

Gretchen Dykstra
8 Garden Street
Cold Spring, NY 10516



Re: Zoning Amendment

Date: April 21, 2014

Dear Cold Spring Board of Trustees
Cold Spring Planning Board

I will not be in Cold Spring on Tuesday, April 29, 2014 otherwise I would attend the public hearing. I am in favor of development at the site, but urge the Board to be careful, particularly about the scale of this project.

My interest is three-fold: to ensure a charming gateway into Cold Spring that addresses practical needs, produces long-term revenues for the Village, and maintains trees and green space.

Charming is, of course, a matter of taste and I, for one, do not necessarily mean a reproduction of 19th century architecture. I would support good modern design that alludes to our architectural history. Too much of anything becomes boring and precious, in my opinion.

However, I believe it is irresponsible of any elected or appointed official in Cold Spring to approve the re-zoning or the ultimate site plan without seeing a three-dimensional scale model. I am amazed that with all the time and all the discussion the Village Board has yet to say to the developer. "Enough. There will be no progress until your proposal in context."

A senior center and municipal space are both important and I would support their inclusion. Beyond one large private gift, however, I am not aware of any *guaranteed* funds for the build-out, rent and maintenance of those uses. *What happens if those funds are not forthcoming and the anticipated municipal spaces stand vacant?* Will the developer be able to rent to commercial tenants? I would urge the limit on commercial space be lifted with regard to vacant municipal spaces after a reasonable time.

I have never been in favor of market-rate senior housing, but my greatest fear is that 55 condominiums are too many—whoever lives in them-- taking up too much space. Since we have not seen a 3-D model can any of us really visualize how big this development will be? The markers on the site only add to my fears. I understand the Village Board rejected the notion of some of the

buildings having three stories in order to reduce the footprint. *Why?* There have long been attractive and appropriate three story buildings and houses along Main Street, 9D and side streets, such as Church and High Streets. I see several from my house alone. *Permitting the increased height of a few buildings at Butterfield would increase the amount of green space.* It goes without saying that the gorgeous copper beech tree deserves a glorious green stage.

In summary I would urge the Trustees to:

- 1) Demand a three-dimensional scale model or its electronic equivalent before your vote.**
- 2) Allow the Planning Board and the developer to rent to commercial tenants, perhaps with short-term leases, if funds for the build-out of municipal spaces are not forthcoming in a reasonable time frame.**
- 3) Increase the total amount of green space by allowing height flexibility.**

I am sorry I cannot be there and thank Linda Lange, a Village resident, for reading this into the record.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gretchen Dykstra', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gretchen Dykstra

submitted
4/29/14
Public Hearing (M)

Anne E. Impellizzeri
15 High Street
Cold Spring, NY 10516

April 29, 2014

Mayor Ralph Falloon
Trustees Michael Bowman, Bruce Campbell,
Cathryn Fadde and Stephanie Hawkins

Re: Proposed Zoning Amendment B-4A

In view of the widespread interest in having as much green space (lawn and trees) as possible on the Butterfield Hospital site, I hope (and please note that I address this as a concerned citizen, not as a member of the Planning Board) I hope the Village Board will reconsider the possibility that was in the draft reviewed on April 10 but omitted in the version now before us. That possibility would permit, not require, a reduction in the footprint of some, not all, of the buildings, with an increase in the permitted height up to three stories or 45 feet.

It is worth noting that the height provision in the current zoning (Section 134-16 G (3) (f) which specifies a maximum of two and one-half stories and 35 feet) is there, not to protect our traditional village, but rather was part of the suburban zoning adopted in the sixties.

During the discussion of possible changes to B-4A on April 10, Mr. Guillaro suggested that permitting changes in footprint and height on 50% of the buildings would be satisfactory, and his attorney suggested that a reduction in footprint of up to 10% could be acceptable (as opposed to the 25% in the draft), but pointed out that they had not requested these provisions.

It impresses me that whether or not the developer now wants this possibility, it could be helpful to permit, but not require, it in the zoning. It could possibly lead to more varied and interesting design as the developer refines the plans, or to an opportunity for improvements during site plan review. So why not at least permit it in the zoning?

