17, arsenic levels exceeded the Unrestricted Use SCOs, and at SS-14 & SS-17, even exceeded Residential Use SCOs. Moreover, the Proposed Action contemplates excavation of soils greater than 2 feet deep for construction of the raised central development platform. Thus, because there was no testing deeper than 2 ft., the severity of any arsenic contamination deeper than only 2 ft. is still completely unknown. The GZA Limited Phase II Environmental Site Investigation Report acknowledges that soils exceeding Unrestricted Use and/or Residential Use SCOs that remain on-site "*may have regulatory restrictions imposed such as environmental easements, or other land use controls.*" (DEIS Appendix N, GZA Report, pp. 15 of 258).

Given the limited testing to date, it is obviously premature to conclude within any degree of scientific confidence that the known arsenic contamination already revealed is not serious enough to warrant concern, as was argued by the Applicant during the Hearing. In actuality, the point of our earlier report was that the opposite is true – the limited testing to date demonstrates that more samples are needed to identify the locations and significance of any elevated arsenic levels. In fact, the Applicant had earlier indicated in the DEIS (Environmental Contamination 4. Mitigation Measures, p 3Q-5) that additional investigations and soil management plans, subject to NYSDEC's applicable DER-10 Guidance, are proposed in order to manage these impacted earth materials. Further, that all contaminated soil excavations and handling will be based on a Remedial Action Work Plan subject to NYSDEC review and comment. However, simply saying that further study is promised and site preparation-related soil disturbances will follow a reviewed Plan neither guarantees that future data-gathering efforts or health & safety protocols will be adequate, nor that there will be any mechanism for NYSDEC or Village oversight and enforcement once this SEQRA review process is concluded. What that statement does is indicate that the DEIS testing to date is itself inadequate.

2. At the April 11 hearing, the Applicant also introduced a design modification for the proposed thickness of the clean fill cap that is to be placed throughout the central development platform. At the hearing, it was stated that the clean fill cap will now be four feet (4') in thickness, rather than the minimum two-foot (2') thick clean fill buffer referred to in the DEIS and often specified by NYSDEC in urbanized multi-family brownfield redevelopment sites. This is a change to the design criteria provided in the DEIS that needs to be evaluated by the Applicant. Construction-related questions arise as to fill volume, slope stability, and compaction, in addition to an explanation as to why the cap thickness is being increased. One assumption for increasing the clean fill cap thickness might simply be to try to ensure that the reburied contaminated soil in the platform is not encountered during installation or maintenance of underground utilities or landscaping, etc. The schematic illustration presented at the Hearing showing a color

cross-section of the contaminated soil comprising the raised development platform depicts a relatively thicker horizontal cap over the top of the development platform compared to the relatively thinner cap thickness covering the platform's side slopes.

3. The Applicant stated dust monitoring will be employed during excavation. However, the potential health impacts from any fugitive dust emissions during construction activities, including trucking, have not been evaluated. This possible environmental impact is important at this site because of the close proximity of students attending, or playing ball at the nearby Hommocks Middle School during the proposed 9-month construction period – particularly during the busy first phase of site preparation work to rework and newly-stage unearthed site soils. Will contaminated soils that are reworked on-site be 'staged' in one or more large piles on the property and for how long? The Applicant seemed to swiftly dismiss the issue, saying that the arsenic-impacted dirt, when excavated, will present only a: *"trivial inhalation hazard."* However, whether fugitive dust, contaminated or not, is a health & safety threat to nearby students, homeowners, or passers-by is clearly a relevant and important issue in need of further review.

Contrary to the Applicant's over-reaching claim that soil contamination is benign and not of concern, the few samples that were collected confirm pesticides, arsenic & lead present at levels in excess of prevailing NYSDEC Part 375 Unrestricted Use Soil Cleanup Objectives (UUSCOs) and (to a lesser extent) Restricted Residential Soil Cleanup Objectives (RRSCOs) within a third of the database. Of these, as many as six (6) surface samples exceeded Residential SCO's for Arsenic. One of these (SS-7) is contaminated at 56 mg/kg – roughly 3.5 times the Arsenic residential Soil Cleanup Objective (SCO) of 16 mg/kg. Consequently, it is disingenuous to claim that the arsenic contamination is exaggerated, and simply a typical representation of soil levels across New York State, especially since this soil will be on the property in perpetuity and subject to future residential land use and disturbance by homeowners and maintenance crews. And as would be expected at a golf course, pesticides were also found in most of the soil samples (35) at levels exceeding 'unrestricted use' Soil Cleanup Objectives (UUSCOs). Four of these samples show soil contaminated with pesticides at levels exceeding 'restricted residential' use SCOs.

4. As our earlier report made clear, there should be concern over the presence of extremely shallow groundwater on this property and the risks a shallow water table may present during construction activities. This point was made clear by a member of the Planning Board during the Hearing, though the Applicant has remained silent on and not examined this important issue. Because the water table is extremely shallow and subject to flooding, and possibly subject to water level changes due to tidal fluctuations, it is likely that storm water runoff, the need for flood-related detention basins, dewatering, limitations from frozen ground during the winter construction schedules, and development platform erosion control problems all present water-related environmental challenges necessitating additional review.

5. We also note that the alternative Condominium Plan will likely involve the need for rock removal (ripping) and/or disruptive bedrock blasting into the relatively-elevated and competent (erosional-resistant) bedrock outcrops at the Clubhouse. These potential impacts have not been adequately discussed or even examined, including the need to consider vibration monitoring of surrounding structures, noise and air quality impacts and related construction traffic for that alternative.

Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP
Memorandum

To: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board
From: Karen E. Meara
Cc: Lester D. Steinman
Stuart Mesinger
Subject: Supplemental Comments on Hampshire DEIS
Date: May 10, 2018

1. Density

At the April 11 2018 hearing, the Applicant's representative asserted that the proposed Project is not subject to limitations imposed by New York State Village Law Section 7-738 enabling law governing cluster subdivisions and that, instead, density for the proposed development is to be determined solely in accordance with the Village's Planned Residential Development ("PRD") provisions. He went on to assert that the maximum number of PRD dwelling units that could be built was 205, nearly double what the Applicant claims could be built under conventional R-20 zoning on the same 94.5 acres.¹ See DEIS at 4-2 (indicating that the R-20 zoning would, in the Applicant's view produce 106 conforming single family homes). In short, the Applicant interprets the PRD provision to empower the Planning Board to effectively double a site's underlying density, an interpretation clearly at odds with the purpose of the PRD provisions, which is "to preserve open space, provide increased recreational opportunities" and "protect environmental values," all of which are compromised by the Applicant's distorted PRD interpretation.

As we noted at the February 14, 2018 hearing, such an outcome is prohibited under state law. Pursuant to Village Law Section 7-738, a cluster subdivision

shall result in a permitted number of building lots or dwelling units which shall in no case exceed the number which could be permitted, in the planning Board's judgment, if the land were subdivided into lots conforming to the minimum lot size and density requirements of the zoning local law applicable to the district or districts in which such land is situated, and conforming to all other applicable requirements.

New York law thus limits density for cluster subdivisions to the density that is permitted in the underlying zoning district (here R-20) and conforms to all other applicable requirements. NYS Village Law Section 7-730(3) provides that any subdivision plat approved by a planning board

¹ We note that in the DEIS the applicant did not use the entire 94.5 acre site to calculate maximum density, but instead used only 65 acres, the amount of acreage the Applicant claimed in the DEIS was devoted to residential uses. Pursuant to that approach the applicant calculated a maximum permissible density of 141 dwelling units. While the Applicant never prepared a conventional subdivision plat for its hypothetical (undelineated) 65 acre residential area, since the Applicant's Alternative B plat only yielded 106 units, a 65 acre plat could be expected to yield substantially fewer units, and certainly far fewer than 141.

must comply with local zoning ordinances, “subject, however, to the provisions of section 7-738.”

Faced with this problem, the Applicant argues in the DEIS that 7-738 does not apply here and that, instead, the PRD regulations were somehow adopted pursuant to NYS Village Law 7-703-a, which was enacted in 2003, many years after the PRD regulations. There is no support for that interpretation in the plain text of either state or local law. Section 7-703-a authorizes a local legislature to enact, as part of a zoning code, procedures and requirements for the establishment and mapping of planned unit development *districts*. Section 7-708 provides that only the board of trustees – not the planning board – may modify zoning district boundaries. Accordingly, statutes passed pursuant to 7-703-a provide for a two-step process, with the planning board evaluating and making recommendations on a proposed application and the board of trustees taking the necessary legislative action to create such a distinction. By contrast, the Village PRD regulations do not speak of mapping new districts and do not provide for board of trustee approval of proposed PRDs. Rather, the PRD regulations authorize the Planning Board to modify normally applicable lot area, side yard, depth and similar requirements in the existing underlying zoning district in a way that closely parallels Village Law 7-738.²

Moreover, even if Section 7-703-a did apply to this proposal, that statute would permit nowhere near the density that the Applicant claims. Section 7-703-a provides that a PUD may be approved only where it is found to “further[] the village comprehensive plan.” As MCEC has previously pointed out, the Village Comprehensive Plan calls for reducing density on this site, not increasing it.

Finally, the Applicant expressed surprise that MCEC used only the residential portions of the site to prepare conventional subdivision plats for purposes of calculating permitted density, as required by NYS Village Law Section 7-738. That surprise is particularly unwarranted, as the Applicant’s DEIS used only those portions of the site that it claimed to be part of the residential development (36 acres of open space + 29 acres of residential development = 65 acres) to calculate density in the DEIS. See DEIS at 3A-15. It was absolutely appropriate, indeed necessary, to exclude the separate non-residential use from the density calculation since there is no proposed connection between the two private uses.

2. Project boundaries and Open Space

At the February 14, 2018 hearing, MCEC pointed out that the Applicant had failed to delineate the boundaries between the proposed golf course and residential uses. At the April 11, 2018 hearing, the Applicant again provided no such clarification. Also recent promotional materials produced in connection with the development indicate that only about half of the 95-acre site would remain open space. We urge the Planning Board to require the Applicant to clearly delineate the boundaries of the different uses, the quantity of open space proposed to be

² The Village PRD regulations also expressly provide that they are enacted pursuant to NYS Village Law Section 7-725 (now 7-725-A), which governs site plan review. Section 7-725-A expressly provides that, where the site plan involves a subdivision, the provisions of 7-725-A do not apply and, instead, subdivision review is subject to 7-728 (subdivision review).

preserved for each use, and whether such open space is proposed to be preserved as such in perpetuity.

3. Private restrictions on the Proposed Project

At the April 11, 2018 hearing, the Applicant attempted to address certain concerns raised regarding the use of private roads for its project. Specifically, the Applicant asserted that, because area residents in Orienta had long used Cove Rd as a shortcut to Boston Post Road, residents of the Proposed Project would also enjoy such an easement. The Applicant is wrong. The best evidence of the scope of an implied easement is the use of that easement over a number of years. Currently, the Club uses implied easements over Cove Road and Eagle Knolls Road for its members, guests, staff and vendors of its Country Club. The Applicant proposes to add to that traffic from continued operations of the Club the residential and service traffic associated with 105 homes. However, the Applicant, as the beneficiary of these two roads for its historic club operations, has no right to unilaterally increase the burden on those roads for its new proposed subdivision use. *See, e.g. Root v. Conkling*, 199 A.D.90, 93 (3d Dep't 1921).

The Club has even fewer implied rights in Cooper Avenue. That street is a narrow dead end street that is used by the Club only to access its maintenance shed at the end of the street, and not for Club members, guests and vendors. It has never been used as a means of ingress and egress for Club members, guests, vendors and employees, except those employees working out of the maintenance shed. Thus, making Cooper a two-way through street to serve as a means of ingress and egress from both the proposed development and the Club itself would be a substantial increase and change in use, one that the Club has no right to unilaterally effectuate. Moreover, making Cooper a two way street would require widening portions of the road. Under New York law, if a grant of easement does not specify the width of a right-of-way, the width is considered that which is necessary to use the right-of-way when created, not as later expanded. *See Oliphant v. McCarthy*, 208 A.D.2d 1079, 1080 (3d Dept. 1994).

Finally, in the DEIS, the Applicant acknowledges that a substantial portion of its property near Eagle Knolls Road is subject to a deed restriction contained in a grant from Cecilia Howell to Alvan W. Perry. The Applicant concludes that nothing in that restriction is inconsistent with the proposed development. The Applicant is incorrect. The Howell Deed expressly provides that only a "dwelling house" may be erected on the restricted land. The Applicant argues that such language means both the singular and the plural and cites to cases in which such language was interpreted to permit a multi-family dwelling. However not one of those cases supports the notion that a "dwelling house" permits multiple buildings. The Applicant's proposal to place multiple "dwelling houses" within the restricted area violates that provision.

**Supplemental Statement of Celia Felsher, President
Mamaroneck Coastal Environment Coalition
to the
Planning Board of the Village of Mamaroneck
on the
Hampshire DEIS**

April 11, 2018

[Note I will speak about 3 things we did not raise at the February meeting.]

1. Flooding Pictures. I would first like to follow up on Mr. Mendes' question regarding water issues. I separately handed out to the PB members pictures of flooding to show why engineering of the berms (something that TyLin engineering commented on at the prior meeting) is so important, and why they will require special attention in connection with planning, construction and on-going monitoring – to protect against erosion, not just from storm surge flooding but also from the runoff and pooling of water, and impact on contaminants in the soil. [Show pictures from the 1992 Nor'easter, Sandy and the March 2nd storm].¹ This shows the importance of monitoring the site (both during and after construction). This will be a massive undertaking – probably one of the largest single construction projects ever undertaken in the Village. The Building Department has had difficulty in the past monitoring compliance during construction of much smaller projects. On-site expertise will be necessary to monitor work on a real time basis. The Village itself does not have adequate resources. Additional competent and experienced resources will have to be hired to do this for the entire construction period and beyond (because the confidence in the on-going integrity of the berms must assured). How this will be done and paid for must be provided in the DEIS.
2. Impact on Community Services. The Planning Board needs clear and supported information regarding projected impact on the Schools. In addition to the overall capacity issues discussed at the last meeting, statements in the DEIS that this project will create a tax surplus for the School District are suspect and need support.

