



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”

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE **September 6, 2017**

PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT: MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
 ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
 CHAN MURPHEY-VICE CHAIR
 CHRISTOPHER OLIVER
 BRENT PICKETT
 DIANE DI NAPOLI
 ANN WEISER

OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB ATTORNEY
 PETE SETARO, PB ENGINEERING CONSULTANT
 CYNTHIA WITMAN, PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE #
LANDS OF CIRE/CIRE OF DUTCHESS	2-4
THE ENCLAVE AT HYDE PARK	4-6
RIGHT HOMES RE-SUBDIVISION	6-8
BELLEFIELD/ST.ANDREWS PROPERTY-INN AT BELLEFIELD	8, 11-27
WILKINSON, ELEANOR	9-10
SCANGA, ANTONIO	10-11
APPROVAL OF PB MINUTES AUGUST 2, 2017	27

Chairman Dupree: Good evening everyone and welcome to the September 6th meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. Please take note of exits around the room and now join me as we salute the American Flag. *Chairman Dupree commenced the Pledge of Allegiance.*

Thank you. A quick housekeeping note. We have said farewell to our esteemed Board Member Tory Kane at the last meeting and we're here tonight to welcome our new Board member Ann Weiser. Who up until now has been an alternate. Welcome Ann. Thank you for sitting through every meeting that you sat through since you were first appointed and reviewing all the past minutes. The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for Cire of Dutchess. They're requesting an extension of time to commence and complete construction. This is located at 4185 Albany Post Road. It's the site that's had a sign that says medical suites coming soon for about the last 4 years. They have started construction in the sense that they I believe installed some of their stormwater management early on, but they have not started to pull the building permit. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

CIRE OF DUTCHESS

Extension of time to Commence and Complete Construction (#58-08)

Location: 4185 Albany Post Road

Grid#: 6064-02-941754

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To re-open the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 0-Absent Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Just for the Board's edification, we were waiting until a final capstone of the stone wall that had been destroyed by a car accident had been repaired and it's been repaired.

There were no comments from the consultants the Board, nor the public.

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To close the public hearing for Cire of Dutchess.

Aye **Mr. Dupree**
Aye **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Ms. Dexter**
Aye **Ms. Weiser**
Aye **Mr. Murphey**
Aye **Mr. Oliver**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE **7-0** **0-Absent** **Motion Carried**

**RESOLUTION TO GRANT A TWO YEAR EXTENSION OF THE TIME TO
COMMENCE AND COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION OF A SITE PLAN**

Lands of Cire

Date: September 6, 2017

Moved By: Mr. Murphey

Resolution: # 58-08H

Seconded By: Ms. Dexter

WHEREAS, on June 6, 2012, the Planning Board granted conditional amended site plan approval to Cire of Dutchess, LLC (the "applicant") for the construction of a 22,800 sq. ft. commercial building and associated site improvements on a 2.68 acre project site located at 4185 Albany Post Road, identified as Tax Grid No. 6064-02-941754, in the Town Center Historic District (the "project"); and

WHEREAS, the project is depicted on a site plan entitled "Calmer Place Commercial Building", prepared by Berger Engineering & Surveying, last revised April 6, 2012; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 108-9.6(a), "a site plan shall be void and the building permit, if any, shall be revoked if substantial construction is not started within one year and the entire project or phase is not completed within two years of signing of the site plan;" and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 108-9.6(b) "the Planning Board may, at its discretion, after conducting a public hearing, grant an extension to an approved site plan. The applicant shall submit a written request 30 days prior to the site plan date of expiration, requesting an extension for a specified time and the reason therefore"; and

WHEREAS, on October 1, 2014, the Planning Board granted the applicant a one year extension of the time in which the applicant must commence construction to and including September 17, 2015 and the time in which to complete construction to and including September 17, 2016; and

WHEREAS, on October 7, 2015, by Resolution #58-08F, the Planning Board granted the applicant an additional one-year extension of the time in which the applicant must commence construction to and including September 17, 2016, and the time in which to complete construction to and including September 17, 2017; and

WHEREAS, on December 21, 2016, by Resolution #58-08G, the Planning Board granted the applicant a nine month extension of time to commence construction to and including June 17, 2017, and the time in which to complete construction to and including June 17, 2018; and

WHEREAS, on May 8, 2017, the applicant timely requested an extension of time in which to commence and complete construction; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was held on July 19, 2017 and closed on September 6, 2017 during which all those who wished to speak were heard.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants a two year extension pursuant to Section 108-9.6(a) of the Code, of the time in which the applicant must commence construction to and including June 17, 2019, and an extension of the time in which to complete construction to and including June 17, 2020.

There will be no written or verbal notification from the Planning Board office to the applicant at such time as the extension expires. Any request for an extension of the deadlines set forth herein must be submitted to the Planning Board at least 30 days in advance of said dates.

**Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

ENCLAVE AT HYDE PARK

Re-Subdivision Final Plat, Site Plan and Special Use Permit (#16-49)

Location: Cream Street at Long Branch Road

Grid#: 6263-01-465957 (1 of 79 grid #s available upon request)

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for the Enclave at Hyde Park. As a reminder, this is a re-subdivision of 74 single family lots into 25 two-family lots or two-family homes which will result in 50 dwelling units. The

applicants are seeking approval for a re-subdivision, site plan and special use permit because clustered housing isn't permitted in this district. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To re-open the public hearing for the Enclave at Hyde Park for site plan, special use permit and re-subdivision.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 0-Absent Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: So you'll notice, colleagues that the applicants are not here tonight. I think that I can put it kind of mildly to say that we've gone through this pretty thoroughly and it appears that most of what the Planning Board would be reviewing has been finalized. However, because this was a subdivision and lot lines are changing and they include separate lot lines that are now owned by transportation corporations, waterworks corporations, etc. it's a complicated approval for us to handle legally. Ms. Polidoro has drafted resolutions, they're just in draft form. We'll be sending those to you if we haven't already. One of them has 21 conditions the other has 20. Mr. Setaro has reviewed them as well. I do want to say there are some duplicates that satisfying one would satisfy the resolution for the site plan and special use permit. However, a couple of the conditions require the Town Attorney input and Attorney Replansky is on vacation this week, so cannot review them. One we actually need language from him for. In the meantime we've sent the draft resolutions over to the applicants, consultants and their attorney so they're able to review them and if they can get rid of any of them before the next meeting then we'll just take those off. We expect to have clarification, just today we found out that the SPDES permit lapsed. That will have to be a condition as well.

Mr. Setaro: It's in the process of being renewed. It will be, but they're waiting on the Health Department to issue approval first, then the DEC will follow.

