Nolan Landscape Architects, PLLC
P.O. Box 8619, Pelham NY 10803
(914) 522-4372
snolan@studionolan.com

July 6, 2023
Yost responses in red below.

TO: Daniel Roemer, Assistant Building Inspector
Valerie Monastra, Consulting Planner
Sarah Collins, Secretary to the Planning Board

FROM: Suzanne Nolan, ASLA
Nolan Landscape Architects, PLLC

DATE: July 5, 2023

RE: **87 Lefurgy Ave.**
Tree Inventory, Arborist Report, Tree ID Plan dated 6-22-23 for
7-6-23 Planning Board Meeting Submission

The proposal is for the construction of a single-family home on an undeveloped lot.

Comments:

1. As requested, an arborist report has been prepared identifying genus, species, and condition of on-site trees, keyed to a plan. Of the 50 on-site trees, 15 are natives and the remainder are invasive Norway Maple.

2. The applicant's tree valuation count does not appear to have changed:
Removals: 32 trees ranging in size from 6" dbh to 40" dbh, totaling **583 inches of tree diameter**
50% Replacement: 583 x .5 **= 291.5 caliper inches**

3. The applicant proposes a replacement planting of 62 trees and 35 native shrubs.
They assume each tree is 3" caliper, or a total 186 caliper inches of replacement.
They propose 35 native shrubs to address the **105.5" deficit** of tree replacement.

4. The 62 trees proposed are:
(40) "Emerald green" arborvitae for hedging/screening
(9) Norway Spruce
(5) American Holly
(7) Canopy trees: Oaks, Maple, Sweet gum
(1) understory: Star magnolia

Recommendations/Requirements:

1. As previously stated, it is unclear whether a steep slopes analysis has been done to determine the extent of regulated trees on the site. Trees with a dbh of 3" or greater on slopes of 25% or greater meet the criteria for regulation. Proposed trees on slopes of 25% or greater are called out as 3" caliper.

87 Lefurgy Ave.
Tree Inventory for 7-6-23 Planning Board Mtg.

2. As previously stated, plans should show a limit of disturbance. Currently, the engineering drawings show tree removals only related to the construction of the house and driveway while the Landscape Plan included in the PowerPoint presentation made to the Planning Board shows tree clearing throughout the property, dramatically increasing the area of disturbance. No justification for removal of trees beyond the disturbance for construction has been provided. Limit of Disturbance has been updated on the Landscape Plan. It is also noted that trees are to be removed for solar panel exposure on the Landscape Plan.
3. The 105.5" deficit of tree replacement needs to be addressed. In addition to increasing the number of replacement canopy and understory trees (there is only (1) understory tree proposed), consideration should be given to limiting clearing to the area of building and driveway construction. Any additional clearing should preserve native trees in good condition. For shrubs to count significantly toward tree valuation their numbers will need to increase. note:(1) 40" tree was removed from removal list Eight understory Native Amelanchiers have been added and shrub count has increased.
4. Tree and shrub choices should be deer resistant. The Emerald green arborvitae that figures so heavily in the planting plan and toward tree valuation will likely attract deer. There is 6' high deer fencing proposed on th rear and side of the property. Neighbor also has deer fencing.
5. Root protection zones for trees to be preserved should be shown on an appropriate plan. Grading should not occur within root protection zones. Tree Protection added to T-100 Tree Plan
6. The tree protection detail provided on sheet T-100 should be corrected as it shows a maximum size of the protection area that should be labelled as the minimum area. Revised.
7. The Landscape Plan should show proposed grading as well as the utility easement. Proposed grading and Easement is on L-101, also see Civil dwgs.
8. A revised Landscape Plan should be formally submitted to the Building Department to facilitate further review and tree valuation determination.

END