



THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE NEW YORK

PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, August 30, 2010

6:00 pm

City Hall

Ken Stickle, 118 Catherine Street- I think the Dutton Park plan is a fiasco. We did not allow the MTA to put up anything past three stories for the parking lot. Why should we allow any private organization to come in and put up three buildings that are five stories tall, that is going to be a big box thing? We are going to put up 1,000 square foot commercial space, which we do not need any more commercial space built in the City of Poughkeepsie. Look at Main Street. We have enough commercial space. Everybody's ward that boundaries the Main Street is suffering. If somebody wants to put in commercial space, we need to do something to turn around upper Main Street, as I keep saying, our garbage pitfall. We do not need overpriced housing put down to the waterfront. We need to bring up the rest of the City of the Poughkeepsie. We have enough foreclosures, we have enough tax foreclosures right on the line. We should be concentrating on the rest of the city instead of allowing an out-of-state developer to come into our city promising us, quote on quote, "23" jobs. How do they come up with these numbers? How will they keep these 23 people actually employed? It does not take 23 people full-time to keep running 14 acres even with 600 units, if you put up brand new units. Where are these people going to be working? We need to turn around and scale this project down. They should be no more than two stories high. I do not care if these people have to sell these things for a million dollars per unit. It is the waterfront. We do not need 600 units put down at the waterfront. We need to scale it back where it is not 25 feet away from the waterfront. We need a 75-foot barrier. That is our Walkway. That is what the city is willing to pay for, 75 feet from that waterfront. We have given away almost every piece of property down on the waterfront. We have no open space left. As a contractor, I cannot see this development going through. All we are doing is putting a lot of money into somebody's pockets from New Jersey. We are not doing anything for the taxpayers in the city, and it is unfair, totally unfair to the taxpayers of the city who have lived here and kept this city going. Thank you.

Virginia Hancock, 26 Lockerman Avenue- It was not that long ago with the Quadricentennial that we were celebrating our river, and now we want to make a barrier, if you will, with buildings as the gentleman previously said. As far as commercial space, we absolutely do not need commercial space down at the river. We do not need 500 and some condominiums. We hear the oft given statement about the taxes that are going to come rolling into the school district, the city, about the jobs. Yes, during times of construction there are going to be lots of people working on the project. This is prime land, prime waterfront property. We have the opportunity to do it right. This is not a

quality project and this is what we should demand in this city. I would hope that you would think long and hard about what kind of a vision that you have for our beloved waterfront. Thank you.

Jonni Griffin, Mid Hudson Rowing Association, 40 Meyer Avenue- Statement

Mid Hudson Rowing Association
P.O. Box 683
Poughkeepsie, New York
12602

August 30, 2010

City of Poughkeepsie Common Council
City Hall
62 Civic Center Plaza
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

Re: One Dutchess Avenue Proposed Development

My name is Jonni Griffin. I live at 40 Meyer Avenue, City of Poughkeepsie.

I am speaking on behalf of the Mid Hudson Rowing Association, the oldest rowing association on the Hudson River and a member and tenant of the Community Boathouse which is located next to the proposed development at One Dutchess Avenue.

The rowers' perspective is perhaps unique in that we spend a lot of time on the Hudson River. We love the River's natural beauty and the wonderful view we have of the city of Poughkeepsie from out there on the water.

Mid Hudson Rowing Association supports the City of Poughkeepsie's goal of improvement of the former Dutton site. We welcomed the development of the Walkway Over the Hudson which has quickly become a world class attraction. These kinds of innovative projects are making good use of remarkable river resources, but, sadly, are missing in the proposed development at One Dutchess Avenue.

It is disconcerting to see that one of the last bits of the City's waterfront would be dominated by such a massive, dense development with little connection to or with the Hudson River.

Official Minutes of the Public Hearing on August 30, 2010 regarding Dutton O'Neil

Although we are pleased that the proposal includes some pedestrian access that will eventually link with the Greenway Trail, this walkway is far too narrow, ... too close to the public roadway., and even has to be shared with emergency vehicles ... due to the severe land limitations imposed by the size and location of the buildings. ... In fact, they are only set back from the river's edge forty five feet, little more than the length of two pick-up trucks or the length of a four-oared racing shell.

We also have strong concerns about safety related to the proposed project.

While the Site Plan shows no intrusion into the river along the length of the project at this time, any future approvals should not include any facility for motorized water craft at this location.

The significant rowing activity in the area of the Community Boathouse, including Vassar and Marist rowing programs, underscores the need for safety along this stretch of the waterfront.

We would, however, suggest that a kayak and canoe dock, along with a fishing facility, would be feasible at the One Duchess Avenue project.

- Building nearly 600 dwelling units will drastically increase vehicle traffic on narrow city streets... These streets are clearly inadequate to handle this load. On good days, North Water Street is a challenge and the addition of delivery vehicles, events at Waryas Park or other development in the vicinity will thoroughly clog the street.
- The Hoffman Street Bridge is also inadequate and the design of its reported rebuilding should be carefully reconsidered in light of the needs of any proposal for the use of the former Dutton Lumber property
- North Water St. does not have the capacity to manage school buses for young children or emergency vehicles. If improvements are required.... will this be paid for by the developer or the tax payers?

Official Minutes of the Public Hearing on August 30, 2010 regarding Dutton O'Neil

Another area of concern is aesthetic. The high rise, high density housing will be much too large for the property and too imposing for the surroundings. The buildings will block important river views.

Finally, we believe that the sport of rowing is integral and significant to Poughkeepsie's historical identity and should be preserved and promoted locally.

From 1895 to 1949, Poughkeepsie was the site of the most significant collegiate rowing competition in the country, known as the Poughkeepsie Regatta.

For over the past fifty years the college regatta has been replaced by scholastic rowing which is now pursued at the Community Boathouse by hundreds of students from seven area high schools ... In addition, two adult rowing associations,... along with Marist College and Vassar College, ... provide rowing programs.