Chairman Dupree: But, for example, we didn't have the information that it had lapsed. All these things are required to be put into the resolution so that's basically it. So I said to the applicants, that I didn't think they needed to come here tonight. Further, we've had no verbal public comment. We've just had the one letter from a neighbor questioning any draw down effects on his well or surrounding wells and we addressed that before. Any further comments from the consultants, the Board? *There were no additional comments, nor public comment.* Ms. Weiser, I should just state for

the record, since you've been in the audience all this time we've been reviewing the application, do you feel ready to vote when it comes time to vote, in 2 weeks we hope. *Ms. Weiser gave her consent.* Thank you. May I get a motion to adjourn this to September 20th?

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To adjourn the public hearings for the Enclave at Hyde Park to September 20, 2017.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 0-Absent Motion Carried

RIGHT HOMES RE-SUBDIVISION

3 lot Re-Subdivision (#16-46)
Location: Reservoir Road, Staatsburg
Grid#: 6167-04-732397, 706377 and 714426

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for Right Homes. This is another re-subdivision. May I get a motion to re-open the public hearing?

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Ms. Dexter

To re-open the public hearing for Right Homes Re-Subdivision.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 0-Absent Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: So in essence, for the audience, this was a three lot subdivision that was approved many years ago. The applicant has been having a hard time selling

it, realtors selling this, perhaps because he had one common drive, which is not popular apparently for three single family houses. So they first proposed three new single drives. After hearing public comment about possible impacts to neighbors' wells and also blasting, they came in two weeks ago with plan revisions that indicated that they would now have two houses with a shared drive. Relocating one approved house location further toward the road and only one shared driveway. This was met I think with more or less approval from my colleagues and myself. In the interim, I was asked to schedule a site walk and did not hear back. Mr. Setaro then wrote a note to the engineer...

Mr. Setaro: I called too, last Friday and left a message.

Chairman Dupree:...and we still haven't heard anything back. After I saw your email, I sent another email, saying if it would be convenient to do it on the weekend, but I still haven't heard back, so at this point we're left not knowing when to adjourn this too because we haven't heard anything. We received no new information since the last public hearing, so we can discuss tonight whether we want to adjourn this for 2 weeks or until October 4th to allow the applicant's consultants to still get information in to us, as well as to schedule a site walk. In the meantime, would anyone from the public like to speak about this application? You're welcome to come up and speak (*to George Utter*).

Mr. Utter: Anything new?

Chairman Dupree: No, all we got was the last meeting where they've revised it so they won't be removing any of the rock that they were going to be doing, that's closer to your driveway. The original driveway will be used for two houses and there's a driveway that will be used for a third one that has been relocated. The original open space has reverted to where it was when we first made the approval so the rock outcrop that people were concerned about is actually a part of the open space now, which was why we had it there in the first place. We actually think these are improvements to what he wants to do because they go back closer to the original subdivision approval, but we're still waiting on new information from the applicant. We're also waiting on a request for the open space deed restriction that was first made back in February that we still haven't received. That's about it and what you heard last time. I appreciate you coming out.

There were no additional comments from the public.

Ms. Polidoro: I'm going to recommend that you continue it for at least a month because the deadline for the next meeting is probably tomorrow.

Chairman Dupree: May I get a motion to adjourn this to October 4, 2017?

MOTION: Mr. Murphey

SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To adjourn the public hearing for Right Homes Re-Subdivision to October 4, 2017.

Aye **Mr. Dupree**
Aye **Ms. DiNapoli**
Aye **Ms. Dexter**
Aye **Ms. Weiser**
Aye **Mr. Murphey**
Aye **Mr. Oliver**
Aye **Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE 7-0 0-Absent Motion Carried

WORKSHOP:

BELLEFIELD/ST. ANDREWS PROPERTY

Subdivision and Site Plan Approval-Hotel (#2017-4)

Location: Albany Post Road

Grid#: 6163-01-131849

Chairman Dupree: We're now out of public hearing mode and we're back into workshop and the first item on the agenda is Bellefield, which we once knew as the St. Andrews Property. St. Andrews of Historic Hyde Park now called Bellefield. The applicants have submitted applications for subdivision and site plan approval for the very first sub-phase 1-A of the overall approved concept plan. Part of the discussion tonight will center on hotel architecture, but the main purpose of the evening was to circulate for lead agency because we now feel as though we have complete packages, ready to go. I believe Mr. Boudreau brought the materials that we need to insert into the Environmental Assessment Forms to circulate and for the Board's knowledge. At the agenda meeting we had our consultants present, as was Ms. Weiser, Ms. DiNapoli and myself, go through the circulation sheet so we set all that up and informed the applicants of the number of things here, so let me turn it over to you guys.

Ms. Van Tuyl: We're going to be a few minutes to set up. What we have brought tonight is an amended power point that shows response to the comments that were made at the last meeting relating to the architecture and we do have a materials board to discuss with you. That said, we're certainly open to any further comments and discussion this evening, but perhaps to channel the discussion, would it be appropriate to start with the amended PowerPoint?

Chairman Dupree: Yes, I think so.

Ms. Polidoro: While they're doing that, do you want to take care of the waivers, while they're setting up?

OTHER BUSINESS:

WILKINSON, ELEANOR

Site Plan Waiver-Kitchen Addition & Porch (#2017-36)

Location: 38 Main Street
Grid#: 6065-19-693224

Chairman Dupree: Yes, actually, good idea. The first waiver request is by Eleanor Wilkinson, it is a site plan waiver request for a kitchen addition and porch. It's located at 38 Main Street, just down the road here. If anybody's had a chance to go by, it will actually be a nice addition. It's a small house and it will expand out nicely. Because it's located...if you're standing at the Vanderbilt mansion site, you could if you craned your neck, see it, barely. It's pretty much hidden and not visible from the river, however and not actually the main site, just the garage. We have a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator to waive this. So any comments from the Board or questions?

There were no comments from the Board.

Eleanor Wilkinson

6065-19-693224

**SITE PLAN WAIVER
Town Code Section 108-9.4 C 2**

**Date: September 6, 2017
Resolution #:2017-36**

**Moved By: Mr. Murphey
Seconded By: Mr. Oliver**

Whereas, an application requesting a waiver of site plan has been made to the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board by Eleanor Wilkinson, on August 24, 2017, for property located at 38 Main Street, Hyde Park, NY, and

Whereas, the application is to reconfigure the front entry of the single family home and to extend the kitchen area on the rear of the home that is located in an historic overlay district, and

Whereas, the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted a variance for construction within the stream corridor, and

Whereas, the change will have minimal impact to the character of the neighborhood, and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the request submitted by the applicant, and has received a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator, and

Whereas, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board for all other changes to the property, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board hereby waives site plan requirements for the file entitled **–Wilkinson kitchen and front porch alterations**, regarding the specific request as received August 24, 2017, and as amended August 27, 2017 by submittal of a detailed list of changed and as identified in the building permit application file for this project.

Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli

Voice Vote 7-0 Motion Carried

SCANGA, ANTONIO

Site Plan Waiver-HVAC (#2017-37)
Location: 61 Fuller Lane
Grid#:6064-02-635952

Chairman Dupree: The next waiver request is for Antonio Scanga. I hope I'm saying that correctly. Mr. Scanga was in the audience, but I told him he could leave. He's seeking a waiver in order to install an air conditioning and heating system on the exterior of his home at 61 Fuller Lane. I visited the site and sent photos to Ms. Moss and to our secretary. It is not visible from the river, even in leaf off periods because there's a rock outcrop on the other side of it and I was excited actually as a neighbor to see that the new owner has actually cleaned up the site really nicely. It looks really good. We have the recommendation from our Zoning Administrator.

Clove Branch Holdings Corp
Anthony Scanga, President

6065-19-693224

SITE PLAN WAIVER
Town Code Section 108-9.4 C 2

Date: September 6, 2017
Resolution #:2017-37

Moved By: Ms. Dexter
Seconded By: Mr. Oliver

Whereas, an application requesting a waiver of site plan has been made to the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board by Antonio Scanga, on August 23, 2017, for property located at 61 Fuller Lane, Hyde Park, NY, and

Whereas, the application is to install an HVAC system for the single family home that is located in an historic overlay district, and

Whereas, the change will have minimal impact to the character of the neighborhood, and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the request submitted by the applicant, and has received a recommendation from the Zoning Administrator, and

Whereas, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board for all other changes to the property, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board hereby waives site plan requirements for the file entitled –Antonio Scanga - HVAC, regarding the specific request as received August 23, 2017, and as identified in the building permit application dated August 11, 2017 for this project.

**Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli**

Voice Vote 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Now we can get back to you guys.

Mr. Boudreau: Just from a paperwork standpoint, we did bring an additional copy of the SWPPP. Tad probably took your copy, so here's another. Also, the 10 copies of the full EAF, we revised that with the plan documents and the additional elevations that Bill provided last week and I also have 7 separate copies of both the elevations and the plan sets to distribute to the Board if they want to see them.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you.

Mr. Boudreau submitted the documents to the Planning Board Secretary to distribute.

Mr. Hoy: Good evening everyone. To update everyone on the last revision of the elevations. This was the elevation that we modified with your help and recommendations. So, we're going to see some different color schemes here so don't pay attention to what's shown right away. We have different colors schemes that we're going to walk through and get the Board's opinion. But, what this does is shows the updated elevations and now below is the porch area that we talked about. We ripped out all of the 'gingerbread' and we just kept the simple railing like we had up on the balconies and so that's essentially the elevations that from responding back to all the comments that we had from the last time. The first one, this is more of a grey scheme and after our meeting last week and I stayed over, I went up to the FDR complex up there and took a lot of photographs, a lot of pictures, walked around... especially like we talked about that barn structure out there, but also it was very interesting to see in some of the outbuildings with the different colors. And so that's where, possibly this greyish color is coming in. The next scheme is more of a green, more of a forest green type color and the last scheme we have is more of a beige, not a yellow. These are the three schemes that we're looking at and so I thought for discussion today we can all talk about some of the thoughts and is there another, a fourth scheme that we should be looking at? We're hopefully honing in on what we're looking at from an architectural standpoint. As we talked before, we're turning the stone as we talked about. This is a great view if you're down on Route 9, on the corner where the light is right now, looking up, so you'll see that stone wraps around and that would be the other side of approach. The one-story areas with the windows on the first floor, there's an outcropping of some meeting rooms that we have and also you can see that some of the stone, how it does pop back also on the whole thing. That's the old scheme with all the gingerbread on it, so we don't want to show that anymore. What we'll do, when we decide a color, we'll update all of the renderings and make sure the Board has all of the updated renderings with the right color. Right now, it's just more of the massing And the architecture, looking at the stone. We'll talk about the materials too, which we brought. These are from the older elevations.

Chairman Dupree: If you could go back to the first floor plan, I just want to clarify something that came up at a meeting. The meeting rooms I believe are here?

Mr. Hoy: Correct, yes.

Chairman Dupree: The dining area such as it is, is where?

Mr. Hoy: In the middle, yes, right in that area.

Chairman Dupree: There was a question by our consultant, Ms. Polidoro, as to whether there was a conference center. There isn't as far as I can see on this level.

Mr. Hoy: No, this is the only meeting space that we have. We have a couple of boardrooms here and then this one room would open up to seat approximately 200 people depending on how you seat them for lecture style. For potential weddings this would be a small little room where it could operate as a banquet area, but it's very small.

Chairman Dupree: You don't have catering facilities inside this, so it would have to be catered off premises.

Mr. Hoy: Catered off site, yes.

Chairman Dupree: And these walls, you said are removable, almost like the Wallace Center.

Mr. Hoy: Yes, they're removable. This whole space can open up to one large area, right there and then you've got a terrace area right here, on this side here and back over here.

Ms. Polidoro: The question was really whether the wastewater flows and the parking and everything had been calculated to accommodate that extra space.

Mr. Boudreau: Yeah, the wastewater has. Bill had given us the detailed breakdown of the entire hotel and we allocated the flow for each space.

Chairman Dupree: What about the parking? If this can accommodate 200 people on its own, I assume you would be thinking that the 200 would all be staying there as well.

Mr. Hoy: Pretty much, this was really to accommodate the guests, not necessarily going out to market anything to the outside. It's really a guest amenity.

Chairman Dupree: I can certainly see it being marketed in the future when you had more parking. And again, speaking for the Board - I think I can do it on this - we want to see this be a success, so whatever you can to make it a success. Thank you. I didn't mean to interrupt you by asking about that, I just wanted to clarify for our attorney. Anything else?

Mr. Hoy: Not right now until we have the discussion.

Ms. Van Tuyl: Would you like to see materials now or do you want to hold off on that?

Chairman Dupree: I'd love to see that materials.

Mr. Hoy: So what we're looking at is an FDR stone as you saw in the elevations. You're looking at a product that looks like slate, but it's a manmade product. This will go in where the porte cochere roof is. Down on all the lower roofs we're looking at more of a slate. Up high in these areas here, will be more of an asphalt, a high grade asphalt type of shingle that would have a shadow to it so it really has some depth. This is more of the Hardie plank siding, it will look like wood, and then some of the trim and then the windows. This is the brick that we've been using on a lot of our hotels and we thought it would match up really well here also. It's called a Stamford Rose, it's more of a tumbled brick. We completed a Courtyard by Marriott with this in a pre-cast, which I can bring in some photos someday when I'm up here next. It just turned out beautiful. So these are the combinations and the color schemes and again this will be the color to be discussed. Questions?

