



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board

4383 Albany Post Road

Hyde Park, NY 12538

(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax

“Working with you for a better Hyde Park”

**MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 20, 2021, 6:00 PM
PUBLIC HEARING/WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING OF
THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD**

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA LIVE STREAMED MEETING:

MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN

ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR

DIANE DI NAPOLI

CHRISTOPHER OLIVER

BRENT PICKETT

STEPHANIE WASSER

ANN WEISER

**OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB CONSULTING ATTORNEY
BONNIE FRANSON, PB CONSULTING PLANNER
LIZ AXELSON, CONSULTING PLANNER
PETER SETARO, PB CONSULTING ENGINEER
KATHLEEN MOSS, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PB SECRETARY
COUNCILMAN KRUPNICK, TOWN WEBMASTER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
CARRAIGE TRAILS (f.k.a. CROFTON MEWS)	2-6
CAMP VICTORY LAKE MASTER PLAN & PHASE 1 CHURCH	6-34
HYDE PARK TOWN CENTER-PARK PLAZA	34-35

Chairman Dupree: Good evening all. Thank you for joining us at the Hyde Park Planning Board meeting of January 20th, 2021. I'll first note that this meeting is being held under the auspices of Governor Andrew Cuomo's Executive Order 202.1, last extended as 202.87, which allows for virtual meetings of public officers. Let me first confirm that each Board Member is alone and not with anyone who might try to influence your decision or vote tonight.

Ms. Weiser: I am alone

Ms. Wasser: I am alone

Mr. Pickett: I am alone.

Mr. Oliver: I am alone

Ms. DiNapoli: I am alone

Vice-Chair Dexter: I am alone

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Let me first, have us all join in saluting the flag of this great nation. *The Chairman led the Pledge.*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

CARRIAGE TRAILS (a.k.a. Crofton Mews)

Extension of Site Plan Deadlines for Construction (#16-96)

Location: 1269 Route 9G

Grid #: 6165-01-340743

In Attendance via Zoom:

Louis Kaufman, Elbow Creek LLC

Matthew Rudikoff, Rudikoff Associates Inc

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for the extension of site plan deadlines to complete construction for Carriage Trails. Also known to us as Crofton Mews. May I get a motion to reopen the public hearing.

MOTION: Ms. Weiser

SECOND: Mr. Pickett

To re-open the Public Hearing for Carriage Trails (f.k.a. Crofton Mews).

Aye Ms. Weiser

Aye Ms. Wasser

Aye Mr. Pickett

Aye Mr. Oliver

Aye Ms. DiNapoli

Aye Vice-Chair Dexter

Aye Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE

Aye-7 Absent-0 Nay-0

Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Mr. Pickett. All in favor, please raise your hand and signify by saying aye. Aye. Any nays or abstentions. No, there being none, the public hearing is open. We are joined by several gentlemen tonight. Mr. Rudikoff, it's good to see you again after so many years. Mr. Rudikoff is a planning consultant representing the applicant, Mr. Kaufman and One Key LLC. I'm sorry, of Elbow Creek LLC, there is a different entity owning this. So if you recall, from our last meeting about six months ago, we extended the public hearing to allow the applicants to sort of restart the process. Most of their permits have expired and I think we were sort of expecting to see more permits, but instead we were sent a revised concept plan that I forwarded to all, that basically reduces some of the density. In the meantime we have new materials that have been submitted as well, but that's not the subject of tonight's public hearing. Nonetheless, Mr. Rudikoff, Mr. Kaufman, do you want add anything to what I had to say?

Mr. Kaufman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have, one of the conditions, before was that we certify the wetland map, which we did and that was submitted. The wetlands have expanded a little bit. And one phase, the last phase actually, was impacted. So we have submitted to you for your review a modification of the plan. We want to maintain most of the plan. We'll refresh all of these permits. But there's going to be less impact now because we are going to be reducing the 317 units to what appears to be if the plan falls out right, about 249 units. So Mr. Rudikoff has been guiding us. We're trying to put in place, you know, trying to focus on what permits we need to refresh. One of the things you had also mentioned at the last meeting was that the Planning Board wanted to guide the approval that you'd prefer we get some feedback from the Planning Board before we pursue with the DEC. So we are, you know, obviously the times have created quite a barrier to moving forward at the speed we like, but we're moving forward now. So we've given you what we're pursuing. We are going to firm that up a bit more, get some input from the Planning Board and the consultants and have to have a meeting hopefully next week. And so that's where we are. And we're going to need time to put this in place and I think you'll be very pleased with what we're going to come up with. I don't know if Mr. Rudikoff, if you'd like to add to that. That's my spiel.

Mr. Rudikoff: Well, yes, I'd like to say, first of all, hello to you, Mr. Chairman. My pleasure being before you again and other members of the Hyde Park Board. And of course your professionals who I've known and worked with for many years, Pete and Liz and Bonnie as well, and Victoria as well. So I'm looking forward to having this be a really informative and substantive, helping one can make it in a very informative and a well-informed process. So where we are now is, we would like to either have this extension approved or have the public hearing continued, following through on your current strategy for some amount of time. And we would expect that within that amount of time, there might be some thresholds identified that you would want the applicant to have accomplished within this timeframe, whatever it be. And then it just strikes me that with the Town's Planning Board's willingness to sort of have this pre-submission meeting, that's tentatively scheduled for next week and with your consultants being there to discuss actually exactly the subject, which is the permitting, that it might make sense if the Board was open to it, that they might consider identifying what thresholds the Town would want us to comply with at that meeting. So at the 27th, that could be a discussion topic. What things do we think we can get done in X number of months that would show responsible progress and allow us to

keep moving. I know personally that since I started working for Lou and George Brandt, that they'd been very supportive. They've been pushing, you know, coming into something like this and getting your arms around so many years of approvals and involvement, it takes a little time and integrating it over. Now, I think we're pretty well organized, and I think we'll have a very positive meeting. And that's what we'd like to do, you know, either get the extension approved or have the public hearing continued, setting thresholds at this upcoming meeting.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you both. And we look forward to working with you. I did send an email out to consultants and to the Planning Board Members. I'm just waiting to hear back from them to see what time we should set it for on the 27th. But I think that would be the best and most productive way to proceed. Unfortunately the size of the files that you sent, it just took too long for them to download and when I tried to blow it up, it became all blurry. So, thank you, Mr. Kaufman for sending paper copies. To, I think Ann and Diane, there'll be three paper copies submitted for us before the meeting next week, for our pre-application meeting. Also I think I wrote to you in an email that I think it's hard for us to actually extend the time to complete construction if you don't have the permits needed to even start construction. So what we were prepared to do tonight, was to extend this public hearing to April 21st, so that would give us both time to work out what needs to be submitted and how to sort of chart a path forward as you said. I think we can identify what areas we need to sort of update SEQR as... fairly easily as well. First, any comments from consultants, on us just trying to do the extension? I didn't believe there would be. Tad comments from you? Thank you. Any comments from the Board, again this is just commenting on the time to complete construction, the hearing? Then, I see Mr. Myers is here. Tom has been here through pretty much every time we've had a public hearing on this application, Tom has spoken. He represents more or less concerns from the Moose Lodge. Tom, can you unmute yourself and speak? There you go.

Mr. Myers: Thank you, Mr. Chairman for giving me this opportunity to speak. I know the public, doesn't say this much. I do want to thank all the Board Members for all the time they give to public service. I do know how much time you volunteer. This is the 13th anniversary of the approval of the site plan?

Chairman Dupree: The last approval, yes, was the 13th anniversary. That's correct.

Mr. Myers: The last approved site plan or the 25th anniversary of the project.

Chairman Dupree: That is correct as well.

Mr. Myers: And you're here for another two-year extension. Well, you're two and a half year now. If you move it, postpone it, they'll have gotten three years out of the last two-year approval. When would you feel comfortable to say, why don't we start again to figure out what's going on?

Chairman Dupree: In essence, I'm going to be honest with you, since you brought that topic up, I would love for them to withdraw the application, start anew, but I have a feeling that their investors might wig out to put it politely. So, because in essence, we won't be starting completely anew, but we will be updating information in terms of SEQR, because I think traffic may be impacted in a different way. We probably need to circulate this to DOT

again, because there were extensive improvements required by the Department of Transportation. And they're reducing density - when I say traffic impacts, everything is going to be lower impact than what it was before by the reduction of density. You just heard Mr. Kaufman say. We will be looking to update a lot of the information that was relied upon way back when.

Mr. Myers: Okay. And don't get me wrong. I would love to see development back there. It's been a few days. But I have reviewed, online, the plans from the 2007 approval. If I might have permission, may I talk to Mr. Setaro offline to discuss what I've seen in the plans that might need a little updating.

Chairman Dupree: Peter?

Mr. Setaro: Sure, that's fine with me as long as it's acceptable to Board, I don't have a problem with it.

Mr. Myers: Well, that's why I was asking basically, the Board's permission, if I could talk to you, Pete. Pete, and I know each other.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah, we go back a ways.

Chairman Dupree: I'm fine with that. I believe the rest of the Board is too. Anyone have any objections? Nope. Fine.

Mr. Myers: Okay. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dupree: Pete will keep us apprised of what the discussion is about.

Mr. Setaro: Absolutely.

Mr. Myers: All right. I'd say thank you very much. And again, to all the Board Members, thank you for your time.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. And Happy New Year to you and Patricia. I haven't seen her in a while either, but it's good to see you.

Mr. Myers: Oh, right now for the last year, we've been keeping a very low, quiet profile.
Laughter.

Chairman Dupree: Like all of us. Thanks again.

Mr. Myers: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Councilman Krupnick, I don't believe anyone else signed up to speak about this application. Councilman Krupnick appears not to be here.