Last year, Marist College reintroduced the historic Poughkeepsie Regatta, which also brings visitors to the area. Marist is planning to do it again this year.

We believe that Poughkeepsie's rowing legacy is an important part of the City's identity and is an opportunity to attract more people to the riverfront while also providing access to the Hudson.

Breakfast on the Walkway to watch rowing regattas will become very popular and is the kind of new possibility that opens up through innovative planning.

Taking advantage of this unique opportunity to combine history and good planning for the waterfront is a challenge most Hudson River towns would welcome. We would be happy to participate in discussions along these lines.

Jeff Anzevion, Scenic Hudson, 1 Civic Center Plaza-

Scenic Hudson, Inc.
One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-3157
Tel: 845 473 4440
Fax: 845 473 2648
email: info@scenichudson.org
www.scenichudson.org



Statement of

Jeffrey Anzevino
Director of Land Use Advocacy
Scenic Hudson, Inc.

One Dutchess Avenue
City and Town of Poughkeepsie, New York

City of Poughkeepsie, Common Council

August 30, 2010

My name is Jeffrey Anzevino, Director of Land Use Advocacy at Scenic Hudson. Scenic Hudson employs about 50 people in our Poughkeepsie office, which has for over 20 years been located on Main Street. Our address is 1 Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200.

First, Scenic Hudson commends the Common Council for scheduling this second opportunity for the public to express their views on the redevelopment of the former Dutton lumberyard. We understand that riverfront cities such as Poughkeepsie are well-suited for development. Clearly, the redevelopment of former industrial sites, and particularly those around commuter rail train stations, should be considered priority areas for development. However, development along the riverfront, according to the New York State Department of State's Coastal Management Policies, should not be designed as exclusively residential areas. This is a major shortcoming of the One Dutchess Avenue proposal.

Project needs water-dependent uses

A kayak launch and fishing pier are easy, low impact ways to add some water-dependent uses that provide amenities for residents--of the development and the City--and for visitors. Likewise, a restaurant, cafes, or retail shops along the riverfront--facing the river, not just along Dutchess Avenue--would help energize the site, activate it with people and, with good urban design, could create compelling public space.

Provide public greenway

As proposed, the dominant residential character of the development, its design with tall 60-foot buildings, short 44-foot setback from the Hudson River, and narrow, 12-foot pedestrian riverfront walkway combine to create a place that is highly unlikely to provide a level of comfort to those who might otherwise walk along the City's riverfront greenway trail. As envisioned by the City, the trail will connect Waryas Park, Walkway Over the Hudson, and Marist College's Longview Park and connection through this 14-acre site is critical. Therefore, this portion of the trail must be designed so that people feel as if they are not trespassing and are actually welcome to walk there.

In effect, however, the design of this project would create a "gated community without a gate." To remedy this, buildings should be set back 75 feet from the shoreline in order to buffer the riverfront trail

from the buildings. This would also provide project residents some open space, which will be connected to parkland to the north and south, including a proposed elevator that will lift people up onto Walkway Over the Hudson State Historic Park.

Developer should provide public walkway

To be sure, the public's investment in Walkway Over the Hudson and in nearby riverfront greenway trails and parks have added tremendous financial value and appeal to this site. With these investments, residences at the former Dutton site are far more desirable than if the City were not committed to establishing a continuous riverfront greenway and if the abandoned railroad bridge had not been converted into a popular park.

Given these public investments that add so much value to the Dutton site, the development of the site should be required to include at the developers expense, a suitable trail, 16-feet wide, that is buffered from the buildings in a landscaped, public greenway at least 75-foot in width. Again, this public greenway will also provide open space and recreation for residents of the site.

Traffic

As proposed, the project is anticipated to generate a constant stream of traffic to a location accessible only by Hoffman Street Bridge and by North Water Street. The developer's traffic study indicates that about 200 new trips in the busiest morning hour and about 250 in afternoon peak hour would be generated by the development. This averages one vehicle every 15-20 seconds.

Likewise, the traffic study predicts about 100-110 new peak hour trips at North Water Street/Main Street/Route 9 ramp. Again, this is another car nearly every 30 seconds. North Water Street is narrow with no opportunity for widening.

And the expected traffic increase in residential areas of Mount Carmel, such as Delafield Street, Hoffman Street, Albany Avenue, etc. would be substantial. And it would generate between 80 and 100 peak hour trips through the residential neighborhood exiting at Albany Avenue/Hoffman Street

Even with the proposed redesign of the Hoffman Street Bridge, its connection to North Water Street at an "offset" intersection would likely cause operational and safety problems. In effect, people driving in or out of the site would need to make quick right and left turns in order to cross North Water Street. This problem could be mitigated by extending Hoffman Street directly onto the site, and constructing the road to curve down to the hill to provide a suitable grade. This would better distribute traffic from the site and provide a second entrance for vehicles destined to the north and east.

Alternatives

When first proposed, the applicant planned about 450 units. Now, that number has been increased by about a third to nearly 600. Why has the proposed program of development increased so dramatically? The DEIS summarily dismisses as "financially infeasible" alternatives of 300-units, however, no evidence is provided to support this assertion. We believe that It may well be that a combination of fewer units and a bit more water-dependent or-related commercial development would be financially feasible and make the project consistent with State Coastal Policies.

Conclusion

Given the plans and information provided in the DEIS, some hybrid alternative that provides fewer residential units with some water-dependent or -related uses in a traditional neighborhood design that includes a 75-foot public riverfront greenway would be better suited to the site and more consistent with the State's Coastal Management Policies. We will submit a detailed letter with all our comments before the end of the comment period.

Thank you.

Official Minutes of the Public Hearing on August 30, 2010 regarding Dutton O'Neil

My name is Andrew Mauer. I reside at 11 Meyer Avenue in the City of Poughkeepsie and I am a board member of the Hudson River Rowing Association which owns and operates the HRRR Boathouse located at 270 and 272 North Water Street on lands owned And leased to us by Vassar College. This property lies to the immediate north of the proposed Dutton Street Project.