Accordingly, I hope the Village Board will reconsider and put in permission for up to 10 % reduction in the footprint with up to three stories or 45 feet in height, on some, not more than 50%, of the buildings, in order to increase the green space on the site.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne E. Impellizzeri

hard copy delivered
4/30/2014
email received on
4/29/14
Missouri, Clark
FRANK
Haggerty

THE CURRENT BUTTERFIELD HOSPITAL SITE CONCEPT:

Sorely Misguided, a Giant Step in the Wrong Direction

So I've been thinking a lot about this project. I know I am not the only one.

Yet it takes considerable time to put one's thoughts together, in a comprehensive manner, on a proposal of this scale. This one shows every sign of having vast implications and irreversible consequences for the village. Clearly, as the largest land development in the village in decades, this project will surely challenge, and likely change, the historic character and the close-knit quality of the village. There is much to consider.

Here's what I came up with. As far as I can see, the Butterfield concept as proposed doesn't do terribly much for the village economy, as it exists today, which, if I may, I would describe as largely based on a range of unusual restaurants, on a cottage industry of eclectic and niche art, theater, and musical activities, a main street venue shopping, and a base for area tourism (most of the tourism is on foot, or in the river). All of this typically comes with a rare personal touch which draws upon and indeed is merely one facet of the compact nature of this community. Most of the balance of the local economy is based on the purchasing power of those who live and work here. (The key difference, the unique advantage Cold Spring has over so many other suburban communities in the region is the ease of its access to the Hudson River, and to the useable if frequently disappointing commuter train system. And that the layout of the village, its walk-ability, dating from the conditions and requirements intrinsic to its origins in the early nineteenth century, its connection and dependence on the river and on the railroad, remains largely intact.)

I don't see how this proposal develops, integrates, or promotes the regional economy; I don't see it doing much for sustainability, or for environmentalism. Of course it revitalizes a long dilapidated property, and it does promise a modest amount of net tax revenue for the village (apparently the school district gets more).

I don't see how this development integrates, physically, with the rest of the village. It seems to create its own, separate space. Sorry to put it this way, but too much of the proposed comes across as 'Let's do this, because we can't think of anything else to do, or let's do it this way, as there's no other way to do it'. This project tries to do something for almost every interest in the region, which is an all but impossible task, as many of the interests are incompatible and in conflict. Probably this is a consequence of the need for a change in zoning, which in turn requires wide public input, and legislative approval. As such, no one person should be held responsible for this situation. We are all, to some extent, responsible.

My worst fear would be for this proposal to develop into a local version of the increasingly common, and what might be described as the 'Mega Project', a type which

is assured of its success primarily due to its great size; and no matter what else happens, because of size it may eventually put many in the area out of business, or at a minimum force drastic lifestyle and economic changes.

As described this development means, if it means anything, increased vehicular traffic on village streets, particularly at the intersections of Route 9D at Chestnut and Benedict Streets (these intersections are already problematic), and on nearby streets and intersections. Understand what this means: everything that goes with more traffic, i. e., delays, gridlock, pollution, noise, more hazardous and difficult driving conditions, more accidents, more roadway maintenance and repair, a reduction in the availability of parking spaces in village, and a decrease in pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Are we all succumbing here to a circular argument for, or one that will result in growth, for the sake of, or effectively in defense of, growth itself? As opposed to a response to genuine needs? Would this development not then be the antithesis of the very concept of a village?

As the only possible conclusion one may have, this development, as currently proposed, threatens our community with a range of hazards and uncertainties. I'll explain later, point by point. But all in all, without a doubt, this proposal is a very bad idea for the Citizens and for the Taxpayers of Cold Spring. I would say also it's a bad idea for Cold Spring businesses and for tourists and other visitors alike. *But it could be a good development. At least it could be a much better one.*

I stop here with this, generally critical, introduction. Next I will take a more constructive approach, rather than being purely negative. Where I can, where I feel I have given sufficient thought to offer something unique and valuable to this discussion, I will do so. I do not claim this to be comprehensive. Nor do I claim professional experience in the field of planning. I base my arguments on common sense. But you decide. Let me know what I have missed.