Councilman Krupnick: I'm here. Sorry, I thought I was unmuting myself and I wasn't. No one else is here.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. There being none. Then just reminder to the consultants and to Diane and Ann Weiser, please respond whether you want me to set this meeting up on the 27th for 11:30, noon or 12:30. We have our agenda meeting at 10:30 and we have only Hospice House that's on it, that I know of so far. If you think an hour is enough, we could start at 11:30. Just respond by email rather than now. And Mr. Rudikoff and Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Arico, I believe you wanted him here too. Oh, that's right, our secretary just reminded, we also have a new application for the SPCA. They're going to be amending their site plan. So I can already tell that it's probably going to be 12:30 before we'll set this meeting up because they're both going to take a while. Hospice House is a revised application, it's a quite large one and the SPCA is brand new to most Planning Board members. It'll be a matter of first impression as they say in courts. So, I'll send you an email tomorrow to set up the time with the zoom link. In the meantime, may I get a motion to adjourn this to April 21st.

MOTION: Mr. Pickett

SECOND: Ms. Weiser

To adjourn the Public Hearing for Carriage Trails (f.k.a. Crofton Mews) to April 21, 2021.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-7 Absent-0 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Any further discussion? All in favor, please raise your hands and say aye. Aye. Motion carries. You'll get an email from me tomorrow, Matthew and Lou. Take care.

Mr. Rudikoff: Thank you and good night everyone.

WORKSHOP:

CAMP VICTORY LAKE MASTER PLAN & PHASE 1 CHURCH

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2018-66)

Location: 277 Crum Elbow Road

Grid#: 6265-04-630350

*In Attendance via Zoom: Richard Rennia Jr., Rennia Engineering Design
Peter Sander, Rennia Engineering Design
Stuart Markowitz, SMA Architecture
Ken Bingham, SMA Architecture
Deanna Lambert, NE Conf. Corp. Seventh-day Adventists*

The Applicants presented the revised Master Plan and Phase 1 Site Plan, received December 22, 2020 and an unofficial draft of the architecture for the Phase 1 Church. Received January 20, 2021. The Board and its consultants made comments, suggestions and asks questions about the plan revisions.

Chairman Dupree: The next application is a workshop. This is for Camp Victory Lake. As everyone knows, this is a rather large site located at the intersection of North Quaker Lane and Crum Elbow. The applicants were last before us back in January, 16 of 2019. At the time we had a very lively discussion on the architecture of the proposed sanctuary, which should be in phase one. Also talking about a traffic study, which the applicants have now submitted, and there were various other issues. One of which I just want to raise tonight again, that Victoria Polidoro, our attorney brought up about whether the lots would be consolidated where the northern lots are, that are along Cardinal Road. Because right now it would take a transportation corporation, if you wanted to just, add those buildings to the central sewer system. Otherwise the applicant submitted a very complete application, at least in my opinion. This is going to have many, many, many phases. This is a master plan. The first phase would be a rather large religious sanctuary - a *large* structure. And for most Board Members, I hope you've had a chance to see the latest sketch of the design that was done today because I sort of admonished their representatives, Mr. Sander, that we might not hear comments unless we saw them. Because I've learned the danger of speaking too soon sometimes. So with that noted, Mr. Sander, Mr. Rennia, all the rest of the team, Mr. Markowitz, et cetera, you're welcome to turn your cameras back on and unmute and you can take it away. Nice to see you all again.

Mr. Rennia: Good evening, everybody. It's very good to see you. I hope everybody's healthy. It's been a long time. We were here just before COVID hit last year, we were just kind of finishing up, waiting on getting that traffic study in and then it hit and it kind of threw everything off, but you know, things being what they are, we're back in front of you, and we're happy to be here and happy new year to everybody. Hopefully 2021 will be a good year. So starting out, I'll just run through, I have a little list here of everything we did submit just for the record. We have a revised master plan set, there's four sheets with that. A revised phase one site plan set, there was nine sheets with that. A revised project narrative, which is also our SEQR narrative and SEQR documentation. We provided a preliminary SWPPP, the traffic assessment that we talked about that was completed by Creighton Manning engineering, our engineering report for the existing wastewater system and our engineering report for the existing water systems. Moving forward, I guess what we'll talk about tonight, we'll just go over the master plan a little bit, and I think Peter is set to put that up on the screen if you'd like us to put the master plan up and share that.

The master plan itself has not changed too much, from what everybody saw before. There's a total of 14 phases in the master plan and we are talking about ultimately an overall approval for the master plan, but then phase one approval. As you can see, right where, actually Peter has the hand there, the bottom right-hand side, that's the phase one area. So that's the proposed pavilion area. And then the Downtown Victory Lake area is the area that's developed now. That is pretty much the heart and the soul of the master plan. The majority of everything is happening there. And then once we cross over on the other side of the lake and the stream, that becomes more of an environmental resource conservation type area. So there's camping, there's the dirt bike track, ropes courses, those sorts of

things are going to be there. So that allows that area to stay pretty much wooded and it's a low impact development side of it. Then of course, we have a couple of parking lots hidden over there as well, too, just cause we need this space for some parking. In the upper right hand corner is the wellness center area and that is located on separate lots right now. And I think the Chairman had touched on that and we can talk about that a little bit in the future as well, too. Or I'll talk about that tonight a little bit. And then they also had bought the other piece of property that's further over to the left, so that's been incorporated in. As far as the wastewater side of it goes, I think that that's something that we figure out in future phases, because there is a breaking point when the existing wastewater treatment plant does have to be upgraded. So depending on future flows, say for example, at the wellness center, if it's something that we can handle there and keep it as onsite treatment and keep it right on those parcels, that is a possibility versus upgrading the wastewater treatment plant. And I think we have to look at those costs, look at what kind of soils that we have. I would definitely agree that if we are going to bring the wastewater say from the wellness center over to the main parcel, then I think it's probably going to be the easiest thing to do is to combine those parcels together. I don't know if anybody has any questions on the master plan itself. One of the other things that we've updated is, I know Liz had asked to get more detail and more tables, to break out everything that goes along with a master plan like this. So we've put the tables right on the master plan. So it's easier to follow, it's part of the actual document and it's not something hard to find in the future. Peter will jump in and run you through those tables quickly. Not that we're going to look at every single number in there, but he'll give you an overview of all the information that's at least included on the master plan now.

Mr. Sander: All right. Hi, everyone. Peter Sander from Rennia. So if you take a look at the tables, we'll just start from the top right corner or top left corner, the existing facilities to remain, outlines all the existing facilities currently present on the site that we're planning on keeping with the master plan development. Included in that is total full capacity of the building, occupancy limits for them. I know it was discussed in previous comments to kind of break it out to see what the total capacity of the camp actually is. So that's why we ended up including all this. Next on the right is a proposed facility. Again, this is just displayed by all the orange objects in the master plan. And being that it's a master plan and going to be done in phases, these are only estimates, total occupancy for these structures will be developed on a phase by phase basis, but we wanted to give a general idea of where the camp capacity was going. Next, we'll move on to the parking area data, and it shows a breakdown of the parking lots and potential surface covers. Again, some of these will not be constructed as part of phase one, but in subsequent phases. So again, just trying to get a general idea of where that would go. Next was vehicle and pedestrian road data, included in part of that initial comment letter we received a few years ago, they wanted a breakdown of materials and square footages. So again, that's what we were trying to provide in that. Land use covers, which is right here in the bottom part is just a breakdown of how the EAF was structured, where it discussed land covers. And again, being a master plan, it's more of a general estimate of what we're assuming will be the ultimate land cover. Proposed development summary is kind of breaking down some of the key figures that we're expecting. And then if you take a look at the bulk regulations, that is existing bulk regs for the site, considering where all the buildings are that are close to the property line, the percent impervious coverage. So again, that's just kind of a breakdown of what we're thinking and just to provide a speedy way to look something up really quick.

Mr. Rennia: So it's basically a lot of EAF data and future data is planted right on the master plan. It's fully documented right there. I don't know if there's any Board questions on the master plan.

Chairman Dupree: So, Richard, the way this works is I'll call on each consultant and each Planning Board Member. It's been a while since you've been before us.

Mr. Rennia: Yes, yes. We want to cover a lot of this tonight and refresh everybody's memory, but not necessarily, I guess, bore everybody to death with every little detail either.

Chairman Dupree: Oh, no, remember you're before what they would a hot board or like a hot bench in the court? Meaning the Board, my colleagues, pretty much read everything that's submitted, I can guarantee you. There's a new Board Member since you were here last as well, Ms. Wasser, I believe. Who served on a Planning Board in Massachusetts, where she was actually the chair. We're very fortunate to have her join us. I first want to thank you for being so responsive to the comments you heard, almost two years ago now. Well, actually two years, almost exactly to now. This was a very thorough application, as I said, we had our agenda meeting last Wednesday and Ms. Axelson has issued a memo that incorporated all the comments that we discussed internally amongst ourselves and through there. I believe that you've received that, so I'm going to let her go over some that she thinks are the most salient. But again, when I first saw this way back when, I thought it was exciting, and I just was recalling that, I believe when I first met you guys, maybe back in 2007, initially, or 2006, somewhere in through there, I was sort of brand spanking new and we were just beginning to discuss the idea of a master plan on this, and I know that the Northeast Conference had to raise money, save money, et cetera. But just to refresh everyone's memory, I believe at the time that you told me this was the largest property that the conference owns in five States and that's why this was chosen to be kind of the site of this big master plan and this very exciting project. So, I look forward to seeing it developed. I'm not sure I'll be here when the last building is done, but in the meantime, I also just wanted to say that I appreciate you putting all this data on a table. One of the problems with the last application, if you've heard about it, Carriage Trails, or Crofton Mews, to us, is that it indeed started 25 years ago and we're into the double digit or double letters of the alphabet for resolutions. We don't really have clear data on it. It's been difficult to try to process it through, and I can guarantee you that when you have applications that may run for a long time like this through 14 phases, the clearer you start the better it's going to be for future Planning Boards, future Zoning Administrators, et cetera. So, it'll just speed the process in other words, down the line. So let me start by calling on our first consultant, Ms. Axelson.

Mr. Setaro: Michael can I interrupt for a second? Do we want Rich to go through some of the details for the first phase?

Chairman Dupree:

Sure.

Mr. Rennia:

Yeah, what we were going to do is just run you through, put up the phase one site plan.

Mr. Setaro:

Yeah, why don't we do that? Why don't we do that before we give comments, because I'm sure some of our comments are going to cover both.

Chairman Dupree:

Yeah, let's do that.

