

September 29, 2021

Mr. Michael Dupree
Planning Board Chairman
Members of the Planning Board
Town of Hyde Park
4383 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538

*Re: Bellefield
SR 9 Hyde Park, NY, Dutchess County, NY
Chazen Project # 81235.10*

Dear Mr. Dupree and Members of the Planning Board:

Please find below our responses to the Planning Board's Members comments received via email from the Planning Board Secretary on September 2, 2021.

Planning Board Member – Ann Weiser

Comment: So glad to see you here tonight with this project. I think the agri-hood concept is wonderful, perfect for this site, and perfect for Hyde Park.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: All of the visual examples you provided are impeccable and I thank you for presenting such a strong vision.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: My main concerns are with building height and length of the rental stand-alone and the loft apartments.

I'll start with the loft apartments. I don't see the need for a height of 51 feet. 1st floor retail has a ceiling height of 20 feet and the two subsequent loft apartments have 10-foot ceilings, so for this 3-story building, you are looking at 40 feet of ceiling height. Unless you are suggesting a 4-story building, you shouldn't need a height of more than 46ft.

I want to point out that all your concept imagery and renderings, the loft buildings show no more than 3 stories in height. 1 story retail below 2 stories residential.

Regarding the stand-alone apartments. The same observation applies. How does the 51 feet in height play out? For 3 stories with 1 story parking (and I emphasize) mostly below grade, I don't see how you need more than 46 ft.

Also in amended PUD concept plan dated Aug. 15, on page 18 while the maximum height states 51', the notes say, "Height does not include parking below first floor". The note appears to be a mistake.

Regarding length – the proposed maximum length of 300 feet is just massive. That is basically a football field. You responded to the town's request to limit length to 200' would "prevent creating the scale and sense of place..." I don't get a "sense of place" from an immense 300-foot building even with articulation.

Response: In response to a number of comments relating to these issues, the proposed Bulk Table has been revised and is enclosed in the SEQR Comparison Report and Project Narrative.

Comment: So, except for my notes to Bonnie for Dr. Gardner regarding the Camoin and Weitzman reports, this is all I have.

Response: Comment noted.

Planning Board Member – Stephanie Wasser

Improved architectural concepts.

Comment: Inconsistencies with the BPDD:

Preserving existing natural beauty- this is our gateway with 1 mile of frontage. Very concerned about the removal of trees, screening, and any change to 150' setback. Elevations and renderings would help to understand how the built-out project will look from Route 9 and further west to the river and beyond. E.g. the proposal specifically says there will be views of The Village across open fields from Route 9, and this is the densest part of your proposal. In the renderings shown, there are a lot of trees removed along Route 9.

Response: Comment noted. Proposed renderings of the SR 9 corridor were presented to the Planning Board with returned comments received. It is the intension of the project team to revise the renderings after an onsite meeting with Planning Board to discuss these concerns. Accordingly, updated renderings will be provided as part of a future submission.

Comment: Additional heights – 4-story buildings are not consistent with the community. 10' ceilings for rentals and 20' ceilings for retail are not required for this market, especially convenience retail. I do support 2 ½ stories over one level of parking depending upon topo and screening.

Response: The view from public spaces and Route 9 would be of 3-story buildings. The parking level beneath the rental and condominium buildings would be visible only from the internal building courtyards. Proposed retail may include a variety of uses with typical clear ceiling heights of up to 20'. See the Design Guidelines on pages 47, 49 for additional information.

Comment: Too much density- an increase of 51%. In The Village, it's increased further to >10 d.u./ac and in The Terrace it's 5 d.u./ac.

Response: The proposed densities reflect a variety of housing types.

Comment: Housing/Commercial ratio--The materials state the additional housing density is necessary to support the reduced commercial, but there are 300,000 people in Dutchess County – you don't expect them to support? This is the tail wagging the dog.

Response: The community's proposed additional housing density is a key supplemental source necessary to support the commercial uses due to convenience and the desire to create a village like atmosphere.

Comment: Bulk- 100 maximum length without a massing break should hold for all buildings. The Crescent hotel length is equal to two football fields; the multi-family rentals would be equivalent to one football field in length without a break in massing. Same for Crescent condos.

Response: In response to several comments relating to these issues, the proposed Bulk Table has been revised.

Comment: Parking garages are not appropriate for this district; multi-level garages are not in the PUD or GB standards.

Response: The proposed parking garages respond to the unique circumstances of the site. In both cases, the number of parking levels is limited to two, and the design of the structures creates a visual appearance without the typical unpleasant appearance of multistory structures. The structures also serve a positive purpose by eliminating surface parking, and preventing any visual appearance that parking is a primary purpose of the site. The parking garage in the core of the Village is proposed to include a rooftop farm or garden. See Design Guidelines page 83 for more information.

Comment: 25' between buildings—you haven't proposed an increase in spacing despite increasing the height and bulk of the buildings.

Response: The concept layout proposes the majority of the building frontage on the rights-of way, open space, or internal courtyards. Where two buildings are end-to-end, a minimum of 25' allows for a driveway or landscaped zone between the buildings.