Here are point-by-point recommendations for the Butterfield Hospital site, starting with two counter-proposals:

1) BUS DEPOT & TRANSIT CENTER The village (and the town) rather urgently needs an alternative transit system, specifically as a back up for and supplement to the current MTA train service. Also, the need for an expansion of the bus service, as currently operated by the county, has been much discussed over the past few years. The need for improvement and redundancy in transit options generally should also have become evident to anyone living or working here, or trying to get around the area during or subsequent to the last few wild storms, and the other various disruptions we have experienced.

By a transit center, I mean a potentially multi-function structure, but at a minimum a municipally supported bus facility, in turn with a minimum

of features as heat, probably some air-conditioning, perhaps toilets, some sort of tourist information (at least a map of the area and of the bus routes along with schedules). Benches or seats? Drinking water? A system to inform passengers of the status of the transit system? These sorts of enhancements would certainly be helpful.

The most logistically appropriate and the only currently available site for a bus facility, for the village and for the region, is Butterfield. It's right at the south entrance to the village on the main highway. It's within a short walking distance to the drug store, the post office, the supermarket, and the two (or three, depending on how they're counted) small shopping centers already in operation. Also close are churches, schools, the West Point Foundry Preserve historic site, the Putnam History Museum. Currently there's a farmer's market as well. Around the corner is Main Street, Cold Spring.

A transit center as I envision it would allow for multiple types of service, and I'll describe what I am thinking in some detail.

The first would be a regular and local service, connecting with other stops in the village, including the train station, and potentially as well to key points in nearby Garrison and Nelsonville. Probably it should service in some way the Forge Gate and Springbrook residential complexes. This service is an expanded version of the existing Fridays through Sundays operation now provided by the county.

Another type of service would be for regional connections, allowing travel for example to and from the Fishkill area for shopping, for access to medical service providers there (but see item 2 below), etc.

Another service type of service would be for commuters, providing for better and more direct connections to and from those portions of the county and nearby counties not easily or directly serviced now by the train network. One example I would think is a bus to White Plains.

Another type would be for tourist or charter buses visiting Cold Spring.

Another type would be for special conditions. This would include temporary alternatives for commuters normally using the train, in case service is halted (which occurs now more and more frequently – by the way, and we should start right now, on planning how best to handle these interruptions).

All of these types of service would be facilitated by a credible transit center. A transit center should be sufficiently attractive and functional to

entice motorists off the road, create alternatives, and serve those who lack other transit options.

2) LOCAL MEDICAL SERVICES Particularly considering the recent substantial growth in the area, the village (and the town) is in need of an accessible walk-in medical clinic, and perhaps an urgent care facility. These could be used both by residents as well as by visitors, for routine treatments of conditions such as poison ivy, sprains, etc. A local medical clinic would offer convenience and flexibility, and it could cut travel times and costs. Overall, local medical service should thereby improve. Certainly here I do not mean to imply a local hospital is needed or desirable. That would probably not fit or be economic in the village today. But everything else dovetails with the current and historic use of the site, and this provides significant continuity.

The two counter-proposals above can facilitate greater flexibility, and provide for more options, and reduce the need for motor vehicles. Thereby it reduces the level of traffic, keeping the roads and the walkways safer for everyone. These two counter-proposals taken together form the core of a philosophically different type of development.

The following are issues that best fit into a category of “need more thought”:

3) SENIOR SERVICES CENTER A locally sited senior center is needed and overdue. I am not precisely sure where a dedicated facility would best be located. I suspect it should be in an accessible point in the northern part of Phillipstown, and near the center of the town’s population. I believe the town and the village need to carefully consider the location of the center, in fact of any facilities and services for residents, so that all those who need the services have them available. But it should not necessarily be located immediately at Butterfield.

In the meantime, I don’t understand why at least limited services are not already offered, at existing facilities like the Cold Spring VFW building.

4) POST OFFICE A post office, at a minimum a retail office, is needed in Cold Spring. It should be somewhere within the village limits and probably near 9D and Main Street. But maybe not immediately at Butterfield. At least the distribution portion of the post office should not be located here.

5) GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES & FACILITIES As far as new town and/or county office space, I am unclear if they are needed. Or exactly how much. If and as they are in fact necessary, these offices and services are logistically best located near or along Route 301 and/or Route 9, i. e., in the direction of and closer to the Town Hall and/or closer to the center of the town along one of the main roads, and for

county offices in the direction of, and closer to, the county seat at Carmel. Certainly not near the busy, already very congested area centered on the Foodtown Plaza.

By the way, are major government buildings not now normally designed with long established principles of civic architecture? Isn't this style of architecture and aren't these types of buildings normally provided with sufficient setbacks from streets and sidewalks, particularly if sited on a busy state highway, to allow for flexibility in outdoor public space, including a forecourt for gathering, and for a range of visual appreciation, so as to be an emblem of some level of civic pride? Shouldn't any key municipal building have significant aspects of a monumental style of architecture?

And should not such buildings, if at all possible, ideally be located near the center of a community's main business district (which in turn is normally near the geographic center of the community), at the center of its own group of official buildings in an easily recognizable zone of governmental and administration activity, thereby allowing for easy pedestrian access from most if not all directions of approach (can't be done here as the proposed location fronts onto a busy state highway, and proposed at its back are a range of privately owned residential properties), and have easy access to commonly used services including restaurants, an ample range of parking opportunities, libraries, etc.? I don't see these standards as considerations in the current design, and I find it difficult to allow for them on the proposed Butterfield site, particularly as it fronts to Route 9D on an inside curve.

6) A JAIL? Will there be, or is there allowed use for a jail on this site? If not, why not? If so, what is the argument in favor of this type of use? My guess, of course, is the answer would be no, but I don't want to make any assumptions. And while this may seem an odd question, given proposals for combined use, multi-jurisdiction court facilities, clarity now is better than surprises later.

Perhaps a task force of representatives of the village, the town, and the county could develop some realistic recommendations for locations for the facilities in 3, 4, 5, & 6. Moreover, wherever a senior center (any community center), the post office, and village, town, and county government offices and facilities are (both temporarily and finally) located, they should be served by bus / transit connections, and every reasonable accommodation for these connections should be made.

7) EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS AT ROUTE 9D Proposed at this site are two story commercial/retail buildings. This is in addition to the existing one story building currently used as medical offices (Lahey Pavilion). One of the two new buildings

is proposed for village, town, and county office space. Space for a senior center has been proposed (see item 3 above). Space for a post office has been proposed (see item 4 above). Space for centralized or shared court facilities for the village, town, and county has been proposed. Space for various other county provided services has been proposed. The building proposed for these governmental services is to be near the middle of the site fronting to Route 9D. The other commercial/retail building also is near 9D.

It has been stated that parking will be provided entirely within this site. But not everyone will choose to arrive via automobile. Seniors at the Chestnut Ridge housing complex, others living across Route 9D, and guests and visitors will likely cross the highway directly on foot, and where there is no existing crosswalk. A break in the existing roadside hedge on the side of Route 9D indicates this activity already occurs. Thus a significant new traffic hazard will be created. The alternative, the use of an existing crosswalk farther down the road, will not be used due to the lengthy detour it requires. A new crosswalk with pedestrian controlled signal lights, in front of the building proposed for municipal / government use, will likely be a result, if this arrangement comes to pass.

The following fit in a category of negative assessment; I detail my rationale in each case:

8) EFFECT ON TRAFFIC AND PARKING It has been stated that parking will be entirely provided by within the site. But not everyone will choose to park onsite. Some will park along nearby streets, legally, as they are free to do so, or illegally. This will be the case particularly for drivers loading or unloading passengers, and for those with plans to conduct brief business within or near the site. Double or illegally parked automobiles as well as commercial trucks can be expected along Route 9D as well as along Chestnut and Paulding Streets.

