

From: Andy Galler <AGaller@philipstown.com>

Date: May 18, 2022 at 3:31:07 PM EDT

To: Neal Zuckerman <nzuckerman@philipstown.com>

Cc: CHERYL ROCKETT <crockett@philipstown.com>

Subject: RE: Keller Session Document “Questions Answered 2022-04-21-PB-HVSF Response to Public Comment” and Memo 5-17-22 from AKRF and Ron Gainer

Good afternoon,

I have reviewed the above-mentioned files which appear to be on the agenda to be discussed during the 5/19 Planning Board (PB) meeting. I thought a personal communication was better suited than a memo from the CB in regard to this matter.

I would like to point out that there is an unfortunate misinterpretation of presumed CB’s comments during a site visit conducted with Keller Session and Badey & Watson. This is then briefly referred to in the 5-17-22 AKRF/Ron Gainer memo. Excerpts from the Keller Session document are provided at the end of this communication for your convenience.

During the Conservation Board’s (CB) site visit, I not the CB made the specific comment that I believed a bridge as proposed could be constructed over the stream and wetland buffer along Snake Hill Road without significantly impacting either (during or after construction) if proper precautions and design were in place. But I went on to question why would an extremely expensive and visually intrusive structure be required providing egress on a blind curve? My personal thoughts on the proposed bridge were a preface and background to my very specific question and not the opinion of the CB. This question was not adequately answered by the applicant nor their two representatives at the site visit (Keller Session and Badey & Watson). I would appreciate it if this could be amended in a sensitive manner.

To date the CB has only had minor discussions regarding the HVSF proposal. We have been awaiting a presentation of the revised, scaled down plans to provide comments, suggestions, and concerns to the PB.

Excerpts:

Question 3c Have the wetlands and watercourses on the project been studied again to include the potential sedimentation during the construction and operation of the Snake Hill Bridge? What are the impacts of the construction and use of the Snake Hill Bridge in terms of disturbance to wetlands and watercourses?

“It is noted that the bridge proposes minor disturbance in the wetland buffer but avoids disturbance in the bed of the stream. The applicant reviewed this new entry on site with the Conservation Board who raised no concerns about its location. Any required permits for the construction of the new driveway will be reviewed by the Conservation Board.”

Question 12a How will the new bridge effect the wetland it is over?

“The applicant walked the site and the location of the proposed bridge with the Conservation Board who expressed no concerns about this new entrance.”

Question 13p Has the Planning Board requested and received evaluation on the bridge's wetlands impact from the Conservation Board?

“The applicant met with the Conservation Board on site offered a walking tour of the new bridge location and they indicated no concerns with the plan as proposed for this new driveway.”

Thank you,
AG

Andy Galler
Chairperson Philipstown Conservation Board