

## Response to Comments on Draft Scoping Document

**Project:** Proposed Adoption of Amendments to Chapter 143 of the Code of the Town of Red Hook entitled *Zoning*, Chapter 120 of the Code of the Town of Red Hook entitled *Subdivision of Land* and the *Comprehensive Plan*

**Date:** April 7, 2009

**Materials Reviewed:**

Oral comments received during the public scoping session on March 10, 2009

Written comments received from:

Supervisor Sue Crane, dated March 16, 2009 (email)

Mr. Barry and Mrs. Roni Gurland, dated March 10, 2009

Mr. Tom Mansfield (undated)

Mr. Frank Stoppenbach, dated March 16, 2009

Historic Hudson Valley, dated March 16, 2009

Hudson River Heritage, dated March 16, 2009

NYS Dept. of Agriculture and Markets, dated March 9, 2009

Preliminary Comment Letter by DC Dept. of Planning and Development, dated February 17, 2009

Scenic Hudson, dated March 10, 2009

Comment	Response
1. Include an alternative that permits greater building potential in the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) District, specifically 4-6 dwelling unit (du) per net acre for single-family houses, 5-8 du for cottages and duplexes, and 8-12 du for townhouses and apartments.	This alternative was added. See Alternative H.
2. Include an alternative that permits less density in the Agricultural Business (AB) District, specifically one du per 20 acres, as originally proposed by the Intermunicipal Task Force, with a sliding scale for parcels smaller than 40 acres.	This alternative was added. See Alternative E.
3. It should be easier to calculate how many development rights a landowner in the proposed AB District has to sell.	This alternative was added. See Alternative C.
4. Study the potential impact on archaeological and historic resources in the Hudson River National Historic Landmark District (HRNHLD), in the planned emerging centers, and in the TND District.	The Draft Scoping Document identifies the need to identify the presence of known historic and/or archeological sites within the Town based upon the NYS Site Inventory and to discuss potential impacts and mitigation measures (see subsection III.F). The only emerging center that is included in the proposed action is the proposed TND District south of the Village of Red Hook.
5. Where zoning and density will change under the proposed action, each of the density changes should be clearly stated.	Proposed density changes will be discussed in detail in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsections II.A.b.III and III.A.
6. Concerns about impacts of the "North East development in Red Hook Village" on the Hendrick Martin house located on Willowbrook Lane were raised.	The proposed actions pertain only to lands within the Town of Red Hook and do not include any amendments to the Village of Red Hook Code. Concerns about code amendments or development proposals within the Village of Red Hook should be addressed to that municipality.

## Response to Comments on Draft Scoping Document

Comment	Response
7. What will be the impact of the sewer in the TND District on the aquifer?	A municipal sewer system is not part of the proposed actions. Should such a system be proposed, it would be subject to a separate SEQR review.
8. Would the sewer system reduce pollution of the aquifer?	See comment above.
9. Will people really walk to stores in the TND District?	Transportation impacts, including pedestrian and bicycle transportation, will be addressed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsection III.D.
10. Trails should be developed in the Town, especially so kids can walk and bike safely to school.	The existing and potential pedestrian and bicycle system will be discussed in the GEIS, as outlined in subsection III.D.c. of the Draft Scoping Document. Potential impacts on pedestrian and bicycle transportation will be addressed as they pertain to the proposed actions.
11. Trails and walkability should be addressed townwide, not just in the proposed TND District.	This is beyond the scope of the proposed actions.
12. We should have alternative transportation throughout the Town.	This is beyond the scope of the proposed actions.
13. How many trails do we need? How do you protect people on trails?	See comments above.
14. What are we doing to address housing affordability in the Town, especially for seniors?	Impacts of the proposed actions on housing affordability will be addressed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsections II.A.c.iii and III.G.f.
15. Housing affordability is also a concern for young people just starting out in the workforce.	See comment above.
16. What will be the cost to the Town to implement the project as well as ongoing costs to the Town due to increased services and infrastructure?	Economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed actions will be discussed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsection III.H.
17. It would cost more to service new roads in rural areas.	See comment above.

