



August 7, 2015

Chairwoman Christine Kane  
Town of Red Hook Planning Board  
109 South Broadway  
Red Hook, NY 12571

**RE: Hoffman Property**  
Town of Red Hook

Dear Chairwoman Kane:

**Please accept this letter as our summary of responses to the Comments received from Greenplan, in a letter dated June 12, 2015:**

Comments:

- A. **Public Hearing.** We believe the Planning Board now has a complete application and can set public hearings on the Site Plan, Subdivision, and Incentive Zoning applications. While some items are still under discussion, the Planning Board can resolve these after the Public Hearing.

Please note the following:

1. The **Agricultural Data Statement** must be forwarded to all owners of farm operations within 500' of the subject parcel and the Planning Board must consider the Agricultural Data Statement and any comments thereon in its review of the application.

*LRC Response: no response required, noted*

2. The Site Plan and Incentive Zoning applications require referral to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development in accordance with **General Municipal Law § 239-m** since the property is located within 500' of the Village boundary.

*LRC Response: no response required, noted*

3. Notice of the public hearing on the Subdivision and Site Plan applications must be sent to the Clerk of the Village of Red Hook at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing, in accordance with **General Municipal Law § 239-nn**.

LRC Engineering & Surveying, P.C  
LRC Engineering and Surveying, LLC  
LRC Environmental Services, Inc.  
Land Resource Consultants, Inc.

85 Civic Center Plaza, Suite 103  
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601  
Tel: (845) 243-2880  
Fax: (845) 265-8175

---

Offices in New York, Connecticut and New Jersey

[www.lrcconsult.com](http://www.lrcconsult.com)

Land Planning ♦ Civil Engineering ♦ Environmental Services ♦ Land Surveying ♦ Landscape Architecture



*LRC Response: no response required, noted*

## **B. Key Outstanding Design Issues:**

1. **One Car Garage.** A one-car garage option is now offered and is shown in the Architectural Package. The drawings have also been revised to indicate units where either attached or detached garages will be offered.

*LRC Response: no response required, noted*

2. **Garage on Lot 40.** The applicant requests that the garage on Lot #40 be permitted to face the street (vs. being accessed from the rear lane). The Site Plan shows this lot with the garage door set back approximately 14' from the sidewalk. The setback is important as it permits drivers to safely back out of the garage without endangering pedestrians on the sidewalk. We recommend that if the Planning Board approves access to the garage from the street, the plans include a note that the garage door for Lot 40 must be setback a minimum of 12' from the sidewalk.

*LRC Response: The Applicant is in acceptance with this comment*

3. **Driveway Width.** The site plan now shows all driveways a maximum of 12' wide at the sidewalk. The curb cut is proposed at 15' wide.

The applicant should clarify what is meant by the following sentences in their response letter: "The applicant is willing to limit the width of the driveway at the sidewalk to 12' for all primary frontage driveways;" and "this requirement [12' wide driveways at the sidewalk] will require setbacks to facilitate the transition."

*LRC Response: The primary/secondary frontage designation applies to corner lots, as depicted on Fig. 18 of § 143-49.1. Lot 40 depicts a garage fronted on the secondary frontage street (carriage home), and due to the style and placement of the home the driveway would need to be greater than 12' at the sidewalk crossing.*

4. **Views from Old Farm Road.** The Site Plan shows wrap-around porches on the four lots (Lots 60, 66, 70, and 83) that have secondary frontage on Old Farm Road; however the applicant states that they do not want to be required to construct wrap-around porches on these lots. Currently only TND House E includes a wrap-around porch with access to both frontages. We recommend the applicant provide additional wrap-around porch options on select TND Houses, and designate these in the Architectural Package as appropriate for corner lots.