In general, we, along with our hosts, Vassar College are in favor of the appropriate development of the waterfront for uses consistent with the City and Town master plans and waterfront development plans. We also favor development that is consistent with the extensive an historical use of this section of the Hudson River by high school, college and adult rowers.

That being said, the Hudson River Rowing Association Board of Directors has reviewed the submitted DEIS and has a number of concerns relevant to the operations that the HRRR organization both runs and oversees at our facility.

In terms of who uses the HRRR facility, there are seven local highschool teams that operate out of the boathouse. These teams represent roughly 500 middle and high school aged children, all of whom are transported to and from the boathouse in various manners between the months of February and June on a daily basis. Various high school teams hold both AM and PM practices usually 6 days a week. In addition to this population, HRRR itself runs club programs between the months of April and November for junior aged rowers. Both HRRR and an additional tenant group, Mid Hudson Rowing Association run adult rowing programs as well during those same months. This combined population represents roughly 300 individuals. With some overlap of the high school population, the number of individuals present on our site throughout the year is typically 650 people.

Our concerns center around site security for which HRRR is responsible, traffic density on the surrounding streets and loss of viewshed from our facility and are detailed in a comment document to be submitted to the Common Council for consideration.

As a high level overview of our concerns let me say that the lack of green space and recreational facilities in the proposal along with a proposed access point to the boathouse site lead us to believe that our site will be utilized as a recreational resource by the residents of the proposed development. This presents multiple problems for us as an organization. Our facility was designed for the effective and safe facilitation of rowing programs. mis-use of our docks and grounds could hinder our ability to run programs effectively and will introduce new workloads on a volunteer corp that currently ensures the smooth running of the site.

The traffic density that will be introduced by this project will add to the current boathouse generated traffic that we feel was not accounted for in this study. As I mentioned, rowers are transported to and from the boathouse from all directions by a variety of means. School buses, cars, bikes are utilized. We ask that this be re-considered.

Finally, our facility is an open space on the waterfront. In addition to running rowing programs, our facility is often utilized for community events such as the Balloon Fest and rented out for private events. Part of the draw to our site for both rowers and these types of events are the sweeping views of the river valley, including the walkway bridge to our south. This project would

take away a significant amount of that view to the south. We ask that the size and scope of the project be reduced in terms of overall height and a move further back from the edge of the river.

Thank you for allowing me to speak and be a part of this process.

Michael Young, 20 Barclay Street- I also want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak after business hours, I missed the first one. I believe Scenic Hudson covered most of my discussion here but I will pick up, I think where they left off. Which is to say that the alternatives that this city council have presented to the appellants, we have requested that, I think there was one regarding neighborhood layout, one regarding less density and one regarding the use of waterfront resources. All three of which were dismissed in less than a page, with affectively the words, "no," and without any sort of detailed information regarding funding for financial liability, funding for financial impact. Actually, the reason behind one thing, to limit themselves as other folks have said, a very large, massive, 600-person building, set of buildings. I think the fact that this environmental impact study has just summarily disregarded a lot of what this council has requested. It seems to me to be an insult to both the city and this council. I think there are other requests along the lines of the fact that the city has asked for a waterfront esplanade, a walkway for people to enjoy the entire waterfront, has been reduced down to about eight feet if you take into account the fact that four were reserved have to be, are basically a fire lane on the side of the road. I think it is also a little upsetting that the commercial space which was intended to be a series of shops, cafes on the waterfront that people could enjoy, has now been relegated to the side street of Dutchess Avenue, and has actually been explained in the environmental impact statement as being intended for the residents themselves and not for the public, and was envisioned to contain a laundromat and a Grab and Go. I think even more upsetting is the fact that the ground floor of this building is reserved entirely for parking. If we want to waste our precious resources of the waterfront, I think there are better ways to do it. I think the architectural style of this proposal looks very similar to the architectural styles that both the architects and the developers have put together both in White Plains and Hoboken, New Jersey, where they originate, and do not reflect the architecture of the City of Poughkeepsie. I question the transit study as well. The fact that they claim that Water Street can easily handle the extra 200 people and 200 cars worth of traffic both morning and evening—I would encourage the entire council to try to take a trip down there to Water Street after the meeting. Just make the turn from Water onto Main and try not to get hit by either a pedestrian or cars coming out of the train station. So in conclusion, I seriously question whether the appellants who supplied the environmental impacts statement actually have listened to this council, and I urge you to question that of them because I do not think there is a respect for the space that is available to them and the zoning to which we can provide them. Thank you.

Andrew Mauer, 11 Meyer Avenue- I am a board member of the Hudson River Rowing Association, which owns and operates the HRRR boathouse located at 270 and 272 North Water Street on lands that are owned and leased to us by Vassar College. These lands and property are to the immediate north of the proposed project under consideration. In general, we along with our hosts at Vassar College are in favor of the appropriate development of the waterfront for uses consistent with the City and Town Master Plans and Waterfront Development Plan. We also favor of course the development that is consistent with the extensive and historical use of this section of the Hudson River by high school, college and adult rowers. That being said, the Hudson River Rowing Association board of directors has reviewed the submitted DEIS and has a number of concerns relevant to the number of operations that the HRRR organization both runs itself in terms of the programs and oversees at our facility. In terms of who uses the