Comment: Phasing: Over 15-20 years, there will be phasing, even if you call them construction sequences (Chazen: six sequences over 15-20 year). 'Sequencing depending upon market conditions' is phasing.

Response: Comment noted. A site of this size will naturally be constructed over an extended build out period and will be influenced by market conditions. Nonetheless, the term "Phasing" of the PUD, in contrast to the general concept of construction phasing, is used in a particular sense and provides for submission of separate sequential Concept Development Plans for a Phased PUD. The instant CDP, like the 2007 approved Plan, is a comprehensive CPD for the entire site.

Comment: Community character: The full build-out of 844 dwelling units would reflect an 8% increase in the population of HP...I consider this a significant impact.

Response: As Lead Agency, the Planning Board will be assessing the potential impacts on community character of the proposed plan, and considering the Town's zoning and planning documents, the Greenway Guidelines, and comparing the proposed plan with the 2007 approved plan. The proposed number of units is appropriately considered in the context of the overall benefits, impacts, and mitigation of any impacts proposed for the site. Relevant factors in the analysis include: desirability of creating new types of neighborhoods in the context of a PUD on a unique site, the varied size of the units, the appropriate net densities in the context of creation of unique neighborhood(s) to be created as part of a PUD, the transect principles as applied to the site, the counterbalancing provision of large areas of preserved open space as part of the plan, and the visual impacts of the proposed project. The extent of the modification from the prior approval is also a relevant factor, and the increase, as viewed in terms of total square footage, is an increase from 53% to 62%.

Comment: Concerned about the request for the transfer of development rights for the residential. Although it provides flexibility for you, we have no idea what we're going to end up with.

Response: Comment noted. Discussion of the various neighborhoods is ongoing, as is the concept of creating flexibility under the supervision of the Planning Board at the time of Final Development approval, without the need in every case to amend the Concept Development Plan. Applicant agrees that further discussion should take place regarding parameters of flexibility in development of the residential neighborhoods.

Comment: Whatever the final mix, height, and density, support as much shared parking as feasible.

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: [Postscript- I completely agree with my colleague that the in the residential neighborhoods, the layout is too linear. I support clustering in the process of reducing density.]

Response: The proposed concept layout (including circulation and development areas) responds to the natural characteristics of the site, including topography, rock outcrops, and open space opportunities and development is clustered to preserve these features.

Planning Board Member – Michael Dupree

Comment: Biggest difference seems to be increase in residential uses, from 53% of total sf to 62% and reduction in non-residential from 47% to 38%. Most people think of two uses, residential v commercial, but Bellefield's zoning does not – it's residential v nonresidential. It appears that agricultural buildings, proposed as three-stories tall (see p. 32), an event barn (15,000 sq ft), an amphitheater and three-story educational buildings are included in the non-residential total. This project is supposed to expand the town's commercial tax base, rather than loading it up with residential uses. But how do ag buildings, an event barn and an amphitheater expand the tax base? Office and destination retail have been drastically reduced, convenience retail is now envisioned – i.e. dry cleaners, nail salons, hair salons, services residents, rather than tourists, will want – and this impacts the fiscal benefits formerly offered. Educational buildings and farm fields are listed as tax-exempt. BTW, throughout the application, there are references to 1,307,742 sq ft of "residential" and 820,578 sq ft of "commercial" (see page 30), but again, some portion of the latter does not seem to be commercial in the conventional sense of the word, at least tax-wise.

Response: It is acknowledged that the terminology used in the zoning provision is residential vs. non-residential. While we agree that one of the purposes of the BPDD District is to "build the Town's commercial tax base," there are other purposes of the BPDD District and the PUD provisions, including, for example, expanding the existing mixed use in the Corridor Business District, promoting tourism-related businesses, allowing for design of new communities that achieve better utilization of land, provide for accessible public open space, permit smaller networks of streets and more economical building types, combining and coordinating land uses, providing additional convenience and economy in location of retail and other commercial enterprises and services, and to create new community centers. We acknowledge that the weighing and evaluation of the various purposes requires analysis under SEQR and ultimately requires the exercise of legislative discretion by the Town Board.

Comment: Next big change would be that almost all of the increase in residential use is multifamily rental apartments. Requesting four stories, height of 51 feet, however, also requesting underground parking and asking that it not be counted into height calculations. Car storage is an accessory use to the residential and I will maintain that it should be included in every instance where it is proposed. Town Board will need to weigh in on visual impacts. It is noted that the CIA across Route 9 has several

tall buildings, but most are three story and do not have parking garages underneath them. In addition, the area of disturbance proposed is significantly larger than the compact CIA campus's and there would be many taller buildings sited on higher slopes at Bellefield, whereas the CIA campus slopes downward as you enter from 9. So, comparing apples to oranges in many ways.

Response: As to the issues of Bulk Table, height, and parking below buildings, please see amended bulk table. The concern about visual impacts is acknowledged. Please see additional visual materials submitted herewith, which specifically assess the visual impacts in the context of the existing setting vis-à-vis the Hudson River and nearby properties. There has also been substantial consideration given by applicant to assuring that the proposed development of the Bellefield site is congruent with existing topography.