Mr. Rennia:

I think that's a good idea. And then we want to run you through the initial thinking on architectural and definitely get the Board's feedback on that. Okay. Up on the screen now is the phase one site plan. So I think this is generally what we had all talked about the last time. If you recall, this pavilion building, on the original master plan wanted to be on the other side of the lake, kind of more hidden in the woods, but the Blanding's Turtle has decided that it may potentially want to use that area. So, we all talked about where would be a good spot to bring the building and working with the Board, it was kind of general consensus that this is our corner here to work with. And we kind of have our backs up against the wall or the building up against the road here and that's something we want to talk about on the architectural side as well, too. So we have, due to not having many other places for the building, but we've backed the corner closer to the road so we can have parking behind and to the side of it. There's an existing parking lot closer to the road that would go away in this particular layout. The other thing that you see in this layout, that's new for the Board is that the main entrance has been moved about 85 feet from where the existing entrance is now. So we've moved it up the hill a little bit closer to the intersection, about 85 feet. And that was as a result of the traffic study and it finds that we have better sight distance for the driveway. So that's something that's new with this revision as well, too. Other than that, I think it's pretty much the same as what everybody remembered that they last saw. And so when you come into the main entrance, we would get traffic right into the pavilion area. The first parking lot that you see would slope upwards, and the drop-off area would be at a higher level than the lower parking lot in the back, it's about a 15-foot difference. We were trying to take the lower half of the building or the auditorium side of it, and try to use the higher height or elevation that's near the intersection, and use that to our advantage to try to hide part of the building. But the building itself has two levels to it. So the parking lot at the top of your screen, that's a lower parking lot. It's about 15 feet lower, which also, puts it lower and it's better to grade around the lake that way too. And we have our stormwater down there as well. Some different stormwater practices that we're looking to use on this particular project are bio retention, dry swales, we have a small pond and then we have another dry detention pond. We're trying to incorporate our green infrastructure right into the parking lots and trying to make that part of the parking lot and also part of the landscape as well, too. Just try to reduce impacts overall with the storm water plan on the project. I think that's pretty much it on the site plan.

Mr. Setaro: Rich, if you could just talk a little bit about the buses and the drop-off and the parking lot for the buses.

Mr. Rennia: Yes. Okay. Thank you, Pete. That was the other thing that we had many discussions with the Board about was how are we going to get the people here? Obviously, there's not enough parking spaces right at the building for everybody that potentially could be housed in the building. So what we came up with was that we needed a place to be able

to have buses drop-off. So the radius has been designed so buses can pull up to that front area, drop people off. The concept that we're looking at here and will be further expanded by the architectural team is basically a patio on either side. So we have the long drop-off area. They're talking about having a Portico over that as well, so people can get out of cars, get out of buses, but then groups of people could get out of a bus and they could stand on the patios on either end or gather groups of people and call them for buses. That part of the thinking here too, that when we're doing a building of this size, where do we kind of stage the people? So that's being thought of here as well, too. So the buses would pull up, drop off, they could leave, and then they can go down and we've provided parking, down near the wastewater treatment plant. So the buses can go down there park, and then they can come back and you won't see those where the buses are parked, from the road at all.

Mr. Sander: Just to demonstrate the route. It would be to come through here, drop off, come down the road, and then make your way back towards this parking lot over here. So that is what's depicted in this plan right here.

Chairman Dupree: Can you describe the proposed road surfaces that will take buses all the way back to the parking area?

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, so the existing surface right now is a paved road and then we're proposing the bus parking area as a gravel area. So we're not adding, we didn't think it was necessary to add more pavement back there. And then all the parking areas here, we're looking at being an asphalt type of pavement. A hardscape type material just because it has to be durable to hold up.

Chairman Dupree: And do you want to go ahead and show the architectural sketches?

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, I thought that's what we would jump to next. And this is being worked on by SMA Architecture, Stu Markowitz, he is the principal. So this view that we're looking at here is from that upper parking lot and would be looking at the entry area with the portico that I was talking about. The idea would be that buses and cars would pull under that portico, do they're dropping off there and then exit. Now this would be the view from the road intersection. Of course, there's no trees in this, so this would be if the landscape was completely bare, which it's not. But this is the idea of what it could look like from the corner. From this particular angle, one thing we talked about with Stu and Ken, is should this building maybe be slid a little bit further to the north so it doesn't feel like the roof is right in the ground? The landscaping, the existing trees, we'll break that up some, but they're trying to make it, even though this isn't going to be a main access point from this side, they're trying to make the building a good-looking building from all four sides and not make the piece that's in the back by the road, this uglier structure, kind of like a square corner of a building and in a piece of flat roof. So those are the discussions that we're having right now. You know, maybe we should try to slide this forward towards the lake a little bit. We'd lose some parking there, but then on our end, we tried to figure out another spot to move some of that parking to.

Mr. Markowitz: We have some sections that will maybe show that a little better for you coming up.

Mr. Sander: We'll move down to the view from the other lane.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. So this would be coming from the north end of Quaker Lane and looking up. And once again, along the road there is existing landscaping and we're proposing a significant amount of evergreen landscaping, but this would be looking at the lower side that I was talking about. That's about 15 feet lower than where the drop-off area is.

Ms. Axelson: It looks like it's three levels in certain parts of the building.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, it's two levels, but the, the center area, the auditorium area, has got to have a much higher ceiling, so you can have lighting and for the acoustics. So that's that center area you see in the top, and that's basically all airspace there. Like the windows that you see, nobody would actually be able to stand there and look out. There might be some catwalks up there. But the, the lower windows that you see, below the lower roof line, there's two levels of windows. Those are actually areas where people would be, that's the pedestrian friendly levels, if you would, where people are going to be walking around those levels.

Mr. Sander: We can show you the section view, which kind of depicts this a little better. Again, here's another elevation from the parking lot portion, kind of giving you a better sense of that pedestrian area and the courtyard. And then we'll continue over to here where the section view really depicts the grade and everything that's going on in that portion.

Mr. Markowitz: Yeah, and this is a diagonal cut through the intersection to the northwest. And this is the condition that Richard was talking about, you can see the lower roof on the left side. You can point that out, Peter, yeah. And you can see the relationship with that to the road and you'll actually be looking down on the roof. And we thought that was, you know, it felt a little claustrophobic.

Ms. Axelson: Are you talking about the Crum Elbow and Quaker Lane intersection?

Mr. Markowitz: Right. That's the intersection we're talking about. Yes. So the intersection elevation is over on the left side of this drawing and those rectangles that you see just to the right of the roadway are the transformers that you probably have seen before just driving there. With the building pulled this far to the south you are kind of looking down on the roof and it's, we thought it was a little bit tight for the building. If we shoved the building to the north, just a little bit, we would get a little bit of breathing room from that slope. And still we would be planting all along that intersection, so that it wouldn't be, if we, I mean, I think it's a good idea to have fire access on that side too, but whether there was some minimal parking there or not, we would make sure that wouldn't be seen from the road, but you would see more of the building. So it wouldn't feel like it was slammed up against the hill.

Mr. Sander: Just to briefly show you what we're kind of thinking, is that if this building were to move in this direction, giving us a little more space between the intersection, which would allow that to be a little more visible. So it wouldn't be right up against the ground over on this side.

Mr. Pickett: How far are you talking about moving it?

Mr. Sander: Right now in the discussions we kind of wanted to get initial feedback from you guys and see where you guys thought about us possibly moving it this way, or moving it a little further north. The structure up to this portion. So it gets a little further away from this higher grade over here, and I can see a little better view of the roof line.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, and we're thinking maybe it's, we're talking or thinking 20 to 30 feet somewhere in that range. We're not thinking very far, but it might be just the roadway width, to move it forward, but just enough to just get it out of that grade a little bit.

Mr. Sander: Approximately around here, this midway to this roadway, that's about 30 feet or so.

Mr. Pickett: Well, it's hard to tell looking at this from a top, global view. It's almost to the point, I'd like to see it staked out, and then have a walk, just to see how it fits with the reality that I know is in the area. It's hard to see how something like this would fit. Right?

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. And I think we can definitely accommodate that.

Ms. Axelson: Actually, as long as you're discussing the location of the building right now, there's one question that I'd like the Board to weigh in on. In the comment memo from my office, one of the things that we point out is the issue of the parking. I believe it's on the north side or in the back, as you say. I'm sorry, I'm losing my sense of direction here, but I think it's this. Yes. So the concept is to have the parking, according to the Code, line up with the building line at a minimum, or be behind it. In this particular context, you've designed the site to try to put more of the intensive stuff south of Victory Lake and have the less intensive stuff sort of north of that whole Victory Lake and stream area. So I really appreciate that kind of design. And I guess the question for the Board is, if this is a standard that the Board can consider varying, is the parking the way it is right now, acceptable to you, or would you like to see it moved back so that longest row that's closest to the road would be moved back to be on the building line? Now they would lose a lot of parking in order to do that, but that's sort of an input from the Planning Board sort of item that I think is important to deal with in this workshop.

Chairman Dupree: I'll ask each member to weigh in on that. And I don't believe it's waiving the requirements as much as it is relaxing the standard. All standards can be relaxed by the Planning Board based on the unique circumstances of each site. And this site, as you can see, there are various environmental constraints around this entire site. It's a little bit of a challenge to get everything in there. I'll also remind the Board that when we last saw this, one of the reasons why we took a look for this building was not just to preserve the free movement of endangered species, possibly along that stream corridor. It's also because you saw with the height of the ground, when you're actually driving down Crum Elbow, part of this would be obscured and it's a very large structure. So that was part of it too, was that the height in that ground level, the grade change would provide, some official screening. I will also add that back when we saw the original building, we might've thought it needed to be screened more because it wasn't as attractive as I think it is now, but I'll also let the Board weigh in on that when we go to the Board. Rich, is there anything else you and Peter want to point out right now?

Mr. Rennia: I think just to tag on what Liz was saying in that parking area that she was directing the Board to, one thing that I would like to point out that is, that below, Quaker Lane, it is significantly lower in elevation. And one of the things we were trying to do was, the lower we got that parking lot, the more we can hide it. So our whole goal here is to try to hide the parking lot, because we still want to keep that country feel to the roads when you drive through there.