HRRA facility, I think it is important to understand the population and activities directly north of this site. There are seven local high school teams that operate out of this boat house. These teams represent roughly 500 middle and high school-aged children, all of whom are transported to and from this boathouse facility in various manners between the months of February and June on daily basis. Various high school teams hold both AM and PM practices usually six days a week. In addition to this population, HRRA itself runs club programs between the months of April and November for junior-aged rowers. Both HRRA and our additional tenant group, Mid Hudson Rowing Association, run adult rowing programs as well during those same months out of this boathouse facility. This combined population represents roughly 300 individuals. With some overlap with the high school population, the number of individuals that are present on our site traveling to and from throughout the year is typically 650 people. Our concerns center around the site's security for which HRRA is responsible, the traffic density on the surrounding streets, and the loss of view shed from our facility. And a further detail on a comment document to be submitted to the Common Council for consideration is a high level overview of our concerns. Let me say that the lack of green space and recreational facilities beyond what has been mentioned by previous speakers in this proposal, along with the proposed access point to the boathouse site between our two pieces of property leading us to believe that our site will be utilized as the recreational resource by the residents of the proposed development. This presents multiple problems for us as an organization. Our facility was designed for the effective and safe facilitation of rowing programs. Misuse of our docks and grounds could hinder our ability to run these programs effectively, and will introduce new workloads on our volunteer core that currently ensures the smooth running of the site. The traffic density that will be introduced by this project will add to the current boathouse generated traffic that we feel was not accounted for in this traffic study. As I mentioned, rowers are transported to and from this boathouse from all directions across the county and by a variety of means. School buses, cars, bikes, even city residents walking to the boat house are how these people come down to that site over the city streets and especially over North Water Street. We ask that this be reconsidered. Finally, our facility is an open space on the waterfront. In addition to running rowing programs, our facility is often utilized for community events such as the Balloon Festival, and is rented out for private events. Part of the draw to this site for both our rowers and these types of events are the sweeping views of the river valley, including the Walkway Bridge to our south. This project would take away a significant amount of that view to the south. We ask that the size and scope of this project be reduced in terms of overall height and to move further back from the edge of the river. Thank you for allowing me to speak and be a part of this process.

Carolyn DeMichele, 54 Dutchess Avenue- I am a real estate broker. I have sold real estate in Poughkeepsie for the last 22 years, and I am also an artist. Looking at this project, which is much too large, they are saying that they are providing needed housing for the area. I really question that when today, this afternoon in fact, in Dutchess County, there are 406 attached units available. That is not counting single-family, multiple-family homes that are in foreclosure in the city, abandoned properties. With the vast high number of rentals that are not being rented, the people in the city are having to lower their rental asking price because they cannot rent them. The project site is also utilizing the whole site to put this building up. They are not leaving open green space, it is much too close to the river, the height is much too high, not in keeping with architecture in the area

although they are saying that they came up with this design by looking at neighboring architecture with a traditional interpretation. Well quite frankly, that is some interpretation. It looks a bit like the Residence Inn on steroids. I do not care what area you are looking at this project from, whether it be from the Walkway, whether it be from Marist, whether it be from the other side of the river. It is an eyesore. In no way does it reflect the character of the City of Poughkeepsie. The impact on traffic—I know a lot of people have talked about Water Street, I want to talk a minute about the other side since I live on Dutchess Avenue. Mainly I think you would be having a lot of people, particularly in the evening, coming from the south, jumping off on the Albany Street exit, which is very short, and people do not realize the need to stop when they come to the corner. As you continue up Albany Street, which is a very narrow street, and usually there is parking on the east side of that street—if you have two cars, because I often come home that way, you can barely pass each other. If it is a truck, you better pull over and hope they are a good driver. Also in that area, that immediate area, we have two schools, two astor schools with young children. We have fleets of school buses that gather there in the morning and the afternoon. There is no room for additional traffic there. This is a residential area that will be totally destroyed with additional cars coming through that area. It is quite frankly just poor design. I think the developer is simply putting in that number of units to make the most amount of money. He is not from here. He will be gone. We have a wonderful opportunity to, people have made wonderful suggestions here, to put something there that the city will be proud of, that we can pass on to our children and grandchildren. We do not want a failed project there that we are going to regret. In closing, I really think and hope that the City Council will go back to them and they need to rethink the size. They need to rethink what they are putting there so that it is in keeping with the City of Poughkeepsie. I love the City of Poughkeepsie. I want it to remain the jewel that it is. I really thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Constantine Kazolias, 47 Noxon Street- I just want to make a few comments. I agree with all the people that spoke before me. Go down to Hastings, towards the river, there is a restaurant down there, it has got a park, and is also right next to the county park so not only incorporate with their park and all the other parks. The height to me as far as I am concerned is, five stories is too much. That reminds me, in college I could not see the forest because of the trees. Now this way you will not be able to see the river because of the height of the buildings. As far as the Walkway, and I am still a strong believer in the Walkway, because Mrs. Rups is the one that instituted it way back when she was on urban renewal. Twelve feet, you could not even get a, whatever you want to get down there, 75 feet should be it. But I was surprised that they would be using it as a fire lane, which is surprising. But also too, there is going to be a gated community. We've already got one, why, gated to me just does not sound right. Something else too is the tax benefits. This is still in the Empire Zone is still affected, will they have the tax benefits? We say follow the money. As far as the fire access, the trucks and all like that, the Walkway, are they going to use it? Once again I might be repetitious in this respect, but the thing is that there was the Walkway near the river that said the 12 feet, 75, you need 75 feet, no two ways about it, that can be the fire zone. When I worked down in New York, I worked for J.P. Morgan Bank. In the meantime they built two additional access subway tunnels into the J.P. Morgan and all like that. So in other words it makes here, developers come here, we got to give them something, why don't they give something back? One thing, the density, when they had the fireworks I could not get past the Market