Chairman Dupree: By the way, I've seen the synthetic slate and I know how much it costs. It's a nice addition.

Mr. Hoy: I think so and really keep it so people can see it not 5 stories up.

Chairman Dupree: There's a lot of slate on our historic structures here and I know when I looked at putting it on myself, it's guaranteed a certain life but it hasn't been used that much throughout what they've predicted to be the life, so we don't really know how long it will last.

Mr. Hoy: I think for the life of this hotel we should be good.

Chairman Dupree: Consultants, any comments or questions about the architecture? No, good. Ms. Weiser, I believe you all received a copy of her memo to the applicants. Because she's been sitting in the audience, but we don't have a public hearing so she hasn't been able to speak, I asked her to get her comments on the record, so let's start with you Ann.

Ms. Weiser: I think in an effort to reduce and simplify and add refinement to the building and make it mirror the Culinary a little bit more, what I would like to see is to eliminate the siding there, there and there and bring that back to the brick. On all elevations eliminate the siding and bring that back to the brick to more reflect the Culinary. In my memo, I thought we should take these two stone pillars/bump outs to two stories instead of four, but on second thought I think it should just be one story of the stone, so that we don't have this second story up here. So it's just one story of stone and four stories of brick. The thing that would help make this similar to the Culinary is if you added stone quoins to the corners here, here, here and there and if this is in the same plane, mirrored quoins would be over here and over here. When this becomes all brick you could choose to add brick quoins, I mean the architects would decide where to add more quoins but it could be here or there.

Chairman Dupree: Does everyone understand what quoins are? They're trim stone and you'll see it at the Culinary along edges.

Ms. Weiser: It's the white that's right there on the side. Then next I would add the tooth-like dentils at the roofline. I would recommend putting those up all along the roofline and also again like the Culinary, in the window casements, add keystone lintels to add a little bit more detail there. Then, I would also suggest removing the decorative trusses up here, here and here and then adding the keystone lintels up there. When you eliminate that architectural finery it sort of begs you to take a harder look at what the balconies, which you've already made simpler, but I would take a better look at these balconies here to make them more in keeping...not that Adirondack-look, something weightier like a stone. Again, that's for the architect and engineer. My final thought was on the south elevation, which is an expanse of brick without windows. There is probably a reason for that, but it does give the appearance of something that is very institutional and facing Dorsey Lane that's not very attractive. Those are my thoughts.

Mr. Hoy: There are a couple of things I'd like to address on that. If we go to the quoins, I think that's a great suggestion, but I would not want to use white. I would

use a brick quoins, the same color as the brick. Instead of white quoins it blends a lot better and it seems like it goes with the architecture as opposed to just slapping on a pre-cast that has nothing to do with what the building looks like right now. That is one suggestion and I think regarding if we go back and put brick in where the siding is, to us it's either or, we're fine with that if you want to go in that direction. That was a response from the two meetings prior. I think we're all with you guys whatever you need or like us to do.

Ms. Weiser: I think what I'm trying to do is reduce the number of materials because it gives it a very busy look, so if we reduce the materials you'll start to get that more stately feel to the building.

Mr. Hoy: I think we have the essence of what we're trying to do here and then the idea of the frieze up on top with the indentures is fine. That might work out as a nice little detail, that's not an issue at all. We can respond to all of these to a point where...the keystones...to put the keystones in you'd have to have a pre-cast type of product there which would be very expensive right now by adding everything we're also adding too. Your comments are very well taken. We were heading in that direction to start out with two meetings ago and we're here to listen and kind of react to what the majority of the Board would like us to do. We all want to make sure this is a success ourselves, architecture-wise and we want to get a really great buy-in from everybody here that we're all behind this product. I think last meeting, I think that Diane you said it, this is the entrance to Hyde Park and this building is going to represent what happens in the rest of this whole area here too. We're all with you on that. We feel that the floor plans, the elevations are very close to how they look in the fenestration. Now it's a matter of what we want to do with the product and the materials.

Chairman Dupree: I should add for the Board in case they don't know the term dentil, for those who've lived here awhile you see it along the roofline for all the Baker built houses with all the stone front they always had dentil along the top. It's a traditional style that makes it a little more elegant. The keystone lintels around the windows are directly from the Culinary Institute's Roth Hall. Even I, myself didn't understand when I was reading the letter the two pillars you were referring to were the ones right up there, above...I didn't quite get that. Now, I understand it, you're talking about lowering it so the stone is all on one plane and that it's all brick above of which I, myself, think is fine.

Ms. Weiser: That way the stone has a relationship to the porch rather than stopping at the second floor and having no relationship to anything else. I think at this point when you have the stone limited to the first level it really does have a strong relationship to the porch.

Chairman Dupree: Before I move on to Mr. Murphey. If we get rid of or remove all of the Hardie Board and it's all brick, then there is no color issue, but do you have a preference for the cream the grey or the green schemes?

Ms. Weiser: My first reaction was yeah to the grey, just because I wasn't a fan of all that color, but if you're going to go with a color, I guess the green will reflect the trees.

Chairman Dupree: It's an earth tone. The grey does, by the way, look a little more distinguished.

Ms. Weiser: It does, so I guess I'll vote for grey if we go for color.

Mr. Murphey: You guys have got to be going out of your mind here. We kind of started with what she wants to change to. I like the revision of what you've got now. I like it in a lot of ways. I have to admit that I was a little skeptical when the subject of the porch came up, but I like it. I surprised myself. I haven't built a hotel in a couple of years and I don't have millions of dollars invested so I as one want you guys to be happy with the product you've got. You're the one marketing it, you're the one who has to make the profit with it and I'm only interested really in you making a profit so that the rest of the town prospers. If you're taking a poll, I'm with the grey, so we do agree on one thing.

Mr. Pickett: Colors, I'll go with the grey or the tan. It seems when you look at the front surfaces that the green tends to chop it up a little bit more than having the smooth surfaces. The entrance to the outbuilding, what is the plan for that material?

Mr. Hoy: We haven't really looked at the architecture for the barn. Again going back to FDR's outbuildings, there are some really good examples of what this could be. Almost like a salt box design from what I saw up there. Simple, but yet maybe bring some of that architecture into this structure here. I think that would be great.

Chairman Dupree: If I recall, the entrance is chained off so only people who need to go in there, it's shown on the plans to be cordoned off.