Ms. Axelson: And that's an important consideration for the Board.

Chairman Dupree: And you have proposed landscaping along there as well.

Mr. Rennia: Yes. Landscaping. And like I said, we're trying to wrap that parking lot with our green infrastructure and use that to help us as well.

Mr. Sander: Also like to point out that this area is actually up on a much higher hill. So even on this portion, this primary parking lot will also be largely blocked by the existing grade.

Mr. Setaro: Two quick things before we get into the details. Richard, is this going to be a year-round facility?

Mr. Rennia: Yes. The pavilion, yes, definitely. They're going to make a significant investment in this, so I know that they're going to want to definitely get regular use out of it. And I think what we talked about with the Board was, you know, they're going to have certain large events that they hold every year. So I think we were talking about around 3000 people that could be in the building, around that level. What I think that they'll do with this building is there'll be a lot more smaller events. Whether it be 300 or 400 people or 500 people, type events that they will be able to hold in here on a more regular basis. But definitely a year-round facility.

Mr. Setaro:

Okay. And then the other thing, you know, talking about maybe a shifting the building a little bit, have you had any preliminary discussions with the fire department?

Mr. Rennia: We did not, but we were thinking if we shift that forward, then what, Stu had mentioned is that gives us the ability to bring a fire lane in. So then you'd actually be able to give the fire department access to three sides.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah. I would probably say that as you're talking about maybe making some changes, I think it might be good to meet with them sooner rather than later, just to see what their needs might be as far as access around the building. Obviously, maybe they would say, we've got access off of North Quaker Lane if we needed it, but again, that's not our area of expertise. So, when you're kind of tucked into the corner there, we always kind of look at, as you do, fire access around the building. It might be a good idea to meet with them sooner than later.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. We'll, we'll get that done.

Ms. Moss: Pete, the New York State Fire Code, I believe works in concert with the building code as to what the requirements are. The fire department usually asks for more than is required, so just keep that in mind, because the Building Department is very clear about what is required by Code.

Mr. Rennia: Okay.

Chairman Dupree: I'll take a moment to note here that this is a place of assembly, so we will assume it's going to be sprinklered, under the Building Code.

Mr. Rennia: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: If you're planning on having an exterior water tank, that should be shown. I don't know if you need that, but sometimes in places like this, we've had interior tanks and we've also had exterior tanks and that would be required to be shown on the Site Plan.

Mr. Rennia: Okay. I'm thinking that in this particular facility that having something buried is going to be our best option here.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah. Well, we'll need to see that on the plan. That was a good point, Michael. Thank you

Chairman Dupree: Also to remind the Board, particularly Stephanie. So the reason why we are doing SEQR on this was we asked the applicants to sort of imagine what would be the, we'll call it the best-case scenario for the applicants, meaning what would it be if this were entirely built out and you had sort of everything functioning at one time. So that's sort of the process we're following. I'll also note though that, as Peter said, it may be that as various phases go through the site plan process itself, we may need to reopen SEQR. If they changed something sort of radically from what we're reviewing here tonight, but I don't think that's going to be the case. That's why we asked them to do what they've done. And again, we didn't get to the point of circulating last time for lead agency or even starting the SEQR process, because we didn't have enough information to go with. I believe Liz is going to address that, that we're not quite ready yet based on some limitations of the traffic impact study. So let me turn it over to you, Liz, do you want to start?

Ms. Axelson: Sure. A couple of things, first of all, I just have to laud this group for planning ahead and trying to look at this site redevelopment as just full of exciting potential. And that being said, I think it's worth it to think about what would your maximum usage be. I guess, you'll want some feedback from the Board. We see different numbers based on those tables. I realized that when you did the tables of, for example, that showed the occupancy for the different buildings and facilities, that you probably didn't intend for those to be added up. But the thing is that, if you're serving a big population here, it's possible, that there may be more than one event happening at a time. So I guess I would urge you to really think about that. The other thing that, Pete and I kind of agree on is that considering the potential use of the sanctuary and the site, the primary road, and again, I'm going to the master plan sheet, the primary road where the bus is going to go out, I can't remember the name of the road. Okay. It's the one that goes to the north of the amphitheater, that big spine, and then continues, it's number 24, and my feeling about

that is that that is going to serve a lot of facilities, including that bus parking area. It's kind of a main, it's like a spine of the site and Pete and I looked at it and my gut tells me that that probably should be paved. It should be a two-way road and should be paved. Even the bus parking area should be paved. I realize you're trying to be sensitive with your surface there because it's north of the lake and the creek, but I feel like you want to be able to accommodate buses, emergency vehicles and service vehicles. Also to some degree, because there's a large parking area over on the other side of the site, if you have overflow, is that three J, okay so there's a potential there to use that parking area as overflow. So that you could avoid using the grass one that is south of it, that's more on the road. So I guess I'm just looking at that back road, number 24, as giving you the potential to have a really stable, durable two-way road, that's going to serve plenty of facilities and allow people to go into the back of the site and maybe park in sort of an overflow area. So I think that's worth some serious consideration, even though I realize you were trying to be environmentally sensitive there. Let's see. I know I had some other things that I wanted to bring up. Going back over to the sanctuary, there is sort of a, you can stay on this map, there's a shared, okay, there you go. It looks like there's an existing driveway for the dwelling that's right near the road. Then there seems to be some kind of a driveway east of that, that also goes out to the road and the recommendation we have is to merge those if possible, to eliminate another intersection in that area.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. Those are two existing driveways right now. So right where you look on the screen, where it says mechanical equipment enclosure, where the text is, there's an existing, old asphalt parking lot in there right now. So that's an existing driveway that goes into that parking lot. And we would have no problem with combining the two of those. The other one is a driveway to the existing house. What we were showing in this particular layout was if all the mechanical equipment is going to be in the back, it goes downhill, we thought that the service people would need some sort of an entryway or an access to actually physically get back there. So that's what we're showing here.

Ms. Axelson: Got it, got it. That makes good sense.

Mr. Setaro: Well, the County will be the one that'll determine, you know, the driveways that they're going to allow out there. So when this goes over to the County, that's going to be part of what they'll look at too.

Mr. Rennia: Right.

Ms. Axelson: And then the other, the other issue that we came up with that shows up in the master plan with all those wonderful tables, you gave us a very comprehensive concept of what your plans are, was that there are some places where it's not clear, how many people can fit in the sanctuary, for example. And also the special event being 5,000 people. But the potential capacity of the site could be much larger than that with the facilities proposed. And again, not discouraging that, personally, this is a great site and I realize it has a large region that it is serving. And I think the traffic engineer from our office also had the same feeling, like try to get clear on what your master plan is, what's your typical case, what's your medium case, what's your worst case and try to plan for that. Because if it is possible to hold larger events or one 5,000 person event and another 1,000 person event, and you've got the ability with that paved road and bus parking area, to be able to drop people at different parts of the site and then have the bus, you know, go away and come

back later. So really think that through, because it would affect your site planning and capacity and also your traffic. But if you're going to this much trouble to do this master planning, I would definitely recommend that that be given some consideration, if you're shooting for the sky.

Mr. Rennia: And one thing I'll just add in on that, that there is a bit of, I guess coming to a realization for the conference, that there's only so many people that they could physically handle on the site and that they would actually want to keep track of. So we have had some of those discussions with the conference as well, too. That shooting for the sky, to a certain degree, that they're shooting for something big here, but they also realize that it does get to a point that they wouldn't be able to manage it. So they don't want it to get too, too big, but that 5,000 number that we've kind of always thrown out, there is something that they feel is a real number and it is a little bit hard to predict for the future, but we are trying to look at these buildings and say, well with the Building Code, you can have this much occupancy, in each of the buildings, but then we realistically have to look at it too and say, well, what's the reality? How many people could they actually invite for an event? And the way that the Conference work's is because there's so many different churches within the Conference and they're spread out across five different States. Not everybody's going to come to one. There are some different themes, to the different events that certain groups would want to come to some and certain ones want to focus on others. And then individual churches can just come here and rent out space to do something for themselves too, as far as a retreat. So there are so many different uses. So one thing we did try to look at is, the high end and the low, low end, but then the realistic end of what we think when there's just kind of normal business here, and then there could be things that we don't know, but they're in between. So we were trying to focus on getting the high numbers, but I do understand what you're saying is don't shoot yourself in the foot by going too low. I think that's what you're saying, Liz?

Ms. Axelson: Yeah. I mean, you know, and the Board can weigh in on this also, but you know, the whole point of the concept we had for the environmental review for this was let's try to do this generic, full EAF expanded review and see if the Board can get to the point where they're comfortable making a SEQR determination on the larger, you know, the larger master plan and site redevelopment, and also the phase one. And then as you move forward, hopefully you'll have done enough planning and enough of the environmental review that each time you come back with a phase, you won't have to go through all this. That's the concept anyway.

Chairman Dupree: That brings up a quick point about the traffic impact analysis. You relied more on information from the Northeast Conference individuals, those who lead it to kind of get an idea, but we're used to seeing ITE numbers in there too. And when this goes off to Department of Public Works, they might be asking also for a more standard analysis in there. So one of the suggestions, I believe it's in Liz's memo, that you have the traffic analysts add in the standard ITE values. That way we are sort of looking at, again, I'll call it the best-case scenario for you guys, in case later on in the future, if they could better handle crowd control, I'll call it, that you might have a really, really busy site at some point. Again, I want to point out for particularly for Ms. Wasser, that having lived here for 27 years - and that was the path that I always took when I went back and forth to the city, was from Crum Elbow Road - I recall in the summer seeing a lot of people there and I've never, ever seen any kind of traffic issues whatsoever. I'm aware that the applicants always inform

the Hyde Park Police, et cetera, when they're going to have those kinds of big events. I also, from my notes, reread that these kinds of events might be open to local people as well. So all of that needs to be factored in through there. But at any rate, Liz I didn't mean to interrupt. You can continue.