Street, down there near the fireworks where they had it. So in other words, to me, I still think this thing is ill designed. You should have access to North, South Arterial Highway so this way they do not go through the streets and all like that. One other thing I will say, after reading the article yesterday and so on, I will say this regarding the mayor, is three big boxes. That is exactly what they are, and I do not want to go into the other comment and all like that. But the thing is, first of all, somebody said that they came in with 300 and now it is up to 500. Vacancy and all like that, there is something radically wrong with the whole project. This whole river thing should be accessed, that is what Mrs. Rups has worked for, and that is what to me, I speak for her even though she is almost made 100. But the thing is, let's have the 75 feet. That is something else that confuses me, are they going to incorporate that 75 feet, 12 or 75 feet walkway into the park with this we are supposed to have open space parkland or whatever, is that going to be part of there? Are they going to add that into it? Is it theirs instead of ours? Something is radically wrong here with the whole thing. I think you have to go back to the drawing board. Let them come down, get rid of the density, knock the buildings down, not knock them down, but you know, not over five stories. The thing is, it is in your hands, development. And let's face it, I will not be here when this development gets done, because I am ready to go anywhere, but not this time. But the thing is, let's have good development. Make it blend in with the landscape and everything else. And I cannot help thinking about these rowing. I think at one time, the City of Poughkeepsie sold some land to Marist College for rowing, if I am not mistaken. So in other words, the rowing is a big thing, and I remember for the collegiate...But anyway, do the job right. Like the old guy, on Chief Crazy Horse, do the job. Just remember that. It is up to you. It is going to be your symbol which you are going to leave behind. And let's do the job right. Blend it in and everything else. And all the people that spoke, we are just rehashing a lot of stuff. But let's cut the density down. That is the most critical task and can keep the pathway open.

Holly Wahlberg, 35 Garfield Place-

Holly Wahlberg
35 Garfield Place
Poughkeepsie 12601

I believe this project presents significant negative impacts which have not been sufficiently mitigated. The following are my chief areas of concern:

1. A walkway only 12 feet wide is obviously inadequate - particularly when the developer is placing it immediately adjacent to the main roadway of a complex with 1,288 residents and no landscaping or other type of border separating the public pathway from this road. So little space has been allotted to the public walkway that the walkway even has to double as a roadway for emergency vehicles. This is in violation of the greenway compact, state coastal policy and city LWRP principles calling for meaningful recreational opportunities for the public along the river's shoreline. The developer's claim that a roadway leading to the garage entrances for all three buildings would have a "low" travel rate seems a strange assertion indeed.
2. The density and scale of this development are simply far, far too intense. In the developer's own renderings, the figures of people along the walkway look like tiny little ants in comparison to the towering 60 foot tall wall of buildings which are to house almost 1,300 people. When that many people call a parcel of land home, we are

essentially adding a new neighborhood to Poughkeepsie. But this project has nothing about it which suggests a real neighborhood in terms of scale, massing or form. As currently designed, this project seems little more than 14 acres of renter warehousing. Because it has none of the characteristics of a traditional neighborhood, it will not generate any of the positive experiences of belonging to a traditional neighborhood. Things like a sense of pride, belonging, identity, neighborliness, community involvement....these things are not fostered by this type of design and scale. Today's urban design has moved well past the days of massive multi story buildings containing one type of tenant in favor of cluster development with a mix of income levels and a mix of owner occupied and rental units. This more human scale of development is even being done in public housing projects where evidence is now showing the low cost doesn't have to mean low quality. And for anyone who's interested, I would encourage you to google Churchill Homes in Holyoke Massachusetts (a city about the size of Poughkeepsie) where the Holyoke Housing Authority has created 110 units on 12 acres using a traditional street grid and town house style of architecture where each unit has its own unique and design and color with a small front and back yard - this is the kind of award winning, traditional neighborhood design project I feel we should be emulating.

3. Aesthetically, this project looks a lot like someone just plopped down a whole row of Marriott residence inns right on top of each other. If built as is, it will be tantamount to creating the equivalent of a sort of horizontal Rip Van Winkle.

The developer asserts that this architecture is "in the character of the surrounding neighborhoods." There is nothing - absolutely nothing - of this character in the neighborhoods near this project. Applying a few "decorative" veneers does not, despite the developer's claims, make it look "traditional" or give it a "residential character." I also believe that the "finger-like" building extensions do not significantly mitigate or disguise the mammoth scale of this design. Nor do they enhance or create a sense of residential character and human scale.

4. We are discussing here the future of one of the most important waterfront parcels on the entire Hudson. I do not at all accept the frequent refrain running through this DEIS - that at least this proposal is better than the blighted, contaminated nightmare sitting there now. To buy into this attitude is setting the bar at the lowest possible level for one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to this city. We don't have to accept the lowest common denominator. We don't have to accept a poor project just to get this site cleaned up. We should have enough pride in ourselves and our community to achieve better than that - not just for ourselves but for future generations who will have to live, for the next 100 years, with the decisions you make today.

Harvey Flad, 115 Academy Street- I find it difficult to say anything more than what Holly has just said and Jeff Anzebino has also pointed out. However I wish to add a few comments, in particular about relevant to yourself as the lead agency on the DEIS and eventually the FEIS. And that is that a history of effort, of looking at various development projects on the river. There is one good example that I would like you to consider working along with, and that was the development of the Shadowshead by a local developer, in which the original designs was very definitely discussed and negotiated and there was a lot of back and forth. The result is a quality development, and that is what I think your role is—to look at the plans and have as your fundamental background, part of what you are doing is to have a development of quality. What the quality of development that we have had on the waterfront, which includes the

Shadowshead, which includes the Walkway over the Hudson, the results are extremely positive, both economically and socially for this city. And that is your role—to make sure that this development, whether it is the questions which have already been raised, I have very difficult problems with in terms of design, density, the Walkway which is so important for our purposes, the amount of open space, the physical and visual access to the river—these are all questions which have already been raised, and they can be changed. You can do it. Thank you.

Barbara Debraski, 9 Dutchess Avenue- I have lived next to Dutton's for 42 years, and in the back where there are only two that really butt up against that, and we have a lot to lose because she has a house and I have a house. I do not like the size, how big it is going to be. It is going to be a blight on the river. Number two, I would like to find out about the sewer. Up until eight years ago, our sewage and refuse went into the Hudson River until the city decided to put a pump down there, a pump station. Now, is that pump station going to be big enough to handle their sewer? Or who is going to pay for it if it is not? That is another reason I am up here. Number two, it is a nice quiet neighborhood. It always was. Kids could play in the street down there. You did not have to worry about getting run over. Now, what is it going to be with these cars going up and down? Same thing on Water Street—it cannot take the traffic. You do not have to be an Einstein, just go down and look. And it is even worse in the winter time when they put the snow up on the embankments. You are lucky if even one car can go through in the winter time. There is no place to put the snow. Where are these people going to put their snow? Put it in the Hudson River with the salt and everything that they are going to throw? I am all for progress, but guys, you got to do it right this time. Thank you very much.