Left turns from the southbound lane of Route 9D, against oncoming traffic, into the site are to be expected. Assuming 9D is not widened to add a new turn lane, this will result in additional traffic congestion and delays southbound. In order to bypass southbound backups, traffic will spill over onto Paulding and Chestnut Streets. Note that congestion and delays northbound already commonly develop, caused by drivers making left turns from Route 9D onto Benedict Street, at three separate locations entering into the three existing shopping centers, and, lastly, entering into the adjoining gasoline station. In order to bypass northbound backups, traffic will spill over onto Paulding and Chestnut Streets, and possibly to Marion and Wall Streets.

A gridlock of 9D may develop if traffic is blocked in both directions by drivers attempting left turns in opposite directions at the same time.

9) TOO MANY DIFFERENT TYPES OF USE ON A SITE OF THIS SIZE The proposed combination of several types of uses (often termed mixed use): commercial, retail, office, government, medical, and residential, are too dissimilar and disparate, particularly for a site of this size. The result, frankly, is a hodgepodge. Mixed use is a great idea, in theory. In practice, particularly if there are more than two uses, probably it won't work on a site this small, in a community this small. Where has it been tried before, in a community of this size? There is yet another proposed use, laudable enough in itself: public access to a not-to-be developed green area at the corner of the site near the entrance to the village. I don't have an exhaustive list of likely consequences, but it's my feeling that mixing these very different types of use will lead to disputes and disagreements, at least dissatisfactions, at some point amongst differing and conflicting interests. An insufficiently clear delineation of the boundaries between private property and public access, and between the different types of uses, will drive this process. This will be compounded by an increasing local population, and by the increasingly transient nature of the population, in which the project itself will greatly contribute. I can easily imagine the village being impacted.

10) TOO LARGE A SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT OF MIXED RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USE A multi-building complex with a combination of commercial and residential use in the village of Cold Spring would be unprecedented. As far as I know it would be unprecedented anywhere within the town. In fact, I am unaware of any example of this type of a development *at any location* in the entire county. If this project proceeds as proposed Cold Spring would therefore be the first in the area to experience it. This would be the test case. We would be the Guinea Pig. More specific to my fears, the brief but disagreeable investigation I had of a much larger but essentially similar development along the waterfront near the Yonkers train station – you need to see it for yourself in person to get the full impact – continues to haunt me. I could not recommend any similarly large scale development for any small village or compact community. Certainly not for the village of Cold Spring.

(Don't get me wrong here. I am not opposed to the type of arrangement, common on Main Street, of walk-in commercial use on the street level and residential use on upper levels, all within the confines of a single building. At the appropriate locations, this type of use within the village should be encouraged. And this type of an arrangement is particularly suitable where there is a relationship or synergy between the use of the

commercial space, and the use of the residential space in the same building, or nearby.)

Separate from the concern described at the start of this section, and in any case, the village does not need, nor can it afford another large scale condominium development. Certainly not at the scale proposed. And certainly not at the Butterfield site. Certainly not near the busy, already very congested area around Foodtown Plaza.

However, if residential development, at level of any density, is to proceed at this site, I would suggest an alternative approach. In order to minimize congestion and interaction of motor vehicles (for that matter, all forms of activity) generated by the residential portion at the site, with existing traffic on 9D, and to separate residential traffic from other types inside this parcel, consider a change of the entrance and exit for the residential portion to Paulding Street, away from and distinct from the Chestnut Street/9D side. This change would probably require at least a partial redesign, involving a removal of at least one of the proposed three single family houses in order to provide space for an internal roadway with access to residences on the site. It may also thereby develop, as part of this alternative, the single family houses either appear in a different arrangement and/or they are replaced by townhouses.

Particularly in reference to the two preceding items 9 & 10, and to put it this way, I would caution everyone against the idea that twenty pounds of potatoes can be stuffed into a ten pound bag. But that is precisely what is being attempted here.

11) COMMERCIAL USE OF DOUBTFUL UTILITY The proposed means a large increase in commercial real estate space within the village, and a change in the balance; perhaps a doubling of the portion of space designed for commercial activity driven primarily by automobile traffic (and as a significant consideration it should be acknowledged that the layout and construction of most of the village predates the automobile era).