Ms. Axelson: No, you added in the point about the traffic study and you simplified it and made it make more sense. I think the other thing that our traffic engineer was saying is obviously this group has been running this site for a long time and they may have a better idea. So when you see the side-by-side ITE numbers, even if it's a shared use thing, they may look bizarrely ridiculous, and it'll shed some light on how much closer the reported traffic is to reality. So that'll be very helpful. I know I had one more thing, but I feel like I'm overstaying a little bit here and it'd be very interesting to hear from the Board. I think at this point, I think those are our main things. Pete, am I missing any other general?

Mr. Setaro: I just want to hit on a couple things really, really quickly. And I don't want to take up a lot of time, but I did talk to Rich last week about some of the items here. He and I are working on a bunch of projects together. So, Liz had mentioned about the two-way access from the phase one site over to the bus parking area, so I know Rich is going to look at that. We do think that in the future that the spine road, there should be a two-way road. I think the Fire Department will want that anyways. So again, some of that is going to be for future phases. The other thing I just wanted to mention quick, and the reason why I asked if this was going to be a year-round facility, which I assumed it was going to. Peter, if you could just pull up the detailed site plan for phase one, thanks. So if you go to the northern parking lot there that you guys were talking about before, so you wouldn't see it here on this plan, but on the grading plan, there are no catch basins in the parking lot. And the high point where it would flow from south to north is kind of the area where the access drive to the parking area intersects with the drive to the front of the building. Peter, if you could just go yeah, right there. Yeah. Right around in there. So from that point, all the way to the north, is basically going to be sheet flow drainage, which we said was around 450 feet of sheet flow. And I understand why Rich and his office designed it like that because of the grades of the site, wanting to slope down to the north as quick as possible, but also because the type of stormwater that he's using as far as the sand filters. If you did have a storm drainage system in the parking lot, the elevations of the subsurface drainage system wouldn't match with the sand filter. But anyways those are like details, so the point is that in the winter time with that long of sheet flow, you may get some icing issues as the snow banks will melt. Then during the evening portion it freezes. I don't know that there's a specific answer to that other than redesigning it, but I don't think the Town has any liability, but I just wanted to point that out, that that's probably not the best condition to have sheet flow that is that long of a length. And even during like a rainstorm, it's probably a little uncomfortable for people walking from the parking lots to the building, but again, it's a private site, but we do have to go and balance approving a plan that's going to be safe for people that are going to be using the facility. So Rich, I don't know if you have anything that you, you know, that's something that we can work on, but I don't know if you have anything to add.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, I think when we had talked about it, my thinking is, in the center, I mean the longest run would be going from left to right from where the entrance road comes down and drops into the parking lot. My thinking is if we take that upper square, that's right above the building, and then I look to have some sort of receptors in there and I have

some ideas. Number one, there's four different islands there. We could maybe expand those islands a little bit, set those lower. Maybe we look at doing something curbsless there, with like a stone diaphragm around them and then we actually let that be some sort of a practice. Maybe those could be bioretention islands. So they're more sunken in and we collect water there. Or one of those long rows of parking areas where they're face-to-face parking, like where you see the 15 and the 15 opposing each other. I actually try to open those up and get a sand filter strip, or get something in between there, revise the grading, but basically take that whole upper square area and get some other receptor in there and still achieve what we're trying to do. But then if I get it into a sand filter or into a bio retention, then from there, take the larger storm events into a yard drain and pipe them out of there and still get over to the upper corner where the dry detention would be.

Mr. Setaro: Okay.

Ms. Axelson: You know your drive aisles can be 24 feet instead of 26. So that may give you wiggle room.

Mr. Rennia: Okay.

Mr. Setaro: All right. So we'll work together on that. So the last thing before I turn it over to the Board is, that we are going to look to do SEQR on the master plan so I looked at the overall concepts that Rich had in his report for stormwater, water and sewer. Rich already talked about the sewer. I thought that the report said that all the phases could be accommodated, but again, that's something that's going to go through the Health Department process, so it's obvious that there's extra capacity in the sewer plant. So the only thing that I wanted added to the water report is just to say that they'll have to be pump tests done on the various wells that are at the site there now. And that there's a possibility that there may be additional wells that may be added to meet the peak water demand. I'm not sure Rich where you got your well yields from. Was that just historical data?

Mr. Rennia: It was data provided to us. We FOILED the Health Department records. And then from their existing water operator.

Mr. Setaro: They're going to go make you do a new pump test, I assume, and all that. So we just wanted to put that into a report, just to have it. And then as far as the drainage goes for the master plan, we have enough information. Rich showed where there could be conceptual stormwater practices to handle some of the future phases. And obviously as those phases come before the Board, the drainage for those phases will become more detailed, but for purposes of SEQR, I think we have enough information to move ahead whenever that time comes. So overall I think that the plans are in really good shape and we'll work together with Rich's office on that. So that's really what I have to add at this point.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Mr. Setaro. I've one other point, if you can go back to the phase one detail. I believe that you were thinking that the area where there's a stormwater practice that's right to the east of that front parking. No, it's right there. I think Pete had some questions about whether people would just sort of march right through that if they were walking.

Mr. Setaro: Well that's a sand filter. So yeah, they'll have to be a couple of access ways or one access way. We don't want people to tramp through the stormwater practice. Tad, right? Maybe she's muted.

Ms. Moss: Yeah, I was muted. Sorry.

Mr. Setaro: All right. I'm thinking of you Tad. We got to go look out for the stormwater practices.

Ms. Moss: I know. We don't want people walking through those. We've had a couple of other sites where they've done that. Yeah.

Chairman Dupree: I know, that's kind of minute at this point, but I did want to point it out because I think you do need to provide some access points in through there. It would be sort of common sense for people to have a focal point to go to, to walk across.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. And I think we're going to have something central there. When the architects showed us the plan with the portico on it, I think that that's really nice. So I think we'll end up coming up with something that continues right across there. And that was, I think we're thinking bio retention there. So we could look at maybe planting plants that have thorns on them and we'll keep people out of there. *Laughter.*

Mr. Setaro: Why don't we just put some barbed wire up in there.

Mr. Rennia: Sure.

Chairman Dupree: I don't think that sounds very accommodating to walk into a sanctuary. That noted. Thank you, Mr. Setaro. Ms. Moss, any comments from you?

Ms. Moss: Yes. I just want the applicant to keep in mind that there's a 100 foot stream corridor on either side of the stream bank. That is to remain undisturbed. So, you may need some variances should you be within a hundred feet of the stream banks?

Mr. Setaro: Yeah. Good point Tad.

Mr. Rennia: Okay.

Mr. Setaro: But we're experts now, right Tad, on those 100 foot variances, right?

Ms. Moss: Yeah. The Zoning Board has been dealing with those almost exclusively, for a couple of months.

Chairman Dupree: And as a reminder to the Board, that's actually the stream corridor staying in an undisturbed state, it's pretty much in the definitions of the Code in terms of the lack of disturbance. And it's meant to allow the free movement of basically animals, et cetera, as well as to protect the actual stream banks themselves.

Ms. Polidoro: So that setback needs to be added to the plans, the line.

Chairman Dupree: I was just going to call on you Ms. Polidoro, any other comments besides adding the setback?

Ms. Polidoro: Yeah, so I think Michael and Liz did a really good job of explaining how the SEQR process is going to work on the master plan within the various pieces coming in later. I do agree that we need some kind of best case or worst case number. So we know what we're doing the SEQR review on and anything above that would trigger additional review. One thing that I didn't see that the Board might find useful is a large event management plan for some of the larger events. It would provide information on how they would be circulating, maybe provide numbers in case of emergencies that the event manager would be able to call and that the Town would be able to call if there was someone that needed to be contacted. I think we did that with one of the events spaces, rural event venues that we were looking at.

Chairman Dupree: Rich and Peter, if you look under our Code under rural events, we passed a law or the Town Board, I should say, passed a law so that people who have larger properties can do big weddings, things like that. And it details what would go into the event plan. It's not anything too onerous, just so many days to notify the police, the fire departments, ahead of time, things like that. That's about it.

Ms. Polidoro: It would only be for the larger events. I mean the day-to-day stuff, no, but maybe something, everything over a thousand or whatever thresholds the Board thinks is appropriate.

Mr. Rennia: Right. And what we've done on other projects in the past, I know Victoria has seen some other stuff we've done, where we've put together a template, where we said, here's a template for this project for their large event management plan. And then, given whatever event that they're giving, that they can start with that template. And there's some open areas in there where they can fill in the blank, so to speak of what this particular event's going to be, how many people there might be, but everything is in there. They can kind of follow through. We have to notify these people, or that people. I think we found that to be helpful and we just made that part of the project documents.

Ms. Polidoro: You know this is very big picture right now, but as you move forward, you will have to identify all of the waivers or modifications that you need from the zoning law, like the light fixtures and the lack of landscaping and the parking. But, you know, we have time for that. I just have a question. What are these round things in between the cabins?

Mr. Rennia: Those are stormwater practices.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay. So are the existing cabins, and then I know that there are some other cabins down on the other side of the parking lot. Are those all already hooked up to the wastewater treatment system?

Mr. Rennia: Yes. Yes.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay.

Mr. Rennia: I guess Peter could pull up the grading plan, he could probably get set up here and that shows utilities.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay. That's it for now? Once we get the additional information, the Board can authorize circulation.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Victoria. And let me start with Ms. Wasser. I'm going to start with you because you haven't had a chance to comment on this at all yet. This is a new application for you.

Ms. Wasser: Okay, great. Thank you. I have a few questions and a few comments. I noted that the usual frequency is 100 to 600 people. So I'm figuring that's a weekend thing, but these other events, which are quite large the 1000 to 3000 and the 5,000 plus events. How often? You don't have to answer it this minute, but I'd like to know, get a better understanding of these maximum usages and not over-planning for something that doesn't happen that often. So I'd like to know the frequency of the larger events. I don't know if you have the answer, if you don't, I'll move on to the next question.

Mr. Sander: So then the larger events happen pretty infrequently. I think currently we have twice a year being shown for the largest events. And then I think 2 or 3 times for those medium-size events being 1000 to 3000.