Carol Kaslowski, 50 Hoffman Street- I too am against this waterfront project. I do not think we need a bunch of apartments. This postcard that I had gotten in the mail, to me it is the ugliest thing I have ever seen. Don't need anything like that down at the river. And as far as the 900 vehicles that will be in our neighborhood, we have enough traffic down there. You have to come down, somebody come down, just one day a week and you will see the traffic. Cars going through the red lights, they are coming up from the river, going through the red lights. I just do not think we need anything like this. I do not know if this is going to be done locally. Is it a local building? I do not know too much about this, it was who is building it. I am totally against it because I know what it is going to do. It is going to make our properties in the area around this project, I know it is going to make the values of our property go up, and we are going to end up paying more taxes. We are all, most of us down there, are senior citizens and we live on fixed incomes. I know these properties are going to be higher priced properties. So, who is going to pay? We are all going to pay. And if that is going to happen, I am out of the City of Poughkeepsie because I am not going to keep paying income taxes because they want to put stuff like this down at the river. I think that the riverfront could be better utilized with things. And we got to remember that we do not live in a rich and famous city. And I just hope that the mayor and all the councilpeople here take all this into consideration. All the people before me have said a lot of things that make a lot of sense. I hope you are listening, because I have not heard one positive comment about this project at all. Thank you for your time.

John Clark, Dutchess County Planning- We have submitted previous written comments on this project at least twice—the last one July 22, so if you want to read the full statement, anyone can. We actually think that this is an appropriate area for development. There are certain benefits that have not been pointed out to the city. I think it should be acknowledged that it will reclaim a severely contaminated site. It is very expensive to do so, if the city would do it on its own. It would provide for a greenway trail along the river, which is really important to us. We really believe in the idea of connecting a quiet cove with the city center on down to the south. And because it is within walking distance from the train station it provides for transit-oriented-development, which is the most environmentally friendly type of development because people can walk more, urban development in itself, building in the city is a good thing, rather than building 600 units out in suburbia somewhere and everybody is really overly dependent on automobiles, they get everywhere. So we think there is actually some merit to developing here. However, we had some serious problems with the development as proposed. We think it is way too close to the river. We have suggested a 50-foot setback as a minimum. We think it is really important to think about that 50-foot setback as parkland, continuous greenway frontage, recreational space for the city—not some private alleyway jammed up against the river, which will seem like a private space rather than a public space. It is also important to think long term. The city has accepted almost \$150,000 worth of grant money to do a transit-oriented-development design around the railroad station itself and to connect the station with the Walkway over the Hudson and the elevator. That is along Water Street, and to dump a lot of the south bound and all the west bound traffic onto Water Street is expect it to go up the Main Street ramp, and cross over three lanes of traffic to get to the bridge is just inadequate. So there needs to be some other solutions here for traffic in that area other than local streets. We think the design is far too uniform in height, bulk and design. One thing about a 50-foot setback is that developers tend to go right up to 50 feet. There can be certain flexibilities built into a zoning law to allow a mix of housing types and sizes and shapes of buildings to encourage something that is not so uniform and out of character. This looks like a repetitive project, not a new neighborhood of individual buildings blended into the city. Then again, we also think the idea of putting all the traffic on a dead end access street in this area rather than a network of access streets with multiple access points on the parcel is really a bad idea. You really need a network to distribute traffic and provide better emergency access rather than just one dead end cul-de-sac. “Alternative To” in the DEIS was supposed to address these design deficiencies. They required a 50-foot setback, a street network, varied building heights and types. The developer did not do an adequate job in the alternative sections. We think that is a major deficiency in the DEIS. We think the DEIS and the “Alternatives To” in particular need to be looked at much more carefully to provide something that looks like it really fits into the city rather than something that is overly repetitive and uniform in character. We also think that you should look for an alternative Route 9 access. There is a spot available that can be done. It would require working with the city and the DOT, but we just think the Main Street ramp and Water Street are really inadequate in particular, and not to mention some of the other access points. My final point is that you should really consider the view from the bridge, the Walkway over the Hudson. It is going to look right down on this site, and the way this site looks from the bridge is going to be critically important. It is how most people are going to see this development. So instead of just standard rooftops, I think you should look at much more oriented towards varied building types, rooftop gardens,

balconies and overlooks as opposed to the standard format building form. They would make this look really good from the top. I would be willing to meet with anybody in the city, we have offered this before, to talk about alternative design, parkland exchange for DOT land around the train station, which I think is a really critically point that has been ignored so far, and alternative traffic options. We are available at any time. Thanks.

Walt Douglas- Company is not new. It was founded by myself, Walt E. Douglas and my wife, Paula F. Douglas, in April 1963, now 47 years old. This started in our basement in Queens and moved to Manhattan, Orange County, Ulster County and finally Dutchess County in New York. Currently it is based in the Family Partnership Center in the north side of Poughkeepsie. New missions, goals and objectives are constant and continual. We have written ? three-fold mission. One, provide a high quality life theater experience, which is intellectually charged and provocative, socially relative, culturally enriching for both actors and audiences. The classics, various contemporary drama through a residence stage program at CUNY Hackett. And through its touring theatre program performances, which travels to elementary, middle and high schools and colleges through the Mid Hudson Valley to foster racial harmony through the arts, especially theatre arts. We remain committed to serve the needs of the citizens of Dutchess County of all ages, particularly those who are of low income. The goals and objectives are one, promote appreciation for the arts through theatre. Two, enrichen the lives of the citizens of the area with a focus on youth students of all races, ethnicities and income levels. Low or middle income, are of course welcome. Exposing them to live theatre and cultural activities, training. We also offer workshops and classes in playwriting, acting and the beginnings of aspiring and emerging professional actors and actresses, designing and implementing creative theatre. These programs are so special needs and at risk youth gain entry through college and programs for individuals with disabilities. In short, New D mission is to educate, inspire and pervade the mind, add culture, and contribute to overall quality of life in the community. At the beginning we produced about ten plays annually, now only just four. Before we had programs like theater performances, touring programs, performances, Fridays, that is the variety band, music, dance, poetry, comedy,