*LRC Response: As noted on the site plan, the buildings shown are illustrative only. Final home selection will be made by the homebuyer. We reiterate that wrap-around porches and entrances from the secondary frontages are not required under the Code and while these options may be offered to a homebuyer and are depicted on TND House Types B, C and E, there should be no requirement to provide such features. We believe that the attempt to severely restrict the buyer's choice of houses on corner lots is unduly restrictive and not justified by the Code. The architectural*



elements of TND House Types B, C, D and E are consistent with section §143-49.1M.(5) of the Code and we believe these designs are suited to the noted corner lots, are consistent with the intent of the TND and we request the PB make such a determination and reflect this in the Resolution of Site Plan Approval.

5. **Waiver Request for House G.** The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement that the garage for TND House G be set back a minimum of 20' from the front building facade and has offered to limit this house option to no more than 10% of the street-loaded lots. There are 26 street loaded-lots, so this would limit the number of non-complying houses to two (2) or three (3) lots. If the Board permits this, we recommend that the plans clarify that the driveway to such lots must be no more than 12' wide at the sidewalk.

*LRC Response: We request the Planning Board grant the requested waiver and limit the number of homes with the condition that no more than three (3) such conditions shall be permitted within the project. All primary frontage driveways will be 12' wide at the sidewalk.*

6. **Waiver Request for Roof Pitch.** Most of the waiver requests for roof pitch are for projections and dormers that fall under the shed roof classification permitting a shallower roof pitch. The remaining waiver requests are minor in nature, for 8:12 pitch vs. the required 9:12. The Design Review Committee has no comments on roof pitch, which appears to be acceptable to them.

*LRC Response: We request the PB grant the requested waiver.*

7. **Waiver Request for Sidewalk.** The applicant requests a waiver from the requirement to install a sidewalk along the north and south sides of the entry square where the Mail Kiosk is located. The justification given for this is that no buildings front directly on the square. However, the square is a place where pedestrian activity should be encouraged. The provision of sidewalks would encourage residents to walk to get their mail, and to socialize in the square, as shown on the applicant's rendering on page 8 of the Architectural Package. Not providing sidewalks along two sides of the square will force people to cross the road more frequently and may reduce the use of the square.

*LRC Response: We support the plan design to not have sidewalks on the north and south of this main square – walkways are planned on the abutting streets in very close proximity. The intent of this main square is to provide open lawn area, suitable to many recreational uses. The width of this lawn area as currently depicted is approximately 127'. The inclusion of sidewalks would reduce this width to approximately 103'. Eliminating the duplicate sidewalks here provides an important lawn area within this main square. We request the Planning Board grant the requested waiver.*

8. **Materials and Colors:**

- a) The applicant has submitted a list of proposed building materials and colors (dated June 4, 2015) for the project, including specifications for the Community Center and Mail Kiosk. The range of colors appears limited. We recommend that a statement be included with the list of colors that slight variations of these colors are permitted as long as they are not garish and are in keeping with the neighborhood.



*LRC Response: The applicant has no objection to the inclusion of this statement in the Resolution of Final Site Plan Approval.*

- b) We recommend that the June 4, 2015 color and buildings material submission clarify that clapboard will be smooth finish as the Board discussed with the applicant at the last meeting, and as is required by the Zoning Law, and also clarify that the “architectural shingle by Landmark Certain Teed or equivalent” on page 2 is a roofing material.

*LRC Response: This is to confirm that smooth finish clapboard is proposed and the Landmark CertainTeed is a roofing material.*

- c) The applicant requests that the Planning Board refer the proposed building materials and colors to the Design Review Committee and solicit any further input from them.

*LRC Response: We trust the Planning Board had made these material submissions available to the Design Review Committee upon submission in June and request confirmation that the Committee is satisfied with our selections.*

9. **Phasing Plan.** The applicant has clarified in which phases the Post Office, Community Building, and proposed recreation facilities will be constructed. The applicant has requested that the Planning Board determines that the phasing plan is acceptable. We recommend that this determination be deferred until after the Public Hearing.

*LRC Response: As the Public Hearing is now concluded, we request the Planning Board make the requested determination.*

We appreciate your efforts to review our revised plans, and look forward to satisfying any outstanding concerns as soon as possible. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,  
**The LRC Group**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rodney Morrison", written over a horizontal line.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rodney Morrison, P.E.