- With respect to District costs:

¹ After the April 11th public hearing there was another rain event (Monday, April 16th), which again showed the significant stormwater problems on the golf course property that need to be recognized and addressed in the DEIS. Photos are attached. This storm was not a nor'easter and did not generate any of the media attention the storms in March generated. This type of rain event with the impact on the Club occurs several times each year.

- A primary driver of District cost is the number of students generated by the project. As Dr. Shaps, Mamaroneck Superintendent of Schools, stated, the DEIS has significantly underestimated these numbers. Instead of the 57 students noted in the DEIS, we should expect up to 91 students.
 - The DEIS argues that only programmatic costs, rather than full per student costs, should be used. The full per student tax cost should be used in the analysis.
 - Given current expected enrollment growth, an additional large number of students would require building additional elementary school capacity, which would be expensive and result in costs well in excess of per student annual operating costs. And where is there land to build more capacity – without giving up precious recreational space?
- With respect to projected additional School tax revenue:
 - The DEIS should provide independent support for the projected assessed values. The DEIS assumes an assessed value of \$2.6 MM for each detached home and \$1.3 MM for each carriage house. However, As Lisa Liquori noted in her report, based on comps for sale of new detached homes in Orienta (mostly 5-bedroom), it would be unlikely the proposed detached 4-bedroom homes would be valued even at \$2 MM – and similarly the carriage home values may be overstated.² And this doesn't take into account the many issues (that an independent expert would take into account) that would adversely impact value relative to recent new construction in Orienta:
 - Additional homeowner expenses, including (i) expenses for maintenance of the private roads, the sewer pipes and other infrastructure and the significant open space that will be the responsibility of the HOA and (ii) costs of maintaining the massive berms (particularly in light of the impact of stormwater/flooding) that will be created on which the homes and the new roads would be built.

² Comparable sales for carriage homes and single family homes in Orienta are attached.

- The arsenic and lead contamination of the property (both under homes and also on the open space) and expected use restrictions for the property (e.g., the inability to use basements other than for storage, and limitations on disturbing property due to possibly impacting capped contaminated earth);
 - The location close to a country club with a significant number of events (weddings; bar mitzvahs; etc.) that will create traffic and noise late at night and on weekends;
 - Concerns with surrounding land used for the 9-hole course if the Club fails; and
 - Finally, concerns that the significant increase in supply (the project would increase total single family housing stock in Orienta by 20 – 25%) would depress Orienta housing values, including homes in the proposed development.
- In sum, if one uses the full per student tax cost for 91 new students (about \$2,020,000) and we were to find that the detached homes were valued at slightly under \$2 MM and the carriage houses are valued at \$1.0 million, a generous estimate, the total assessed value from the project would drop from \$193,700,000 to \$144,600,000, with total school taxes paid by the homeowners dropping to \$1,938,993, leading to tax shortfall of almost \$200,000. It is therefore important to get reliable and supported independent information.
3. More information about Club Operations. The developers should provide much more information about the ownership and operation of the Club, and expected economic and legal relationships relating to the Club, in the two primary proposed scenarios, so the PB can determine whether the Club would really be viable following development.
- In the cluster development, how is the Club to be owned and managed?
 - What happens if, as would be likely (given the previously submitted report of the golf course expert), the 9-hole golf club fails? How would the Village and the surrounding homeowners deal with what would likely be unusable land (given contamination and water issues)? Would the clubhouse be turned into a catering hall?

- In the condo alternative, there would be tension between the two uses of the building facilities. There would be the condo owners, who actually own the building and facilities and live there, and there would also be club members, who want to use the same facilities for recreational use and for catering to support club operations. We need to understand the mechanism for allowing club members to use facilities located in the condominium building, which would not be owned by the Club. Also, who would own the golf course acreage and what obligation would those owners have to continue to operate and maintain the golf course? And how would condo owners manage/maintain the facilities created for Club use (including catering facilities) and share revenues generated by those facilities? What if the condo owners decide they no longer want to allow their facilities to be used for Club activities, including catering events? We all know that proceeds from catered events are crucial to survival of the Club.
 - Note that the developers have said in many contexts that the proposed development “is the only way to support the existence of the long-treasured club”. First, they need to explain how the proposed development would support the club – given the very small number of additional members (at reduced fees) that the development would provide, and the fact that all the revenue generated by the development will be taken out by the developers. Second, it is clear this is not the “only way” to support the club. In fact, the development would probably lead to failure of the club – and quickly.
4. Finally, whatever happened to Toll Brothers? They were identified in Mr. Zarin’s June 2015 letter as a ‘co-applicant’ but have not been heard from since the scoping session. Toll Brothers was touted as the development partner with expertise in single family housing development. This was important in the application, because the other development partner has significant experience on luxury condominium complex development, but not in single family home development. With a project of this size and complexity, especially given the critical issues relating to flooding, major regrading of the property and the massive amounts of internally generated and externally sourced fill, significant experience in building large-scale housing developments is critical. The Planning Board must understand who will be developing this project – and if necessary the application should be resubmitted to properly identify the applicants.


Attachment 1: April 16, 2018 Storm Photos

4/16/18



4/16/18





4/16/18

4/16/18



4/16/18



Comparable Sales in Orienta: Carriage Homes



1 / 16



\$980,888 Price Decrease

Active

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

1301 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4341

4 Beds, 3 Full Baths, 1 Half Baths, 2,950 Sq Ft, Attached, Town House

Pristine corner unit Townhouse has it all!
Brand new wooden floors were just installed throughout th...



1 / 30



\$1,125,000 

Contract

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

301 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4345

3 Beds, 2 Full Baths, 1 Half Baths, 2,856 Sq Ft, Attached, Town House

Stunning private End Unit with Spacious First Floor Master Bedroom with enlarged Bath, Steam Shower...



1 / 27



\$720,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

302 FAIRWAY GREEN

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

2 Beds, 3 Baths, 2,300 Sq Ft, Built in 1985, 0.190 Acres, Attached

Welcome to Fairway Green! This contemp home, ideally situated on a quiet street in Orienta, has a FIR...



1 / 30



\$720,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

1302 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4341

3 Beds, 3 Baths, 2,466 Sq Ft, Built in 1985, 0.190 Acres, Attached

An exceptional sunny end unit with Master Bedroom on main level, in desirable sought after Fairway G...



1 / 28



\$725,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

1103 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4339

2 Beds, 3 Baths, 2,294 Sq Ft, Built in 1985, 0.190 Acres, Attached

Impeccably maintained Townhome is beautifully located in the center of Fairway Green. First Floor M...



1 / 25



\$725,000 

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

202 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4344

**3 Beds, 3 Baths, 2,503 Sq Ft, Built in 1985,
0.079 Acres, Attached**

Homeowners association. First time offered.
Beautifully maintained. New eat in kitchen.
Convenient d...



1 / 26



\$738,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

303 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4345

**2 Beds, 3 Baths, 2,503 Sq Ft, Built in 1985,
0.190 Acres, Attached**

Welcome to Fairway Green, a private, unique
Townhouse community steps from the Long
Island Sound, Co...



1 / 30



\$1,330,000 

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

901 Fairway Green

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4325

**4 Beds, 5 Baths, 3,754 Sq Ft, Built in 1985,
0.190 Acres, Attached**

Discerning buyers will be delighted with the
high end details throughout this totally
renovated town...

Comparable Sales in Orienta: Single Family Homes



1 / 30



\$1,520,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

621 Fairway Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4410

4 Beds, 4 Baths, 2,916 Sq Ft, Built in 1928, 0.349 Acres, Detached

Classic elegance best describes this pristine four bedroom center hall colonial. Intrinsic architectu...



1 / 28



\$1,815,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

629 Fairway Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4410

5 Beds, 5 Baths, 3,372 Sq Ft, Built in 1950, 0.342 Acres, Detached

Welcome to a beautifully renovated Colonial with every possible amenity. A wide foyer opens to a hug...



1 / 25



\$2,095,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

626 Fairway Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4409

**5 Beds, 6 Baths, 3,938 Sq Ft, Built in 2008,
0.350 Acres, Detached**

This redesigned and quality renovated colonial on upscale Orienta Point is a perfect blend of effort...



1 / 28



\$2,406,750



Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

606 Fairway Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

**5 Beds, 7 Baths, 4,490 Sq Ft, Built in 2016,
0.353 Acres, Detached**

Spectacular new custom home, by established DESIGN BUILD firm AJC STUDIOS. Your new home has 5 bedro...



1 / 26



\$2,170,000



Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

732 Cove Road

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4324

**6 Beds, 6 Baths, 5,300 Sq Ft, Built in 2016,
0.570 Acres, Detached**

Beautiful and Bright New Construction in Orienta! Home is uniquely set near Hampshire Golf Course. A...



1 / 30



\$2,295,000



Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

906 Skibo Lane

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4725

**5 Beds, 5 Baths, 5,050 Sq Ft, Built in 2017,
0.282 Acres, Detached**

Smart, Stylish & Sophisticated new construction on prestigious Orienta Point! A "Rockingchair" front...



1 / 30



\$2,339,000



Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

735 Bleeker Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4516

**5 Beds, 5 Baths, 4,401 Sq Ft, Built in 2011,
0.445 Acres, Detached**

This sophisticated and elegant colonial home is located in the prestigious Orienta point, Mamaroneck...



1 / 21



\$2,050,000

Sold

[VIEW DETAILS](#)

635 Bleeker Avenue

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

**4 Beds, 4 Baths, 4,838 Sq Ft, Built in 2016,
0.230 Acres, Detached**

Orienta new construction! Classic center hall colonial with a flat 1/4 acre. Magnificent kitchen wit...



Advisors for Community and Environment

Memorandum

To: Stephen Kass, Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP

From: Ariella Maron, Lion Advisors

CC: Karen Meera, Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP

EMERGING BEST PRACTICES AROUND COASTAL ZONE POLICIES AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

INTRODUCTION

Coastal communities across the globe are creating plans and taking actions to protect people and property from major storm events. Building on the lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina along the Gulf Coast in 2005, the call to action after Hurricane Sandy along the East Coast in 2012, and the urgency after a year of intense storms in 2017, local governments are utilizing a growing set of best practice tools—physical, financial, and social—to enhance the resilience of their cities, towns, and villages.

Resilience is the ability to prepare and plan for, absorb, and recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse events¹. As weather events become more frequent and intense due to climate change, disruptions and stressors become a common concern among local government officials and residents alike. This memo addresses approaches to flood hazard mitigation that support the long-term social, economic, and environmental sustainability of communities.

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT INCREASING THREATS AND RISKS

In the Northeast, coastal communities face increasing threats from shallow coastal flooding, storms such as hurricanes and nor'easters, shoreline erosion, and sea level riseⁱⁱ. According to research commissioned by the Regional Plan Association (RPA), the Tri-State Area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut could see at least one foot of sea level rise between 2030 and 2050, three feet between the 2080s and 2100, and six feet in the next centuryⁱⁱⁱ. The RPA analysis found that approximately one-third of Mamaroneck's population today could be inundated at six feet of sea level rise, making it one of the hardest hit Long Island Sound towns. Given that housing and infrastructure constructed today will likely still be around in the 2050s and 2080s^{iv}, decisions on where to locate them and how to design them today impact how communities will fair in a future with more water.



Figure 1 New York State Climate Change Clearinghouse Mapping Tool, Hampshire Country Club Site: Hurricane Sandy storm surge (left) and sea level with projected increase of three feet (right).

Existing flood maps do not fully reflect these changes, and therefore, do not adequately portray a community's vulnerabilities to flooding and storm surges. Best practices in coastal resilience look beyond historical flooding experiences and existing flood maps to integrate climate and sea level rise projections into their planning. This includes not only identifying buildings and infrastructure at risk for eventual permanent and temporary flooding, but also the assessment of the impact new development and changes in topography could have on

community resilience. What will the impact be on neighboring critical facilities, housing, and the roads that provide access to and safe evacuation from them?

For example, municipal leaders from Greenwich, New Jersey, located on the Delaware Bay, received support from NOAA to address the increase in the frequency and intensity of coastal storms and the potential permanent inundation of some low-lying areas. NOAA developed an inundation map for Greenwich, intended to provide a better perception of storm and inundation threats, allowing Greenwich to plan and prepare for potential impacts to “cultural, historic, and natural resources, infrastructure, people, and other drivers of local character and economies”^{vi}. The mapping exercise revealed that with projected sea level rise, future storms could inundate freshwater supplies and flood buildings that are not currently at risk today. As a result, NOAA recommends that local officials seek to expand its land acquisition efforts and incorporate projected sea level rise into its water infrastructure capital projects.

BEST PRACTICES FOR COASTAL COMMUNITY RESILIENCE PLANNING

Once threats and risks (i.e., vulnerabilities) are understood, there are a number of different tools coastal communities are utilizing to meet their resilience goals. While resilience plans reflect the specific physical, economic, and political challenges and opportunities of each community, their general framework is similar: take a multi-scale approach to planning; guide development, vulnerable uses, and infrastructure away from the floodplain; and preserve and utilize open space assets.

Take a multi-scale approach

Both local and global responses to recent storm damage incorporate protective measures at multiple scales: property, community, and region. Typically building codes and local ordinances focus on the safety of new and renovated buildings, zoning and/or economic incentives promote appropriate land uses and protect open space from development at the district and community levels, and major capital investments (i.e., infrastructure) and protection of large swaths of natural areas target regional resilience.

In regards to subdivisions and other master planned development, the American Planning Association (APA), in partnership with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), provides guidance on how sub-division planning decisions can help mitigate flood hazards within and beyond property boundaries^{vii}. Building on the lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, Superstorm Sandy, and a number of recent flooding events, its 2016 publication, *Subdivision Design and Flood Hazard Areas*, lays out five general principles:

- Focus on data-driven decision making, using only the best available data to assess risk and inform decisions. 2.
- Avoid new development in the floodplain whenever feasible.
- Maintain natural and beneficial functions of the floodplain.
- Adopt a No Adverse Impact approach to floodplain management.
- Consider future conditions of the floodplain, including development impacts and climate change.