Daniel Montello, 11 Spruce Street- I just wanted to make a few comments on the Dutton site. I bought a house in the City of Poughkeepsie on Spruce Street about four years ago. It was falling down, overgrown, had not been lived in in I believe seven years. I came here as a homeowner and not an absentee landlord. I put a lot of money into the house, spent thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars improving the house, so it was not an eyesore to the community anymore. That including putting nice, very expensive deck on the back of the house due to the river views that I have. I live across Route 9, with power lines and river views—I enjoy them. Probably as close to the river as I will get with my salary. But I do enjoy it as well as the other people. And the neighborhood—it is a quiet neighborhood. A construction project of this size would kind of take away one of the only nice parts of my house. I live along Route 9 so it is not the the quietest place to live, but that is one of the high points and I do enjoy sitting on the deck with my neighbors and my family looking at the river. That would be completely gone if there were these buildings here that would, that were supposed to be five stories high. Along with what everybody else said with the traffic, there will be a lot more traffic in the area. I am certainly not against progress and building, I'm unemployed in the town of Hyde Park. As you all know what goes on up there. There is a lack of building and a

lack of a tax base and I am certainly up for a development of some kind on this property because it is an eyesore. I would just like to see it scaled back, not quite as high. I know it is quite a drop off there, but it would obstruct and take away the view of the river from the whole neighborhood. That would be a terrible thing, but I would like to see something nice go up there.

Arlene Chiaramonte, 80 North Water Street- It would be impossible for North Water Street to handle this project's impact, even if it were just the cars going to the train station. No one is going to walk to the train, and we do not even have adequate parking at the train station. I know that is supposed to be resolved. Thank you very much.

Mark Pastreich, Livingston Street- Many, many cities have to evict and remove buildings to get a beautiful waterfront like we have right now. But to take this waterfront and impact it, in the future when people go up and down the Hudson—how will they know when they pass Poughkeepsie? They will see three big, dumb elephant buildings—that will be the sign that they will be passing Poughkeepsie. We have a unique opportunity to preserve a piece of land, which is irreplaceable. It is the waterfront. It is the feature of this city for the last, approximately 400 years. And the question is, do you shoot a big arrow through it or do you just shoot a dagger through it? That seems to be what is on the table. I believe the city should own that property. I am willing to put a five figured number, which right toward a joint thing, to buy it back, to use government funds. But the city should own it. It is a feature of the City of Poughkeepsie, which talks about its wailing future, which is all about it. And then to let it go, you will not see any kind of money. You will decrease the value of the city, the value of anything, and it is wrong. If you believe something is wrong, it is wrong. It is not wrong in a small portion or a big portion—wrong is wrong. You have a waterfront that is beautiful. I think everyone of us, you gentlemen and ladies included, go down there on a nice day like this for a half hour and say, am I allowing this to turn into anything other than what it is? What should be preserved for the next hundred years for the people in the city and who are drawn to the city. You have other cities you are competing with. Newburg, Kingston and all—Poughkeepsie will be known as the three, dumb elephant buildings going down the river. That is how they will know it. I think it should be owned by the city, controlled by the city, and not given away for any kind of thing. And if Obama has any money in plans, this is where it should go. I am willing to contribute, not only conversation, but money toward it. This is what I believe, and I think in the long run, it is the right thing. Thank you.

Henry Matthews, 302 Bridgeview Drive (Hudson Pointe)- I am by all means a taxpayer. I also have a business within the City of Poughkeepsie on Mill Street. I have been a boater all my life. I am a former Commodore of the Hamburg Yacht Club and I have been an officer ever since. I am also vice president of the Hudson River Boating and Yacht Club Association, a group of 34 boat clubs up and down the Hudson from the Bronx to Hyde Park, so my river credentials are fairly well established. I am also the past owner of Brass Anchor Marina. What I want to bring to the board, just to put on record, is as far as the containment of the contamination of the brown fields at the site, there exists a feasible method by using a material called polyurea. There are two websites that I would ask you to direct your attention to, and I will be glad to put any communication in the future, but the two websites are fsi.com and also versaflex.com. I am a factory rep for

those companies, and I just want to go on record, it is my understanding that the property south of Shadows, the figures were something like 6,000,000 which grew to 13,000,000. I disagree with having to take out the enormous amount of soil, the thousands upon thousands of gallons of diesel fuel which were burned to dig them, move them around rather endlessly, and to cart them, as I was told, the several hours away into Connecticut, and the trucks going both ways. Our material, which you can read about on those websites, and I have a sample, I will give you all samples if you like, all the literature you need. It is economical, it is approved and proven, the EPA loves this material. We have been down there, we have spoken with them. It is a game-changer in the petrochemical industry. For example, where you used to have clay around oil tanks, they are now using this. If there is an oil leak, and you have clay, you end up with a bunch of contaminated clay. With this fabric, it is totally impermeable. It comes with a lengthy adjustable warranty. Depending on the thickness, you can drive trucks over it. It is fully approved for mediation in brown fields, also for encapsulation of polluted concrete. So I just want to go on record, we have had discussions about other public works with various city government individuals, commissioners, etc. Sometimes information was or was not translated over the years, so I just would like to go on record tonight that this is a viable solution that can save the city a lot of money in an EPA approved manner. Thank you.

