



# TOWN OF SAUGERTIES PLANNING BOARD PROJECT OVERVIEW FORM

<b>Project Name:</b>	Terramor Catskills
<b>Location:</b>	Off Route 212 and Cottontail Ln
<b>S/B/L:</b>	27.2-8-28; 27.2-8-32.110



## PROJECT INFO:

### Description:

The proposed action involves constructing a 75 unit "glamping" campground on a site consisting of two (2) parcels totaling 77.51 acres in the Moderate Density Residential (MDR) zoning district. The applicant proposes a number of accessory structures and uses including employee housing. The project proposes +/- 18 acres of disturbance, and on site water and wastewater treatment facilities.

**Zoning:** Moderate Density Residential

**Min. Lot Size:** 1 acre

**Acres:** 77.5 acres

**Use Type:** Campground

### PB Approval(s) Requested:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sketch Plan           | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Subdivision |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Subdivision       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Final Site Plan                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Lot Line Adjustment     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Modification           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Use Permit    | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____            |

### Site Utilities & Access:

**Water:**  Well  Public Water District: proposed

**Sewer:**  Septic  Public Sewer District: proposed

**Access:**  Private  State  County  Town

### Third Party Approval(s) Needed: (check any that apply) N/A

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NYS Dept. of Health            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ulster County Health Department |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NYS Dept. of Env Conservation. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Town Highway Dept</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NYS Dept. of Transportation               | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US Army Corps of Engineers     | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NYS Historic Preservation Office          |   |

### Record of Appearances

3/15/22- Sketch Plan Review  
7/19/22- Review Continued, NOI prepared

## PUBLIC HEARINGS & REFERRALS:

### Public Hearing

Required: Y  N

Noticed on: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Opened: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Closed: \_\_\_\_\_

### County 239 Referral

Date Referred: \_\_\_\_\_

Response Rec'd: \_\_\_\_\_

### ZBA Referral

Referral Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved  Denied

### Additional Review Requested

Requested From	Comment Requested   Received
Town Engineer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Legal Counsel <input type="checkbox"/>	
Other Traffic Eng.	

## SEQR REVIEW:

### SEQR Classification:

Type I  Type II  Unlisted

### Environmental Assessment Form (EAF):

Date of initial submission: 2/27/22

Latest Revision (if applicable) 7/1/22

Short Form

Long Form  Part 1  Part 2  Part 3

**Coordinated Review:**  Yes  No

Intent to Serve as Lead Agency: 7/19/22

Lead Agency Notice Sent: 7/26/22

Lead Agency Declared: \_\_\_\_\_

### Determination of Significance:

Negative Declaration: \_\_\_\_\_

Positive Declaration: \_\_\_\_\_

Published in ENB: \_\_\_\_\_

Building Department 7/20/22



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Howard Post, Planning Board Chair  
Members, Saugerties Planning Board

**FROM:** Adriana Beltrani, AICP  
Max Stach, AICP

**RE:** Terramor Catskills; SBL 27.2-8-28/32.110

**DATE:** December 14, 2022

**CC:** Becky Bertorelli, Planning Board Clerk  
Alvah Weeks, Building Inspector  
Dennis Larios, P.E., Town Engineer

---

We are in receipt of the following items:

- Comment Response Letter dated August 1, 2022 prepared by Kevin J. Franke, Director of Environmental Services for the LA Group, including attachments 1 through 8.
- Expanded EAF prepared by the LA Group, dated December 6, 2022, including the following Exhibits:
  - A: Updated Environmental Assessment Form;
  - B: Aerial Image of Project Site;
  - C: Cut/Fill Diagram, Dated December 1, 2022;
  - D: Geotechnical Engineering Report, prepared by Terracon, dated December 5, 2022;
  - E: Wastewater Collection and Disposal Memorandum, Prepared by CT Make, dated November 30, 2022;
  - F: Water Supply, Treatment and Distribution Memorandum, Prepared by CT Male, dated November 30, 2022;
  - G: Air Quality Report, prepared by Ramboll Environmental and Health, dated December 2, 2022;
  - H: Indiana Bat and Northern Long Eared Bat Habitat and Acoustical Survey, dated October 5, 2022;
  - I: NYS DEC/USFWS Correspondence;
  - J: Visual Impact Assessment, Prepared by the LA Group, dated November 2022;
  - K: NYS SHPO Correspondence, dated February 10, 2022;
  - L: GPI Technical Memorandum, Summer Traffic Counts, dated August 30, 2022;
  - M: Central Hudson Will Serve Letter;
  - N: Noise Assessment Report, prepared by Alliance Technical Group, dated November 11, 2022.
- Site Plan Set, updated December 2, 2022 prepared by the LA Group et.al. containing 86 Sheets including Survey, Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Sewer and Water;
- Letter to Chairman, prepared by Charles J. Gottlieb, dated December 2, 2022 containing NPV and Public Comment Response (December 6, 2022); Site Plan Application, updated December 2, 2022 signed by Ahmed Helmi.

We previously reviewed additional documents, enumerated in our August 12, 2022 memorandum.