Comment: New uses are proposed, including the event barn, membership club, commercial recreation, animal husbandry, agriculture and food manufacturing. The latter does not seem to be explained and is perhaps meant for the future, but it should be described precisely – manufacturing will impact traffic (see SEQR comments at end). I do not see an area reserved for animal husbandry in the CDP, nor commercial recreation per se? Latter should also be explained. Membership club – where is this? The residential uses are described as being supported by gyms, spas, etc... so are those only available by joining as members? Last, there is a catch-all for “other incidental uses in support of the overall development.” I believe that this is vague and should be deleted. If new uses not now envisioned are appropriate to the site in the future, the applicant should return and amend the CDP.

Response: New uses are proposed, including the event barn, membership club, commercial recreation, animal husbandry, agriculture and food manufacturing. It is acknowledged that use of the term “food manufacturing” was perhaps inartful, and created an inaccurate impression of the proposed activity. This submission clarifies the nature of the proposed activities on the site, including additional traffic materials. It is noted that a PUD can include uses not otherwise allowed by the underlying zoning, and it is also acknowledged that the definitions and parameters of such uses should be clear. As to the final point in the comment relating to “other incidental uses....,” such terms are not unusual in zoning regulations to authorize accessory or incidental uses which are not specifically defined and this phrasing was used in the 2007 Approved Plan. The applicant is happy to work with the Town’s boards and consultants to develop the appropriate language to use, if such flexibility is desired. Finally, the applicant would like the Concept Development Plan to allow the Planning Board to have an appropriate amount of flexibility at the time of Final Development Approval, to approval development that is within the approved overall concept, but differs in a reasonable way as to layout, specific boundaries, or other similar factors. The process of returning to amend the CDP is a complex and lengthy process, and may not be necessary, provided that the

Town Board and Planning Board can agree upon an appropriate range of factors where the Planning Board could exercise flexibility, and the extent thereof. These issues will continue to be discussed during the review process.

Comment: The second hotel does not represent a new use, per se, but the originally approved CDP had only one hotel and it was to be the only tall building. The second will be double the size of the first, and at 75 feet tall – this would not support the claim that the overall impression will be a low-rise, “small town center.” No objections to a second lodging facility, but this site will be dominated by many buildings that will be taller than anything in our town except the water tower and the main building at the CIA.

Response: The comment raises important visual impact issues, which are being addressed in this submission. The SEQR Comparison Analysis has been updated to include a Zone of Visibility and additional cross sections to address visual concerns.

Comment: Page 1, under 31,000 sq ft of restaurants, the fourth bullet point lists “artisanal food manufacturers – are those envisioned as actual purveyors of meals eaten on premises, or making pasta, jellies, etc... for purchase? In looking at the Bellefield web site, I see pictures of what appears to be a factory where some libation is produced, and it notes that between 10,000 sq ft to 200,000 sq ft of multi-tenant space is available “for businesses that produce high-quality food and libations.” This sounds truly visionary and great, but I do not believe that your account for the trucks and deliveries and workers in the traffic numbers. The town needs to have a realistic idea of what the volume of vehicles will be as this, if successful, would add a lot, I suspect.

Response: The proposed concept plan does not propose any food production over 15,000 sf and what is proposed is mostly on premises retail. The traffic analysis included the food production uses as retail space in estimating the trip generation potential of the project. The estimate of trips includes all vehicle types such as cars and delivery vehicles and includes all users such as employees and visitors.

Comment: Page 1, 774,328 sf of non-residential commercial uses also lists “437 keys” which includes 137 keys previously approved for the Inn at Bellefield. Remaining hotel will have 300 rooms. Page 7, labeled as Hotel/Conference Center, 300 keys, but plus the 32 hotel villas means 469 keys? Back to my first bullet point: numbers for commercial do not tie and should. – the difference of 46,250 sq ft seems to be “related amenity space” for the residential uses?

Response: The 32 hotel villas count towards the 469 hotel keys. The associated square footage of these keys has been included within the total non-residential square footage and the ratio is accurate. The hotel villas were included in the residential density calculations to be conservative, but will be removed as part of future submissions.

Comment: “Trail system is designed to link to off-site Town-wide existing and future proposed trail systems leading to Val-kill.” Where are these connections? They seem to lead to an entry/exit on St. Andrews Road and then stop. The nearest trails are on NPS land north of the other Bellefield PDD parcel (which has no trails) and one would have to either walk west, down St. Andrews, cross and proceed north to the trail heads at the Drive-in or walk up St. Andrews and north on 9G (where there are no sidewalks) to get to Val-kill. Is this really a link and these linkages are required under the code – here I note that the prior CDP accomplished this by means of a proposed shuttle service from the hotel to the historical sites.

Response: The trails map has been updated to reflect comments and resubmitted. See HH Figure 3.

Comment: Overall Visual Character: While the layout appears to generally conform with our zoning requirements, it does not fully comply with the “Building and Parking Setback Along Route 9” of 150 feet as there are structures within this setback. Aerial photography as well as driving by the site reveal that there are areas along the frontage where trees are sparse and should be supplemented with substantial landscaping. Enhanced landscaping must be provided in these areas to comply with the SEQRA Findings Statement and the following related zoning sections:

- a. Albany Post Road Corridor study regarding significant landscaping at page 11;
- b. BPDD purpose and character in 108-3.1.1, K.(1) and (2);
- c. Site development plan standards in 108-4.5 E. (1)(b)[3] and 108-4.5 F. (1) regarding landscaping;
- d. BPDD standards in 108-5.12 B.(1)(f) and B.(12).