Ms. Wasser: So if it's half a dozen events a year that go beyond that 600 number, I just think we should be thinking about that as we look at the large-scale planning, and make sure we're not putting too much impervious in or overdesigning. Although I think Victoria's comment on the plan for large gatherings is important. Variance for height. It may be in everything I read, I just don't remember what is the height at the peak of the roof and the height at the peak of the cross?

Mr. Sander: So the way that height is measured for the Zoning Code is actually kind of peculiar, it takes it from the middle point of the roof.

Ms. Wasser: Yeah, well, sometimes it's averages. No, I understand it's not a flat parcel. Give me a point of reference and a height.

Mr. Rennia: That's something that Stu, I mean, it's not fully designed yet, but maybe Stu or Ken can just give a rough idea.

Ms. Wasser: Yes, right, because I realize you're going to go through this with the Zoning Board, but the Zoning Board's going to ask for our opinion as well, so I'd kind of like to know how tall that is.

Chairman Dupree: I should add that it's measured from an average of the lowest elevation to the top elevation and then from the roofline/edge to the average between the peak.

Ms. Wasser: And this elevation.

Mr. Bingham: Hi, this is Ken. No, the only dimension, because it's still a work in progress.

Ms. Wasser: Okay. So it's a question you can answer in the future. I don't want to take more time now. And then some comments, I like the idea of shifting that parking north, but I also would like you to take a look at shifting it northwest. There's a triangle of unused land by the dotted phase one line. Yeah. That may be part of the solution. Something to look at, if you need more parking or want to shift parking. And I also agree, looking down on that roof, maybe one of the ways to improve that visually is a sharper increased angle on that roof. It kind of looks in the drawing like it's a shed roof, even though it may not be. It's just, you know, that's, yeah, you just skipped by it.

Mr. Markowitz: No, go back to the first view, I think that it, it's actually, that's it, yeah. The closest group there, there are various panels and we've broken the roof up to try to make it a little more interesting, visual interest and also to help break down the bulk of the building. It is a large building.

Ms. Wasser: I appreciate that. The one from Quaker Lane is the one I was looking at. I guess it wasn't that one. What's the next one. Okay. I don't know. The next one. Okay. Never mind. There was an image I'd seen that it looked like, anyway, that was my comment. So I do agree, you know, to improve that look, whatever you want to do to move it. Landscaping at the roads. Okay. That's not shown yet, but there'll be screening. And I do like the bus drop off concept where they'll be down below. So I wanted to comment on that as well. You mentioned catwalks inside. Are there going to be performances or special lighting or something that the community could use in future for performances? I heard you say catwalks and being a theater person I...

Mr. Markowitz: There is in our program, accommodations for lighting and media. That is definitely part of our building program.

Ms. Wasser: I think those were just some of my questions for now. Thank you

Chairman Dupree: Stephanie, before I let you go, can you offer a comment on the proposed architectural elevations, because I know they were looking for that tonight?

Ms. Wasser: Well, they were greatly improved over what we saw, I think when I first came on the Board two years ago. I don't have, you know, I think other members of the Board will have some more specific architectural comments. Generally, I look at it and I like it. My comment was on the roof and that what that roof would look like at the intersection, if it sits where it is now, looking down on the roof, that, you know, I was concerned about how that would look. But I, I think it looks quite nice. I don't have other objections to it. I don't want this to be construed as any improper statement, but you know, the height of the building and then the height and size of the cross. I'm just kind of wondering about that. That you come around the corner and it might be a little overwhelming, but I don't know. I tread on that subject very carefully. I'm just giving you, just an impression.

Ms. Franson: Michael. Hi, I have SKO-6 in front of me and I'm looking at that cross section or that diagonal and when I measured it from the base where the doors are up to the top of, right below the cross, that's 93 feet. So then you need to add on additional feet for, if I go to the top of the cross, it's about 129 feet.

Ms. Wasser: Okay. That gives me some sense of it. And for general rule of thumb purposes, even though we have varying grade one story equals 10 feet. So that's almost 13 stories.

Chairman Dupree: Before I let you go, Stephanie, would you weigh in on the idea of whether you think that we are interested in trying to relax the standard for having all parking be behind the lot and behind building? In other words, the parking that Liz, there you can, right up along, the one that's along North Quaker.

Ms. Wasser: I have more of an issue with the one to the north, even though they're talking about depressing it a little bit and hiding it. I don't really, I mean, I need to look at landscape screening, concept. If it's screened, I doesn't matter as much, right?

Chairman Dupree: It's just in our Code, one of the standards is that all parking should be behind the front building line. Tad would opine that this has two front building lines, I believe, one on North Quaker and one on Crum Elbow.

Ms. Wasser: That's the confusion. I don't know. Honestly, I forgot about that. You know, that you construed two fronts on this, and I was really focusing on the other parking. I'm going to defer for the moment. I don't have a strong objection to it, but I'm happy to think more about it.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Ms. Weiser, comments?

Ms. Weiser: I guess I'll just start on the parking, since it is so far below grade and that we may not be seeing it from the street, I'm okay with that parking. Although I wouldn't mind seeing the building move a little bit north, just so that when we look at the view north west from the road. Because it's so roof forward right there, if there's any way, because you already moved further north, just so that you sort of mitigate that expansive amount of roof. That would be helpful. I see that this is a more fully realized version of what was submitted in 2017. Well, I'm really glad that you guys revisited this and moved away from what we saw in 2018. But in general, I think the building is attractive. I'll look forward to more detailed elevations as we move forward,

Chairman Dupree: That was pretty comprehensive. And next I'd like to hear from Mr. Pickett.

Mr. Pickett: Thank you. Kind of looking at this, conceptualizing it both on the short and long term. We're talking about 3000 to 5,000 plus people, that's pretty sizable for Hyde Park. I think we need to keep that up in the reviews that we have looking forward. One of the main concerns that we've had in the past is safety with regards to traffic. And I think also the design of the stormwater and they've seemed to address quite a bit of that. And I think that's something that we'll keep a light on. I would like to have a site walk, the rheology of the land and the way it slopes and how they plan to fit that building. I'd kind of like to see where they would plant it, you know, put four steaks in the corners and then maybe even float a 93-foot balloon on where the approximate center is just so we get an idea how everything would fit, both the building and the cross that's going to go on top. When we decide or look at relaxing the standards on the parking area, we can also get an idea how that fits into because, again with the plantings and the landscaping and the

rheology, there's a lot that goes into that and how it fits with a building, hides it, shows it. So I'd like to have a site walk. And I do like the architecture.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. And I believe that we can arrange a site walk. A bunch of us took one before, when the sewage treatment plant was under review, the wastewater treatment plant, I should say. And they have site managers who are present at all times there right now, lovely people. I'll ask for that formerly in a bit. Thank you, Brent. Those were good comments as well. Ms. Dexter?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Yeah, it's hard to figure out where to start. This is such a tremendous improvement. A lot of thoughtful planning has gone into this.

All right, so let me talk about the moving of the building. It's a large building, it's articulated, it has the land around is different from one side to the next, so as I'm looking at it from that northwestern intersection, I'm only seeing a little piece of it. I think I'm only interested in moving the parking north, if we need to add in something like a fire lane or something, if it's required for safety purposes. I'm not sure moving it is going to accomplish that much, that I can see, plus they lose parking. which would, you know, they've got, I see a lot of work here to try to maximize whatever parking they can. So yeah, unless it's for a safety reason, like the fire department says we really need to get in there, so you have to move your building, I don't need to see that moved. Same kind of thing for the north parking. To me that's going to be very similar to driving by the Culinary Institute, all of that parking that they have, it's hidden, you just don't see it. So I think the same thing is going to happen here. You might see the glint of sunlight on them maybe as you're driving by, but I don't think you're going to see that, especially since they're going to put some landscaping in there. Those are my thoughts on the building and the parking. Pete, thank you very much for pointing out about the sheet flow on that northern parking lot. I know you guys will work that out. I was looking at the narrative and there they talked about the attendance for the events. Would that change once you have this beautiful large building, would you have more events than what you're currently projecting?

Mr. Sander: So, we've kind of deferred that one to the camp staff. Currently, these are kind of set events that they hold every year, more of a traditional base. It really depends on once they get the building and kind of evaluate the use of whether or not they're going to add these more events in. So again, that's kind of more of a camp question, but we can get back to you if they have any plans for expansion.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Well, again, it just kind of goes to the frequency of use at a very intense level.

Ms. Lambert: Right? Right, so speaking from the Camp's perspective, the whole idea of this is just to make everyone a lot more comfortable. Right now we're using a lot more tents. So we're not intending on expanding the usage to maximize the facility, but we want to make sure that the environment is acceptable for everyone when they do attend. That they have a comfortable spot to sit and we could be of more use to the community also.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Thank you. That's excellent. There's a piece here in the narrative on page 17, talking about getting the building variance. And again, it talks about where the elevations are being graded too and so their calculations show that using our building

height methods, they believe that they are going to need a 10-foot variance for the building height, noting that those other structures, the cross and the parapets don't factor in.

Ms. Polidoro: Did that apply to this new plan? Or was that based on something prior? I guess that's a question for the architect.

Mr. Rennia: Those numbers are definitely going to have to be revised once we have a final building. So those are definitely something in flux at the moment. Just kind of like the parking area, a little bit. When Pete and I had spoken, I told him because of the architecture and wanting to be creative, the plan right now that you're looking at shows this very straight, two rectangles together, this straight uniform building. Where once the architecture is a little further along, we will take that exact footprint and put it in here. So there's definitely a few things regarding the building, the perimeter around the building and then the height of it are definitely... the numbers are in flux at the moment.

Vice-Chair Dexter: That makes sense.

Mr. Rennia: But we do want to keep that variance number as low as possible to go to a ZBA, to not be asking for a variance that's just too, too much.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Right. And I think that also kind of plays into the placement of the building, that if you do nestle it into the land, it is not as high on all sides. Once you start taking the average. And then I think my final question is in the current plans, there are a couple of underground water storage tanks, 25,000 gallons. Will you be needing to, I'm assuming that's because when you do have your big events, that's your extra water so that you don't have to draw it all out of the ground. Would you be doing something similar? I don't see anything in this master plan. Of course it could be hiding somewhere.

