

April 26, 2023

Site Planning
Civil Engineering
Landscape Architecture
Land Surveying
Transportation Engineering

Environmental Studies Entitlements Construction Services 3D Visualization Laser Scanning

Chairperson Steven Kessler and Members of the Planning Board Town of Cortland Planning Board 1 Heady Street Town of Cortlandt, NY 10567

RE: JMC Project 14088

Hudson Ridge Wellness Center 2016 Quaker Ridge Road Town of Cortland, NY 10567 Response to Landscape Comments for Site Plan Review

Dear Chairperson Kessler and Members of the Planning Board:

We are writing to address the following comments received regarding the review of the Landscape Plan for the above-mentioned project from Mr. Kobasa as well as our subsequent conversation with Chris Kehoe. We would also believe it is important to note that the prime focus of the Landscape Plan was to develop substantive screening and buffering for the property, especially to accommodate the concerns of the neighbors to the north.

We do not recommend making changes to the species on the north property line because we met individually with each property owner, and viewed the Hudson Ridge property from their homes, yards and decks and discussed the type of landscaping they were requesting which is represented in this plan. As such, we have tried to accommodate Mr. Kobasa's and Mr. Kehoe's recommendations where they seem most appropriate as discussed below:

# Comment:

a. If they are going to use White Pines as screen trees, they should plant large evergreen shrubs or small ever green trees in front of them or behind them so that when the white pines start shedding their lower branches there will still be screening.

# Response:

Of the (12) Pines specified (8) are along the road area just behind the existing arborviate hedge. In this area as the pines lose their lower branches, visibility into the site will still be screened as there is an existing arborviate hedge closer to the road. We have; however, placed an additional (8) shrubs at the base of the pines to

JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC | JMC Site Development Consultants, LLC

accommodate lower branch loss. The other (4) pines are interior to the site and do not require additional plantings because the loss of their lower branches does not have an impact on screening as they are interior to the site.

#### Comment:

b. Can they swap out the Spruces they are proposing for Native evergreens such as White Spruce, Eastern Red Cedars, American Holly?

# Response:

The proposed Norway spruce and Serbian spruces while not native, are very well-behaved non-natives that do not spread as invasive species do. They were chosen for their quick growth rates, dense habit, and disease resistance. We have switched some of the spruces to white spruces wherever practical but not along the northern property line because the Landscape Plan along the northern property line reflects the desires and concerns of the adjacent neighbors. The American Holly and Cedars are very slow growing, so we did not use them in this area.

In lieu of some of the Arborvitae within the site we switched them out to the Eastern Red Cedar, again where we thought they would work best.

#### Comment:

c. Can they propose an alternative to Green Giant Arborvitae. While this is considered more deer resistant to others in a cold winter the deer will eat the bottom half of the plant if there is no other food source.

# Response:

The arborviate has been proposed primarily along the northern property line/fence line. The fence will serve to protect the Arborviate along the fence, and it is our recommendation to our client that they either "burlap" the bottom of the fence or spray the fence with deer repellent prior to the winter season. Again, the arborvitae has been chosen for the fast growth, density, and disease resistance, and requested by several of the neighbors.

#### Comment:

d. Could the plan accommodate a few more trees that provide a habitat for birds/butterflies and a little "less boring" overall.

# Response:

The primary goal of the Landscape Plan is to provide privacy and screening for the neighbors and for the property. The Applicant agrees that adding native flowering trees would be mutually beneficial for the property for aesthetic interest as well as

the environmental habitat enhancements. The revised plan includes (21) native flowering trees (Dogwoods, Shadblows and Redbuds).

We believe that the revised plan responds to the comments of Mr. Kobasa and Mr. Kehoe where most practical and that the flowering trees address the comment of "birds and bees". It is also important to note that the (11) proposed white oak trees provide tremendous habitat value as well as screening.

In closing we would like to note that this is an existing site, with existing buildings and existing roads and parking, and is already fully landscaped. We believe that the previously proposed evergreen screening addresses concerns of the adjacent neighbors for screening and the new additions/modifications (species changes and flowering trees added) reflect the most recent comments from Planning Board members and staff and are more than generous particularly in in light that this site is fully developed and landscaped.

Sincerely,

JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture & Land Surveying, PLLC

Lucille V. Munz

Lucille V. Munz, RLA, ASLA Senior Landscape Architect

CC: Chris Kehoe, AICP Planning Director Steve Laker, Hudson Wellness Ralph G. Mastromonaco, PE PC

 $p:\2014\14088\archive\deliverables$  and submissions  $\2023-04-26$  planning board submission \imp planning board comment response letter  $\deliverable$  hudson ridge wellness  $\deliverable$   $\deliverab$ 