Guide development out of harm's way

At each scale of protection for coastal communities, there are two main objectives: keep vulnerable uses out of harm's way and manage water. There is universal consensus around the easiest way to achieve the first objective: guide new development away from the floodplain in the first place. With the use of regulatory (e.g., zoning) and financial (e.g., transfer of development rights) tools, communities are aiming to cluster critical facilities and vulnerable uses onto higher ground, usually in more dense, existing neighborhoods. This reduces the risks and costs associated with rescue and recovery post storms.

According to David Godschalk, a professor at UNC Chapel Hill and author of numerous policy papers on resilience, "Subdivision location and design can either reduce or worsen vulnerability to natural hazards. Obviously, location on or adjacent to hazard-prone lands, such as landslide or floodplain areas, heightens the risk of disasters^{viii}." Critical facilities, in addition to housing, need to be protected from hazard risks. Additionally, placement of roads, residential lots, and public facilities within subdivision projects can increase hazard risks by reducing evacuation or public safety access. The resulting increase in impervious

surfaces can also generate increased stormwater runoff, which heightens flooding risks, and failure to conserve natural vegetation and environmental features, such as wetlands, can reduce the capacity of the environment to contain or absorb hazard forces. To address these issues, progressive local governments are utilizing land use designations, overlay districts, density bonuses, transfer of development right incentives, and even land buy-outs to keep future development out of hazard areas and promote development in safe growth locations.

Worcester County, Maryland, the home of Ocean City, is a leader in the US in forming a coherent strategy to long-term climate change impacts^{ix}. The County released its Comprehensive Plan in 2006, building on its 2002 Atlantic Coastal Bays Critical Area Law that ensures more sensitive development activity for shoreline areas. The Comprehensive Plan guides development to designated growth areas in the historic towns, while limiting development in floodplains, thereby reducing imperviousness and preserving the biological functions of the floodplains. The Comprehensive Plan also lays out recommendations to acquire properties in the floodplain and to develop a sea level rise response strategy.

As part of the 100 Resilient Cities initiative, the City of Norfolk, Virginia, is following Worcester County's example via an innovative approach. In November 2016, the coastal city unveiled its Vision 2100, a roadmap to advance a holistic resilience strategy. The plan organizes the city based on neighborhoods' risk and asset profiles and proposes distinct strategies for each, including, for example: transferable development rights for homeowners in chronic flood areas; reduced development in high-risk areas; and refocusing investment in "high and dry" areas that have the potential to increase economic opportunity for the city's poorest residents.

Preserve and/or reconstruct natural areas and their ecological functions

By guiding development away from areas that tend to flood or are projected to flood in the future, communities are able to preserve existing or create new open spaces. Besides serving as community amenities, the natural environments

of coastal regions are essential moderators of the impacts of natural events such as intense rainfall and hurricanes and play a positive role in enhancing the resilience of communities^x. Reconstruction of wetlands tends to occur where historic wetlands had existed before being filled for development. It is no coincidence that these areas—areas that were historically wetlands-- tend to continue to flood, even after development, making their reconstruction even more beneficial.



Figure 2 (above) Historic Map of New Rochelle and Mamaroneck Townships circa 1881, Source Historic Map Works.




Figure 2 (right) Exhibit 3C-4, FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas, Hampshire Country Club DEIS, Source VHB.

Waterfront areas that are designed, either naturally or artificially, to flood and handle salt inundation, not only act as a buffer to surrounding areas but also help upland areas drain floodwaters more quickly and hold water to reduce flooding to adjacent property.^{xi} There are numerous examples of local governments utilizing park land, natural areas, and/or farmland to capture and store floodwaters to protect surrounding residential areas, businesses, and infrastructure.

For example, in North Yorkshire, England, local and national governmental agencies and research institutions partnered together to pursue a project to

protect and restore part of the floodplain. This effort was in response to the infilling and development of the natural floodplain with residential and commercial uses that were impacting its capacity to store floodwater, and as a result, businesses and residences were flooding. The project included a number of natural measures including construction of a large flood storage reservoir constructed to store approximately 120,000m³ of flood water. In December 2015, the flood storage area was tested for the first time in response to Storm Eva, and it successfully allowed the floodplain to perform its natural flood alleviation function, reducing peak flows and mitigating flooding^{xii}.

The Netherlands, a country known for its dykes, is now also restoring the natural floodplain to protect areas most in need of flood protection. Instead of raising the level of the dykes, marshes and flood water storage areas have been created to temporarily store flood waters when needed. To allow for greater flood water storage, floodplains levels have been lowered and some homes and families have been relocated to expand the floodplains are. For example, in Rotterdam, the city most at risk of flooding in the Netherlands with 90% of the city below sea level and vulnerable to a rising ocean, the City reclaimed 22-acres of fields and canals to create the Eendragtspolder, a public amenity that collects floodwater in emergencies. It is near the lowest point in the Netherlands, about 20 feet below sea level. With its bike paths and water sports, the Eendragtspolder has become a popular retreat. Now it also serves as a reservoir for the Rotte River Basin when the nearby Rhine overflows, which, because of climate change, it's expected to do every decade^{xiii}.

In New York, the design of parkland around the Bronx River proved the benefit that re-creation of the floodplain and natural water storage can have. Newly constructed parks along the river have utilized design strategies that provide open space and recreational activities for neighboring residents and provide essential flood mitigation and protection from storms like Superstorm Sandy. During Sandy, the parks did flood, as designed, and functioned as buffer zones for the surrounding neighborhoods - helping to protect them from flooding and debris. The construction of the parks required the land adjacent to the Bronx River to be recontoured to better reflect its historic topography. The “new”

shapes, created through excavation of fill and the building of berms (landscaped hills), allow the parks to act as floodplains that can hold and absorb floodwaters, while also filtering stormwater runoff from upland areas before it enters the river.

CONCLUSION

Recent storms and weather patterns signal that climate changes are already occurring. In response, local officials must help their communities best withstand the resulting impacts by making well-informed planning and development decisions. To do so requires information on projected climate impacts as well as integrated planning approach that looks beyond the safety of one property to the community, town, and region as a whole.

There is no one single measure that will holistically enhance the resilience of local communities, but rather a number of measures that require partnerships across levels of government and sectors. These measures include moving and/or keeping people and structures out of harm's way and protecting and restoring critical natural systems to protect communities in the face of climate change^{xiv}.

i "Resilience" US Green Building Council (2016). *2016 USGBC Resilience Summit: Solutions for Sustainable Land Use*. (Conference Report). Retrieved from <https://www.usgbc.org/sites/default/files/2016-resilient-cities-report.pdf>.

ii National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Office of Coastal Management. Retrieved from <https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/stories/delawarebay.html>.

iii Regional Plan Association. (December 2016). *Under Water: How Sea Level Rise Threatens the Tri-State Region*. Retrieved from <http://library.rpa.org/pdf/RPA-Under-Water-How-Sea-Level-Rise-Threatens-the-Tri-State-Region.pdf>.

iv Zhou, N. (2017). *Age of Housing Stock by State*. Retrieved from National Association of Home Builders Discusses Economics and Housing Policy, Eye on Housing website: <http://eyeonhousing.org/2017/01/age-of-housing-stock-by-state/>

v McGarry and Madsen Home Inspection (2015). *What is the Average Life Expectancy of a House?* Retrieved from McGarry and Madsen Home Inspection website: http://www.mcgarryandmadsen.com/inspection/Blog/Entries/2015/7/15_What_is_the_average_life_expectancy_of_a_house.html.

vi New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJ DEP), Office of Coastal Management (2011). *Coastal Community Vulnerability & Resilience Assessment Pilot, Greenwich Township, Cumberland County, NJ*. Retrieved from NJ DEP, Coastal Management Program website: <http://www.nj.gov/dep/cmp/docs/ccvap-greenwich.pdf>

vii Schwab, J., Berginnis, C., Read, A., & Walny, N. (2016). *Subdivision Design and Flood Hazard Areas (PAS 584)*. Retrieved from American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Services website: <https://www.planning.org/publications/report/9112664/>

viii Godshalk, D. (August 2003). *Urban Hazard Mitigation: Creating Resilient Cities*. (Natural Hazards Review Vol. 4, Issue 3). Retrieved from <https://ascelibrary.org/doi/abs/10.1061/%28ASCE%291527-6988%282003%294%3A3%28136%29>

ix Beatley, T. (2009) *Planning for Coastal Resilience: Best Practices for Calamitous Times*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

x Beatley

xiBuroHappold Engineering (2013). *Sandy Success Stories: New York, New Jersey*. Retrieved from Environmental Defense website: https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/content/SandySuccessStories_June2013.pdf

xii Murray, A. (2017). *Natural Flood Management: Adopting ecosystem approaches to managing flood risk*. Retrieved from Friends of the Earth website:

http://www.heritageweek.ie/content/images/natural_flood_management_a_study_for_friends_of_the_earth_february_2017.pdf

xiii Kimmelman, M. The Dutch Have Solutions to Rising Seas. The World Is Watching. (2017, June 15). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/15/world/europe/climate-change-rotterdam.html>.

xiv Beatley

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: James Desmond <kajim2@optimum.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor and Board
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear Members of The Planning Board,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. This property is a CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREA; designated as such in our Mamaroneck Village LWRP, established in 1986.

The property acts as a possible overflow "pond" to hold storm surge and tidal overflow when a hurricane or Nor'easter or even a heavy rain overwhelms the sanitary sewer system and the storm water pipes and manholes. The property is a safety valve for the village that should not be re-engineered with Tons of fill and concrete to build these condos. Do the builders know how close the water table is to the surface? Where have they explained to future buyers how they will handle the volume of water that can be expected in a major storm? What thought has been given to understanding TIDES? What do you do when all the roads in-and-out are under water? Hampshire sits RIGHT ON THE SHORE OF LONG ISLAND SOUND.

Flood waters are a frightening thought which definitely must be considered today. Our planet is obviously in a transitional moment when weather has become a major player in everyone's lives.

Think hard on allowing this development. Think about all the elements, not only water, involved in this major change which you ... and we, are all involved in. It will change the Face of our Village in ways we can only guess at...until it is built.

Yours truly,

Jim Desmond
347 Prospect Ave
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Member of the FIRST COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION, 1986

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jenny Kuhns Cook <jennykcook@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:13 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear Board Members,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

I have 3 elementary-aged children, and am experiencing the effects of the increased enrollment issue first-hand. My third grade son is in a cohort at Central school with 27 children per class, exceeding the district's own guidelines.

Even if housing is geared towards demographics without school-aged children, the amount of traffic and congestion we deal with around Boston Post Road and Palmer Avenues, at various times of day is inconvenient, and often, unsafe.

We live in a unique community full of diversity and a nice mix of urban access and culture and green spaces. If we tip the scales too far towards development, we will lose the appeal this area holds to us all.

The land at Hampshire is not appropriate for either a housing or condominium development - let's not focus on which is the least of two evils.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Cook
830 Orienta Ave
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Larry Thaul <lthaul@milleniumfin.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:14 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: 'Larry Thaul'
Subject: L Thaul, OPINION on Latest Development Proposal and suggested course for Hampshire

To All:

As an avid golfer, Hampshire member, local community resident off Weaver Street in the Town of Mamaroneck, and concerned citizen, I can tell you that it is good to see the extreme care, planning, forethought taken and, above all, the resumption of the discussion in devising an acceptable plan to develop the HCC parcel. Notable are the level of care and detailed considerations contemplated in the current proposal. The concern shown in the proposal of the impact of developing the 105 units in the 65 carriage houses while improving and protecting the property is genuinely good to see. What I differ with is the end result of developing roughly half of the near natural property by turning an 18 hole treasure into a 9 hole course. Of course, this would be irreversible and, in my opinion, woefully rued down the road.

For my own part, I believe the best plan is to continue to press for the necessary amendments to code, zoning and other municipal-environment-regulatory agencies to accomplish a condominium complex as previously proposed on the site of the current clubhouse. Perhaps I've missed some meetings but should pressing forward in this way have an endgame, that is the one to be taken, even if the final figure is a compromise, still profitable, somewhat reduced from the formerly proposed 121 units.

Notwithstanding the litigiousness and adversarial nature which this issue seems to bring out, the outcome I prefer is far better than the press for 100% development of our scarce remaining land. As previous studies have shown, it would likely be far less costly to upgrade the club main house property, surrounding infrastructure, and build fewer units but provide ample return for the owner and a boost to the tax roll while placing less of a burden of new students at the schools than the proposal to construct the carriage houses would. The community of residents who stand to benefit by remaining in their community at peri-retirement and retirement age would be served as would the community. The vibrancy of the community would be kept intact. It appears that the ingress-egress challenge (and evacuation route) could be addressed adequately, as well. This would likely represent a much shorter construction period, with much less inconvenience to the local neighborhood.

Our elected and appointed officials and professionals with the various agencies, boards, commissions, authorities and governing bodies should see the value in the smaller scale development and work towards a zoning change compromise. Perhaps there would even be additional town givebacks such as a landing to launch small craft or kayaks/canoes, all to the benefit of our locality.

Let's work towards this goal - together - not at odds as a bloodsport. Together we can achieve a compromise beneficial to a significant number and yet conserve and enhance this beautiful parcel. To ignore this is to misconstrue the development concept of 'highest and best use' and move ahead with the maximum development permitted by law under current zoning. This, I respectfully submit, is not the highest and best *application* of the land for our community in both the short and the long-term. We ought not deprive the owner who has tried for years to effect changes in zoning characterization for the improvement to us all. They, too, have their rights. For the record, I'm thus averse to the current proposal in its current form.

I'm in favor of continuing the airing of views in this matter. The mayor and the VOM board of trustees should consider rezoning the property for multifamily. Further, the downsized condo solution would help retain and enhance Hampshire and best serve the Age 55+ population.

Barring a continued community conversation we may well end up with 9 holes and strategically placed plastic replicas of the turkeys, possum, geese and other native flora-fauna seen on the course and grounds. I may be sans biology PhD, but I know they will never return once gone.