The applicant seeks site plan and special use permit approval for a 75 unit “glamping” campground including a wellness center, activity lawns, swimming pool, lodge and facility operations including a maintenance facility, golf cart storage and on-site employee housing. The project is proposed on two (2) parcels totaling 77.51 acres in the Moderate Density Residential (MDR) zoning district. The applicant proposes to gain primary access from Route 212 with emergency access via Cotton Tail Lane.

The applicant previously submitted documentation for the August meeting and requested to adjourn to a future meeting date. Our office reviewed that submission and provided comments to the Planning Board prior to the request for adjournment, therefore, comments from August are captured herein:

### **Process 12/20**

1. Per advisement of the Planning Board Attorney, the Lead Agency Notice of Intent should be recirculated to the Town of Saugerties ZBA to ensure all interested agencies have been notified of this project. A revised NOI is attached to this memo.
2. The applicant has submitted an Expanded EAF with supporting studies and analyses as exhibits. Although not strictly required by SEQR, due to the degree of public interest, and the volume of environmental information included in the expanded EAF, we suggest the Planning Board schedule an informal public hearing prior to adopting a Part 2 EAF. There is likely to be input by the public on the potential impacts that may occur, and it would be helpful to hear those prior to the adoption of the Parts 2, 3 and determination of significance (positive or negative declaration).
3. The Ulster County Planning Board has provided comment. The Saugerties Planning Board should review these comments to ensure that required modifications are satisfactorily addressed. We generally agree with the required modifications enclosed and provide additional comment in the SEQR section below.
4. Additional information regarding wetland delineation, jurisdictional determination, stream classification and associated surface water disturbance permits must be provided.
5. A more robust landscaping plan may be warranted given the results of the Visual Impact Assessment, assessment of potential nuisances, land clearing and similar comments provided by the Ulster County Planning Board.
  - a. The Planning Board may wish for an NPV botanist to review the planting plan and seed mixes proposed.

### **Application**

1. The applicant proposes to merge the two parcels as part of the application, a subdivision application will be required and should be coordinated through the Planning Board secretary.  
**12/20 remains relevant- 8/16- The Lot Consolidation Plan should be included as part of the complete set of plans.**
2. The application forms must be signed by the preparer.  
*8/16- Comment remains relevant.*  
**12/20- Addressed**

## Planning & Zoning

3. In issuing a Special Use Permit, the Planning Board must consider the supplemental requirements set forth in the zoning code and can request additional studies or analyses to support its review. Based on our review, specific consideration of the following provisions is warranted:

§245-34.D states:

- a. (g) Smoke. No emission shall be permitted of a shade equal to or darker than Ringelmann Smoke Chart No. 2.  
*8/16- Comment remains relevant*  
**12/20- See SEQR discussion below. The applicant's studies indicate that wood smoke from untreated wood will not equate to Ringlemann No. 2 or similar measurement.**
- b. (h) Odors. No emission of odorous gases or other matter shall be permitted in a quantity or of a type that permits it to be detectable, other than by instrument, at the property line.  
*8/16- The applicant points out that in addition to wood smoke, odors from grill stations and other food preparation may be detectable at the property line.*  
**12/20- See SEQR discussion below.**
- (i) Other forms of pollution. No emission of fly ash, dust, smoke, vapors, gases or other forms of air pollution shall be permitted which can jeopardize human health, animal or vegetable life or which otherwise contributes to the deterioration of or detracts from adjacent properties.  
*8/16- To be reviewed by the Board. The applicant indicates that this is met.*  
**12/20- See SEQR discussion below.**
- c. (o) Character and appearance. The character and appearance of the proposed use, buildings, structures, outdoor signs, and lighting shall be in general harmony with the character and appearance of the surrounding neighborhood and of the Town of Saugerties and shall not adversely affect the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Town.  
*8/16- To be reviewed by the Board.*

*Lighting. The Lighting Plan appears to demonstrate 0 footcandles at the property line in all but two locations which are located at the entrance drive. It appears that the entrance light exceeds .1 FC into the right of way of Route 212.*

- i. Specifications for tree mounted lights must be provided.*
- ii. The K value or warmth of the lights should be provided.*
- iii. Two road lights are modeled on the plans, LB and LC, however only one road light is specified- are LB and LC the same design?*

*New landscaping is proposed to create "green buffers" and reduce impact to the neighbors. These consist of a mix of eastern hemlock and rhododendron. The Board may wish to request a visual impact analysis including line of sight profiles and photo simulations of existing and proposed viewpoints where appropriate to demonstrate that the proposed distances and screening are adequate along parcel boundaries.*

**12/20- Lighting comments remain relevant. See SEQR and Site Plan comments below. A Visual Impact Analysis has been provided as Exhibit J in the Expanded EAF.**

- d. (q) Sewage treatment and water supply. The adequacy of available sewage disposal and water supply services supporting the proposed activity or use shall be sufficient to meet the needs of the proposed activity or use. This consideration shall include, but not be limited to, the suitability of water supply and sanitary sewage facilities to accommodate the intended use and adequate means to protect surface and groundwater from pollution.