Mr. Pickett: Is that planned to be dirt or gravel?

Mr. Hoy: It's going to be inaccessible.

Mr. Pickett: My thought on it was...

Mr. Boudreau: There's a gravel drive going down, everything else is grass.

Mr. Pickett: Ok. My thought on it was, in Asia I've seen a lot of parking lots and driveways that are the buried cinder block with grass growing in it. It's pervious and surprising how well it maintains.

Mr. Hoy: Grass Crete, I think is the proper name for it.

Mr. Pickett: Not in favor of having it all brick. To me it looks too institutional. I'm not particularly in favor of having kind of a CIA knock-off.

Ms. Dexter: So I had also sent an email, but I don't think anybody else saw my email. I think I only sent it to Mr. Hoy, Mr. Gaudio, Mr. Mulroy and Mr. Oates. So, I'm showing the elevations to people in the town and I've heard it now multiple times, when they took a look at this proposal the first thing they said was that it looks like the dorms up at Dutchess Community College, Conklin Hall. It has brick, color, brick, color, brick, color, brick, color, white peaks, white peak roof...it has a bump out...and

I don't want to model it after the dorms. They are fine for the college, but I would kind of want to go away from that, so I like Ms. Weiser's comments about trying to simplify this a little bit. There is probably a happy medium. To me architecture is like art, it's in the eye of the beholder. I like the idea of bringing the stone down because as you do look at it, it's kind of...I don't know, she's using terms like planes, so maybe that's what I'm seeing that I'm not a big fan of. If it were all at the same level, that might be good. As far as doing something that's not exactly the Culinary, the rear side, if you can show the west elevation, I think what I do like is surrounding the really big window. I do like that not being brick and I would like it grey, but it doesn't have to have all of the stone there. I don't like the green. I don't like the crème. To me that looks like Conklin Hall. If you do get a chance you can query and see tons of pictures of Conklin Hall. I do like the idea of simplifying it. I like that you took out all that extra work on the lower level porch. I think that makes it nice and simple. I also sent an email that showed my favorite is at the Vanderbilt. If we're going to talk about favorites. The Carriage House. There is a Coach House and a Carriage House both associated with Vanderbilt. They would take the wood trimming at the peaks and do it a darker color instead of a brighter color. That's kind of what I was looking at thinking that maybe they could bring a darker tone to the top. Because if you're going to go...there is something about the white and if you're not going to mimic the Culinary, maybe pick an element that you saw at FDR that's not white. I really appreciate you working with us and I don't want to change my mind but after seeing the dorms I'm like yeah, I think maybe we can make a few changes on this.

Chairman Dupree: I should add that the Conklin Hall dorms, when Anne was saying that there is brick and color, the color is different color Hardie Board and they actually have green, russet and crème along with...yeah, it's pretty busy, but it's really long. It has more rooms that this does, it 465 rooms and there's a grade change. So at any rate, I think part of the reason that this was described that way is because of the colors that were initially used, honestly. But the peaks do look a little similar. I pass by it on the way to the Trustees meeting so I see it often. This isn't going to be quite so long and bulky. This is a much smaller space.

Mr. Oliver: First off, I really like the materials selection that you guys have provided with the slate roof style, the red brick and stone. I'd also have to agree that the colors in my opinion make it really busy. I think if we stuck with the brick and the stone that would go well. Another thing about the west elevation on the two pillars that Ann was talking about. I think if we brought those down one story and then the next two bump outs in each direction, keep that at two stories and then after that bring that down to the first so you're making a peak up. Being that this is the gateway to Hyde Park, I look at the east elevation and I'm in love with it and I said this 2 meetings ago, unfortunately I wasn't about to make it to the last one, and I just think although it may not be the main entrance or provide the same function, if we could get something like that on the west elevation, so that's what you see. In my opinion, I think that just really brings everything together on the front facade and looking at the west elevation you have this huge expansive façade and it's not really broken up. That might break it up better.

Mr. Hoy: Just to clarify, on the west elevation what I think I heard you say is if you kept this at this elevation here with the stone and then stone the stone at this point here?

Mr. Oliver: Correct and then after that come down to the first...yeah.

Mr. Hoy: What about this area here, is this to be brick in your vision?

Mr. Oliver: Correct.

Mr. Hoy: So all these would be brick, so you'll get more of a monotone of elevation if we go back to doing that.

Mr. Oliver: Let the tapering stone kind of play off of that.

Mr. Hoy: It will be a very plain elevation when it's all said and done.

Mr. Oliver: And then add a larger structure where that is there to kind of extend that façade out. Kind of have the peak here and come out to kind of mirror off of these changes so you're coming off of that and creating a bigger space in here like you have on the east elevation. Because that's what you're going to see from Route 9.

Chairman Dupree: Do you mean like the drop-off area, you'd like to see that bumped up some?

Mr. Oliver: But keep the...

Mr. Hoy: What you're saying is if we would increase this height right in here and along these areas right here what will happen is if you rent the second floor room all you'll see is a plane of roof. You won't be seeing anything at all, because we don't have a lot of distance here. Unfortunately to do what we did here, which was to bump this really far out. Maybe we can try to do it with materials as much as we can. That would be the only thing. Unfortunately, I wouldn't want that second floor room.

Mr. Oliver: Yeah, especially since you'll probably get some river views there.

Mr. Hoy: Well if not it will be some better views than looking at the back of a roof. I know this is not the right porch area, but at least when you see it in perspectives, you do see the ins and outs and then what will happen, Mr. Oliver, you're also saying that we should bring this down one level too here?

Mr. Oliver: I would say bring that down one level and wrap it around the entire building.

Mr. Hoy: Okay, unfortunately I don't have a copy with me of our first presentation, but that's pretty much what we had initially.

Ms. Polidoro: Well, the roof lines in the bump outs were different.

Mr. Hoy: I think one of the things that's exactly...we had these all in Hardie Plank on the first proposal, but our brick came way down to here, but we never had these in brick before. We'd be glad to put an elevation together. It wouldn't take much time to show you what that would look like, but you're going to see a mass of brick on the

backside there with no breakup at all besides the ins and outs of these areas here. It will read...with the stone being down here...I actually would probably bring this up here, down, this down, up here and then up a stone, back down, up and back down there. It will be a...

Mr. Oliver: More of the idea was to get the material more consistent without being so busy with the colors and...

Mr. Hoy: I think one of the pieces that we did react to, or tried to react to was this Moscow...you can find a building like this anywhere, Montreal, NYC, it doesn't matter. What it does, this is an architecture that's a three element, tripartite design is what they call it and so that's where we were trying to react to by having this one elevation here, middle elevation and then the top elevation here to try and break up some of that massiveness that you're going to see with all brick.