Most respectfully,

Lawrence J. Thaul
Town Mamaroneck resident
HCC member and golfer

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: The Kents <tomandsophiekent@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:41 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Sophie Kent

490 Bleeker

Apt. 5H

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Randi Spatz <randik2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:43 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Randi Spatz
615 Claflin Ave

Randi Spatz
914-217-5968

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Potash, Andrea <ArPotash@distinguished.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 4:44 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; kwaitt@vom.ny
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

To the Planning Board:

I am a resident of the Village.

I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be harmful for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative in its current form.

There have been numerous presentations by both sides, but the experts on the "anti" side have been far more persuasive. Among many issues raised are the notion that the underground garage with concrete walls would keep out Long Island Sound, the disturbance to the community to the years of trucking in the tons of fill, much of it unclean, and the certainty that the trucks would have to find or develop another means of egress, since Cove Rd. is private.

We suspect that the comments in favor of the project were from letters written by the developers and sent by people who don't live in Mamaroneck. As such, their comments should not carry any weight.

Sincerely,

Andrea Potash
950 Sylvan Lane
Mamaroneck, NY

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Thomas Kent <tjrkent@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 5:07 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy
Subject: Hampshire condo development

As a village resident, I wish to add my voice to those who oppose the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development. It is also injurious to our village.

I hope the Planning Board will give more attention to messages from village residents than from outsiders.

Thank you for your concern and attention.

Tom Kent
490 Bleeker Ave., Apt. 5H
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 11, 2018
THROUGH
May 12, 2018

187 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC LANDA Public Comment
188 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC WOLFF Public Comment
189 05 11 2018 Hampshire CC GROSS Public Comment
190 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC ORANS Public Comment
191 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC PORAT Public Comment
192 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC LARSEN Public Comment
193 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC CHILDERLEY Public Comment
194 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC TOLL Public Comment
195 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC ACKERMAN Public Comment
196 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC CHAPIN Public Comment
197 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC BOURDAIN Public Comment
198 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC J BOURDAIN Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Lloyd Landa <llanda@optonline.net>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 6:29 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

The most significant reason is the long term effect on the harbor and waterfront .The comprehensive village plan calls for protection of the harbor and marine recreation zone. Any change in the zoning of properties in this zone has a major effect by creating a precedent for other coastal marine zoning. This could lead to long term development that would look like a ring of condos around the harbor.

Adding 125 units to overcrowded roadways is dangerous. Flooding conditions make Rushmore Ave. impassable during heavy rains, leaving only Orienta Ave. for egress.

Rushmore and Orienta Avenues are badly overcrowded in the morning and afternoon school times.

The suggestion by the developer that they would consider a bus to the station during rush hours was tried when I moved to Orienta and was soon ended.

There are incremental costs for sewers, infrastructure, police, fire, DPW services, that continue to go up in cost year after year when the developer is gone and all the village residents pay the bill.

Rising school population will be part of the need for additional classrooms.

Careful study of the above and other effects of this overly large proposed development, indicate that the Planning Board should not grant approval.

Please share this with the members of the Planning Board.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Landa, DDS
728 Walton Ave. Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: joanna wolff <jwolffschneiderman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 8:33 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Hello,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. This scale of this project is grossly out of proportion with the character of the community and in a delicate land area.

The Owner's of the club should submit a viable plan that doesn't require any variances or special permits.

The knew what they where buying when they purchased the club in it's delicate environment. The VOM should not place our fragile community at risk because a developer wants to reap profits.

Thank you for your thoughtful time spent on this matter

Sincerely,

Joanna Wolff
940 Fairway Lane
10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Joanna Gross <jiegross@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:03 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Joanna Gross

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Sam <sosamso@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 7:16 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Hampshire zoning

Good morning members of the planning board,

Let me start by saying thank you for taking on this role. Thank you for volunteering.

I have been to a few of the Hampshire meetings since the developers started sharing their ideas. I cannot say that I am well versed in the zoning laws but am concerned. I have lived in the Larchmont, Mamaroneck area since 1971. Having looked at the plans presented I see no benefits to this development for our community. The tax increases brought by it would not out way the strains on our community and services. I see no reason to bend or change zoning to allow this to happen.

I could go on with my reasons but I think you have heard this all before. I have attached a link connected to a story I listened to on CNN in my car. It was about Astro turfing. It is when paid actors represent themselves as residents or supporters. I am not accusing the developers of this but please ask where everyone lives when the comment. Members of the club who live elsewhere should not carry the same weight as residents.

Thank you again for your time,

Sam Orans
1035 Seahaven Drive
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Samuel Porat <samuel.porat@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 7:59 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Samuel Porat
1014 Greacen Point Rd
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Kim Larsen <kimlarsen@mindspring.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

We are residents of the Village and believe that Hampshire's condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Kim and Todd Larsen

531 Orienta Avenue



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jonathan Childerley <Childerley7@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 9:52 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Jonathan Childerley
405 Toni Lane
Mamaroneck
NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Elizabeth Toll <etollack@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 10:10 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

[name and address]

Elizabeth Toll
917 Cove Road
Mamaroneck
Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Elizabeth Toll <etollack@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 10:11 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,
Richard Ackerman
917 Cove Rd
Mamaroneck

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Deborah Chapin <deb.chapin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 10:22 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

As a former Mayor of the Village of Mamaroneck, I am well aware of the pressures that exist when Boards consider applications for development. I am also well aware of the tactics used to create an impression of community support to influence a decision.

From the outset, I thought that the proposed condominium development at Hampshire was too large, too dismissive of environmental concerns and would place too great a burden on the essential services of the Village. The ploy of now using it as a viable alternative to a housing development that any reasonable person can see is not feasible, on so many levels for so many reasons, is offensive.

Surely we are all smarter than this developer thinks we are.

I am not opposed to crafting a reasonable compromise that provides for some development, recognizes and protects the environment and the deals with the realities of our schools, roadways and neighborhoods.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of the issues.

Deborah Chapin
deb.chapin@gmail.com
914-381-2557 (h)
914-629-5701 (c)

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: CHristopher Bourdain <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 11:01 AM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

CHristopher Bourdain
22 Lafayette Rd
Zip Code: 10538
Email: cbourd3@gmail.com

Submitted from: 100.2.221.162
ID#: 74

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jennifer Bourdain <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bourdain
22 Lafayette Rd
Zip Code: 10538
Email: jbourd2@gmail.com

Submitted from: 100.2.221.162
ID#: 75

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 12 2018
THROUGH
May 12, 2018

199 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC WARNER Public Comment
200 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC STEIN Public Comment
201 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC SISKIND Public Comment
202 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC GOLDSTEIN Public Comment
203 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC GARDNER Public Comment
204 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC LAG Public Comment
205 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC PINCUS Public Comment
206 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC RUNCIE Public Comment
207 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC L PINCUS Public Comment
208 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC K DESMOND Public Comment
209 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC RYAN Public Comment
210 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC T RYAN Public Comment
211 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC ACKERMAN Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Steve Warner <steven.d.warner@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 11:19 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Hampshire Development

All -

I am writing with my deep concern about the proposed development at Hampshire. I believe it will forever change the character of our village.

I know there has been a significant amount of planning board meetings and discussions concerning this development. As a life long resident of the village I would hate to see this decision impact the lives of future generations, young and old, about all there is to enjoy in our great village.

I hope you fully consider the impact that this development will have on the environment, traffic, open spaces and most importantly the school systems. I have observed over the last few years the explosion in enrollment in school age population. Previous developments in our community failed to consider both the adequate factor for children in the developments and equally important the turnover of "empty nest" homes to young families. I do not believe our schools - from the elementary to secondary can absorb the impact of the proposed Hampshire development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Warner
1015 Seahaven Drive
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jean Marie Stein <jmstein1@optonline.net>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 11:21 AM
To: Victor Tafur; Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Development of HCC

To the Members of the Planning Board and to the Board of Trustees of the Village of Mamaroneck,

I am writing to let you know of my intense opposition to any development at Hampshire Country Club. While development is often seen as progress, the recent pace of development throughout the entire Village has created a community that is barely recognizable to the one that I chose to purchase a home in 27 years ago. The congestion on the roads and the overcrowding of our schools has reached a breaking point. The obliteration of the skyline by massive condo developments is unrelenting.

With less and less open space, one must do all they can to preserve what is left. There is no need for me to reiterate the litany of lies the developer has tried to feed to you and the community. We all know this is, and always was, a money grab- one that stole from the Village and the Town the opportunity to create more open space for the residents of the community.

I understand there is a group willing and able to purchase the land and run it as a golf course. I encourage you to do all in your power to facilitate that deal before the destruction of one of the last open spaces in Mamaroneck.

Sincerely,

Jean Marie Stein
1061 Bay Head
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Amy Siskind <amysisk01@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 12:23 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Hampshire

Dear Planning Board,

I am a resident of Orienta, and have been for over two decades. Remember, you represent those of us who live in the Village of Mamaroneck.

Since my time here, the community has become increasingly crowded. Earlier this year, parents like myself with children in our school system received an alarming letter from the school superintendent regarding the overcrowding of our schools, and steps they are taking to address this best they can. Our class sizes are getting larger and our schools are bursting with students. The last thing we need is another big development which would bring in many new students that our system is not equipped to handle! This will make our class sizes bigger yet, and hurt the quality of the education we can provide to residents.

Further, this area is already overcrowded and the additional traffic this project would bring, would make our already congested village that much worse. The impact on the environment would also be troubling.

Finally, I want to remind us that when this owner bought Hampshire, it was in the spirit of continuing to operate a club. Instead, he has brought in a hedge fund who seeks not to better our community, but to line their own pockets at our expense. There is no benefit to us.

I trust you will represent the people of this community in which you live and turn this down.

Thank you,
Amy Siskind
4 Skibo Lane
Mamaroneck

Amy Siskind
President, The New Agenda
T: [914.630.4844](tel:914.630.4844)



Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Arthur Goldstein <agaent@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Victor Tafur
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Proposed Hampshire CC development

To: Planning Board

I live at 940 Sylvan Lane, Mamaroneck, NY 10543. I believe the condominium housing development at Hampshire CC would be TERRIBLE for the Village and should be totally rejected.. Thank you. ARTHUR Goldstein

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Kathleen Gardner <kathleen.gardner6@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 1:03 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am writing to voice my intense opposition to the proposed condo development at Hampshire Country Club. Please put the value of open space in this community above corporate greed.

Your primary mandate is described as "conduct[ing] and facilitat[ing] studies on current and long-term planning and land use issues in order to improve quality of life in the Village."

Please ask yourselves how this proposal will "improve the quality of life in the Village." The negative environmental impact? The additional strain on an already over-burdened school system? Disruption to the community during the 5-years of planned construction? (Particularly the large construction vehicle traffic and rock blasting near the Hommocks School). Increased flood threats to Orienta and Hommocks School? (Remember Superstorm Sandy and the 1992 Nor-easter when a resident drowned on the golf course during the storm surge? Flooding will only increase if that land is further developed). Where exactly would the improvements to the quality of life in the Village come?

Please deny this application.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Gardner

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Cecile Lag <cec40steph@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 1:13 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

To the Members of the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board

I am writing to register my opposition to all plans for the development of Hampshire Country Club. I have followed the attempt of the developer to change zoning of the Village, and I am shocked by the ongoing actions of this developer to try and go against the community of our village and alter the harmony in place.

You have already heard the negative arguments of school overcrowding, flooding and traffic, but also you must look at who is behind this developer. A vicious Hedge fund who from the start wanted to maximize on their return whatever the cost or damages to the Village.

I honestly do not see any benefits coming from either proposals and I strongly oppose to their new 100+ houses project that would damage the environment of Wetlands on top of all the other negative points already discussed.

Regards,

Cécile Bassas
1064 Bay Head,
Mamaroneck, NY10543
10 year resident.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Robert Pincus <rpincus649@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 2:44 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear Sirs and Madams,

At the last public hearing before the zoning board, I was surprised and disappointed at the inference that anyone who opposed the new condominium was doing it from a matter of self interest and NIMBY. I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative and the reasons described by the proponents are obviously wrong.

Sincerely,

Robert Pincus
706 Claflin Ave
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Catriona Runcie <cat.runcie@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 2:55 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

We are Mamaroneck Village residents who would like to voice our opposition to building homes on the Hampshire Country Club property.

It's our understanding that both building proposals (condos and single-family homes) run counter to existing zoning laws and should, therefore, be rejected. There is no benefit to the community in building there--just increased traffic, loss of green space, and more pressure on our already over-crowded school system--so why would we change zoning requirements to accommodate the owners' desire to monetize it by building homes?

Yours,

Catriona Runcie & Dimitri Sirota
1 Pirates Cove

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Lillian Pincus <lilpincus@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 4:27 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

[name and address]

Lillian Pincus
706 Claflin Ave. Mamaroneck
Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Katherine Desmond <k347m@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor and Board
Subject: Hampshire comment

Honorable Members of the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board and Board of Trustees,

This is my second written comment to you on the Hampshire development. I am writing again because I, as a Village resident, have been receiving unsolicited mailings and contact from Hampshire attempting to win my approval of their ill- conceived project.

I wish to state that I remain 100% opposed to the project. I view it as a vast and dangerous land use experiment that could take a toll on our quality of life as well as our safety.

Has Hampshire ever provided you with any actual photographs of any similar "berm built housing on a wetland" project on the East Coast?

We all saw Houston Texas underwater in last Fall's flood due to overbuilding. WHat's to prevent that from happening here?

I believe that the Hampshire project, in a such a flood prone *Critical Environmental Area*, could easily become a mini-Houston Texas that would adversely effect all of us in the Village.

Sincerely,

Katherine Desmond, resident since 1975

347 Prospect Avenue
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Paul Ryan <paulr10383@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 8:36 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt; Leon Potok; nseligson@townofmamaroneckny.org
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire Development per submitted Plans

Dear Mr. Sjunnemark, Acting Chair, and Members of the Planning Board:

As most of you know, I have worked on environmental issues in this Village as a member of various land use Boards and Commissions and as an elected official in the Town of Mamaroneck for the better part of 30 years. Now, as just a plain private citizen, I must emphatically comment on all of the building plans related to the Hampshire Country Club.