But what in the world does this mean? How may this much new commercial space benefit the village? What types of additional commercial space does the village really need, or can benefit from? Precisely what is lacking in the village? What may village residents really make use of? Do we need another bank? How would a large increase in commercial space not radically impact the character of the village?

What commercial service establishments does the village actually need, as distinct from those of motorists and travelers with destinations other

than the village may somehow find more interesting or enticing, than a visit to the village itself?

12) ESTIMATED VALUE OF NET TAX REVENUES TO THE VILLAGE INSUFFICIENT TO COVER THE INHERENT UNCERTAINTIES AND THE RISK OF MISCALCULATION Net annual tax revenues to the village of \$60,000, \$100,000, or even \$120,000 is not a significant benefit, given the risks and unknowns of indirect, intangible, externalized, and difficult to measure impacts (as has been suggested elsewhere in this analysis) the proposed development is likely to bring to the village.

Residents and friends of the village of Cold Spring, indeed every interested party, should have the opportunity to consider the analysis presented here, and where in agreement, to act upon them.

Composed and Signed by:

Frank Haggerty
12 Main St., #2
Cold Spring, NY 10516

NOTE

This document is now in its third revision. Hopefully each revision is more up-to-date, more comprehensive, and more measured than the earlier one.

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Initial draft, 1-19-2014

Revised with additions, changes, deletions, and renumbering, to 1-30-2014

Revised with bibliography, discussion of effect on pedestrian crossings at 9D, more detailed impact on area traffic and parking, practical value of village net tax revenue, and thoughts on principles of civic architecture in design of governmental and official buildings added, and renumbering, to 4-29-2014

A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jane Jacobs, *The Life and Death of Great American Cities* (particularly chapters 2-6)

James H Kunstler, *The Geography of Nowhere*

Kenneth T Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*

Received via email
4/30/14

"Read at Public Hearing"
on 4/29/2014 by
Aaron Wayne
4/29/14
MA

Tuesday, April 29, 2014

To the Mayor and village board,

I recently reviewed the financial projections and claims in the developer's EAF application and would like to go over what I found during this review.

- My analysis shows that the project will generate at least \$200,000 less in revenue contributions each year than what is projected in the developer's EAF. This disparity alone causes me to question the reliability of the developer's forecast.
- In the economic analysis on page 58 of the EAF, the developer assumes that every resident of these units would all continue to earn the equivalent of full a salary while living in the units, even though the occupants would all be of retirement age.
- The developer's forecast does not seem to account for the use of enhanced STAR discounts, which as you can see from condo units now on the tax rolls, can reduce a household's school tax payment to zero.
- The developer's projections do not reflect the loss of tax income to the village if the county should buy or lease one of the commercial buildings. This loss of taxable square footage could reduce tax revenues by more than \$90,000 each year.
- The developer's projections do not show what would occur if the age restrictions on residents were not enforced locally. This is a likely scenario as it is difficult to enforce these age restrictions and it is easy for a municipality to lapse in this responsibility. My analysis shows that a lack of enforcement could result in an annual loss for the village of \$100,000 or more.

These are not small issues and these are not the only shortcomings I found in the developer's calculations. What would give me more confidence in this process is for the developer's tax income projections to be reviewed or verified by an independent financial authority, which is a standard practice that so far Cold Spring feels happy to shrug off.

Of course, there is an alternative to conducting an independent financial analysis. It is for the developer to give the village a full guarantee by a creditworthy institution of the tax income currently projected by the developer.

For the mayor and the village board to fail to seek either of these two options strikes me as both negligent and a failure to live up to the financial responsibilities you accept once you take office.

Thank you,
James Geppner, Village resident

Susan Kenney
31e Paulding Avenue
4/29/14
PK

I am here to speak for the members of the Paulding Avenue Neighbors Association.

With up to 110 new senior residents and their visitors, plus hundreds of other daily visitors to the offices and businesses at Butterfield, we expect many people will look to take a nice walk on Paulding Avenue. Unfortunately, there is currently no sidewalk on the Butterfield side of Paulding Avenue, forcing pedestrians to either walk in the street, or cross to the east side which is especially dangerous for seniors.