The proposed fields would limit screening and additional landscaping. The proposed barn “signage” in the 150’ buffer could appear incongruous with the architecture of the hotel which will be the closest building to it. On the other hand, I like the idea that the barn would be more or less housing farm implements and is the main sign.

Response: The applicant acknowledges that the Visual Impacts of the proposed CDP are very important. This submission includes additional materials focused on assessing visual impacts in the SEQR Comparison Report. The project frontage on Route 9 is almost a mile long, and offers varied existing conditions as to visibility, quality of plantings, grade, etc. No viewer of the site is able to take in this expansive frontage in a single glance. There will be pedestrian viewers of portions of the frontage, including those using the crosswalks, or walking through the pathways of Bellefield or the CIA. Yet the situation of the viewer of the frontage will, in most cases, be that of a driver heading north or south on a multiple-lane state highway, resulting in transient, forward looking views that will take in the overall frontage in a relatively short amount of time. The plan for the frontage will have multiple purposes.

The Bellefield CDP differs from the previous plan, and the character of the frontage approved for the 2007 plan may not be altogether appropriate for the new plan. The 2007 plan was predominantly destination retail. It had been a common treatment of the frontage for such uses that they be hidden from public view by means of planted berms, evergreen plantings, and grading with curved approaches from the highway that prevented views of large parking areas surrounding large buildings. The 2007 approvals provided for substantial plantings, but also allowed for some select open areas with views, and areas of stormwater features which offered views, but there was an overall concept of substantial vegetated screening, although the 150 foot setback was to have also allowed a walking path. The character of the new plan may call for a different approach to the overall linear setback along Route 9 and proposed plantings would include demonstration farm and garden plantings and would be rotated seasonally and in accordance with a farm manager's oversight.

The specific provisions regarding the 150 feet provision in the zoning law is that it is a setback for all buildings, structures, and parking. See 108-5.12. B. 11 (b). There is a separate provision providing that the structural and parking facilities be "visually unobtrusive," but this does not necessarily require that all elements be completely screened from view.

Comment: Throughout the narrative, it is noted that the new multifamily rentals will add "housing diversity." And the Weitzman marketing report claims that households earning the county's median income can afford these rentals. But it also claims that there is a sizeable market for second home rentals in NYC. And the justification for the underground parking and taller heights includes "development aesthetics, contemporary design and market demand". Hyde Park's housing stock will not be more diversified by adding luxury rentals to luxury purchase to own. The prior CDP included 23 affordable homes, meaning the sales price would accommodate families earning 80% of the county's median income, as noted in the FEIS. Is there a similar guarantee for these rentals - that some will not be at a market rate? 10-foot ceilings are I believe proposed for the multifamily which would seem to add more costs to the units and therefore making the rental costs higher.

Will any housing be affordable, for sale or rent? I believe that the affordable housing – as limited as it was – was added because of impacts to community character. Hyde Park is distinctly mixed income, and our median income is less than the county's. Per capita income is \$36,000 a year here. Will residents be able to afford to own or rent here should they so desire?

Response: As the previous comments have noted, the 2021 plan is different than the 2007 plan, in response to national and international changes in the sustainability of destination brick-and-mortar retail. Yet, as pointed out in previous comments, it remains among the purposes of a PUD within the zoning provisions to provide economic benefits to the Town. The provision of luxury rentals in the product mix is intended to add a new element of free-standing rental buildings to the overall type of housing offered in the Town. The high quality of these units, and their location within a "Main Street" setting will also add to the economic benefits to the Town. There is no proposal to include affordable housing at this location.

Comment: Applicant is seeking a temporary increase of residential development up to 72% during construction – which given the lack of vertical construction on the hotel, makes me worry that we could ultimately see only housing at the site, should the commercial not find financing. Applicant reserves the ability to request even greater increases in the proportion for residential by seeking approval from the Town Board, though how that process would work is not explained – amend the CDP?

Response: The 2007 approvals allowed for a temporary "imbalance" in the residential/non-residential ratio during construction, since it is not always possible to maintain a ratio as various elements of a project are developed. Several comments have pointed out that these procedures need to be clarified. It is acknowledged that any provision on temporary ability to exceed the authorized ratio will have to be approved by the Town Board as part of the CDP approval.

Comment: New provisions for measuring height are being sought all so that the underground parking would not count. But it should, to me. It is usable space if not habitable as I noted earlier.

Response: Please see revised Bulk Table in this submission.

Comment: Parking: applicant has reduced the number of spaces from 3892 and has eliminated underground parking and is now proposing at least one parking garage, and probably two but those will be screened. This is preferable I believe to parking lots.

Response: We added the second parking garage as proposed and relocated the educational building to screen the parking structure from SR 9.

Comment: Construction sequence: proposed to be completed in six sequences over 15 to 20 years. Fiscal Impact study should reflect this as the one for the prior CDP detailed.

Response: Comment noted.