You have heard my testimony at the last two public hearings held under SEQRA regulations regarding the DEIS for the Project. You can see by my address below that I have no personal interest in this fight - just the long time interests of the Village and Town residents as well as the safety of Hommocks Schoolchildren.

Under absolutely no circumstances should any residential building take place in the MR-1 District, as identified in the Village's LWRP (adopted by NYS and the VOM in 1986). Building ANYWHERE in this Zone would constitute "spot zoning" and would jeopardize the entire existence of the Village's MR and MC Zones and the Village's express desire to preserve and protect its waterfront for future generations.

In addition, the current residential plan currently before your Board is a catastrophe in the making. The Hampshire property was designated in 1986 as a Critical Environmental Area by the Village. Denuding this CEA of almost 500 mature trees and their root systems is a disaster in itself. Adding several hundred thousand cubic yards of land fill to this property would, by definition, destroy the CEA and add to the flooding problems downstream in the Town of Mamaroneck.

Finally, the desire for a quick "one shot" tax windfall to the Village's finances would hurt the Village in the long run, destroy a wildlife habitat, add fresh "polluted" water filled with construction mud and debris to a recognized salt water wetlands in the Town of Mamaroneck, thereby adding to its degradation.

Please, for the sake of future generations, deny this application for the lasting benefit of our Village and Town. Recommending the changing of the zoning of this property to Recreation (as was done in the Bonnie Briar Syndicate v Town of Mamaroneck lawsuit) would prevent this type of development from ever reaching your Board in the future.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul A. Ryan
314 Livingston Ave.
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Toni Ryan <boolieryan@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 9:41 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt; Leon Potok
Subject: Strong Opposition To Hampshire Proposal

Dear Mr. Sjunnemark (Acting Chair), and Members of the Planning Board:

I am a life-long resident of the Village of Mamaroneck and, while I lived in the Washingtonville neighborhood for over 70 of those years, your decision regarding Hampshire's proposal will affect the entire Village.

Preserving the character of our Village has been a political battle cry for as long as I can remember. To me that means that we preserve open space, we respect the environment, we allow development but only planned development, we live by and respect documents that many people over many years have put in place and have protected. In the instance before you, the most important documents that are in place, that you must use in making your decision, are the Village's Comprehensive Plan, and the Village's Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan (LWRP). These documents are the guidelines by which we protect the character of our beloved Village. Allow these documents to answer the request to change Hampshire from what it is to an overly developed property that will destroy open space, add to already horrific flooding problems, disrupt and possibly destroy flora, fauna, and wildlife that have been in place for decades, put students at the Hommocks at risk during construction, create traffic problems for everyone using main roads, potentially add to our already overcrowded schools. The consequences of allowing Hampshire's proposal will adversely affect all of us for a long time to come.

Please use the documents mentioned above to help you reach the only right decision, the decision that will protect all of us and the character of our Village today and into the future. Please vote NO.

Respectfully,

Toni Pergola Ryan
Former Trustee Village of Mamaroneck
314 Livingston Avenue (201W)
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Sent from my iPad

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Letal Ackerman <letal@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 10:05 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Letal and Andrew Ackerman
626 Fairway Ave, Mamaroneck

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTAIL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECEIVED May 12, 2018

THROUGH

May 13, 2018

- 212 05 12 2018 Hampshire CC FELDMANN Public Comment
- 213 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC KIRCHOFF Public Comment
- 214 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC YOUNG Public Comment
- 215 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC DESPOUX Public Comment
- 216 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC CARROLL Public Comment
- 217 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC GRANT Public Comment
- 218 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC KIMBALL Public Comment
- 219 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC G GOLDSTEIN Public Comment
- 220 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC MOTTE Public Comment
- 221 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC J L DECAUX Public Comment
- 222 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC M DECAUX Public Comment
- 223 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC FLEURY Public Comment
- 224 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC M FLEURY Public Comment
- 225 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC BOILLOT Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: caryl feldmann <caryl1015@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 10:40 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the Hampshire developments presented to the Village should be rejected. This is my 53 year here in Mamaroneck and my fourth home. I have lived on Stiles, Flagler, Seven Oaks and now at Fairway Green. I know that the tides do go our, but the water remains and if the rains are heavy, it takes days before all the water is absorbed.

I also taught here from 1966-1994 and remember the years 1968-1969, when there was no room for students in their neighborhood schools due to overpopulation. The upper grades at Murray were sent to Mamaroneck Avenue School and those at Chatsworth went to Central and I think one 6th grade class was housed at the Hommocks and one temporarily at Larchmont Avenue Church. The parents at Murray were upset when they learned that some of their students did not qualify for bus service and had to walk or be driven. We do not want a repeat of that year. Our schools would clearly be impacted by Hampshire's proposal .

Thank you for your service,

Caryl Feldmann

503 Fairway Green

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Kathryn Kirchoff <kkirchof@montefiore.org>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 12:18 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Oppose Real Estate Development at Hampshire Country Club

Dear Mayor and Planning Board Members:

As a lifelong resident of our community and a family who owns a home directly bordering the Hampshire Country Club, I am writing this letter to implore you to oppose any real estate development on the Hampshire Country Club property.

My concerns are twofold:

First, the Hampshire Country Club property borders a fragile marine ecosystem and is itself a beautiful and valued open space in our increasingly overdeveloped municipality. Experts have already advised strongly about the environmental impact of disturbing contaminated soil next to residences and a school. Destruction of hundreds of trees in a flood zone will undoubtedly jeopardize both the safety and property of current neighbors, as well as the safety of those who might live in these developments. Long-time residents will recall the man who died in the Hommocks Road area during a Nor'easter in the 1990s, but what they might not know is that emergency vehicles such as the ambulances could not even make their way down the road as they were overtaken by floodwaters. It seems irresponsible to me, no matter how much landfill is dumped in the area (which already sounds like an environmental disaster) to develop this area into a densely populated residential neighborhood. The effects on the wildlife and ecosystem itself would be a great loss to our community.

My second concern as a parent of children in Central School is the impact that this development will have both on our already overcrowded and overstressed school system, and on our municipality in general. The development would lead to increased traffic in an already congested area, increased school enrollment (many parents of children from elementary school through high school are already 55!) and increased strain on our police, emergency services personnel, sanitation, etc.

I urge you strongly to oppose real estate development in Hampshire Country Club. I think you know in your brain and your heart that development would be the wrong decision for many reasons. Please know through this letter and great public interest on this topic that you have my support as well.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Kirchoff, MD
26 Elkan Road
Larchmont, NY 10538

Part-homeowner of my mother's current residence:
26 Rockridge Road
Larchmont, NY 10538

(Directly bordering Hampshire Country Club- and waterfront property every time we have a major storm and water comes all the way over the Hampshire Golf Course to our neighbor's backyards!)

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jennifer Young <mcteaguenyc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 1:32 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire Condo Development

Dear Planning Board:

I am a resident of the Village. The condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development should be rejected as a alternative. It is not permitted under the zoning laws.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Young
955 Protano Lane

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jean-Francois Despoux <jfdespoux@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 2:28 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Jean-Francois Despoux
991 Green Meadow Lane
Mamaroneck 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Mary Carroll <mcullencarroll@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 3:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Hampshire Country Club

I am writing to express my opposition to any development at Hampshire Country club. This site provides the bulk of the remaining open space in Mamaroneck. The rate of development and expansion in this community has been extraordinary in the 25 years we have lived here. The roads are over-crowded, the schools are full to bursting, and creating condos on this property will simply add to these problems. The developers will take their financial windfall and leave town. The residents of Mamaroneck and Larchmont will be left to deal with the additional crowding and flooding that will result from increased development.

I urge you to try to find a group willing and able to purchase the land and run it as a golf course, saving one of the last and largest open spaces in Mamaroneck.

Sincerely,
Mary Cullen Carroll
96 West Garden Road
Larchmont, New York

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Terry Grant <tegrant@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 3:55 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Planning
Attachments: Attach0.html

Request From: Terry Grant
Email: tegrant@embarqmail.com
Source IP: 174.201.9.212

Address: 1016 orienta avenue
City: Mamaroneck
State: NY
Zip: 10543
Phone: 4349815142
Organization:

Re: proposed Hampshire Club development,
I am opposed to the proposed development for reasons of safety and population pressure.
Flooding issues: no one looking at this site would say it is a wise place for development. Flooding is guaranteed.
Pressure on schools from increased population: schools are already at capacity
Evacuation risk for orienta point peninsula and cove road: as recent storm damage made clear, it doesn't take much to block egress from orienta point. Equally obvious is how limited the egress is from gimmicks. In an emergency, it might well be impossible to safely evacuate residents from orienta point. This development would increase that risk.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Anne Kimball <annekimball1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; kwaittL@vomny.org
Subject: Proposed Hampshire development

Dear Planning Board,

As stated by many experts and members of the community at the public hearing regarding the Hampshire DEIS, the proposed 105-home housing development should be rejected because it is illegal, it is not feasible and it will have many significant adverse impacts on the community.

In addition, the large luxury condominium development presented in the DEIS as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be bad for the community for many reasons and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Kimball
36 Lincoln Street
Larchmont, NY 10538

PLANNING BOARD, May, 2018

To the Planning Board:

I have attended all the meetings regarding Hampshire Country Club's proposals. In addition, I sent a letter to the Planning Board in April addressing and opposing the 105 homes.

At the meeting on April 11, I heard several employees and members of the club, who do not reside in the Village of Mamaroneck, talk in favor of the Condo project. In the final analysis, that is what Hampshire really wants.

I believe that the Condo development would be a disaster for the Village of Mamaroneck and should be rejected.

Behind our property, which borders Hampshire's ponds, there are numerous dead trees and uncared for debris on the surface. The present grounds are neglected. How will they care for an "upscale" property? Members of the planning Board are welcome to view this area by contacting me.

Thank you for your interest and service to our Community.

Gloria Goldstein
940 Sylvan Lane
914-777-0009, gloagol@aol.com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Vianney Motte <vianney.motte@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 7:56 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village.

I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Vianney MOTTE
615 Sylvan Avenue
MAMARONECK, 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Decaux Jean-Luc <jean-luc.decaux@jcdecaux.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 8:35 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Victor Tafur; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.
Sincerely,

Jean-Luc Decaux
1020 Nine Acres Lane
Mamaroneck NY 10543

This e-mail and its attachments may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail and its attachments, you must delete it. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this e-mail in error.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: malene decaux <malened@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 8:38 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Victor Tafur; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Keith Waitt; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

malene Decaux
1020 nine acres lane
mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Christele Fleury <christele.fleury@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 9:30 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; potok@vomny.org; Victor Tafur; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Christele Fleury
905 Skibo Ln
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: maxime fleury <maxime.a.fleury@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 9:59 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Leon Potok; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Victor Tafur; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Maxime FLEURY

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Lisa Boillot <lisagagnumboillot@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:09 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be **rejected** as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Lisa Gagnum Boillot

Lisa Gagnum Boillot
(914) 319-4605

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 13, 2018
THROUGH
May 14, 2018

226 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC A BOILLOT Public Comment
227 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC E BOILLOT Public Comment
228 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC WOLKOFF Public Comment
229 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC E BOILLOT Public Comment
230 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC SERTON Public Comment
231 05 13 2018 Hampshire CC R SERTON Public Comment
232 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MC CARTY FALK Public Comment
233 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MISSE Public Comment
234 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC V FLEURY Public Comment
235 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC ALLEN Public Comment
236 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GRANT Public Comment
237 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC CRABTREE Public Comment
238 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC CECIL Public Comment
239 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LUSK Public Comment
240 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GOULLIN Public Comment
241 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC FEITLER Public Comment

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: eagle nest <uveaglenest@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:11 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Aramis Boillot
810 Pirates cove
Mamaroneck
ny10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: LISA GAGNUM BOILLOT <lboillot1@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:14 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: etienne boillot
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Etienne Boillot
810 Pirates Cove Orienta
Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Allan Wolkoff <awolkoff@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:14 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

To the Members of the Mamaroneck Village Planning Board:

I am a resident of the Village, residing at 890 Pirates Cove. I believe that the condominium development for Hampshire Country Club presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development is ill-advised and would be a poor choice for the Village short-term and for the future. It should be rejected.

Yours truly,
Allan Wolkoff

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: LISA GAGNUM BOILLOT <lboillot1@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:15 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: etienne boillot; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Re: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

>
> I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.
> Sincerely,
>
> Etienne Boillot
> 810 Pirates Cove Orienta
> Mamaroneck NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Doug Serton <douglas.serton@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 10:27 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Nora Lucas; Victor Tafur
Subject: Rejecting development proposals for Hampshire

I'm writing to express my deep concern over the consideration being given by the Board to the volume of robot-like form letters showcasing support for the development of Hampshire.

At stake with either the developer's original proposal or the current 100+ single family homes plan is the well-being of our children and schools, the character and safety of our community and the precious ecosystem we are fortunate enough to have as neighbors.

To think the selfishness of those who have financial interests at hand or those who are not permanent members of this community would be given equal - if not greater - consideration in this matter is shocking.

These matters are not a popularity contest. The issue in front of this Board is about maintaining and preserving the inviting DNA of this Village and well being of its residents for decades to come.

I strongly endorse the decision to turn away the current proposal and to put an end to the idea that the originally rejected condo development be given a second look.

Doug Serton

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Rachel Serton <rachel.serton@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 11:13 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Victor Tafur; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire Development

Planning Board Members,

I am writing in strong opposition to the development of Hampshire. This development would be detrimental to our area.

All the reasons that families move to this area are at risk if this land is developed. Think about the environment, schools, health, safety, children, time, traffic, green space, fresh air, budgets...

Those who live here and are invested in this community understand the current issues that we are already facing and know that developing this land would exacerbate existing problems in addition to creating many new problems.

Please do not be fooled by template letters as a result of a PR campaign, many even coming from people who don't live here and/or are employed by Hampshire and the developers.

Please preserve our community and support the best interest and quality of life of those who live here.

Thank you,
Rachel

May 14, 2018

Martha McCarthy-Falk
612 Brook Street
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

To the Chairman and Members of the Planning Board
Re: Hampshire Club

As a resident of Mamaroneck for most of my life, I am expressing my opposition to a residential build out at the site of the Hampshire Club.