Mr. Oliver: If we are going to have color, I would go with the grey.

Ms. DiNapoli: I am in total agreement with Mr. Murphey. Is he still breathing? *Laughter.* You guys must be going crazy. You have 7 people with 7 different ideas, but that's why they pay you those big bucks, I'm sure and we're making you earn every dollar. I was very impressed with the letter that Ms. Weiser sent to you the other day and it gave me some food for thought. It also made it clear that I probably have totally lost the battle of not having brick and doing it like the Wallace center, but that's okay. So we move on. I do like the suggestions of simplifying it and I know I've said that in the past. This is much better. I think we've come a long way. That being said, I think we still have a bit of a way to go unfortunately, Mr. Murphey. I think we're headed in the right direction. It really does help after we've had our discussion and you do a rendition. You've put a lot of thought, we've put a lot of thought in and we think this is how it's going to look and then sometimes you go, that's not the way we thought it was going to turn out. I totally agree that if we could get rid of the siding that would be a much calmer appearance. If we're going to have siding, I too vote for grey. I'm sure we could have other choices too. I agree that the Adirondack look, if you're going to balance the Culinary on one side and this is going to be the dramatic balance on the other side of the road and if that's what some of the initial drawings are that were maybe not mimicking the Culinary, but you're balancing it, then it needs to balance it more. Thereby, the Adirondack look would have to go. The siding would go. I like the added details that Ms. Weiser had suggested, all of them. I'm not going to repeat them all. I still would like to have you entertain the concept and I understand that it did not go over well this whole graduated down for various reasons, but is it possible to do just one story stepdown on either end as a balance? If you bring the end section down one story and you do the same thing on this side, just one story, so you get what you were suggesting, a peak in the middle. Just drop it on story down. The peak would be on the fourth floor. If this is a five story building and you're dropping it down one story. Architecturally, that would give us some interest without the radicalness of all the tapering down. I understand that it's difficult to accomplish that, but it also supplies us with some drama in a stately fashion. On the first floor, are those the conference rooms or the meeting rooms?

Mr. Hoy: No, they're on the other end.

Ms. DiNapoli: On the eastern side, what's in these rooms on the first floor?

Mr. Hoy: All of this is the meeting room, then there's guest rooms here and over here, so they'll be taking advantage of the amenity of the porch. What you're talking about is dropping here on both sides. We would probably lose about 20 rooms if we did that and going back to Mr. Murphey's comment about we've all got to be happy about making money.

Ms. DiNapoli: Yes, absolutely. So there is no way. I'm not suggesting that you should lose 20 rooms, but there is no way that it could be made up from that lower level if you push out a little?

Chairman Dupree: There is no room to push out because you're following the footprint of the building that was approved as part of the concept plan that was adopted. You're trying to stay within a certain space.

Ms. Polidoro: Are you talking about like dropping it with dormers or just dropping it a floor.

Ms. DiNapoli: The two ends are four stories.

Mr. Hoy: This would lower down to this level here and same on the other side, so you lose 1, 2, 3 plus the side rooms all the way back because this is a 'C' shaped building. You'd end up losing all of those rooms in the back too. I'm guessing 15-20, plus or minus. I'd have to look at and study it.

Ms. DiNapoli: I kept trying here. I figure more than one way maybe to skin the cat. If the stone could be, is it equally wrapped around the entire building, because that would also give some continuity?

Mr. Hoy: You have a one story building coming out here, where the meeting rooms are that's why we stopped it on that side there. The other side, there's no reason we can't maintain it all the way through on the southwest side. You see it stops right here. Again, I think we have the pool building that starts over here too. We'd have to look at that.

Ms. DiNapoli: I do like Ms. Weiser's suggestion of the quoins on the corners. In looking again at the Culinary, if you're doing away with the siding and you're having just the stone and the brick, the quoins in the off-white and if you add that detail around the windows it would give it a more substantial look and more break it up. And again, sometimes you have to look at it on paper and then we look and go, no that was not a bright idea.

Mr. Hoy: As I mentioned, I think the quoins are a great idea, but I would not put them in white. It would look like they were applied as an afterthought. It is more integral to the elevation if you take the same material and make quoins out of them. I think that's a great idea. The pre-cast on all these windows would be extremely expensive with the keystone. Especially if we go back now and change this all out to brick. The other material to look at is a stucco material too and we can get stucco to get that contrast material versus...that way you wouldn't have the detail of what you're

seeing up there, that's what's throwing people off, but more of a cleaner look or product.

Ms. Dexter: Grey stucco.

Mr. Hoy: Absolutely, grey stucco.

Ms. Dexter: That's directly from FDR also.

Mr. Hoy: The one wing on the left hand side.

Ms. DiNapoli: I love the color of the brick and I was going to suggest a type of brick like that and the stone and all are really smart looking. I thank you for all of your patience and at one meeting maybe the architect can come and we can thank them in person too.

Mr. Hoy: But then I have to pay for him. *Laughter.* He's going to have to come up eventually yes.

Chairman Dupree: So happy to conclude. A couple of things, first, despite Mr. Murphey's comments that we shouldn't be weighing in too much on architecture, I think as I said before, I think this sets the tone for whatever else is going to go there. So it's important to me and I think it's important to the citizens of Hyde Park. This, I hope will last for 100's of years just like the Culinary Institute and be a real success, so we want to make sure we get it right. This noted, I told you last time, I'm the one who likes the gingerbread, but I'm not going to go there because we've already moved beyond. If I can kind of summarize what I've heard tonight, it might be helpful, I hope it's not too expensive and you can certainly stick with these sizes and I don't think that you have to do them all, but it might be helpful if you had two elevations to show. One of which, I think you need to have the stone at least up to the second level otherwise down here it disappears. Particularly because we have an elevation, there'll be landscaping and I don't think you'll see it otherwise. I heard three people say to lose the siding and I'm going to be the fourth. If you lose the siding and add the dentil, then whether you need the decorative trim up here I'm going to leave to you and the architect. By seeing dentil I almost feel like you need to have dormers up there then because that becomes the more traditional style. At any rate, I'd like to see something like this. Anne Dexter's comments are almost separate, to her this should go all the way up, the stone to kind of frame the window. Ann Weiser's comment is this is not matching in through here, so I don't mind seeing it go up that way particularly if these are all going to be brick. I like the quoins and I love the lintels. I'm aware that the price point you're going to have to charge for this can't be that high, so we have to be mindful of your costs too. I'll go ahead and say, even though I think they'd be gorgeous, I'll take a no on that because I don't think it's necessary just because of costs. You're already adding a lot here and I'd like to see something get started on this site that can therefore be the mechanism that lets other things start happening on the site too and I don't want to get bogged down in that. I think just from what I heard, it seems like actually we're closer than some might think if you were just watching us. We're narrowing down on reducing the amount of materials that are there. We all seem to be in agreement that the quoins would be a majestic and elegant addition to it. I don't know based on ZH architects down in the city, if