Mr. Rennia: No, we weren't showing, for phase one, we're not showing any improvements to the base water system or to the base wastewater system, because that water system, as you just alluded to and what Deanna was saying before, they have a certain amount of people that come here in the summertime as it is, but it's very spread out and they put up large tents. And part of this project is to be able to have this one main building where everybody can get together. Rather than having one kind of church program on one side and another program on another side and maybe the youth program and then there's the adult program. Well, in a building like this, they can bring everybody together. And then the adults can watch the youth choir or the youth ensemble may be able to put on a production and it makes for a full weekend. So inside the pavilion building, it'll be services, but then there's also a lot of different activities and everybody can get together to see them. But for the water, the way that it works out is, they have enough capacity because they're used to having this number of people there throughout the summer. And then the same thing on the wastewater. Oh, but what was discussed before is that this building is going to have to, or is going to need a sprinkler system. So we will need to show some storage tanks someplace in the phase one site plan that would be added. And that water, those would be filled up and the water would just sit there in the case of the sprinkler system needs it.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Thank you very much. I'm just really pleased at how this is starting to shape up. And I thank you for the amount of detail that you've given us. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Anne that was a great point, by the way, about the water storage tanks. Of course it's always good points. I want to point out to everyone that at 61,000 square feet, this is roughly the size of say the Sake' Brewery; the old Stop and Shop, is a little bit bigger. As Stephanie pointed out and Bonnie provided the information, depending on where you stand, it is going to feel tall. I personally, to echo on what Anne said, I think that there's actually a lot of good articulation on the building. We did point that out last time that the Code requires any plane that's over a hundred feet, so that does help break up the scale, but it is still a large building as has been pointed out. Mr. Oliver comments?

Mr. Oliver: Yes. I have a few comments. In the northwest view from Quaker, in that picture, is the scale kind of accurate with how close it is to the road from that viewpoint? Yes. That's the view.

Mr. Bingham: It is accurate to scale.

Vice-Chair Dexter: That's the south view.

Mr. Oliver: Yeah, I had the wrong, wrong thing written down. So that distance from the road to the, I guess it would be the east elevation is fairly accurate?

Mr. Bingham: Yes. It's a built in a 3D model, so it was modeled on the drawings from Rich and Peter.

Mr. Oliver: Okay. In your ideas of moving the building north, would that get closer to Quaker or move away or not really change?

Mr. Sander: So it would just move alongside Quaker. So instead of this parking area right here, that's where the building would be rather than moving closer to the road. So it's just going to move North along, or parallel to the road.

Mr. Oliver: Okay. So bringing it more down the slope would actually pronounce the elevation more from that view, correct?

Mr. Sander: Exactly. Yeah. This would definitely, it would look closer to you if you were standing at this spot.

Mr. Markowitz: This is Stu Markowitz, it's a real balancing act to try to get a little distance from the intersection without pulling it too far back without losing too much parking, just enough to get some space and some distance, so that the roofs aren't quite so close.

Mr. Oliver: My fear with that idea is that by doing so, I think you're actually going to pronounce the scale even more in the size of the building, even more from that viewpoint. Where it might be better kind of tucked in the hill, the way you have it. That's just my personal opinion. And then I really like the architecture and the colors and the design. And I haven't seen the landscape plan yet, but one of my suggestions or ideas would be rather than making rows of screening, maybe focus on clump plantings of like large evergreens. Because it has a lodgey feel to it with the architecture and the color. And rather than completely hide the structure, break up the viewpoints with larger plantings and you can see through them differently.

Mr. Sander: Yeah. Our thinking was to actually provide some evergreen screening along that side of the road. You can see in our planting plan right along here.

Mr. Oliver: Right. You see how you have it in a row? I'm saying more like on the north end where you have that kind of pocket at the edge of the parking lot, do like a mass clump there of like six or maybe seven large evergreens and then have a break in the planting where you have maybe a 30 or 50 foot view shed to see the building and then have another clump of large mass plantings of evergreens, so that can still see the beauty of the building. And it kind of lends itself to, rather than a linear line of screening, more natural broken up because that's kind of the feel I get from the building.

Mr. Sander: Okay.

Mr. Oliver: And then, I think I touched on the parking idea. I personally, wouldn't like to see it go farther north because I think the building's going to look larger from looking south if you do that. And then going to the concept plan, if you can go back to that.

Mr. Sander: Are you speaking of the master plan?

Mr. Oliver: Yes, the master plan? Sorry. So I agree with what Liz had brought up about the road being paved. I think having an unpaved road will create a lot of issues, especially since you're going to use the site year-round. You're going to have structural issues, year-round issues, issues in the winter with snow and ice, trying to maintain the road, especially for buses and larger vehicles. And additionally in the summer you're going to have dust issues, especially with large gatherings of up to 5,000. I'd also like to point out on the master plan where you have that back road labeled as 24, right in that circle there, right near the overflow parking for the buses. It looks to me that for buses it would be a right only out of there is that accurate?

Mr. Sander: Yeah. We don't really intend for any of the buses to go beyond this junction. Being that we were kind of thinking of it more as a dirt and gravel road, buses really wouldn't be suited to do large loops around the service road.

Mr. Oliver: And then how would the buses exit the whole site?

Mr. Sander: So they could either come out through, down here and then continue along here.

Mr. Oliver: So they would go to the west, you're saying?

Mr. Sander: Come in here, just begin picking people up or, this is actually something we could cover in our large event management plan as the correct busing route. And that's something we can kind of analyze and explain out to you guys a little better.

Mr. Oliver: I just think that where that road comes in off of Victory Lake Road.

Mr. Sander: Are you saying?

Mr. Oliver: Yeah. Right where you just were, back the other way. Right where it's labeled at Victory Lake Road where it goes in. So if you can maybe make that, so that it would be an easier turning radius for a bus if they want to leave the site that way. I think it's just in this stage, if you kind of constrict yourself so much that it doesn't lend itself to future growth.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. I actually think listening to it, that that's actually a really good point. We should probably make it, oh, I'll take away the word probably, let's say definitely, make it so that the buses can swing some more of these corners a little bit easier, because although we may all talk about it and envision something, somebody is going to get in that bus and they're going to decide how they think is the easiest way to go and they're going to want to make the turn anyway. So we should think about that.

Mr. Oliver: It's much easier to do it at this stage.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. It's a point well taken.

Mr. Oliver: And my final note, about the size of the events, I think it actually might be good for Hyde Park. I mean, you know, 5,000 people at an event, that's going to have a trickledown effect on a lot of local businesses. You know, people are going to spend money doing other things. And so I'm glad to see that that's a possibility coming here. So thank you.

Mr. Rennia: Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Chris, before I let you go, I think that I need to have you weigh in also on the parking being in front of, I think I know you don't want the building to move North and want to keep the parking at and you propose different kinds of landscaping. I think you're okay with having parking, being in front of the building line.

Mr. Oliver: I don't know about that radius that connects the two parking lots right there, but if that could be shifted to the west, you know, maybe 10 feet or 15 feet, it would give us more room for that kind of landscaping along Quaker. But I don't know if that turning radius there would allow that.

Mr. Sander: So you're saying kind of along where my cursor is. Right? So just shift it?

Mr. Oliver: I would almost want to see it shift more to the west, if you could, and line up the back line, if it would make any sense.

Mr. Sander: Yep. So this would come flush with this is what you're thinking.

Mr. Oliver: I mean, that's what my eye sees, and then that would give you more space and buffer between Quaker and the parking.

Mr. Rennia: Okay. And what I'm thinking tonight, listening to all the comments, I'm picturing how we're going to rework the parking for drainage, with Pete's comments and then some Board Member comments and then the possibility of trying to use that upper triangle. So I think what we might try to come back to you with, is once we incorporate the

architectural footprint is, you might see from us, if we're a little unsure, you might see two concept plans. Because I can already kind of picture maybe two potentially different ways to approach this.

Chairman Dupree: That's quite all right. I promise you, Mr. Rennia. And Ms. DiNapoli, comments?

Ms. DiNapoli: Yes, I do. First of all, welcome back. It's nice to see you and thank you for such a colorful plan. I find the architecture quite interesting and I have the advantage of being last, next to our Chairman, which means everything has more or less has been said already. I do have a couple of quick questions. On these plans in the front of the sanctuary, on the side, it says that the mechanics, close to Crum Elbow, the darkened piece, is that where you plan to keep all of your mechanics?

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, we were thinking that that's where the outdoor mechanical, I mean, the HVAC system for the building hasn't been designed yet, but we know on a building this size that there's typically some sort of mechanical equipment like chillers, they have to basically, they look like more metal boxes and they pull a lot of air through them. They're typically in a fenced in area to keep people away from it. So, we were thinking that that might be a good area to hide that type of mechanical equipment.

Ms. DiNapoli: And seeing it from the road?

Mr. Rennia: It goes downhill there, so that sits down from the road and then we were proposing some landscaping as well. When we get in a little more detailed, we could also look at maybe something, screening with a fence, although we do need airflow, because we need air flow through. Yeah, that was our hope, that it sits down much lower than the road. And we were proposing some additional tree plantings, landscaping up near the road.

Mr. Sander: Yeah. As you can see in this plan, this existing residence kind of sits up on the hill and then it comes down. So it should block it from view of the road, especially with supplemental landscaping.

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay. Your lampposts, just that you'd be aware and I think Liz has this in her notes, that they need to be all one color all the way down. There was a question when we were looking at your lighting plan, it looked like the base had pebbles?

Mr. Markowitz: I think it's a rendition of.

Mr. Rennia: It's a concrete hatch. So we're proposing to have basically, a round extension of concrete, get it up above the parking area.

Ms. DiNapoli: So you're going to have concrete and then you have the post on top?

Mr. Rennia: Yes.

Mr. Setaro: We typically have them paint that black.

Ms. DiNapoli: Yeah.

Mr. Rennia: Oh, okay.

Mr. Sander: Yeah. We'll add a leader to make sure it's painted black.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah. So, it's darker in color and matches more to the post. It seems like...

Ms. DiNapoli: It has to be all one color, yes.

Mr. Rennia: Yeah, okay. That makes perfect sense. And we like to have the concrete up out of the ground a little bit, because somebody's going to hit it, a snowplow or the lawnmower person, it's just makes it a little bit of a sturdier design that way.