The Village of Mamaroneck has seen relentless development of any and every available space. Traffic and parking have become more and more challenging with each addition of a residential unit. Our schools are becoming crowded and over-crowded, requiring additional funding by taxpayers to keep pace with the population growth and the ability to continue to provide stellar education for the children who attend. The infrastructure is overburdened. Adding more people, and all that comes with them, shows a lack of concern for these issues.

A silent player in this drama is the environment and how we are caring for our piece of the planet. Green spaces are the loser in many of the decisions the village boards make when giving the go ahead to developers. Loss of these spaces makes us more vulnerable to flooding. Developing this specific area is counter to the guiding principles of our own environmental laws and removes yet another opportunity to preserve the breathing space that mother nature requires. These are facts.

We want our children to be civically responsible. We teach them to care for the environment. You, who are in the position to make decisions that impact the entire population and the place that we live, have an opportunity right now to show that you are civically responsible and that you care for the environment. Be an advocate for us and our land.

This is the last open space in our area that has not been developed. Leaving it open to the public as a public golf course or as a public park would be a welcome use of this beautiful area. Either of these plans will benefit the community, rather than developers. It is time to think of us, the residents and taxpayers, ahead of the contractors.

Thank you,

Martha McCarthy-Falk

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Fred Misse <fredmisse@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 8:02 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Frederic Misse
615 Forest Avenue
Mamaroneck , NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Vincent Fleury <vincent.s.fleury@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 8:23 AM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Victor Tafur; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear all,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Vincent Fleury

Privileged and Confidential Information

Vincent FLEURY
905 Skibo Lane
10543 Mamaroneck

vincent.s.fleury@gmail.com

Cell: + 1 914 482 55 57

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Michael Allen <mallen@vateragroup.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 9:54 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Mayor Tom Murphy; 'vafur@vomny.org'; 'Renee Crabtree'
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village.

Regarding Hampshire, is there an option available, for the Village, maybe in joint venture with Village of Larchmont and Town of Mamaroneck and with county/ state/fed conservation funding support, to purchase the property so it remains green space for the residence to enjoy similar to the Rye golf course?

In my view this would be best option as it eliminates any increase in population density which at this point is chocking our schools, playing fields and roads.

Best regards

Mike Allen

Michael Allen
930 Greacen Lane
Mamaroneck NY
10543
H 914 698 0866
W 212 590 2950
C 646 894 7151

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Sally Roberts
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 10:04 AM
To: Mayor and Board; Robert Yamuder; Agostino Fusco; Daniel Sarnoff; Betty-Ann Sherer; Greg Cutler
Subject: FW: Planning
Attachments: Attach0.html

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Terry Grant <tegrant@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 13, 2018 3:55 PM
To: Sally Roberts <sroberts@vomny.org>
Subject: Planning

Request From: Terry Grant
Email: tegrant@embarqmail.com
Source IP: 174.201.9.212

Address: 1016 orienta avenue
City: Mamaroneck
State: NY
Zip: 10543
Phone: 4349815142
Organization:

Re: proposed Hampshire Club development,
I am opposed to the proposed development for reasons of safety and population pressure.
Flooding issues: no one looking at this site would say it is a wise place for development. Flooding is guaranteed.
Pressure on schools from increased population: schools are already at capacity
Evacuation risk for orienta point peninsula and cove road: as recent storm damage made clear, it doesn't take much to block egress from orienta point. Equally obvious is how limited the egress is from gimmicks. In an emergency, it might well be impossible to safely evacuate residents from orienta point. This development would increase that risk.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Renee Crabtree <renee.crabtree79@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 10:59 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development and proposed housing development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development and the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village given the over-crowding of our schools and roads and the environmental impact of the housing development, which would require tons of soil/landfill, upsetting the wetlands adjoining the golf course.

Sincerely,

Renee Crabtree
930 Greacen Lane,
Mamaroneck, NY
10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: John Cecil <jcecil@eagleknollscapital.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:10 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Oppose Hampshire Condominium Development

Importance: High

Dear Planning Board:

I am a long-term resident of the village. I strongly oppose the development of the large condominium complex on the Hampshire property that the real-estate developer is proposing as an alternative to its 105-home development.

Oriente is now a beautiful residential part of our Village. The proposed five-story, 125-unit condominium with a 200-plus parking garage is totally out of character with the area. One of the responsibilities of the Planning Board is to preserve what makes our Village and its various neighborhoods attractive for our residents. This project is clearly not suitable for this location.

Such an enormous project would also result in years of construction traffic and noise. It would result in ongoing congestion on the roads leading in and out of the area. And it would permanently diminish the value of homes in the vicinity.

For all these reasons, the Planning Board should not recommend that the property be rezoned to permit the construction of the condominium.

John Cecil
Village Resident

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jack Lusk <jlusk@harrisrand.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:29 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Hampshire Country Club Development Proposal

Dear Planning Board,

I attended the Planning Board meeting last Wednesday. Let me start by saying that I am most appreciative of the attention and overall effort that the Board gives to its work. At the same time, I was very surprised and concerned to hear Acting Chairman Sjunneemark's remarks regarding recently received comments supporting the condominium alternative plan. He stated that based on his review of the comments received over the prior 12 days, 64% (based on a total of 14 comments) were in favor of the condo development.

Ms. Savolt then correctly noted that virtually all of those (all but 1 in fact) were form letters prepared by and sent through the Hampshire website. I reviewed the full packet of comments made during that period (which were available at the meeting). Not only was the actual number quite low (8), only one of those letters was from an independent Village resident. Of the 8 letters, 7 were form letters from the Hampshire website, 4 of which were from people outside of the Village of Mamaroneck, 1 was from Mr. Rob Sutton, who gave his address at 1025 Cove Road, which means he works for and is an employee of the Club, and 1 was from Andres Bermudez-Hallstrom, who no longer lives in the Village. The one letter not on the Hampshire form was from a person residing outside the Village.

Mr. Sjunneemark seemed to give the same weight to these letters from non-residents, including form letters provided through the developer's website (because, as he said, someone took a minute or two to go the Hampshire website link and push the send button), as to individual and thoughtfully drafted letters of deep concern submitted by committed Village residents. If Mr. Sjunneemark was actually influenced (public comments aside,) by a small number of mostly form letters over a short (12-day) period, from people outside of our Village, is disappointing and very disturbing.

I sincerely hope the Planning Board is more careful in its consideration regarding Hampshire than those remarks would indicate. It is surely telling that the Club is trying to lobby for an alternative plan while pushing forward with what appears to be an unbuildable proposal for new homes.

Sincerely, Jack Lusk (Resident of 1002 Cove Road)

Jack Lusk
President and CEO
Harris Rand Lusk
122 East 42nd Street, Suite 3605
New York, NY 10168
Phone: (212) 867-5577, Ext. 201
www.harrisrand.com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Arnaud Goullin <agoullin@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; potok@vomny.org; Keith Waitt; Victor Tafur
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

We are residents of the Village. We believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Patricia and Arnaud GOULLIN

1025 nine acres lane

Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Susan Feitler <susanfeitler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 12:06 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.
Sincerely,

Susan Feitler
433 Claflin Avenue, Mamaroneck, NY

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 14, 2018
THROUGH
May 14, 2018

242 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LUSK Public Comment
243 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC KASS Public Comment
244 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC CECIL Public Comment
245 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LASALA Public Comment
246 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MEYEROWITZ Public Comment
247 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MALONEY Public Comment
248 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LASALA Public Comment
249 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GUADAGNOLO Public Comment
250 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC KAPLAN Public Comment
251 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GIOVE Public Comment
252 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GILBERT Public Comment
253 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC SUPPORT PETITION Public Comment

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 14, 2018
THROUGH
May 14, 2018

242 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LUSK Public Comment
243 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC KASS Public Comment
244 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC CECIL Public Comment
245 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LASALA Public Comment
246 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MEYEROWITZ Public Comment
247 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MALONEY Public Comment
248 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LASALA Public Comment
249 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GUADAGNOLO Public Comment
250 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC KAPLAN Public Comment
251 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GIOVE Public Comment
252 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC GILBERT Public Comment
253 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC SUPPORT PETITION Public Comment

Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP
Memorandum

To: Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board
From: Stephen L. Kass
Karen E. Meara
Cc: Lester D. Steinman
Stuart Mesinger
Subject: Hampshire DEIS, Additional Comment on Alternative G
Date: May 14, 2018

In view of the obvious effort now being made by the Applicant, through its extensive public relations campaign and its communications to the Planning Board prior to the May 9 work session, to solicit support for its condominium proposal, it is important to note that that proposal (Alternative G in the DEIS) relies on an extensive underground garage which is itself illegal under the Village flood plain laws. Those laws require offsets (i.e. hydraulic equivalency) not only for “fill” placed below the base flood elevation, but also for “structures” placed below the base flood elevation. See Section 186-5(A)(3)(c). Since there can be no question that the garage structure, with its proposed elevation of 1.0 feet above mean sea level (see DEIS Figure 4-8), would be a “structure below the base flood elevation” and that it would displace a substantial amount of uncompensated hydrologic storage capacity within this flood plain area, it would be prohibited (absent an unlikely variance) by Section 186-5(A)(3)(c) of the Village Code. In view of the Board’s extension of the DEIS comment date until May 14, we would appreciate your adding this comment to the list of DEIS comments as well. Thank you.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jack Lusk <jlusk@harrisrand.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 12:16 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: FW: Hampshire Country Club Development Proposal

Last word on the draft EIS; please note for the record that even though Hampshire's lawyers insist publically that Cove Road and it's extension through Hampshire are public thoroughfares, the Club has placed perfectly nice signs on both Eagle Knolls and Cove that state the road is **PRIVATE**, and only open to local traffic. In fact, Hampshire has repeatedly supported maintaining the private nature of the road in the past. I guess that is the definition of having it both ways. Sincerely, Jack Lusk (resident 1002 Cove Road.)

Jack Lusk
President and CEO
Harris Rand Lusk
122 East 42nd Street, Suite 3605
New York, NY 10168
Phone: (212) 867-5577, Ext. 201
www.harrisrand.com

Dear Planning Board:

I have been a resident of the Village of Mamaroneck for 32 years. I am strongly opposed to the proposed 105-home development of the Hampshire Golf Course.

The proposed development has many severe problems, any one of which is sufficient to cause the Planning Board to reject it.

1. **Flooding.** Since I have lived here, there have been four major flooding events caused by Nor'easters and hurricanes, as well as rain-based flooding every year. Storm surges from the Sound have come through the Bird Sanctuary behind the Hommocks School and across Hommocks Road completely flooding the golf course. In one such flood, a man driving on the road that cuts across the golf course was swept off the road and drowned. The proposed construction will reduce the capacity of the golf course to contain the floodwater (the "bathtub" effect described in the Planning Board public hearings) and interfere with water flowing out through the drainage system under the Hommocks playing fields. The result will be:
 - a. **Life threatening safety risk** due to blocked egress for residents on Hommocks Road, Oak Lane, Eagle Knolls Road, the residents of the proposed development, and possibly Cove Road.
 - b. **Flooding of homes** on Hommocks Road, Oak Lane, Eagle Knolls Road, as well as those homes on Fairway Green and Cooper Avenue near the golf course.
2. **Airborne poisons.** Soil sampling done by the developer found arsenic and other dangerous contaminants in the ground of the golf course. Arsenic is highly toxic. Exposure causes vomiting, pain, and cancer. Its release through construction dust and ground water poses a serious health risk to:
 - a. **Children and staff at the Hommocks School.**
 - b. **Residents of surrounding homes** and
 - c. **Construction workers** and **residents** of the proposed development itself.
3. **Traffic congestion and related children safety risks as well as noise and exhaust pollution at the Hommocks School.** The intersection of Hommocks Road, Boston Post Road, and Weaver Street is already a major bottleneck. In the mornings, at School dismissal and during workday evenings, traffic backs up from the Post Road up Weaver all the way to Myrtle Avenue. The proposed development will greatly worsen this problem.
 - a. During construction, the developer will bring in: (1) more than 200,000 cubic yards of fill based on the estimates of independent experts; (2) gravel, asphalt and cement for roads and sidewalks; and (3) concrete, lumber, drywall, etc. for 105 homes. There will also be all of the associated construction vehicles (bull dozers,

cement mixers, graders) and cars for hundreds of workers. **Construction is expected to last for 5 years.**

- b. Once construction is complete, the 105 homes with 200-plus cars along with delivery trucks, service vehicles, etc. will add hundreds of trips per day in and out of the development site.

All of this will cause massive traffic jams at the Hommocks/Boston Post Road intersection. In response, much of that traffic will spill out of the only other exit from the site, down Cove Road and Orienta Avenue. In addition, hundreds of school children who walk to Hommocks School will be exposed to risk from construction vehicles and traffic, and the School itself will suffer from greater traffic noise and exhaust fumes.

- 4. **Schools over crowding.** The addition of 105 homes will add many more children to our schools. After all, our school system is the primary reason people move here. Unfortunately, our schools are already over capacity. A large addition of children will lead to larger class sizes, the reassignment of children among elementary schools, and possibly the need to construct a new school building, an enormous expense.
- 5. **Legal liability for the Village.** Any injuries or health risks resulting from the development will likely lead to costly lawsuits and possibly enormous liability for the Village. If there is contamination of the School or neighboring homes, there will be safety risk. The cost of remediation will be very high. Arsenic is an element. It does not break down or dissipate over time. The only remediation is by physically removing all of the dust particles on building surfaces, in ventilation systems, and on playing fields. Lawsuits for health and cleanup costs will likely be brought against the Village for approving the project given that it knows that contaminants have been found in the soils.

* * *

For these reasons, the Community is overwhelmingly opposed to the project. This was evident in the overflow crowds at the public hearings. The Planning Board should reject the proposed development.