*8/16- More information should be provided to the Board by the Town Engineer and applicant regarding the feasibility of locating the proposed water and wastewater treatment infrastructure on the site. In particular, the requirements of the SPDES permit, and discharge into an intermittent stream should be discussed. Correspondence with NYS DEC should be provided.*

*The applicant indicates that step-drawdown and constant rate pumping tests will be performed on the wells and water quality samples will be collected. The applicant offers that neighboring wells may be monitored to determine impacts. This may be a valuable exercise for the Board to facilitate.*

**12/20- We defer to the Town Engineer regarding satisfaction of this comment. We note that well and pump testing was completed and submitted as Exhibit E and F- Water and Wastewater Memoranda prepared by CT Male, dated November 30, 2022. Correspondence from NYS DEC regarding SPDES permitting does not appear to be provided in the December submission.**

- e. (s) Nuisances. The proposed use shall not be more objectionable to nearby property owners or occupants by reason of noise, fumes, vibration or lighting than would be the operations of a permitted use.

**12/20- comment remains relevant- 8/16- The applicant's comment response letter [August 1, 2022] seeks to compare the proposed project to other uses permitted in the MDR district. The response indicates that the South Peak subdivision permitted 43 single family homes and would be capable of supporting 50-60 single family homes. This is inaccurate. The approval resolution for South Peak subdivision was for the approval of 23 single family lots, a reduction in density largely due to the depth to bedrock and difficulty of locating individual septic systems on the site. In addition, the same subdivision would today be subject to §245-26, Conservation Subdivisions in the LDR, MDR and HDR Zoning Districts, where lot or unit density would be based on net lot area as opposed to gross lot area. While this exercise has not yet been performed, "constrained land"<sup>1</sup> as defined in the code is clearly present on this site, and we therefore question whether 50-60 single family homes would be permitted or feasible on this site at this time, as claimed.**

**The applicant claims that the use would be permitted if owned by a government entity. Public campgrounds rarely involve the type of facilities, densities and improvements being proposed by Terramor, and typically have greater buffers to residences. In most cases public campgrounds are proposed as elements of larger state parks that allow a range of outdoor activities. Such campgrounds would not usually be concerned with nuisance impacts to local residences due to significant separations between public campgrounds and nearby residences in most cases. It should also be considered that any public recreational facility would typically be more sensitive to resident (and voter) concerns than private recreational facilities.**

**The applicant also posits that a publicly operated recreation facility or jail would be potentially permitted in the district may produce noise, amplified sound and high levels of lighting. These are not convincing arguments. First it is a stretch to interpret a jail as a**

---

<sup>1</sup> §245-56: CONSTRAINED LAND- Land containing one or more of the following: state- and/or federal-protected freshwater wetlands; one-hundred-year floodplains or flood hazard areas; watercourses; steep slopes of 25% which are 2,000 square feet or more of contiguous sloped area.

government office or building. Jails are complex facilities, not just buildings, and in most cases are pre-empted from local zoning. As for public recreational areas, these are listed as elements of public open space, and usually would include playgrounds, athletic fields and similar, which would usually only be operated during daylight hours or lit only for pre-arranged special events. A more intensive recreational area such as a public golf course, stadium or other area that involves significant lighting and public address facilities, if not pre-empted from local zoning, would likely require a special use permit as an “Amusement and recreation service... not otherwise classified.”

In our opinion, the Planning Board will need to consider the potential for nuisance from smoke, odor, noise and lighting and determine if the proposed use is more objectionable than those permitted as-of-right. This is a real issue based on the proposed density of campsites and proximity between campsites and neighboring residences, and the lack of mitigation or project changes in response to this issue.

- f. (v) The design of structures and the operation of the use (including hours of operation) shall ensure compatibility with surrounding uses and with the scenic and visual characteristics of the Town.

*8/16- Per the Town of Saugerties code, the tents are likely considered structures (the Board may wish to confirm this with the Building Inspector). The applicant response seems to only address the design characteristics of buildings on the site. As discussed, the tent locations adjacent to neighboring residences should be demonstrated to be compatible and/or sufficiently screened from view.*

**12/20- Future submissions should include more detail regarding materials and color palate to be used for buildings and signage. Information has been provided to the Board including the Visual Impact Assessment, hours of operation and noise restrictions and building elevations.**

§245-11.I includes the following paraphrased considerations:

- g. The Planning Board shall consider the following: Overcrowding of units; and the extent to which noise or light interferes with the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties.

*8/16- See above comment 3.d regarding lighting. The applicant proposes to conduct a noise evaluation to demonstrate compliance with this section. We have suggested to the applicant that operational noise such as truck backup signals be included as part of the assessment.*

**12/20- See below SEQR discussion.**

4. Campsites are now proposed along the western boundary of the site which are located near to existing residences and residential lot lines. A field investigation conducted on June 7, 2022 showed these sites are clearly visible from these existing residences. While forest cover is shown on the plans as a buffer, the forest cover actually lacks significant understory, consistent with mature eastern hemlock forests. At least 7 or 8 tent sites depict fire pits situated between the tent site and the property boundary. With the proposed design, a fire is likely to be visible from the existing residences and woodsmoke (both smell and visible smoke) could carry over to adjoining residential parcels. (See below image which depicts a residential structure from a camp site proposed at the time.)

