

Comments from 6/6/18 and 8/1/18 Public Information Sessions on MOD

Comments recorded by AKRF, Inc. – Town Traffic Consultants

1. Many Tamarack Drive neighbors commented on the very difficult sight distance (vegetation blocking sight distance) exiting Tamarack Drive (echoed by some other side street neighbors).
2. Lower speed limit on 202/35 near hospital. Concern was expressed specifically about cars speeding out of the Conklin intersection eastbound by Tamarack Drive.
3. Timing for Conklin Avenue and Bear Mountain Parkway. Once one platoon of vehicles eastbound gets the red light the opposite signal turns green for the westbound platoon creating no gap for exiting side street traffic.
4. Several questions about the ways cut through traffic would be reduced. Turn restrictions were discussed. No issues with BMP left-turn prohibition (folks were skeptical this would help calm traffic at BMP). No direct issues with relocating traffic to Conklin although no Conklin neighbors were specifically identified.
5. Comment about large trucks from Lowes and where they would go. Commenter believes trucks are using 202/35 today and will use it more into the future to go between Yorktown and Peekskill especially with BMP not allowing trucks. Question about whether trucks could be directed to a portion of BMP to stay off 202/35.
6. Adaptive signal concept well received
7. Straighten out approaches of 202/35 and Dayton Lane using church property to make the intersection safer and more aligned (comment from Peekskill Planner)
8. Several community members concerned about safety on 202/35 with a recent crash by Tamarack . Interest in seeing crash study that will be included in TIS.

Written Comments received at the meetings:

9. What is the anticipated rental rates for the apartments? Will they be affordable?
10. Concerns about increased traffic on corridor
11. Schools can't handle the influx
12. Seems like too much development in too small a spot
13. Provide this area of Town with sewers
14. There is a well at the corner of 204 Lafayette Avenue. Resident asks the Town to please consider the environmental impact of this project to this well. The well is 23 feet deep and stone lined and has approximately 17 feet of water at any given time.
15. School bus access to the project site
16. Buffer with hotel and residential area
17. Why so much medical space
18. Hotel should go somewhere but not here.

19. Professional marketing and promotion of the Town of Cortlandt to create buzz and attract businesses and young residents. Roll out the red carpet for potential investors.
20. How much of the traffic inflow/outflow will be from Route 202 and other streets?
21. Are there any plans to widen Route 202 or extend the Bear Mountain Parkway so the traffic can flow through and around better? If no then?
22. Speeds on Lafayette are a problem
23. Mailboxes across the street on Lafayette. Residents almost get hit crossing the street.
24. Wait a long time at the traffic signal at 202/Lafayette – can that be improved
25. Widen 202/35 now
26. Security around the walking path on the Lake. Who is going to monitor security around Lafayette?
27. Look into economic uses of the Lake. Good Work!
28. Speed on Route 202 is a concern
29. Impact on site distance on side streets of Route 202
30. More green time on the existing traffic signal for the Hospital as opposed to Lafayette Avenue – Why?
31. Traffic impact concerns on Route 202 – it is a two lane highway.
32. Concern about property values decreasing
33. Wildlife impacts near the wetlands – e.g. turtles, rabbits, birds etc.
34. For the residential buildings – will any be affordable or offered to lower income families?
35. Assisted Living is a nice thing to have in our Town. Traffic light is needed at Dayton Lane cannot make a left out of there now.
36. The MOD District should be expanded to include Conklin Ave which is a collector road between Route 6 and Route 202 and well within 1000’.
37. Expand MOD District further down Route 202 including large houses along the Route including Ogden, Tamarack etc. Some of these are large enough properties to accommodate more medical oriented offices.

Comments received via email

1. Turning onto 202 from Tamarack can be very hazardous. Since the installation of the light at Conklin many drivers traveling east leave that light at enormous speed. Many occasions I have look left and then made a right turn only to see a car on my bumper. The ability to see a car traveling east on 202 from Tamarack is very limited. It worsens when there are mounds of snow on the bank or if the weeds are too high. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive](#)