John Cecil
Village Resident

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Susan LaSala <susan61@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Leon Potok; nlucas@vmny.org; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Susan LaSala
621 Oakhurst Rd
Mamaroneck NY
914-7771266

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Jean Meyerowitz <jean@thelibos.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 3:31 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development, Hampshire trolling though Facebook

Dear Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board,

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

I have previously raised objections to the 200 unit proposal, and for the same reasons I stated in my prior email, I believe that permitting the development of a massive condominium project on Delancey Cove would be a terrible decision, which would forever alter our village shoreline and contribute to the overcrowding, and traffic and school congestion in our small village. It would add so much more air, noise and water pollution and threaten the wildlife that reside here and contribute to our already dire flooding problem.

I believe if we continue to allow this kind of development in our Village, it will be less desirable and ultimately greatly harmed. These undeveloped places are vital to the residents' ability to live in peace. It is imperative we don't allow development to encroach on us in this manner.

Finally, I strongly urge you to consider from whom you receive emails in favor of development. My brother took a picture at my home and posted it to Facebook, ever since he reports to me, on a weekly basis and sometimes more, he receives Facebook posts from Hampshire Country Club making all kinds of false claims about the proposed development and about those neighbors in opposition to the club. In sum and substance the club claims that the opposition is dishonest and trying to harm the village.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Jean Meyerowitz
541 Eagle Knolls Road
Larchmont, New York 10538

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andrew J. Maloney <AMaloney@kreindler.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 3:44 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: 'Maloney, Tara'; pmaloney@Investcorp.com; Eileen Bosco (emb140@icloud.com); Mayor Tom Murphy; 'vafur@vomny.org'; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

There are some who believe that the new condo residents will generate more tax revenue for the Village. This is a short term bait and switch argument. The additional residents will *drain* revenue at the end of the day because more Village services will be required for the additional residents. For starters there will be additional students in the overcrowded public schools, additional busing will be needed, additional sewage and policing of an entirely new neighborhood will be needed. The additional traffic in out of both ends of Cove Road will clog quiet streets that have long enjoyed and paid dearly for a quiet neighborhood. The wetlands will be destroyed and the green open space in town will be diminished. The only ones who can possibly favor this will be those who stand to make money off the sale and reckless development of the space.

All of the above will drag property values down in one of the more affluent neighborhoods in the Town and Village. If you think "that's too bad for the rich folks," think again. When property values go down, property taxes go down. When property taxes go down, revenue for the town and village go down just as the population is increasing and requiring more revenue for the additional services.

This is a terribly bad idea.

Sincerely,

Andrew J. Maloney

511 Orienta Ave

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Donald LaSala <donlasala@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 3:49 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Dear Planning Board of the Village of Mamaroneck,

This letter is to express my opposition to the proposed developments at the Hampshire Golf Club site, in what we long time residents call the Hommocks, a wetlands area with has a Nature trail which my wife and I use for bird-watching all seasons.

As a tax-paying, third generation resident of the Village, I strongly believe that the condominium developments presented as an alternative to the existing proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village, a disaster for the environmental quality /quality of life for current and future generations of near-shore residents. This area has always been prone to seasonal flooding, which is worsening every year as climate change takes its toll on our shore communities.

It should be rejected as a viable alternative, as it will overtax the water/sewer/ road systems and will essentially be a 'boon-doggle' to allow a company profit and pass the social/future costs onto the tax-payers.

You were elected with a mandate, IMO, to protect and enhance the quality of life for residents, their guests and children, not to enrich developers looking for a novel angle to cash in. It is clear to me that those behind these attempted developments have no vision of the former but are dedicated to the latter.

Sincerely yours,

Donald F. LaSala, Jr.
621 Oakhurst Rd.
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Charles Guadagnolo <cguadagnolo@mcrtrust.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Charles Guadagnolo

1030 Old Post Rd.
Mamaroneck

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Daniel Kaplan <dkaplan@dorflaw.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 4:11 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Proposed Hampshire Development

Dear Planning Board,

My wife and I are long-time residents of Orienta Point. It is inconceivable that the Planning Board will approve the pending DEIS Proposal for construction of more than one hundred homes. There is no way that the Developer can ensure the safety of the people that may buy the homes if they are ever built. Those of us who have lived in the Community for a long time remember the tragedy that occurred when a surge of water took the life of a friend and neighbor on the property. Volunteer firemen have told us that, in an emergency, if there has been a rainstorm within a few days of an emergency, they could not evacuate people living on the property.

There are numerous environmental reasons why the Proposal is unsound. The so-called alternate to the one hundred housing project is an even worse use of the site and should not even be considered.

Respectfully,

Renee and Daniel Kaplan
1065 Seven Oaks Lane
Mamaroneck, NY 10543

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Stephen Giove <SGiove@Shearman.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 4:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Stephen Giove
541 Eagle Knolls Road
Larchmont, NY 10538

This communication and any attachments may be privileged or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this in error and any review, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. In such an event, please notify us immediately by reply email or by phone (collect at 212-848-4000) and immediately delete this message and all attachments.

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

February 14, 2018

Stuart Gilbert

1050 Nautilus Lane

Mamaroneck, NY 10543

To the Mayor and Board of Trustees of the Village of Mamaroneck-

My wife and I have raised our family in Mamaroneck and have deep roots in the area. But, maintaining a house like ours has become a burden we no longer wish to carry. My wife and I would like to "buy down," put away our snow shovels, remain in Mamaroneck and enjoy our senior years. We have no desire to sever ties with the community, our synagogue and close family friends.

Our goal has always been to find a quality condo or apartment complex with first class amenities. A tennis court outside would be of special importance to me personally. A golf course would be icing on the cake.

The sale of homes like those from my generation would create room for new younger families to move into Mamaroneck with fresh ideas and new energy- a "Win-Win" for all.

I am in favor of the new 55 plus condo community at Hampshire CC. I know many others of my generation have been reluctant to speak publicly but privately say "count me in if approved and built."

Regards,

Stu Gilbert

917 797.4242 cell

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u>
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course. I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/4/18	Dee Owen	404 Fairway Grn. Mamaroneck, NY	deewowen 404 @gmail.com	Dee Owen
5/4/18	Howard Green	404 Fairway Green Mamaroneck	hgreend8312 @gmail.com	Howard Green

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important!

Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u>
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course. I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/3/18	Judith Landau	604 Fairway Green	Judith.R.Landau@yahoo.com	Judith Landau
5/3/18	Tom Landau	" "	Docotis27@yahoo.com	TR JLD

Your Support is Important! **Petition**

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

RECEIVED
MAY 14 2018
BUILDING DEPT.

<p>The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u></p>
<p>Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course. I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.</p>

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/3/18	GREG GUDDEL	SAME ↓	GREGGUDDEL@GMAIL.COM	Gregory A. Gudde
5/3/18	DIANE GUDDEL	1101 FAIRWAY GREEN MAMARONECK, NY	DIANE64DEL@GMAIL.COM	Diane M Gudde

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/29/18	Tom Siemson	115 Ralph Ave.		Tom Siemson
4/29/18	Alex Davidson	723 Old White Plains Rd Apt B		Alex Davidson
4/29/18	Burt Billinger	516 Van Kenst Pl		Burt Billinger
4/29/18	Randy Scott	799 Old White Plains Rd		Randy Scott
4/29/18	Harry Jackson	731 Old White Plains Rd		Harry Jackson
4/29/18	Albert Lopez	250 Mamaroneck Ave		Albert Lopez
4/29/2018	Deane Drummond	739 Old White Plains Rd		Deane Drummond
4/29/18	Michael J. Puccio	195 Grand St	11	Michael J. Puccio

RECEIVED









MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

<p>The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.</p>
<p>Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.</p>

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/29/18	Alex Lopez	811 Hall St		
4/29/18	Tommy Laine	260 Grand St		
4/30/18	LARRY ALBERT	622 SECOND AVE S.T. MAMARONECK NY	l.albert@hamjournal.com	
4/30/18	Kathy Weeks	101 Rockland Ave Mam'k, NY 10543	Daleskittykat@yahoo.com	
4/30/18	J. Miller	136 Lib Lane		
4/30/18	RUDY SORIANO	265 MADISON ST		
5/1/18	Marcus Jackson	11 Madison St	MarcusJackson@gmail.com	
5/1/18	Robert Alexander	11 Madison St	ALLentRd19112@yahoo.com	

RECEIVED
MAY 14 2018
BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

<p>The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.</p>
<p>Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543</p>	<p>We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.</p>

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/1/2018	LAURET ALLEN	11 Madison St	LAURET11@Yahoo	Lauret Allen
5/1/18	DEE Hollinger	266 Waverly Dr	11dee826@att.net	Dee Hollinger
5/1-18	Tom Winters	151 Penn macar Rd	E + Boneisi	Thomas Winters
5-1-2018	SHAN Robertson	418 Mamaroneck Ave	sterin@G-mail.com	Shan Robertson
5/2/18	Tiffany Rawlings	725 olden Plms Rd	TSR781@Gmail.com	Tiffany Rawlings
5/2/18	Nancy Williams	286 Richbell Rd		Nancy Williams
5/2/18	Chris Dejesus	1421 Mamaroneck Avenue apt 2f		Christopher Dejesus
5/12/18	Cara Bay d	799 old wht pke		Cara Bay d

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck. Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/12/18	Gloria J. Cherry	725 Old White Rd.		Gloria J. Cherry
5/12/18	Jarrett Winchester	418 Mamaroneck Ave Mamaroneck, NY 10543	Jarrett Winchester @gmail.com	Jarrett Winchester
5/12/18	William J. Card	314 Chestnut Ave		William J. Card
5/12/18	Cristian Lopez	144 Washington St. Mamaroneck	CR-Lopez93@yahoo	Cristian Lopez
5/12/18	Lisa Anderson	723 Old White Rd.		Lisa Anderson
5/12/18	S. Humphrey	418 Mamaroneck Ave Apt 13		S. Humphrey
5/13/18	L. Wesley	627 Mamaroneck Ave		L. Wesley
5/13/18	Robert Hutt	614 2nd St		Robert Hutt

BUILDING DEPT.

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

[illegible]

Your Support is Important! **Petition**

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/1/18	M. Klein	Larchmont Acres	Clairement@aol.com	M. Klein
5/1/18	L. Riso	257 MAMARONECK AVE MAMARONECK	Louis Riso	L Riso
5/1/18	Josiane B	Seaview AV	JadenAnela @GMAIL.COM	Josiane B
5-1-18	PABLO R	Dubois Ave.	JPablo88@usa.com	Pablo R
5-1-18	Sohu Pranty	219 MALE	FDNY 37@fdnyc.com	Sohu Pranty
5-1-18	Sullivan Bose	553 Palmer Ave MAMARONECK		Sullivan Bose
5/1/18	D Mand	101 Fenimore Rd Mamaroneck		D Mand
5/1/2018	Natalie Ludwig	101 Fenimore Rd Mamaroneck		Natalie M. Ludwig - Har L

Natalie M. Ludwig - Har L

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck. Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/27/18	Rodrigo Camacho	953 WESTMONT ST #1A	RODRIGO.CAMACHO@GMAIL.COM	Rodrigo Camacho
4/27/18	Sarah Flans	2 SEARD ST NY 10543	SARAH.FLANS@GMAIL.COM	Sarah Flans
4-27-18	Lisa Loiacono	129 Ellsworth Harrison NY	Loiacono_Lemon	Lisa Loiacono
4/27/18	Melanie DeRosa	602 Rockland Ave Mamaroneck NY 10543	derosa@yale	Melanie DeRosa
4/27/18	Anibal Carasin	191 Woodlawn Avenue New Rochelle	AVENUE NEW ROCHELLE	Anibal Carasin
4/27/18	Manny Pappas	332 Richbell Rd APT B2	mpappas1015@gmail.com	Manny Pappas
4/27/18	George Pappas	332 Richbell Rd APT C4	peppase@whi.com	George Pappas
4/27/18	Ulysses Davis II	94 Augustine Rd.	UDAVISII@GMAIL.COM	Ulysses Davis II

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/27/18	William Colangelo	105 Calvert St Harrison NY 10520	Colangelo23@gmail.com	William Colangelo
4/27/18	Kevin Marciano	215 Jensen Ave Mamaroneck, NY 10543	kmara970@gmail.com	Kevin Marciano
4/27/18	Jackie Bender	61 Myrtle Blvd. Larchmont NY 10538	jbgrase@gmail.com	Jackie Bender
4/27/18	VINCENT AGUIARDO	63 Myrtle Blvd Larchmont NY 10538	Vinny2685@yahoo.com	Vincent Aguiardo
4/27/18	Kenix GAO	255 Mamaroneck Ave Mamaroneck NY 10543	Kenix316@hotmail.com	Kenix Gao
4/27/18	Scott Colangelo	1065 Seven Oaks Lane Mamaroneck 10543	SKIS4718 AOL	Scott Colangelo
4/27/18	Mark Mayne	1204 Sunnyvale Ave Mark		Mark Mayne
4/27/18	FRANKIE Capelli	222 Centre Ave New Rochelle NY 10805	Frankkigirl@gmail.com	Frankie Capelli

RECEIVED









MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/27/18	Joseph Palancia	114 mamaroneck Ave	Jag5242@hotmail.com	
4/27/18	Cristina Savone	106 Travers Ave	Savone13@gmail.com	
4/27/18	Daniela Laize	Jefferson Ave	dlaine19@gmail.com	
4-28-18	Mario Grella	Hunter St	Mgrella.321@gmail.com	
4/28/18	Michelle Arena	Hunter St.	michellearena93@aol.com	
4/28/18	Gastak	Rye Rd		
4/28/18	Vicente Reyes	658 Mamaroneck Ave	Reyes193@gmail.com	
5/1/18	Jashmy			

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2018









BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important!

Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
 1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck. Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
4/27/18	Michael Rivers	116 Elliot Ave	mikerivers116@yahoo.com	
4/27/18	Charlie Delean	160 Waverly Ave	Cs.delean@gmail.com	
4/27/18	Chris Sprague	255 100 25 Purchase Street	sprague@hotmail.com	
4/28/18	Helder Santos	410 5th Street Mamaroneck	Heldro@yahoo.com	
4/28/18	Deena Viapiano	542 Webster Ave New Rochelle	Dceenai68@aol.com	
4/28/18	Michael Sitzer	416 Mamaroneck Ave	michael.sitzer@gmail.com	
4/29/18	Donna Gorman	123 MAMARONECK AVE		
5.1.18	Amy Noh	225 MAMARONECK AVE		

RECEIVED







MAY 14 2018

BUILDING DEPT.