- a. The applicant should suggest methods to ensure that these sites meet the above referenced special permit standards with relation to screening and buffering campsites and campfires from adjacent residences.

*8/16- See above comment 3.d. The Board may require a visual impact assessment to determine whether the proposed screening, a mix of eastern hemlock and rhododendron is sufficient. We note that fire pits*



*shown on the revised site plan are still located between the residence and the tent location- these may be visible through the tree line without sufficient screening.*

**12/20- The Visual Impact Assessment demonstrates that proposed sites are clearly visible from adjacent private property. The Visual Impact Assessment does not appear to address the location of fire pits, which may be more visible than the tents. More extensive landscaping may be warranted.**

5. *Comment addressed-8/16, a building inventory has been added to sheet L-2.0. 45 "Woody 35" and 30 "Woody 45" are proposed and are interchangeable.*
6. The comment response letter states that the maximum capacity of a Woody 35 tent is 6 people and for a Woody 45 tent is 8 people. This equates to a capacity of 510 guests at the facility. The Water and Wastewater Basis of Design Reports indicate that the maximum capacity of the campsites is 240, which vastly underrepresents the possible worst-case scenario.

*8/16- Total number of tents is confirmed to be 75 with a maximum capacity of 240 at full occupancy.*

- a. It seems that these lower numbers are based on average occupancy rates from the Bar Harbor site. We question whether this Bar Harbor site is representative of the proposed site in terms of market economics and demographics.

**12/20 remains relevant- 8/16- The applicant indicates that the market reach for this site is similar to the Bar Harbor location but will likely be a greater mix of couples than families. No supporting evidence has been provided to the Board at this time. We note that Bar Harbor is approximately 4.75 hours from Boston while Saugerties is approximately 2 hours from New York City- does this have any bearing on the visitor makeup and occupancy rates?**

- b. We defer to the Town Engineer on what standard to design a water or wastewater system, but to meet the hard-look requirement under SEQR, a "reasonable worst-case standard" should be utilized, which would be related to full occupancy, or if full occupancy is not reasonably likely to occur, then some percentage of full occupancy that is reasonably likely to occur. The Planning Board may wish to impose an occupancy restriction based on the capacity outlined by the applicant to establish environmental determinations and/or findings, and for the wastewater and potable water facilities.

*8/16- Comment partially addressed. Capacity and occupancy has been clarified: 240 maximum guests, 32 employees can be housed on site not including the general manager and their family. We continue to defer a detailed assessment of the water and wastewater systems to the Town Engineer and note that the Welcome Center, Wellness Center and the Mess Hall are not included in the BOD reports.*

**12/20- We defer to the Town Engineer in the review of the most recent reports.**

7. Traffic. We question whether traffic impacts from this resort campground should be assessed as a traditional campground/RV park or as a resort hotel. We suggest that the Planning Board engage with a Traffic Engineer to review this and other traffic related questions.

*8/16- The applicant indicates that the resort hotel trip generation would likely only generate 12 more vehicles than that projected by the June 2022 Traffic Impact Study and would not warrant additional analysis.*

*The area proposed to be cleared to improve sight lines to the south, per recommendations in the TIS, should be shown on the site plans. Correspondence with NYS DOT regarding whether proposed improvements within the right of way of Route 212 can be installed (shifting the speed zone transition and installation of a radar speed feedback sign) should be provided to the Planning Board.*

*Does the applicant propose any improvements to improve crash statistics at the Route 212 and Glasco Turnpike intersection per the TIS recommendations?*

**12/20- Above comments remain relevant- see SEQR discussion. An updated memo (August 30, 2022) assesses traffic counts conducted in February 2022 and again in August, concluding that counted volumes are 25% less than what was used to analyze the intersection.**