2. Trucks travel on 202. This is an even bigger concern now that Lowes will be opening in Yorktown. Going south on Lexington from route 6 is not a viable traffic route due to the slope of the street to the 202 light. Many trucks go south onto Conklin from route 6 and then travel east on 202. I believe that once Lowes opens truck traffic will increase. There has to be a safe way for trucks to travel east/west to route 9 or route 684 since these are the only highways that they can travel into the area. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
3. The proposal includes 368 residences. Regardless of the size of the apartment it is highly likely that there will be two adults in each (even the studio). The cost of renting in Westchester will require this. Cortlandt Manor is not a walking town. Nor is public transportation frequent. And so these will be two car households that bring a total of close to 700 residential cars onto 202. This excludes the retail and the medical office traffic that will also be on 202. I do not think 202 can support this. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
4. The current plan has only once entrance into the development with an emergency entrance on Lafayette. Seems like a lot of traffic for only one main entrance. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
5. Need to time the lights better from Lafayette to the Bear Mountain parkway and 202 intersection. I suggest you retime the lights through to Lexington Ave. Many times during rush hour going east on 202 I am the last car the can fit through the Croton 202 light. All of the lights need to coordinate. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
6. They explained that they may consider trying to move traffic off of 202 on to the Bear Mountain Parkway. My suggestion is that the side streets, Arlo, Old Locust and possibly Locust need to be restricted to right turn only onto 202. Currently when traffic is bottlenecked on the Bear Mountain, cars will turn to these side streets (especially Arlo) thinking the traffic is better and further bottle neck 202 going east. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
7. I would have hoped that this plan would include the ability for the houses along Tamarack to be placed on a sewer system. Unfortunately, this is not in the plan. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
8. I understand the need for the medical offices, assisted living and the 92 bed hotel. That is something that could benefit anyone living in the Town of Cortlandt. [Ida Wise-Murray 39 Tamarack Drive]
9. Traffic: as it stands now for any resident turning off of Tamarack onto Route 202 right or left, is an absolute nightmare. The speed that other drivers get up to as they are approaching our street is at least 40mph if not more. It is to the point that I feel we are

taking a big breath and hoping for the best when we turn out. The sight line visibility is VERY Limited any time of the year, it could be weeds in the summer or snow in the winter, either way not good. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]

10. With the above mentioned traffic nightmare it's not a question of do we need housing because the answer is yes, the question becomes why do we want more traffic? We cannot afford another 600-700 residential cars dumping into the already heavily congested area. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
11. The plan calls for 5 story buildings, has a site visibility plan been completed for our homes that are adjacent to this property? If not I think we all deserve one. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
12. Retail stores: We do not need another bank or pharmacy. We have more than enough of them in Cortlandt and the size of the Retail area needs to be smaller. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
13. Conklin Avenue Light: we need to address the timing and amount of cars that this light lets through at any given point. It needs to be fixed regardless of this project. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
14. Entrance and Exits: Will there be another exit (not Emergency) to this property or will all the traffic come out onto Conklin Avenue? [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
15. With the very first proposal for VS Construction we were promised to be tied into a sewer system. Why has that been squashed? No mention of that with this proposal. As a resident that will be impacted shouldn't we be able to bring that back into a positive for us? [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
16. On a nightly basis I am stuck in bumper to bumper traffic when driving on 202. I cannot imagine having the huge number of cars associated with the proposed construction added to the traffic mess we already have. [Kim Trapanese 4 Nancy Lane]
17. I am a property owner on Tamarack. On a nightly basis I am stuck in bumper to bumper traffic when driving on 202. I cannot imagine having the huge number of cars associated with the proposed construction added to the traffic mess we already have. It is extremely difficult to get out of Tamarack as it is - too many cars, and many going way too fast. I had hoped the new light would have helped but that is not the case. I would like to state my concerns over a project of this magnitude being proposed and I am counting on the Town to keep the current residents quality of life status quo - in a perfect world —traffic would get better not worse. I am confident the results of the

traffic survey will show the traffic on 202 cannot absorb the numbers of cars associated with the proposed construction. Please keep the residents of the surrounding area of the MOD involved with the process by announcing meeting and sharing information as it comes in. [Chrissy Czuy 43 Tamarack Drive]

18. The other concern I have is the development is proposed on wetlands. I read the proposal and I do not understand why this property is not included in the rules of building on a wetland? The proposal says it is excluded from these rules. I would like an explanation..... or maybe (I am hoping) I read it incorrectly?? My property is on the downward slope from the proposed site and as you know water flows to the lowest point-- I am concerned I will have water issues on my property since wetlands are included in the building proposal close to my property. Again- I hope I am reading the plans incorrectly and that the wetlands will not be disturbed in the construction. [Chrissy Czuy 43 Tamarack Drive]

19. On which of the town's websites and where on that website will I find questions and answers from the Town wide public survey and the 9 Chapters and 205 policies? [Robert and Eleanor Rose, 20 Tamarack Drive]

End of Comments received as of 8/6/18.