SEQR:

Comment: Traffic impacts: The event barn, village green and amphitheater: I could not find any details on how these will be used? Will there be concerts and performances, food festivals like the pictures used for marketing the site? Such events are welcomed in our town, and I applaud the applicant for incorporating them if so, but Table 8's Trip Generation Chart does not break these uses out, and we will need more information in order to assess traffic impacts. Can anyone or any entity rent the barn, or green and amphitheater? What is the potential for different events to occur frequently or simultaneously? The event barn is listed as part of the commercial uses. Food manufacturing should also be listed for traffic generation. Otherwise, I agree that there will be less trips generated at peak times owing to the reduction of office and destination retail.

Response: After further direction from the PB the traffic study was updated and is included in the revised EAF and separately for the Board's review.

Comment: Traffic impacts: Page 73, "It is noted that item 4 (installation of a landscaped island to create a right-turn only lane onto St. Andrews Road) is not needed as a capacity improvement." This was a NYSDOT requirement and will need to be discussed with DOT personnel as the applicant appears to be requesting that it be eliminated. If memory serves, it was designed to make it easier for residents wishing to use the St. Andrews entry to reach their homes.

Response: The language was intended to distinguish that this particular improvement does not improve capacity. The Applicant understands that if any modification of this improvement is desired in the future, then further coordination with NYSDOT will need to be undertaken.

Comment: Recreation: the prior CDP specified that public and pocket parks would be open to all residents and would include playground equipment. Latter is never cited here, so will these have equipment meant to appeal to children, adults and teenagers?

Response: The Concept Plan includes pocket parks, trails, and larger open spaces and the Design Guidelines include the landscape palettes for these Common Spaces. These spaces vary in size and location and would be accessed by residents and visitors.

Comment: Community Character: page 57, “The goal of the proposed development was identified on page 12 of the 2017 Findings Statement, “provide a new gateway presence to the Town of Hyde Park.” To this end, the project design included an “approximately 250-foot setback with substantial landscaping and vegetative buffer to provide a visible separation from the development and the roads”. The visual assessment provided indicates that there will be little separation from the development because of the planned removal of undergrowth and existing trees to accommodate the farm fields. The landscaping proposed in the 150-foot buffer seems to be comprised more of conical evergreens to allow these views. Think about reflecting the CIA’s landscaping across along the west side of Route 9.

Response: While the Zoning Law itself makes some requirements for any PUD on this property (e.g. addressing gateway elements, estate-like setting, protecting important views and natural features, retaining tree rows, hedgerows, stone walls to maintain the rural flavor, avoidance of clear-cutting, major grading) the chosen visual solution appropriate to the 2021 proposed CDP may differ somewhat from that which was required for the 2007 plan, since the plans differ in important features. For example, the 2021 plan lacks the same destination retail/office element of the 2007 plan which was the driver of much of the proposals for substantial buffering within the route 9 setback with select views into the site, and for the requirement of a further setback with landscaping of 250 feet at the NW corner of the site.

The applicant acknowledges that analysis of visual impact is a relevant issue of environmental concern and the additional materials in the submission are designed to address that.

Comment: Community Character/Affordability: Where will the persons who maintain the fields and agriculture in this site reside? According to the marketability study, the residential design needs to be “similar to upscale resorts.” For that matter, the Weitzman study seems to be focused more heavily on selling and renting dwelling units rather than developing and marketing the commercial uses which now seem to be more of an afterthought on how to even better market the housing (hence the switch from destination retail to convenience).

Response: The Weitzman study was prepared to address the rental units to respond to initial questions as to whether there was actually a market for the proposed stand-alone rental buildings

proposed in the project. As there is no similar product type in the Town, the study was requested to establish its viability and results from an economic analysis. The Applicant intends to engage a management company to manage open spaces through the Master Homeowners Association.

Comment: Pedestrian connections: Original CDP FEIS Findings Statement, p.8: “Included in the landscape plan will be either a sidewalk from the intersection of the access road with Route 9 to the intersection of St. Andrews Road and Route 9, or in the alternative, an internal pedestrian route connecting the same two intersections.” I still do not see this pedestrian route shown and the narrative asserts that the 2021 Proposed Project provides the connection between the CIA and the sake facility to create “a culinary corridor.” Where is this physical connection?

Response: The trails map has been updated to reflect comments and resubmitted. See Figure 3.

Comment: Visual Impacts: The applicant seems to be seeking permission to only have massing broken every 150 feet, rather than the Town’s requirement in all other zoning districts to break every 100 feet in width. Given the requested height of so many structures, I believe that Bellefield should break up the mass every 100 linear feet, to reduce negative visual impacts and maintain a small-town feel. See, also, prior comments on proposed views into the site from Route 9, and lack of screening.

Response: In response to a number of comments relating to these issues, the proposed Bulk Table has been revised.

Comment: Fiscal Impact Study: my comments were sent directly to our planning consultant Bonnie Franson who is compiling other Planning Board members’ comments into a single document. However, the DC EDC 2007 report estimated fiscal benefits from year 1 at \$245,000 to the Town and \$595,000 at full build out (which was assumed to occur in 10 years). I see no reason why the same methodology was not used since Camoin relied on the DC EDC report otherwise for “consistency” and estimating the tax benefits in year 1 as though the site was already fully built out strains credibility.