8. *Comment addressed 8/16. 10 tents will have an indoor and outdoor shower- this may be included as a condition of the special use permit.*
9. *Comment addressed 8/16. Accommodations for 32 employees is provided and clarified on Sheet L-2.0*
10. *Comment addressed 8/16- the GM house contains 3 bedrooms for the GM and their family. The house is not for general employee use. This may be included as a condition of the special use permit.*
11. The number of residential and non-residential employees and/or non-employee residents should be established. The comment response letter states that 42 employees are anticipated, split into two shifts. The letter totals 28 on-site employees, while the architectural drawings and BOD report indicate up to 48 individuals could be accommodated within the dorm and studio units. This calculation does not include the General Manager's House, as the capacity of this building is not clear (comment #8). **12/20 remains relevant- 8/16- Comment partially addressed. The applicant response states that 42 employees will be hired with housing for 30 employees. Elsewhere in the response letter and on Sheet L-2.0 housing is provided for 32 employees, though it is noted that two spaces are reserved and are not anticipated to be utilized all season.**
12. *Comment addressed 8/16. The kitchens serve only the employees staying in the dormitory style housing (24 employees). An outdoor grill is also provided. Not all employees will utilize the mess hall at once based on scheduling.*
13. The Building Inspectors should review the site, building and floor plans to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other applicable building codes that could impact site design. We believe this may be a concern with regard to employee housing as depicted in the architectural plans. **12/20 remains relevant- 8/16- Comment remains relevant.**
14. We have counted 168 parking spaces. A parking calculation reflecting the maximum capacity of the resort should be included on the site plans which differentiates guest parking from employee parking. The Planning Board shall determine the appropriate number of parking spaces (245-29(a)). *8/16- Sheet L-2.0 indicates that 44 parking spaces are dedicated to employees. Please check the label for employee parking, it indicates 22 parking spaces, but it looks like there are more than that on the plan.* **12/20- Total employee parking spaces depict 34 but the table indicates 44. Please check. Please confirm that 8 EV charging stations are proposed.**
15. *Firewood comment addressed 8/16.*
16. *Seasonality. Comment addressed 8/16. General Manager is on site year-round. Events are proposed only between May and October.*
17. *Dumpsters -Comment addressed 8/16.*



18. We note that 2-3 box truck deliveries could occur per day. Is this anticipated year-round? Where and when are these deliveries received? It appears that loading space is accommodated only at the maintenance buildings and the Lodge.  
**8/16- We defer to the Town Engineer and the Board whether truck turning movements, including for dumpster pickup, should be provided.**
19. *8/16- Comment addressed. Restaurant is open to guests only.*
20. While the notes sheet lists a diversity of plantings, the landscape plans indicate only the type of planting proposed (evergreen tree, deciduous tree etc). More detail should be submitted regarding landscaping given the ecological importance of the site.  
**12/20 remains partially relevant- 8/16- Additional information has been provided, however we may provide future comment as the visual assessment and other studies as may be requested by the Planning Board have been submitted. Per SEQR comments below, the Board may wish to request a Biodiversity Study/Habitat Assessment be performed for the site.**
21. *Addressed 8/16- The applicant has clarified that 30,000 gallons of propane is proposed to be used on site but only 3,000 gallons total is to be stored on site in separate 1,000 gallon tanks. Site plans have been revised to show the location of propane storage tanks.*
22. We defer review of the erosion and sediment control plans, grading plans, road profiles, construction details, water and wastewater concept plans and the SWPPP to the Town Engineer.  
**8/16- No response necessary.**

#### **Additional Comment 8/16-**

23. A number of rock walls are noted throughout the site, which are culturally significant on a local level. The applicant conveyed that the retention of these rock walls are important to the aesthetic of the site. We note a number of locations where these rock walls are within the limits of clearing- will they be rebuilt? Will the rocks be used elsewhere on the site? Restored rock walls should be shown on the overall site plan.
24. Are tents proposed to remain in place year-round? Can they handle the potential snow load?

#### **SEQR/Environmental Review- Updated 12/20**

1. This is a Type I action under SEQR as more than 10 acres is proposed to be physically altered. The Board previously circulated the Lead Agency Notice of Intent to involved and interested agencies. A revised NOI including the Town of Saugerties Zoning Board of Appeals is attached to this memorandum and should be forwarded along with a digital copy of the application to this potentially interested agency.
2. We have previously reviewed the long EAF Part 1 and provided comment. A revised Part 1 EAF has been submitted and reviewed by our office.
3. Next Steps- A draft Part 2 EAF had been provided to the Board prior to the September meeting however, the Board has not reviewed or adopted same. Since that time the applicant has submitted significant additional information in the form of an Expanded EAF. A SEQR public comment may be

opened to confirm that the Planning Board has received all of the information it needs to continue SEQR review.