Your Support is Important! Petition

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5-1-18	Dana Cozart	PO Box 612	dncozart@yahoo.com	
5-1-18	Debra Nash	225 Mamaroneck Avenue		
5-7-18	Stephanie Rodriguez	509 Fayette Ave	struadriguez3298@gmail.com	
5/10/18	Bill Cole	11 BATES RD HARRISON		
5/11/18	Maxine Arendt	71 Hilltop Ave New Rochelle, NY	bebotaranda@gmail.com	
5/11/18	Dana L. L.	37 Michelle		
5/11/18	Louisa Arciniegas	1015 Calhoun Ave		
5/11/18	Michael Arciniegas	1015 Calhoun Ave		

RECEIVED









MAY 14 2018

Your Support is Important! Petition

BUILDING DEPT.

The Residences at Hampshire Country Club- Proposal
1025 Cove Road, Mamaroneck, New York 10543
www.theresidencesathampshire.com/get-involved
www.theresidencesathampshire.com

The Residences at Hampshire-Proposal 1025 Cove Road Mamaroneck, NY 10543	The Residences at Hampshire Country Club Proposal, which complies with the property's current R-20 zoning, will bring significant economic benefits to Mamaroneck and the region. Assure landowners rights! <u>Help support a development that will bring Jobs, Commerce, and Revenue to Mamaroneck.</u> Expected to generate approximately \$5.2 million in taxes annually, including approximately \$1.5 million net (after costs associated with 57 new students) in annual school taxes, which would be enough to fund eliminated programs without increased taxes on our neighbors.
Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board Mamaroneck, NY 10543	We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and support this proposal.

Date	Printed Name	Address	Email	Signature
5/1/18	Frank Madaleno	1514 N Jans St	aaholiday@gmail.com	
5/1/18	Keith Hagan	447 N. Barry Ave	KCHUTST@aol.com	
5/4/18	Patricia Doherty	215 Jensen Ave	PD1306@gmail.com	
5/4/18	Amy Terpela	123 Mamaroneck Ave	Amy.Terpela@yahoo.com	
5/7/18	Will Lamar	9 Carroll Ln	williamlamar@yahoo.com	
5/11/18	Theresa Dunk	50 Victoria Rd.		
5/11/18	Joe Faber	123 Mamaroneck Ave		
5/11/18	Brian Gassich	123 Mamaroneck Ave		

PUBLIC COMMENT
HAMPSHIRE COUNTRY CLUB PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECEMBER 2017 DEIS -SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
RECEIVED May 14, 2018
THROUGH
May 14, 2018

254 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC TRAFFIC COMMISSION Public Comment

255 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC HOFSTETTER Public Comment

256 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC LIBO Public Comment

257 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC KIM Public Comment

258 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC MISSE Public Comment

259 05 14 2018 Hampshire CC CORDERO FAGE Public Comment

260 04 11 2018 FELSHER SANDY photos submitted at meeting

261 04 11 2018 FELSHER OTHER RAIN STORM 2015 AND 2016 photos submitted at meeting

262 04 11 2018 FELSHER DECEMBER 1993 NOR EASTER photos submitted at meeting

263 04 11 2018 FELSHER MARCH 2 1918 NOR EASTER photos submitted at meeting

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Abby Roberts <abbyroberts46@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor and Board; Elena Decunzo; Sally Roberts; Kelly Wenstrup
Subject: Re: Traffic Commission recommendations to the Planning Board re: the Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") for the Hampshire Country Club Planned Residential Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Betty-Ann

I wanted to follow up briefly on Hampshire's comments in the last public hearing regarding the the comments the Village of Traffic Commission submitted on the DEIS (in email below). In the public meeting, Hampshire gave verbal assurances that Cooper Avenue would only be used for emergency access and not as a two-way road.

One quick point on this:

I can only discuss in my personal capacity as the Village Traffic Commission did not officially vote on this, but there is concern that once the Cooper Road access point is built, it will be easy to turn it back into a one or two way road for the development, as originally envisioned by Hampshire (relevant excerpt from DEIS executive summary below) and as Old Boston Post Road is currently used by the rest of Orienta. Should that happen, there's no guarantee that the developer will then install appropriate sidewalks and other traffic safety measures along Cooper and Old Boston Post Road, as recommended by the Traffic Commission and various other commenting parties.

One thought would be to ask Hampshire to sign a provision that says that if, at any point in the future, Cooper is turned into a one or two way road for use by the development, Hampshire would be required to install a sidewalk from Cooper Avenue to the Old Boston Post Road / Boston Post Road intersection.

Thanks in advance,

From the executive version of the DEIS:

Cooper Avenue, which currently extends from Old Boston Post Road to its terminus at the driveway to an existing golf course maintenance facility, will be extended into the Project Site and will intersect with Cove Road. **This roadway extension is currently envisioned to be a two-way, full access road for development residents to provide access to Boston Post Road (US Route 1) via Old Boston Post Road as well as a road for emergency access.** Improvements to Cooper Road will be required to widen the existing roadway to accommodate the increased two-way traffic. A new internal roadway, "Road A", will intersect with Cove Road and terminate in a cul-de-sac.

On Thu, Mar 29, 2018 at 9:30 PM Abby Roberts <abbyroberts46@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi Betty-Ann,

The Traffic Commission held a special meeting tonight to discuss the Hampshire DEIS. Elena took minutes, but given the timing issues of the April 11 hearing I wanted to pass on our recommendations to the Planning Board as soon as possible.

Traffic Commission Recommendations to the Planning Board:

1. **Comprehensive Plan Update.** We recommend that any development of this size and scope be considered in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan Update plus new chapter on sustainability and mobility that's in progress, particularly considering the Village of Mamaroneck's goal and prioritization of more complete streets, walkability and bicycling.
2. **Old Post Road Sidewalk.** We recommend that since the plan shows Cooper Avenue as being an egress and ingress to the development, resulting in more traffic on Old Post Road, that to protect the pedestrians and bicyclists on Old Post Road a sidewalk from 1015 Old Post Road to Boston Post Road be installed and better protection for the pedestrian and bicycle lane that is perpendicular to Cooper Avenue be provided.
3. **Hommocks school safety.** We recommend that Hampshire provide more data on the volume, noise and safety of large truck and construction vehicle traffic driving down Hommocks' Road by the middle school during the school day.
4. **Hommocks Construction Truck hours.** We recommend that Hampshire revisit the hours it proposes to drive construction trucks down Hommocks' Road by the middle school, given the hours proposed are during prime school travel hours and the middle school students are unattended.
5. **Traffic data review.** We recommend the traffic data sets be revisited during greater time, school and seasonal windows, when the data may be greater than currently reflected in the report which looks at one-hour windows during March, which is not prime walking / biking time for residents.
6. **Old Post / Boston Post Intersection Traffic.** We recommend that Hampshire provide a solution to the increase of traffic at the intersection of Old Post and Boston Post road during the 7:30-8:00am timeframe, and inability of the traffic to clear the traffic light as a result of additional traffic from using Cooper Avenue as an egress / ingress by the Development.
7. **Sight Lines / Cooper turn on blind curve.** We recommend Hampshire revisit the sight lines and trees analysis in the context of increased collisions. For example, even if Hampshire cuts back the bushes to the right side of Cooper onto Old Post Road as proposed, the curvature to the right is still blind and could increase traffic collisions.
8. **Emergency vehicle road access.** We recommend Hampshire explain how they would enforce and widen privately-held streets for sufficient emergency access and egress and ingress, and without resident agreement. For example, we believe Cooper would have to be widened for emergency vehicle specified use.
9. **Private Road Cost to Village.** We recommend the planning board take into consideration that private streets historically have caused access, safety and traffic issues that have resulted in unexpected costs and other burdens to the Village and surrounding communities.

10. **Event Parking.** We recommend Hampshire provide a more specific analysis of expected resident and non-resident event parking following the planned decrease in golf course size and renewed focus on events as a source of income.

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: John Hofstetter <johnmhofstetter@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 6:13 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer; Ingemar Sjunneberg; Lou Mendes; Richard Litman; Kathleen Savolt
Cc: Victor Tafur; Mayor Tom Murphy; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt
Subject: Hampshire Country Club Condo Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Planning Board -

What is the community benefit of this project?

Years of construction, traffic, noise, less open space, a small nine hole golf non-contiguous golf course no golfer in their right mind would play coupled with the added benefit of spreading emergency service workers ever thinner in the event of flood/hurricane and less of a flood plain for run off in a critical environmental area.

It is my understanding that in order to apply for a subdivision of a property and the creation of a Planned Residential Development in the Village of Mamaroneck there needs to be a calculation of the number of lots that the property can be subdivided and can legally be built upon as the property stands now. After that calculation is made and only after that calculation is made can, the lots can be amalgamated as part of a cluster development in exchange for providing something of benefit to the community. (Other than being cheaper for the developer this current project as proposed does nothing for the community.)

So first we need to calculate how many buildable lots are currently in the Hampshire development area given environmental and geographic considerations. The majority of the property is a flood plain with certain very limited areas that are elevated on buildable knolls. Most of the property on it's very face would not be buildable in it's current state for safety reasons.

The property is currently zoned R20 which requires a minimum of 100 feet of street frontage on a public street for a subdivision to be legal. Given that virtually none of the property is located adjacent to a public street none the applicants claims and calculations as to the number of "allowable" lots are accurate. The property in question is not adjacent to Hommocks Road as that is the Town of Mamaroneck and subject to Town Zoning. The applicant has no "as of right ability" to develop more than a handful of homes (maybe none) on the property - if their current lots adjoin a public street, which it appears is almost non-existent as Cove Road, Eagle Knolls are for the most part private roads.

Secondly - the Village is under no obligation and is not required to accept road/streets from a developer that would allow street frontage and a more dense development (le more lots) than they would be currently entitled to build upon.

In the current environment where there is concern about schools being overcrowded, we are at a tipping point. We have seen a lot of new construction with in the Mamaroneck school district. This new development could be and probably will be the tipping point to where we need to build new

schools, a very expensive proposition - One that would grossly outweigh any minimal tax base increase this project would provide.. Historically a developers assumptions have been drastically under played in relation to the number of people who will have school-aged children moving in to their homes. With a lot more still to come online in the near future it will be a growing problem. Also if concern is the fact that nearly every new construction building in the Village Of Mamaroneck has had to come back before this Board or the Zoning board for variances, special permits, changes of use or deviations in some way. Something is amiss with all of the new construction has to come back before you with revisions.

I encourage you to reject this application and let the developer step forward with an appropriate project, or for that matter continue to operate as a golf club.

Sincerely,

John M Hofstetter 914-584-1845 johnmhofstetter@yahoo.com

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Ethan Libo <ethanlibo@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. Sincerely,

Ethan Libo, 541 Eagle Knolls Road Larchmont, NY 10538

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Danny Kim <info@theresidencesathampshire.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 8:23 PM
To: Mayor Tom Murphy; Victor Tafur; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Betty-Ann Sherer
Subject: I support The Residences at Hampshire Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Village and Planning Boards,

I support the plan to develop a portion of the Hampshire Country Club property with a residential use. Adding a residential component to the Club will ensure that it can remain an important recreational and social resource for the community. It will also provide important tax and employment benefits to the region and the Village.

The current plan to add beautifully-designed carriage houses and single-family residences consistent with the character of the neighborhood, would also preserve a large portion of the golf course and the associated open space on the property. To the extent that the Village would want to preserve a larger portion of the property, then it should permit Hampshire to incorporate residences into the clubhouse and maintain the entire 18-hole golf course.

I respectfully urge your support for this proposal.

Sincerely,

Danny Kim
138 Friendship Ct
Zip Code: 10603
Email: dannyckim1@gmail.com

Submitted from: 67.82.205.218
ID#: 78

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Gersende MISSE <gersendemisse@yahoo.fr>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 9:42 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am a resident of the Village. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative.

Sincerely,

Gersende Missé

615 Forest Av

Mamaroneck

Sent from my iPhone

Betty-Ann Sherer

From: Andrea Cordero Fage <talktome_cordero@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:29 PM
To: Betty-Ann Sherer
Cc: Mayor Tom Murphy; vafur@vomny.org; Nora Lucas; Leon Potok; Keith Waitt; Lisa Boillot; gregory.fage@hotmail.com
Subject: Opposition to Hampshire condo development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Members of the Village of Mamaroneck Planning Board,


I am a resident of the Village, and I strongly oppose the plans for the development of the Hampshire Country Club. I believe that the condominium development presented as an alternative to the proposed housing development would be terrible for the Village and should be rejected as a viable alternative. It would have a highly negative impact on the environment, worsen the overcrowding problem in schools, cause significantly more traffic that would be more dangerous for the neighboring school and its students, present flooding issues, etc., to name a few.

The developers are clearly not concerned with the best interests of the village and its residents, only how to get the best return for capital and make a profit.

Please allow us to maintain the beauty and integrity of our village and deny this applicant.

Sincerely,

Andrea Fage, 10-year resident




023_012

Home Fair Camera

05/22/13

d135341.jpg NNNANANN



023 015 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
d135343.jpg NNNANANN



023_027_Home_Fair_Camera_05/22/13
d135351.jpg NNNANANN



377 005 Home Fair Camera 02/27/18
snapshot_001.omp HHHHHHHH




023 019 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
d135349.jpg NNNANANN



023 023 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
d135350.jpg NNNANANN



380 004 Home Fair Camera 02/27/18
Untitled--S-ned-07.jpg NNNAN&NN




023_040

Home Fair Camera

05/22/13

d135355.jpg NNNANANN



023 044 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
d135356.jpg NNNNNNNN



023 065 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
Sandy - Ha~owards.jpg NNNANANN



023 004 Home Fair Camera 05/22/13
d135335.jpg NNNANANN



023_008

Home Fair Camera

05/22/13

d135336.jpg NNNANANN

GOLF CART
PARKING
ONLY



885 d135354.jpg 10 11/6/2012 2/4/2013
Home Fair Camera



24979244_001_(Hampshire County Club.jpg)