Response: Fiscal comments will be addressed by Camoin Associates in a future submission.

Planning Board Member – Anne Dexter

Comment: 'Agrihood' definition. How is Bellefield defining their version of 'agrihood' in order to fit in with the Hyde Park/Dutchess County culture? Vineyard, winery, farm? CSA? However, Bellefield defines it, this should be focal point(s) of the project.

Response: The Bellefield Agrihood would include a curated plant palette and rotation of crops reflecting the agricultural characteristics of the surrounding region. Environment and soil conditions will inform appropriate plant cultivation with emphasis placed on material historically grown in the region, native plants, and plants or crops that reflect the food-centric retail and food and beverage program. The demonstration farm aspects of the agrihood would be characterized by educational benefits, wellness aspects, and cultural history of the region. Residents could engage through various means including tending to their own portion of a community garden or by joining a CSA program.

Comment: Affordable housing/workforce housing. No mention of how someone living in Dutchess County with the mean income could possibly afford to live at Bellefield. Where will the workers (farm, winery, services) live? Need to see affordable housing as a strong component of this project.

Response: The proposed additional housing, and particularly the free-standing rental units, are designed to diversify the housing types available in the Town, while also contributing to the Town's commercial tax base, which is one of the purposes of the Bellefield PDD District.

Comment: Clustered development. Housing (townhomes, condos, single-family) all follow a linear, traditional layout with sewer, clustering is not only possible, it should be a model for this development. I would consider higher-storied units if they were clustered (see CIA dorm layout as an example), allowing for more true, open space. As currently laid out, there is minimal 'open' space - I would hope that an 'agrihood' could be an example of clustered development leaving open land for recreation and farming.

Response: The proposed concept layout (including circulation and development areas) responds to the natural characteristics of the site, including topography, rock outcrops, and open space opportunities and development is clustered to preserve these features. As described in the approved 2007 PUD, a percentage of the site will be open space, available for recreation, farming and cultivation, or preserved.

Town Engineer – Pete Setaro, P.E.

Comment: The narrative references submittal of a SWPPP meeting the NYS DEC standards. This will require a phasing plan with detailed grading. The phasing plan has not been submitted for the development, perhaps use the first 5 acres of disturbance anticipated as the first phase. A conceptual stormwater analysis must be submitted for review with this application.

Response: Stormwater-related aspects of the amended Concept Master Plan were discussed on a conference call on 9/24 between this office, the Town-designated engineer and Town stormwater officer. At that time, it was determined that a stormwater management report will be prepared for the amended Concept Master Plan, which will be submitted under separate cover. The stormwater management report will provide preliminary proposed locations for stormwater management areas

for the post-development condition based on the amended Concept Master Plan layout and indicate preliminary quality and quantity calculations for the proposed new impervious areas. A comparison of impervious areas between the 2007 concept master plan and the 2021 amended concept master plan has been conducted. The difference in impervious area between the two plans is approximately 2%:

New Impervious Area Comparison Table

	2007 Concept Master Plan	2021 Concept Master Plan	Difference (%)
Impervious Area (ac)	68.9	70.4	2%

As the exact phasing of the buildout of the project and final layout for each neighborhood are unknown at this time, phasing and detailed grading will be provided with individual site plan applications in the future as each section of the site is developed. A full stormwater pollution prevention plan in accordance with NYSDEC standards, and identifying highly erodible soils on the soils map, will also be provided at that time.

Questions regarding high-level overall earthwork estimates and roadway grading were also discussed. Figure 11 has been provided that shows the approximate earthwork amounts for each of the proposed neighborhoods. As stated, detailed grading and phasing (including that of earthwork) will be provided with the individual site plan applications. Figure 12 has been provided to show the approximate amount of cut/fill required along the proposed Omega Road. Callouts of the finished grade and existing grade have been provided on the plan in addition to a profile of the proposed roadway.

Town Planner – Bonnie Franson, AICP

1	As a general comment, the concept plan needs to be organized into a single set, and it needs to be made clear what constitutes the full plan set with a cover sheet identifying all sheets that are part of it. Various submissions have been made from Hart Howerton and Chazen, and these should be integrated into a single package.
RESPONSE	A single plan set has been provided as part of this submittal.
2	All maps need to be dated, so that the Town can track the most recent versions of each plan sheets.
RESPONSE	Dates have been added to figures.
3	The concept plan should be submitted at greater than an 11" x 17" size and scale so that setbacks, distances, etc., can be checked to see if what is shown on the plan meets what is being proposed for bulk standards is feasible, at the conceptual level.
RESPONSE	All maps have been re-submitted at a minimum of 200' scale.
Figure 01 - Bellefield Overall Concept Plan	