4. Expanded EAF. An Expanded EAF was prepared to address potential impacts as outlined in the Part 2 EAF. We provide the following preliminary comments on the Expanded EAF and attached Exhibits:
  - a. Impact on Land- We defer substantive review of the Geotechnical Engineering Report (Exhibit D), Grading, Cut and Fill plans, SWPPP/SPDES permit to the Town Engineer.
  - b. Impact on Surface Water- We defer substantive review of stormwater and wastewater treatment/discharge to the Town Engineer. The project site includes disturbance to .39 acres of ACOE regulated wetlands. The project site contains one Class B stream and other intermittent streams which will incur disturbance. The wastewater treatment plant will discharge into on-site waterbodies.
    - i. Ducks Unlimited Fee in Lieu mitigation must be coordinated with the ACOE and correspondence provided to the Planning Board to demonstrate mitigations are appropriate to the permitting agency.
    - ii. A jurisdictional Determination for the ACOE wetlands remains to be provided.
    - iii. Per the August Comment Response Letter, p. 4, the streams on site must be classified by NYS DEC to determine permitting (Article 15 Protection of Waters) and wastewater discharge requirements. Correspondence with NYS DEC must be provided.
  - c. Impact to Groundwater- We defer review of this section to the Town Engineer.
  - d. Impacts on Air- 75 campfires are proposed associated with each campsite. We note that campfires most proximate to existing residential property lines (western property line) are 100 feet or more from the property line. While some campfires will be located closer to the southeastern property line, these properties are larger, and residential structures are located a significant distance from the property boundary. While the campfire smoke may not pose a public health risk, the analysis also relates to Special Use requirements related to nuisance and odors. We note that the use of untreated wood will limit the smoke opacity to comply with §245-34.D(g) – Ringelmann Smoke Chart 2 or better.
    - i. The applicant states that vegetation in the project area would reduce particulate concentrations by between 55-88%. This statistic appears to be based on a single study of vehicular emissions, and vegetation studied was limited to cedar, redwood and live oak. These species are not specified as vegetative buffers on the site plan. Cedar could be an appropriate addition to buffer plantings. The Applicant should address whether particulate associated with wood smoke is equivalent to vehicle emissions in terms of the ability for vegetation to filter.
    - ii. The analysis lacks discussion of typical wind patterns for the area as well as a discussion of cumulative impacts from multiple fires going at once.
  - e. Impacts on Plants and Animals- A detailed study was prepared to detect the presence of Indiana and Northern Long Eared Bat which found that approximately 17.5 acres of potential roost, foraging and transit habitat may be present on site and that Indiana Bat but not the Northern Long Eared Bat was detected on site. The NYS DEC confirmed that mitigations proposed are supported by the department (p. 11 Expanded EAF).
    - i. The mitigations proposed include control of outdoor lighting to be low level and motion-sensor. Details to this effect should be provided on site plans.

- ii. Tree clearing notes must be added to site plans if not already included.
- iii. We question whether mitigation #7 has been depicted on site plans. Campfire rings should be spaced away from wooded areas to keep smoke away from potential roost areas- is this specific to identified habitat areas or forest throughout the site?

Additional habitat analyses may be warranted given comments from the County related to sensitive wetlands and the Ulster County Core Habitat area. We raised this in our July memorandum as well. Ulster County recommends, as a minimum, that educational signage and delineated trails be respectful of wetlands and sensitive habitat areas. Educational signs and trail specific wayfinding signs should be shown and detailed on the site plans.

- f. Impacts to Aesthetic Resources- We have reviewed Exhibit J, Visual Impact Assessment and suggest that additional enhanced screening be provided along the western and southeastern property lines to screen and buffer the project from neighboring residences. While tent locations are assessed, fire pits are not included in the assessment. Consistent with the County comments, the degree that light from fires will be visible has not been demonstrated. In addition, enhanced vegetative screening is suggested by the County to offset the land clearing associated with the project. We suggest a full buffer planting be considered by the Board.
- g. Impact on Historic and Archeological; Open Space and recreation; CEA's- We take no exception to the applicant's discussion related to these resources. NYSHPO has provided a finding of no effect and CEA's are not present on or near the project site.
- h. Impact to Transportation- The area proposed to be cleared to improve sight lines to the south, per recommendations in the TIS, should be shown on the site plans. Correspondence with NYS DOT regarding whether proposed improvements within the right of way of Route 212 can be installed (shifting the speed zone transition and installation of a radar speed feedback sign) should be provided to the Planning Board. See above comments.
  - i. We note that this section concludes that there will not be any significant adverse impacts on parking, but parking is not discussed.
- i. Impact on Energy- Please confirm that 8 EV parking spaces are proposed, and that these parking spaces are considered in the total energy use estimate accepted by Central Hudson. A discussion of which buildings are heated and cooled is not included in the Expanded EAF. Utility plans should also indicate same.
- j. Impact on Noise, Odor and Light- See comments on Impacts to Air with regard to Odor.  
Light- See prior and recent comments on the lighting plan. Motion sensor lights should be identified on site plans.  
Noise- The Noise analysis predicted an increase in ambient sound levels of 3dBA or less at all receptors which is within the requirement.
  - i. Project quiet hours and restrictions on the use of amplified sound equipment are proposed mitigations for impacts due to noise as well as impacts to the Indiana Bat.
- k. Impact on Human Health. We note that PFOA's are not discussed in this section. Should NYS maximum contaminant levels MCL's for PFOA/PFOS change, the applicant will be responsible for meeting those requirements. We understand that regular well testing will be required to operate the facility.

- a. Consistency with Community Plans- The Planning Board should review the Comprehensive Plan goals presented by the Applicant.
  - i. We also note goal #6: “The Town and Village support, and encourage, planning policies that promote environmentally sound development ... The Comprehensive Plan also seeks to strike a balance between open space conservation and economic development as stated in the Open Space Plan.”
  - ii. P. 18 of the Expanded EAF states that the Campground will bring approximately 996 tourists at estimated capacity yearly to the Town. The occupancy estimates earlier in this report states 824 yearly guests based on Bar Harbor occupancy rates.
- b. Consistency with Community Character- It is unclear why the applicant identifies businesses located near the project site but does not characterize them. We note that of the 5 businesses mentioned, two are home businesses and Red Onion is the adaptive reuse of a residential structure for a restaurant.
  - i. When considering impacts to Community Character, the Planning Board should consider the following NYS DEC guidance: “Community character is defined by all the man-made and natural features of the area. It includes the visual character of a town, village, or city, and its visual landscape; but also includes the buildings and structures and their uses, the natural environment, activities, town services, and local policies that are in place...Changes to the type and intensity of land use, housing, public services, aesthetic quality, and to the balance between residential and commercial uses can all change community character.”