Janet Houston, 114 Rinaldi Boulevard- Thank you for letting me speak. I did not sign up because I had spoken before, but after listening tonight, I just wanted to remind the councilmembers and the mayor that much of the vision that has been mentioned tonight for the waterfront is contained in your LWRP, which I am sure that you do know. I hope that you would take a look at it. The Waterfront Advisory Committee of which I am just one member, will be meeting soon. We have a responsibility to comment on whether or not any development on the waterfront complies with the LWRP, and that the Council has a responsibility to require that the WAC report to you. I just hope that you will keep that in mind. I feel sometimes that our local waterfront committee is not being tuned in to or informed about everything that is happening in terms of development. This is just a remind, and I look forward to being part of that report that you will soon receive. Thank you.

Fred Schaffer, 170 Creek Road, Pleasant Valley- Despite having a non-city residence, I have always been a part of the City of Poughkeepsie. My parents had a store on Hamilton Street when I was a kid. I was the only one not surprised by how beautiful Poughkeepsie was when the Walkway was opened because I always thought it was a great city and enjoyed being here. All my life I had an office in Poughkeepsie. I think I agree with most of the speakers—Holly and Scenic Hudson—that this is way over scale for that particular area, especially when it is hemmed in by Route 9 and the railroad tracks. I think everybody is going to be embarrassed by this if it is constructed as proposed. I have seen the drawings for it. So that is a general statement. I think you should use your power to try to scale it back and make it so it is going to be architecturally suited for this area and for the view from the Walkway over the Hudson. In particular, I think the waterfront has to have a wider path—I think more of a promenade than just a path. One of the reasons the Walkway is successful is because it is 24 feet wide—children are up there riding their bikes, learning how to ride their bikes, everyone is happy and smiling. I think the waterfront has to have the same type of feeling with a wide walkway so that people can enjoy it, feel pleasant. I think we are missing a

great opportunity to create this greenway trail through the City of Poughkeepsie if we are going to make it as narrow as I see proposed. I think, even more than Scenic Hudson, it can be at least 24 feet wide with a buffer, something close to that 50 foot total length before the buildings come on the river. I have been proud to take people up on the Walkway, taught them how beautiful Poughkeepsie is, the views looking north, the views looking south. I think if this project goes forward anywhere near the way it is proposed, that everyone here is going to be embarrassed by it when they go up on the Walkway.

Joe Edwards, Albany Street- My concerns are living on Albany Street, there is going to be the traffic flow going in and out of there, obstruction of neighborhood views to the river. A lot of people like looking at the river. Then there is going to be construction, dust coming out of there. What is going to be coming out of that ground because I do not know if it is clear. The traffic flow out of there, could possibly be remedied in and out of Route 9 across the Hoffman Bridge. I am not sure the name of the street, but off of Water Street, the zigzag, but there is an access point, you could actually make a ramp so that you are not getting traffic on Albany, Delaview, going up Hoffman through the residential zones. I grew up in Terrytown and General Motors could pull out 3,000 cars a day, three times a day, and I do not know how they are going to figure out routing stuff. The elevations of the houses for people who live on Albany Street, that overlook the river, they are going to be affected. I am curious as to how high they are.

The following letter was submitted for the record:

September 5, 2010

Member of the City of Poughkeepsie Common Council,

While unable to attend the public hearing on this project, Please include my concerns, as provided here, in the record for consideration as the approval process for this project continues.

With it in mind, that I believe that the proper residential development of this parcel can serve the wellbeing of the City, there are numerous considerations to be taken into account, and I will focus on the following:

- This riverfront project can and should accommodate and promote the walkway along the Hudson which is essential to the ongoing revitalization of not only the city of Poughkeepsie, but the well being of the Hudson Valley. As proposed, the "walkway" in front of this project is sadly only a meager and token gesture toward what is needed. The walkway between this development and the river must be a robust and well planned venue which will attract both the general public and certainly the residents of this project. One should only visit the riverside park in the lower west side of Manhattan to see how a recently developed public venue was not only accommodated for the public but also enhanced the value of the luxury apartments across the road. This walkway, as attached to the Dutton O'Neill project should include space for walking, biking, blading, sitting, and shade trees – all available to the public and certainly an enhancement to the residents of this project. The development of these walkway

Official Minutes of the Public Hearing on August 30, 2010 regarding Dutton O'Neil

accommodations should be completed with a major, if not complete, investment of the developer. On a related note, any necessary improvements to the bulkhead at this site will require the necessary but appropriate investment of the developer.

- The proposed density of these buildings goes beyond what is reasonable given what the site can absorb. The height of the proposed development exceeds what is reasonable given the surroundings. This development should fit into and compliment the area rather than sticking out like a sore thumb. The visual impact including height, mass, color and design of these buildings must take into account and support the beauty that we see along the Hudson River today.
- It is unfathomable to think that the traffic produced by this project can be accommodated given the existing/proposed roadways. Water Street cannot withstand nor support the anticipated traffic. Absent direct entry/exit to/from Rte. 9, this project, as proposed, is not feasible.
- The City of Poughkeepsie should and must provide development opportunities that will attract new residents. This is necessary in order to promote and sustain the well being of the city and we need to welcome new citizens. Nevertheless, as proposed, this proposal does nothing to address of those living in the city now who endure substandard housing, crowded apartments, and crime ridden apartment houses owned by absentee and disinterested landlords. Given the economic opportunity that is being extending here to the developers, the city should and must propose that the developer contribute to an Affordable Housing Trust Fund to be administered by the City. This would allow for the capital needed to promote good affordable housing opportunity for the people who live with the city Poughkeepsie and are in need of the same. As an alternative, the developer might propose that this development be "economically integrated" with set aside units priced for those city citizens who need affordable / workforce housing.

I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the public comments surrounding this proposed development which, if done well, can and should be an asset to the City of Poughkeepsie. Thank you.

-Brian Doyle
3 Kimball Rd
Poughkeepsie, NY

Chairman Klein adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Dated: March 21, 2011

I hereby certify that this a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on Monday, August 30, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
Deanne L. Flynn
City Chamberlain