4		The Terrace appears to have several different arrangements for the townhomes. Is there a significant size difference between them?
RESPONSE		Arrangements vary; however, linear or shared autocourt lot types would include the range of townhome sizes noted in the marketing report. The bulk table includes an average size.
5		It is presumed that the spot elevations are existing grade. To what extent will there be grading at the upper lots in the Ridge to accommodate dwellings? Will they be terrain adapted? These appear to be on a ridgeline and may be visible. Can any existing vegetation be retained on these parcels?
RESPONSE		Grading for lots as required to create buildable lots and accommodate access and drainage will tie into existing grade and preserve existing vegetation where possible.
6		While considerable effort has been spent on rendering the Village main street and multifamily buildings, there are fewer renderings and plans of how the Terrace and Ridge would be developed. The Town Board has expressed that it favors detached dwellings in the mix, so that the project is not overwhelmingly multifamily. It would be useful to put additional design time into enlarging sections of these neighborhoods and how they would be laid out, showing road widths and sidewalk cross sections, and samples of how the lots would be platted at a larger scale, taking into account topography, to ensure development of these areas is feasible.
RESPONSE		The Applicant shared various neighborhood lot sketches to aid in conversations about road widths, sidewalks, topography, etc. with Town representatives. Figure 2 indicates the proposed program for single family detached program in the various neighborhoods.
7		Within the Ridge and based on the scale, lots are as small as about 5,200 square feet. What size homes are contemplated on these lots? It would be useful to show a sample plan that meets the proposed setback requirements, and what remains for construction of the dwelling with garage and yard space.
RESPONSE		See response 6.
8		Some of the townhome footprints in the “crescent” area of the Terrace neighborhood measure around a 750 square foot footprint. They are also about 25 feet in width. Another lot in the Terrace has a width of about 19-20 feet. Were these intended to have two car garages, given the price points for these units? Without more detail, it cannot be determined if the number of proposed townhouse units is actually feasible.
RESPONSE		Townhomes may vary in width and would be designed to accommodate the Owner’s parking for the unit. Arrangements vary; however, linear or shared autocourt lot types would include the range of townhome sizes noted in the marketing report. The Figures have been updated to reflect building footprints for townhomes rather than lots.
9		Some road widths in the Terrace are measuring about 20 feet wide.
RESPONSE		Minimum road width (pavement width) for a two-way road without on-street parking is 20 feet. Maximum is 24 FT.
10		Some of the easterly lots in the Terrace are the larger lots in the development. From a marketability perspective, will there be demand for them as they are across the street from small lot townhomes?

RESPONSE		The Applicant’s opinion is that the mix of housing types creates a vibrant atmosphere that is desired.
11		Some of the townhomes in the Terrace have 4,760 square foot footprints. Are these actually lots and not buildings? There should be consistency in the rendering with regard to showing buildings versus lot, from a color perspective.
RESPONSE		The Figures have been updated to reflect building footprints for townhomes rather than lots.
12		The four townhouses seem out of place at the boundary of the Crescent and the Village – they are not a part of an overall community. It is recommended that their location be reconsidered.
RESPONSE		The plan is currently developed to a concept level. Details such as these will be resolved at site plan approval stage. This concept has been successful in other master planned communities, such as Serenbe.
Figure 02 - Bellefield Program Concept Plan		
13		The single-family homes need to be broken out into the cottage and estate lots, even at a conceptual level, to demonstrate the numbers can be achieved.
RESPONSE		This information is provided in Table 1 – Amended PUD Concept Plan – by Neighborhood, which is provided in the project narrative and within the SEQR Comparison Report. Figure 2 has been updated to differentiate the single-family homes by color.
14		Condos and rental buildings are not a land use – these should be labeled as multifamily dwellings, and a designator like “C” and “R” can be used for ownership.
RESPONSE		The project narrative and SEQR Comparison Report indicates the Town’s land use groups in Table 4 Approved Plan vs. 2021 Plan. This information has been updated and provided in Figure 2.
15		Tax exempt is not a land use – the uses should be included in the program legend.
RESPONSE		The Tax Exempt description has been modified to include the use type (e.g., community use). The Applicant has retained the tax exempt description to relate the current project with the former approved plan, which included “tax exempt” uses. See also updated Figure 2.
16		What does “Total Res” signify – can this be deleted? Or were the total number of units intended to be included here?
RESPONSE		Comment noted and reference deleted.
17		Both parking garages are shown as “potential” – the northerly garage has always been proposed and has not been presented as “potential”. Please clarify intent.
RESPONSE		Both parking garages are intended. See Figure 2.
18		The neighborhood boundaries should be added to this graphic.
RESPONSE		See Figure 2.
Figure 03 – Bellefield Circulation & Trails		