### **Site Plan 12/20**

Please note that given the size of the submission and the potential for revisions, we will likely have additional comments as the review process continues.

1. Boundary & Topo Survey. The source and date of the wetland delineation should be included in the map notes for all sheets.
  - a. Sheet 1- Item 12, check spelling of “item.” This plan shows a storm sewer easement- does this easement impact the development of the emergency access road proposed?
    - i. Are items 10 and 11 shown on the map? We are unable to locate the referenced easements.
  - b. Sheet 2- the applicant should be aware that several neighboring structures appear to encroach over the property boundary.
  - c. Sheet 4- Are the property boundaries for properties along Raybrook Drive accurate? They should be depicted to the roadway. It does not appear that existing adjacent residential structures are shown.
2. Landscape Architecture. We defer review of sheets L-1.1, 3.1-4.9, 6.1-6.6 to the Town Engineer. In general, numbering tent sites or labeling tent clusters would assist with referencing site plans.
  - a. L-0.0- A plant schedule is provided where a number of shrubs and perennials are not specified but they are listed- are these species proposed for a later time?
    - i. The Planning Board may wish for an NPV botanist to review the proposed seed mixes to confirm they are appropriate.
    - ii. In general, the plant schedule should be included on all plans where planting is proposed.
  - b. L-2.0- The Zoning Table must reference the zoning district and applicable overlays.

- i. Employee parking spaces do not equate to 44 spaces, are spaces included at the General Manager's home? Please check.
      - ii. Given the ecological sensitivity of the site discussed above, wayfinding signage should be included on the plans. We note the potential for guests to take "shortcuts" from campsites east of the wetland to access the lodge, pool and cabana. Visitors in the "Eastern Loop" could cross the wetland via the stone wall for example.
    - c. Sheet L-5.1-5.9-In general, these plans are busy with call outs. Consider consolidating information to the legend where possible (for example as relates to pavement types). Numbering tents on the keyed pages would also be helpful for reference.
      - i. The lighting symbology in the legend should be labeled by lighting type. Please ensure that the lights shown match the lighting plan (L-7.1-7.3) and the lighting details. (L-8.6). Please ensure that all lighting is specified including bollard lights, road lights (does a full circle symbolize two lights per post where a half circle indicates one?), tree mounted and building mounted lights.
      - ii. We reserve more detailed review of layout sheets, including landscaping, wayfinding and lighting for future submissions.
    - d. Detail Sheets- In general, color images, precedent images or product sheets depicting material and texture, should be provided to the Planning Board.
      - i. Sheet L-8.2- Material and color should be provided for the split rail fence, wood fence and privacy fence & gate. What are the gate posts made of for the privacy fence?
        - We note the privacy fence/gate seems to be labeled as "composite fence" elsewhere on the plans
      - ii. Sheet L-8.5- What types of grills are proposed? Details and specs should be provided for the grills to the degree that they are known. The detail for the "grill station" lacks sufficient detail- elevations should be provided.
        - The freestanding sign proposed cannot exceed 32 square feet per sign face. Please confirm the size conforms or indicate whether a variance is requested.
3. Architecture- Due to time constraints we defer review of these sheets to the next submission.
  4. We defer review of Sewer and Water Engineering sheets to the Town Engineer.

**TOWN OF SAUGERTIES PLANNING BOARD**  
SEQRA NOTICE OF INTENT TO BECOME LEAD AGENCY

**DATE:** July 18, 2022  
REVISED DECEMBER 20, 2022

**TO:** Involved / Interested agencies (see attached list)

**RE:** Kampgrounds of America, Inc. DBA Terramor Outdoor Resorts – Site Plan and Special Use Permit approval

This notice is issued pursuant to Part 617.6(b) of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

The Town of Saugerties Planning Board, as an involved agency, proposes to establish itself as Lead Agency for the proposed action set forth herein for purposes of conducting an environmental review pursuant to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act, or SEQRA) of the Environmental Conservation Law. The Town of Saugerties Planning Board is circulating herewith the annexed Application, together with Part 1 of the SEQRA Short Environmental Assessment Form, Application, Site Plan, and related exhibits. In accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(2)(i), the Planning Board intends to conduct coordinated review of this action.

**PROPOSED ACTION:** Application from Kampgrounds of America, Inc. DBA Terramor Outdoor Resorts for Site Plan and Special Use Permit approval, for the Project Known as Terramor Catskills Glamping Campground.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The proposed action is situated on 77.51 +/- acres of land with primary access from New York State Route 212, in the Town of Saugerties, Ulster County, New York.