once they see the dentil that they'll be the ones proposing this. I think a lot of this did come from Mohonk Mountain House which, legitimately there, are different wings and additions that occurred over many different decades over the centuries. I like looks like that that make it look like it's been added onto but I'm not really sure that this achieves that because it still looks like one new piece with different siding on it, a la Conklin Hall. I think that by reducing the colors you're not going to have that effect any more. The rest, I'll go with the simplified porch because I think that the porch is a great addition. This should be the pool area, I believe, starting over in through there, the exercise and pool, the conference rooms are down there but you do have rooms here and although I love Chris's first thought about making this higher, this does then eliminate the desirability of all the rooms there and right there, so I think we have to stay low on that side. Our concern, no one's really commenting about the east elevation because we all seem to like it. Our concern is more, what presents to the public. What's nice about this is initially without having the porch and without having the area for humans to come in and out of, it almost seemed to be turning its back on Route 9 and it doesn't do that anymore. So I appreciate all the changes that have been made. If you want to have a second elevation that instead of showing the stone up, would then show stucco where you think the stucco should go, then that would be a suggestion that we could then look at. Even though this may seem like this is going to take a while, I'm certainly aware after reading the comments from DOT prior to circulation that there are some things that we're going to have to work out ahead of time. I don't want anything to drag us down, which is why I want to get architecture done early, now! So we all kind of agree on this and even though we might not agree on every detail, I heard enough of the individuals here, that I'm confident that we're going to come to something...we may lose this, this may be my favorite, I've already lost that, but I want to go along. I like very traditional style and more antique style and I think that as I said last time, the whole siding thing the way it was going both vertically and horizontal, that threw me off from the very beginning. It just looked dizzying to me to have both the Colonial Revival look, which is the FDR stone as you're calling this here along with the more traditional brick from a different earlier time period, than with these. I do understand why they came...they do look like some of the dormitories on the CIA campus and they very much resemble Mohonk Mountain which is higher up. I hope we've given you enough to kind of go on tonight. What I mostly heard was less Adirondack style and more traditional and no one didn't like the quoins. The only person really is Mr. Pickett who said who said he'd prefer to have something different there so it doesn't look monolithic. I think there is a way you can make it look non-monolithic and that's why I was talking about keeping the stone here but if you'd like to do even a third elevation that shows what this would look like just at the base, then you can. Again, I think it would be lost that way, except for the other side where you're going to see it when you drive up initially. That should conclude our architectural discussion.

Before we discuss circulating or read the resolutions, I just want to point out to everyone that we did receive fairly detailed comments from the DOT. The overarching, as I called it earlier, kind of theme was that they would want the Planning Board to understand and work into how to phase the mitigations. That will be subject to some discussions obviously. Way back when at our very first meeting I said if you're just doing the hotel, we've got to figure out what the DOT wants because to remind the Board, part of the mitigation measures that are proposed are a complete redesign of the intersection at St. Andrews and Route 9. I mean substantial. This alone is not going to trigger than. A lot of what triggered that was the residential use because you

had the entrance off St. Andrews that you're not even contemplating yet. So long as the Board can establish some way for us to move forward that satisfies DOT and my colleagues, I don't think that's that big a deal. I'll also point out that some of the general plan comments that they pointed out have actually already been corrected because of revisions we've already gone through ourselves. So I'll be interested to see what they say once they get the newest plans because some of these, I think do go away. There is also a couple of discussion or suggestion about new mitigations. And again, just for the audiences and the Board's understanding, what they sent to DOT would be the traffic impact study, which would be the entire site. Plus there is a look at any kind of delta there is from any kind of relocating the hotel and having a different size to here. I think you guys have done a great job on that. We always knew from the first traffic impact study, once fully built out, truly fully, that there would be some drops in levels of service at certain intersections and they reference those. So long as DOT is fine with this, then I am too because I don't know any other way to solve this without somehow making this into a 6 lane which none of us want. We're a semi-rural community, kind of a bedroom community to Poughkeepsie, but I don't want to see 6 lanes of traffic going up and suddenly narrowing down into two in the middle of Route 9. That's what we'll move forward. Any other comments from your side.

Ms. Van Tuyl: We appreciate the comments and I'm sure Bill will take them into consideration. We appreciate everyone's comments and I think there's merit in what everyone is saying. It's very hard to describe, as you said, what you want if you can't see it at the same time. I think we hear the goal of simplification and of stateliness, of being a good neighbor to the CIA without mimicking the style and putting a good face towards Route 9. We all share the same goals and now that we have materials, I think the idea of eliminating as many differing elements as possible to eliminate any busyness that might arise and we're going to try to do that without making the building look more monolithic. I mean Roth Hall is a very large building and carries that off in a stately way, but actually is an institutional building. Whereas we're trying to have this share that presence but in a way that doesn't read totally institutional. So it is a subtle thing to manage but I think what we're going to do is get some elevations to you and come back and discuss this again. As you know we have many issues to discuss. We decided not to even try to talk about the DOT tonight. Tom Johnson from Larry's office is absorbing all of that.

Chairman Dupree: No, let's absorb it all. As I said, this is in response to a plan that has already been changed somewhat. Some of it, like the bike and pedestrian, there's a lot of things here that I think once they see the newer plans that we're going to send over to them as part of our formal circulation, I anticipate that there'll still be detailed, but they won't be quite like this. Some of them maybe be softer, some of the geotechnical and the traffic impact, that probably won't change that much. The other thing I just wanted to say, you brought it to my mind, Ms. Weiser in her letter, stated that since this is a gateway, if you look at the CIA's Roth Hall as a pillar and this would be the other pillar. As I pointed out, I think at the last meeting and the meetings before that, we're kind of looking at 108-4.5 as a guideline because those are the site plan standards we use for everywhere and those do state specifically that if you have a site that's located adjacent to, which this would be, anything that's on the national historic registry than it should be consonant, not mimic, but consonant. I think that's kind of where we're going here. To look at here, to create something as

Ms. Van Tuyl said so eloquently, to have presence and a stateliness, yet also not look like where a bunch of Jesuits lived, an institution and now students are forced to go into. Because we don't want anybody forced in, we want this to be a welcoming presence to draw people in. The only other comment I heard was a discussion about bringing the stone all the way around instead of stopping. That's for you to consider and show on an elevation. To me that seems like a good idea, but I don't know what the difference is in price for the stone versus the brick.