Ms. DiNapoli: Thank you. I also agree, it would be very helpful if you could stake this out and I don't know if this is too cumbersome of a request, to stake it out where you have it now and then just add maybe two stakes where you were thinking of moving it. So this way we have a sense of, you know, the differences between both sites and Brent's idea of a 93-foot balloon, would be great, because as much as you try to imagine it would be most helpful, being able to walk around and then going up and down the two streets, seeing the visual of it. I commend you all for all of your hard work on this plan. I think it's going to be a great asset to our town and we are very appreciative of that.

Mr. Sander: We're very excited to work with you guys on this too.

Ms. DiNapoli: Oh, and I forgot Michael, my comment about the parking. I am not vested at this moment one way or the other.

Chairman Dupree: Okay, you and Stephanie then. Thank you. So Mr. Rennia and Mr. Sander, I promised you a hot bench and you got one tonight. I told you everyone would have read through everything very carefully. I really don't have that much to add myself. I will say only, that the kind of use that's envisioned here, I think is a great one. I personally, growing up in the South, I remember seeing big groups of people sitting at picnic tables underneath tents and having, as I said, driven past this so many times over the years, I'm actually going to miss seeing a big crowd of happy people, smiling, laughing, kids running around, but at the same time, it's weather dependent. It's going to be much better this way to have it under one roof and to have different programmatic activities. So I understand what we're calling for here. I also personally am not, I don't really think I'm as disturbed perhaps as what other people are, even though it seems really large and massive, including at the height. I'm also aware that churches in general, places of religious worship tend to be big buildings. Growing up in Louisiana, where we don't even have counties, we have parishes, everyone's Catholic, like I was raised. We have different sized churches depending on the congregation. And this is used by a series of different churches across five states. So because of the use that is proposed, I think that that's appropriate. I want to thank both of the architects for working on this. Again, for doing a nice job, a great job of articulating it so that I think that it does really reduce down the sort of mass, scale of it. I also think having listened to my colleagues that a site visit is called for. I think what we want to do is wait for them to stake it out when then we have maybe the two concept plans that Mr. Rennia mentioned because there's no rush to walk out there right now. I personally, if you need to have the parking, Ms. Axelson pointed out that the drive aisles right now are two feet wider than what's required in our code. If the parking needs to stay front of the

building line, I'm okay with it, as long as it's also screened. I want to point out that I really liked Chris's idea about clumping landscaping, because I don't love to see little marching soldiers up and down in a row. That noted the Board would need to make a sort of finding that sufficient screening would be accommodated by having intermittent views of the building, because as a point of fact, we are required to screen between residential and non-residential uses, and this is a non-residential use and there are residential uses across the street. But that noted, I agree wholeheartedly with Chris, when I saw the building this afternoon, it has so much more pizzazz than what was, well, let me just go ahead and point out, no offense to Rich and Peter, but the building we originally saw was boxier. It was just a design by Rich and Peter. It wasn't really design done by an architect. This has been refined extensively.

Mr. Rennia: And everybody knew that was just a placeholder at the time, so we can get a location picked out.

Mr. Markowitz: As the architect, I have no comment on it. *Laughter.*

Chairman Dupree: No, but when I saw it today, I did, like Chris, had the idea that it felt very rural and sort of Adirondack in style, which seems appropriate for that area because it is very rural. And one of the reasons why I've always taken the Salt Point Turnpike exit off of Taconic and taken Crum Elbow is, when I'm coming from the city, it's actually a lot shorter to take a couple of other roads and go through Poughkeepsie, but it's not nearly as nice. This is a really beautiful way to approach Hyde Park. I think this is going to be a nice addition to keeping it very pretty. I'll also point out, it's in Ms. Axelson's comment memo, but you will need to show areas for snow storage. And beyond that, I recently saw a Facebook post by a resident who I believe commented that the Planning Board collectively had a big head, but I'm not going to care about that because I want to point out that it's a pleasure to lead this Board as always because all of you did a great job with your comments tonight. I think you've given very clear direction to the applicants and their consultants, about what you're looking for, ideas for ways to improve the functionality of the layout, particularly with what Chris just pointed out about how buses are really going to flow in through there, because we will need to see turning radiuses to make sure that everything is adequate for that. This is why it's fun. I didn't have to really add any more comments than the ones I just did, which were pretty brief because all of my colleagues covered everything so thoroughly. Anybody else have any other comments before we conclude this application at the moment?

Mr. Markowitz: Just the thank the Board and for your careful look at the plans, even though they are still very preliminary, but we hope to address your comments and continue to refine the design.

Chairman Dupree: Which reminds me also that, in the first place, the cross, I defer to Ms. Moss, but I don't believe that the cross as unusable space would be included in the height of the overall structure. And again, to sort of look at the process, remember we would be doing SEQR and then approving a master site plan. As part of that, we'll be approving the phase one as well, I hope, but there may be some timing issues because, once we can get SEQR going on this, then I believe that we can maybe conclude that. We'll see how fast, but I hope quickly, because we've all identified traffic as being the most important. Although tonight I heard two members talk about a balloon test, so there may be some issue with

visual impact. But the applicants, I believe are already proposing ways to mitigate that by tucking it into the building or hiding it behind a higher elevation of ground, as well as proposing different kinds of landscaping. That noted, we will definitely need to nail down the location of the buildings and the different parking, et cetera, for phase one, before we can approve that. But I look forward to this and what we'll do is just as soon as you're ready to submit revisions, then let us know. I do think that as I said, the traffic impact analysis before we send it out, should definitely have ITE numbers thrown in there. Because you've also heard everyone talk about trying to nail down, if not precisely, but an idea of, the sort of maximum capacity. And I appreciate Ms. Lambert, Deanna's comment that they're not looking to use anything new yet, but we should all consider when we're looking at potential future impacts, what the future may bring. And as Peter said, it may be that there might be some more programming because, and so there'll be more frequency because now other churches can use their congregation to rent it. Those won't be large events, but we never know once this is built, I think it's going to look really great. You may actually have more people coming in than just the congregation. You may have cousins, relatives, whatever. So since we identified traffic as the biggest concern, I think that's what we need to kind of nail down as best we can with the idea that we can always take a look in the future, through future site plan. As I said, if there are no other comments, then it's a pleasure working with you guys, all of you. And I'm sorry for the limitations we have to undertake to do this by Zoom, because I really prefer our first meetings on new applications or rather significant applications to be in person, but we can't do that right now, so we're going to keep on doing this until we have a high enough vaccination rate that we can start meeting in person again. So thanks everybody.

Mr. Sander: Thank you everyone. Really appreciate it.

Chairman Dupree: If you need, at any time, as you know, to contact us, feel free to do so. We try to respond by email as quickly as possible as you have probably already seen.

Mr. Sander: Yeah, you guys rock at this. Very responsive. Always really appreciated.

Chairman Dupree: Can you tell that to the Facebook poster?

Mr. Sander: Yeah, I'll make a post when I go home.

Chairman Dupree: Anyway, thank you very much. And we'll see, as soon as you're ready. Stay safe and take care.

Ms. Lambert: Thank you everyone.

OTHER BUSINESS:

HYDE PARK TOWN CENTER-PARK PLAZA

Site Plan Amendment Approval Phase 2 Exterior Modification (#2020-15)

Location: 4240-4260 Albany Post Road

Grid #: 6064-02-965956

Board Member Wasser logged off the Board Meeting.

Chairman Dupree: And the last item on the agenda tonight, is we're making a correction to the previous approval resolution for the Hyde Park Town Center Park Plaza. Tad pretty much quickly caught that she thought that there were two signs that were on the site plan that were too large. As it turns out when she got the scale done correctly, they weren't, as you saw, she did a mea culpa and fell on her sword for us, running us an email, even though you don't have to Tad, for heaven's sakes. Little things like that happen all the time. So we're going to correct the prior resolution by pointing out that the two signs now are correct. And I believe this is going to be moved by Ms. Dexter.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION 2020-15C, ENTITLED "RESOLUTION TO GRANT SITE PLAN AMENDMENT APPROVAL AND AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF A TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY"

**Hyde Park Town Center Park Plaza
Phase 2**

Date: January 20, 2021

Moved By: Vice-Chair Dexter

Resolution: # 2020-15D

Seconded By: Chairman Dupree

WHEREAS, on January 6, 2021, by Resolution No. 2020-15C ("Resolution"), the Planning Board granted the applicant, Cosimo Town Center LLC, site plan approval for Phase 2 of a project to make exterior improvements and other alterations to an existing shopping center (the "Project") located at 4240-4260 Albany Post Road, Tax Parcel No. 6064-02-965956, in the Town Core PW-2 Zone; and

WHEREAS, the Resolution recommended issuance of the sign permits for the Project, with the exception of those for CVS and Mid-Hudson Regional Early Learning Center; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board seeks to revise the resolution to delete the sign permit exception for CVS and Mid-Hudson Regional Early Learning Center.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the first resolved clause of the Resolution is hereby amended to delete the phrase "with the exception of those for CVS and Mid-Hudson Regional Early Learning Center" so that the Zoning Administrator may issue permits for said signs.

Aye	Chairman Dupree
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE

Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0

Motion Carried

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Dupree: I will second it because I've just realized Stephanie popped off to have a Zoom celebratory dinner. So I'll second and any further discussion? All in favor, please raise your hand and say, aye. Aye. One abstention because Ms. Wasser is not present for this. Thanks again to our consultants also, for doing a very thorough job on evaluating Camp Victory Lake, because it is a big, big project, but I think everybody says an exciting one too. So there being no other business, may I get a motion to adjourn?

MOTION: Mr. Oliver
SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To adjourn.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Absent	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Motion to adjourn. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman Krupnick as always for running our meeting on the technical aspects and see everyone in a couple of weeks. Stay safe.

**** Motion made at the April 21, 2021 Hyde Park Planning Board Meeting****

MOTION: Ms. Wasser
SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To approve the minutes of the January 20, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

Aye	Chairman Dupree
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE Aye-7 Absent-0 Abstain-0 Nay-0 Motion Carried