Our members believe that to accommodate increased foot traffic from Butterfield there needs to be a sidewalk on the west side of Paulding Avenue extending from the partial sidewalk on lower Paulding Avenue to the end of the 9D sidewalk in front of Butterfield.

Since the proposed Butterfield complex has created the necessity for a sidewalk to safely accommodate an increase in pedestrian traffic, our association believes that the developer should be held responsible and be required to install it.

B4A Zoning – Meeting 4/28/2014

4/29/14
NA
Page 1
Shirley
Norton

Dear Mayor Faloon and Village Board of Trustees:

First of all I want to thank Mayor Ralph Faloon, and Board Trustees - Mike Bowman, and Cathryn Fadde for their generous donation towards purchase of the video system for the Board meetings. Thank you for demonstrating your commitment to public access.

I also want to say that I remain very supportive of the B4a zoning change. From attending Village Board meetings and the Planning Board meetings I have come to believe that the EAF Study & Conclusions have made it very clear that the Butterfield Site is very appropriate for the Butterfield Project. *- my interest*

So I am asking you all to approve this zoning change & move the Butterfield Proposal back to the Planning Board as soon as possible. I live directly across the street from the Butterfield Site and have been waiting patiently, far too long, with others, to see this project be underway. We want to see this thing happen in our lifetime, long before we are in our graves! A proper Senior/Community Center is desperately needed for our area, a center similar to the Senior Center in Mahopac & Pleasant Valley. A place where we can offer computer classes and a variety of cultural activities, like art classes, gardening workshops and plan for a community garden, exercise, lectures, ballroom dancing, etc. Right now we are confined to a very small stuffy, dark basement room at Chestnut Ridge Apartments and a very small space at the American Legion building. This not at all adequate to accommodate and serve the 500 plus Senior's.

Many of you here who are not Senior's will eventually become one of us! We have a very capable developer who can provide the facility the Seniors so desperately need which will greatly serve the community. We don't have the financial support to rebuild at the American Legion nor

page 2
Shirley
Norton

can we ask the taxpayers to pay for it. NO ONE NEEDS ANOTHER TAX!

The Philipstown Recreation Center is not adequate for most of us because of the cost of the classes and location.

I also want to say that I hope that you don't base your decision on this one meeting here tonight but the many meetings that have been held the past five plus years. A large number of Senior's are not able to be here, but remain supportive of the project. It is time to make a decision, if not for us, certainly do it for your selves for you will someday soon be wearing the title of senior.

Please do base your decision on common sensibility and the proven adequacy of the proposed Butterfield Project, and the needs of the citizens of the community whom you represent!

Thank you, Shirley Norton - Cold Spring

Aaron Wolfe
19 Church Street

4/29/14

Luncheonette

Added to the zoning after the review.

Is there a definition of coffee shop or luncheonette? I think we can expect that alcohol will be sold unless we have a definition. This isn't necessarily a bad thing, but you should know what you're asking for.

Can a 15 seat restaurant survive on foot traffic alone?

We can expect that such a business will want to cater to commuter traffic.

This increase in traffic was not accounted for in the neg. declaration, because it was not part of the plan.

The public did not have a chance to speak to the planning board about this addition. To allow this last-minute change with no review would be irresponsible and possibly reckless.

Independent financial Review.

The neg dec declared that we would not need another police office, and wouldn't need ANY infrastructure improvements.

Accepting that that is the case, how much closer does BF bring to needing these expenditures?

Will the next development, or maybe parking meters--which could require more policing--, for example, push us the extra bit over the edge?

Butterfield can't be evaluated in a vacuum. We have to know how its costs affect the village as a whole. We need a professional, independent financial review.

Quality of life

The comprehensive plan calls for a walkable, bikeable, pedestrian friendly village, with all parts of the village interconnected.

The butterfield site plan shows us nothing but facilities for cars. Sidewalks are an afterthought, bike infrastructure is non-existent. It gives us nothing but more car traffic and a busier Chestnut St. in terms of a pedestrian friendly village.

If Butterfield residents are not comfortable walking around the village, they will drive to Main St. and create parking issues.

Before you vote to approve, please understand that these changes contradict what the village has already approved in its comprehensive plan.