Mr. Hoy: It's about the same.

Chairman Dupree: That's just then an esthetic that the architect can feel free to review, reject, etc....

Mr. Pickett: On the east elevation too? Are you talking about all the way around or just on the corners?

Chairman Dupree: Actually, I thought just to go to the corners and stop. You would keep the east elevations just as they are. I didn't hear anybody complain about the east elevations, except maybe the use of the siding there too.

Mr. Oliver: If you could go back to the west elevation please, right here, bring the stone up and then come down to right about here, go over, then come down again. That way it creates the focus toward the center and gives you that sense of...

Chairman Dupree: That's a great idea, you're causing the peaks or rather massing...

Mr. Oliver: And that will break up the expansiveness of the brick and I figured I'd just share that.

Chairman Dupree: That's a great share. Even though there are seven different voices, what's nice is that each of us somehow manages to say something really intelligent and smart and I think that one really was so thank you Chris. Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Boudreau: We have received comments from DOH and we're working with Morris Associates on SWPPP comments and we're making progress on, so we are moving forward.

Chairman Dupree: Good. We don't have anything back from DEC, but we'll have something back I anticipate, once we circulate ourselves. When would you like to schedule the next meeting? A month?

Ms. Van Tuyl: I think a month would be good.

Chairman Dupree: Bill, Mr. Hoy, if you have any questions feel free to reach out to me. If I can assist in advance. As you know, I don't speak for everybody, but I have a good sense now for where each person is and like I said there's a commonality for all. We'll put this on for the October 4th meeting and in the meantime let's get started with circulating for lead agency. Who has this resolution?

Ms. Van Tuyl: May I just mention one item about the circulation? We had included in the EAF the three versions of the front elevation. I think that's certainly appropriate for circulation.

Chairman Dupree: It's totally sufficient.

Ms. Van Tuyl: It's more than sufficient really. You don't want to confuse anyone with colors that we've moved beyond.

Chairman Dupree: One of the questions I have is do we feel like we're ready to refer this to County Planning under 239m? I think we're just circulating right now for lead.

Ms. Polidoro: Right now it's just SEQR circulation.

Chairman Dupree: I wanted to have a more firm grasp of what the architecture would be before going to County Planning because they require all those things.

Ms. Van Tuyl: I think that's appropriate. Yes, they do.

Ms. Polidoro: They'll want more landscaping details.

Chairman Dupree: They've got a lot of landscaping details in there but they may so at any rate, Mr. Pickett you have this resolution?

**RESOLUTION DECLARING INTENT TO SERVE AS LEAD AGENCY
ST. ANDREW'S AT HISTORIC HYDE PARK (now known as Bellefield)**

Date: September 6, 2017

Moved By: Mr. Pickett

Resolution: #2017-04

Seconded By: Mr. Murphey

WHEREAS, the applicant, T-Rex Hyde Park Owner LLC, has submitted an application for subdivision and final development plan approval for Subphase 1-A of the approved Concept Plan for the St. Andrew's Planned Unit Development ("PUD"), consisting of a 5-story, 133 guest room hotel located near the intersection of Albany Post Road and West Dorsey Road, tax parcel no.6163-01-131849 (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Project relates to final development plan approvals for the first sub-phase of the St. Andrew's mixed use PUD, which includes, without limitation, a residential area in the central portion of a 339 acre project site (the "Site"), and a pedestrian-oriented mixed use center in the western portion of the site designed with new urbanism principles that includes a variety of uses, including hotel, restaurant, retail shops, cafes, offices and in-village housing, all located within a walkable setting; a number of park areas in the Village Center together with a market square, and a plaza that would be the focus for activity

in the mixed use center; a total of ten miles of trails and five miles of sidewalks throughout the project, linking various components of the development with the Town's trail system; with open space constituting approximately 200 acres or 58% of the Site (the entire development project being identified as the "St. Andrew's PUD," or "the Proposed Action"); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board served as lead agency in a coordinated SEQRA review of the St. Andrew's PUD, which included preparation of Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements as a predicate to the Town Board's adoption of the PUD legislative zoning designation for the site and approval of the Concept Plan and Comprehensive Development Plan for the site; and

WHEREAS, after accepting the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the St. Andrew's PUD as complete, the Town Board adopted a SEQRA Findings Statement on August 29, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Concept Plan for the St. Andrew's PUD was approved by the Town Board on August 29, 2007; and

WHEREAS, due to changes in project circumstances, the Town Board reevaluated the proposed SEQRA mitigation relating to sewer issues, and, after holding a public hearing thereon, adopted an amended SEQRA Findings Statement on June 13, 2017; and thereafter filed and circulated same; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board, having completed the SEQRA review of the St. Andrew's PUD and having granted all approvals within its jurisdiction, has ceased to be an involved agency and has informally expressed its consent to a reestablishment of lead agency, and the service of the Planning Board as lead agency for the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has jurisdiction to review final development plan applications for all proposed development on the St. Andrew's (now known as Bellefield) site; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board desires to serve as lead agency relating to the Proposed Action, including ongoing final development plan approvals for the PUD development, which shall include appropriate supplemental SEQRA review of proposed project applications and will include determinations of whether any proposed Project changes may result in any significant adverse environmental impacts beyond what was reviewed by the Town Board in the FEIS and subsequent SEQRA Findings Statements; and

WHEREAS, the Project presently before the Planning Board is depicted on a site plan entitled "Inn at Bellefield" prepared by Chazen Engineering, dated June 30, 2017, and elevations prepared Z.H. Architects received on September 6, 2017 (the "Site Plan Set") and a subdivision entitled, "Preliminary Plat, Map

of Subdivision Prepared for T-Rex Hyde Park Owner LLC prepared by Chazen Engineering dated June 30, 2017 (the "Plat"); and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a Full Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") for the Project dated August 25, 2017.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby:

1. **Acknowledges and confirms the designation of the development of the St. Andrew's PUD (now known as Bellefield) as a Type I action under SEQRA;**
2. **Declares its intent to serve as lead agency in a coordinated review of the Proposed Action and directs its Secretary to send notice of its intent to reestablish lead agency to all interested and involved agencies.**

**Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Weiser**

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

MOTION: Mr. Murphey
SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To approve the Planning Board Meeting Minutes for August 2, 2017.

**Aye Mr. Dupree
Abstain Ms. Weiser
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Mr. Murphey
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett**

VOICE VOTE 6-0 1-Abstain Motion Carried

MOTION: Ms. Dexter
SECOND: Mr. Murphey

To adjourn.

Aye	Mr. Dupree
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Ms. Dexter
Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Mr. Murphey
Aye	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

DRAFT