## Response to Comments on Draft Scoping Document

Comment	Response
18. I support walkable centers to enhance economic development. My concern is about traffic at the light in the Village of Red Hook.	The GEIS will identify intersections of concern in the Village of Red Hook and the Town based on data from existing traffic studies, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsection III.D.a.ii, and will discuss the impact of the proposed zoning amendments on such intersections.
19. The commercial zone on the Hoffman property should not be expanded as this will impact the water supply for Rokeby Homes and the residential character of the area.	Impacts of the proposed actions on ground water resources and community character will be addressed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsections III.B.a and III.G respectively. It should be noted that the existing B1 zoning district south of the Village of Red Hook was expanded at the request of Town’s Economic Development Committee.
20. How do we figure out what the boost to the local economy will be as a result of this project in these difficult economic times.	The proposed actions are a long-term plan for the Town and cannot be assessed only in the context of the present market swing. Fiscal impacts will be addressed as outlined in subsection III.H of the Scoping Document.
21. I’m concerned that this will impact the viability of agriculture by defining what farmers can do with their land. The Town shouldn’t be defining what agriculture is or what farmers can do with their land. Is it consistent with NYS Agriculture and Markets Law?	In the proposed AB District, “agriculture 2” would be a permitted use. This use is defined as “any activity connected with the raising of crops, livestock or other farming operation permitted by the New York State Agriculture and Markets Law.”
22. The definition of “agriculture” would exclude the raising of swine and mink and commercial horse boarding operations in the AB District.	See comment above. The raising of swine and mink and commercial horse boarding operations would be included in the definition of “agriculture 2” and would therefore be permitted uses in the AB District.
23. The tax consequences are the same even if you’re just shifting development from one part of Town to another. I don’t want to see any new buildings in Town. It’s already financially impossible to get enough commercial development to offset the costs of residential development.	Economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed actions will be discussed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsection III.H.
24. If you want farmers to keep farming, you have to make the review process simple.	Subsection III.A.b.II of the Scoping Document has been revised to specifically include a comparison of the Planning Board review process for existing and proposed uses in the proposed Agricultural Business District.

## Response to Comments on Draft Scoping Document

Comment	Response
<p>25. The Centers and Greenspaces plan will encourage residential and commercial growth in our walkable village centers while preserving the surrounding farmland and open spaces. When the economy recovers, Red Hook will be in a much stronger position to compete for needed business investment once the plan is adopted. The incentive zoning mechanism to transfer development from the AB District to the TND District is a proactive tool for promoting investment in the centers while preventing sprawl, and this will prevent property tax increases.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed actions will be discussed in the GEIS, as outlined in the Draft Scoping Document subsection III.H.</p>
<p>26. Incorporating a TND District and an AB District emphasizes the Town’s desire to sustainably plan for the future. It will protect open space, agriculture, rural character, natural resources and scenic beauty, and the TND District will improve air quality as a result of the reduction of carbon emissions from vehicles, and generate a stronger economic base, which will contribute to quality of life.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Additional Comments Unrelated to Scoping	Response
<p>The following comments were not related to the Scoping Document and process but will be taken into consideration by the Town Board in its review of the proposed Local Law and Comprehensive Plan amendments.</p>	
<p>1. The amendments permit the Planning Board to “deem” things, such as how much land can be set aside for recreation, without specifying what the criteria for “deeming” is.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>2. The Sky Park Airport property should not be included in the proposed AB District as it is being considered as a possible site for a hotel/spa/conference center.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>3. I’m concerned about the equity of my land in the AB District.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>4. We need a committee to entice businesses to Town and to help expedite the review review.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>5. Will the TND District entice Toll Brothers to come here?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>6. We don’t want to be like Fishkill. We may get 3 or 4 story buildings in the Village with more infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

## Response to Comments on Draft Scoping Document

7. The proposal will boost economic development in the Village. We need to create an identity for the Village to enhance its character.	Comment noted.
8. Will the Tree Committee be consulted to make sure the right trees are planted?	Comment noted.
9. Historic Hudson Valley will need time to assess and evaluate how this proposed zoning change might impact Montgomery Place.	Comment noted.
10. A number of detailed revisions to the Local Law were recommended by Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development to further fulfill the plan's primary goals.	Comment noted.