The parcels identified on the Town of Saugerties tax maps are S/B/L # 27.2-8-28 and 27.2-8-32.110 (see location map attached to EAF).

**CLASSIFICATION OF ACTION:** Type I Action pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.

**DESCRIPTION OF ACTION:** The proposed action involves constructing a 75 unit “glamping” campground on a site consisting of two (2) parcels totaling 77.51 acres in the Moderate Density Residential (MDR) zoning district. The applicant proposes a wellness center, activity lawns, swimming pool, lodge and off-street parking spaces. Structures related to the facility’s operation include a maintenance facility, golf cart storage, and on-site employee housing. Primary access would be gained from NYS Route 212 with emergency access via Cotton Tail Lane. The proposed NYS Route 212 access area would require crossing of an unnamed Class B stream within a Federally regulated wetland, and approximately .25 acres of wetland disturbance. Water supply would be from on-site wells, and wastewater collection would involve a package treatment plant with surface discharge to an intermittent stream. The Project would involve 18.72 +/- acres of land disturbance.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.6(b)(3)(i) a Lead Agency is to be determined within thirty (30) calendar days of the date that the annexed materials are transmitted. Please state your agency’s interest regarding selection of Lead Agency and any potential environmental effects of the proposed Action. If you agree to the Planning Board being designated as Lead Agency, please sign the enclosed copy of this letter and return it to the Planning Board at the above address as soon as possible or transmit an email indicating your consent.

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that this determination, subject to agreement of the agencies involved, shall become effective 30 calendar days from the date of mailing provided at the top of this notice unless affirmative



consent from all involved agencies is received prior to that date. Failure to respond within such 30 days period shall be deemed to be the consent of such agency or entity.

**Please Check a box** below and return by mail to the address stated below or email to [bbertorelli@saugertiesny.gov](mailto:bbertorelli@saugertiesny.gov):

- [ ] The \_\_\_\_\_ agrees and consents that the Town of Saugerties Planning Board should act as Lead Agency for purposes of SEQRA review of the above mentioned project.
- [ ] The \_\_\_\_\_ does not consent that the Town of Saugerties Planning Board serve as Lead Agency. To contest lead agency designation, the undersigned intends to follow the procedures outlined in 6 NYCRR 617.6(b)(5).

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please return within 30 days of the mailing of this correspondence to:

Mr. C. Howard Post, Chair  
Town of Saugerties Planning Board  
4 High Street  
Saugerties, NY 12477  
845-246-2800 ext. 358  
[bbertorelli@saugertiesny.gov](mailto:bbertorelli@saugertiesny.gov)

As an involved or interested agency, please send any comments or questions you may have to the address noted above, for consideration by the Town of Saugerties Planning Board.

This Notice is being sent to the following involved/interested agencies:

United States Army Corps of Engineers  
New York District  
Western Permits Section  
Mr. Brian Orzel  
26 Federal Plaza  
New York, New York 10278-0090

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation,  
and Historic Preservation  
Technical Preservation Services Bureau  
C/o Sara McIvor, Regional Coordinator  
625 Broadway  
Albany, New York 12207

New York State Department of Environmental  
Conservation  
John Petronella  
21 South Putt Corners Road  
New Paltz, New York 12561

New York State Department of Transportation  
David Corrigan, PE  
11 Quarry Street  
Kingston, New York 12401

New York State Department of Health  
Corning Tower  
Empire State Plaza,  
Albany, NY 12237

Ulster County Health Department  
C/o Laura Bell, Environmental Health Manager  
Golden Hill Office Building  
239 Golden Hill Lane  
Kingston, NY 12401

Ulster County Planning Department  
Mr. Dennis Doyle, Director  
County Office Building  
PO Box 1800  
Kingston, New York 12402

Centerville Fire Company  
c/o Fire Chief  
859 Saugerties-Woodstock Road  
Saugerties, New York 12477

Town of Saugerties Building Inspector  
Mr. Alvah Weeks, Jr.  
Town Hall  
4 High Street  
Saugerties, New York 12477

Town of Saugerties Highway Department  
Raymond Mayone, Superintendent  
25 Churchland Road  
Saugerties, New York 12477

Town of Saugerties Water/Sewer Department  
Mark Resso, Superintendent  
PO Box 117  
234 Lower Hudson Street  
Glasco, New York 12432

Town of Saugerties Conservation Advisory  
Commission  
Town Hall  
4 High Street  
Saugerties, New York 12477

Town of Saugerties Zoning Board of Appeals  
Patti Kelly, Chair  
Town Hall  
4 High Street  
Saugerties, New York 12477

Town of Woodstock Town Board  
Bill McKenna, Supervisor  
47 Comeau Drive  
Woodstock, NY 12498

Diaz Memorial Ambulance Service  
Lisa Benjamin, General Manager  
P.O. Box 147  
Saugerties NY 12477

Woodstock Fire District Company 5  
Captain Dawn Neal-Ellsworth  
PO Box 222  
Woodstock, NY 12498