19		As mentioned further below, cross sections for the secondary circulation should also be provided. Minimum widths for drive aisles to access the below grade areas for the main street buildings should be identified. All areas need to be accessible to emergency service providers.
RESPONSE		Minimum width is 20 FT for drive aisles to below grade areas; maximum width is 24 FT.
20		It would be useful to show the location of the Maritje Kill and wetlands relative to trail locations.
RESPONSE		No trails are proposed within wetlands. The wetland delineation is currently under regulatory review.
21		Some of the trails, e.g., immediately west of the Terrace, are shown along a side of a steep slope. Can these be realistically constructed – have their locations been vetted in the field? It would be useful to have a few topographic spot elevations in the open space area of the Maritje Kill, to show where the stream valley is, and how the topography slopes up from the valley.
RESPONSE		Trail locations will be field verified for constructability.
Figure 04 – Bellefield Mixed Use Building Height Study		
22		A purpose of the analysis was to give the boards a sense of what the heights are of buildings in comparable village centers. The heights shown for Montgomery Street do not appear to be accurate – the image notes that the heights are “estimates”. Assuming the man in the photo with the blue shirt is 6 feet tall, the height to the top of the first floor appears to be closer to 12-13 feet. The upper story is not 14 feet but possible 10 feet. These buildings are not representative of the heights of the buildings in the main street area. How were these measurements obtained?
RESPONSE		Overall building height was arrived at by considering the height of persons as they passed by building elements such as windows and doors. Once building elements were generally sized, we used visual proportions within the perspective of the photo to extrapolate the overall height of buildings.
Figure 05 – Bellefield Master Plan		
23		For the line between the Terrace and the Ridge, could it be aligned with the trail breaks so as not to go through a lot?
RESPONSE		Comment noted. See Figure 4.
24		There appear to be 50 cottage lots in the Terrace, based on the program and the neighborhood boundary shown on Fig. 2, not 45.
RESPONSE		The correct number of cottages in the Terrace is 45, as listed in the table on Figure 4.
25		The Barn/Community Building is 3,000 square feet larger in Table 1 of the Project Narrative than the program on this sheet. Please check.
RESPONSE		Barn/Community Building in Village is 25,250 SF. This will be corrected on Figure 4 in a future submission.
Figure 8 – Utility Map Conceptual Water Main Plan		
26		We defer to the Town Engineer on the review of these plans. In general, are pump stations required, and are they shown? In addition, it would be useful to show where the mains are in the adjoining streets. A discussion is provided in the Project Narrative, and it would be useful to illustrate the locations.

RESPONSE		There are no pump stations proposed for water infrastructure.
27		Is there a map of the sewer mains?
RESPONSE		The sewer main is shown on Figure 9.
28		All new construction/development requires electrical and utility lines underground by code. Please confirm this is what is proposed throughout the Bellefield Agri-hood.
RESPONSE		Yes, the utility infrastructure will be constructed underground. The Applicant is working with Central Hudson Gas & Electric (CHG&E) to coordinate underground installation.
Unnumbered – Initial Construction Sequence		
29		A narrative should accompany the basis for this phasing sequence. Why is the sewer line to St. Andrews Road being constructed in this phase? If it is being constructed, is the Terrace development to be advanced? St. Andrews?
RESPONSE		The construction sequencing narrative has been modified to explain that Construction Phase 2A is proposed to advance utility infrastructure to allow for future construction phases of Terrace and St. Andrews neighborhoods.
30		Based on the drawing, there appear to be 4 townhouses, not 8 townhouses to be constructed in Phase IIA. Also, note that in the presentation (6/28/21), the four townhouses in this slide are shown as rental units. It was our understanding that all townhouses are for ownership.
RESPONSE		Townhouses are proposed to be owner occupied. The graphic will be updated to indicate 4 units.
31		What is the difference between a serviced condominium flat and a condominium flat? This term is not used elsewhere.
RESPONSE		The owner of a serviced condominium flat will have access to hotel services (e.g., housekeeping and food service, etc.). A description of this has been added to this section.
32		If the amphitheater is constructed as part of Phase 2A, what parking area will service it? Is there sufficient parking for the development being shown in this phase?
RESPONSE		The amphitheater has been removed from Phase 2A though the grading will be undertaken during this time.
Route 9 Visual Assessment		
33		What is the methodology for rendering the scale of the building in these images? Were the height and location of the buildings verified in the field? The purpose of these renderings was to determine the extent to which buildings are screened from the Route 9 corridor.
RESPONSE		3D massing models were utilized to prepare the base drawing materials for the digital visualization. 3D massing software allows for the input of proposed heights and the horizontal placement of buildings at a 1:1 scale.
Parking Diagrams		

34		In the Village parking diagrams, the 210-parking space lot does not appear to be sized for 210 parking spaces, based on the scale presented on the plans. You can see it is smaller than the area that shows 220 spaces. Other plans show this as a parking garage. This needs to be clarified – are the 210 parking spaces being achieved because of a planned parking garage?
RESPONSE		The parking diagrams will be updated as part of the future submission to show that the 210 parking spaces noted above are being accommodated within a parking garage.
35		The 90 spaces for the northerly building may overestimate parking spaces.
RESPONSE		The parking diagrams will be updated as part of the future submission

Please find 12 copies of the following documents:

- Project Narrative
- SEQR Comparison Report and EAF Form
- Consolidated Plan Set
- Hart Howerton Design Guidelines
- Chazen Traffic Memo 2017, with 2021 update
- Hudson Valley Cultural Resource Consultants (HVCRC) Supplemental Phase 1B Archaeological Field Reconnaissance Survey 2021
- Langan Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report 2005
- Endangered, Threatened, Rare Species Report and Impact Assessment 2021

Please place us on the October 6, Planning Board Agenda. We look forward to advancing this application to its SEQR resolution and recommendation to the Town Board.

Sincerely,



Larry Boudreau, RLA, MBA



Caren LoBrutto, Senior Planner, Chazen Companies