

**ZERO PLACE
FULL EAF EXPANDED PART 3**

February 28, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	3
SECTION A	
Project Description / Proposed Action	6
- Project Location and Environs	8
- Principal Project Components	9
- Conformance with NBR Zoning District Standards	11
- Required Permits, Approvals and Compliance Determinations	12
- Ownership and Management Considerations	14
SECTION B	
Potential Impacts and Related Mitigation Measures	15
- Visual Character and Aesthetic Resources	15
- Consistency with Community Plans	33
- Consistency with Community Character	41
- Traffic and Transportation	46
Conclusion	60
ADDENDUM (SECTION C)	
- Visual Analysis	61
- Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District	62
- Impact of Geothermal Wells	63
- Zero-Energy Commitment	63
List of Exhibits	65

ZERO PLACE

FULL EAF EXPANDED PART 3

Introduction

Net-Zero Development LLC (“Applicant”) has prepared this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 pursuant to adoption by the Village of New Paltz Planning Board (“Planning Board”) on January 3, 2017, of “ZERO PLACE / Scoping Document of Issues to be Addressed in Full EAF Expanded Part 3” (“Scoping Document”).

The Planning Board’s preparation and adoption of the Scoping Document followed its review of the Full EAF Part 1 and supporting documents submitted by the Applicant and its own completion of the Full EAF Part 2.

The Applicant under the overall coordination of David Shepler, LLC member, has prepared this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 and associated Addendum with the assistance of its now expanded project team consisting of the following professionals:

- Barry Medenbach, Medenbach and Eggers Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, P.C.;
- David Toder, BOLDER Architecture, PLLC;
- Philip J. Grealy and Justin Dates, Maser Consulting P.A.;
- Arlette St. Romain, Chazen Engineering, Landscape Surveying & Landscape Architecture Co., D.P.C;
- Pasquale Strocchia, Integral Building + Design;
- Arthur F. Brod Jr., PLANNERS EAST Incorporated; and
- Michael A. Moriello, Riseley & Moriello Attorneys at Law.

The Full EAF Expanded Part 3 first reviews the basis on which the Planning Board completed the Full EAF Part 2 and then addresses the particular concerns stated by the Planning Board within the Scoping Document, providing requested analysis and considering potential mitigation measures. In doing so, the Applicant has set forth through the Full EAF Expanded Part 3 a modified Site Plan, a modified Landscape Plan, and modified Building Floor Plans and Building Elevations for Zero Place (“Project”)

incorporating to the extent reasonable and practicable mitigation measures noted by the Planning Board.

Among their other features, the modified Site Plan, Landscape Plans and related Building Plans, both Floor Plans and Elevations, depict the following:

- Reduction of approximately 11% in building length and 10% in building mass, footprint and gross floor area.
- Reduction of more than 40% in leasable retail floor area and two fewer residential units, the reduction in retail area providing for a 21% decrease in combined peak hour shared parking demand and a 35% decrease in vehicle movements attributed to Zero Place at the PM Peak Hour.
- Enhanced building design both responsive to input voluntarily sought from the Village Historic Preservation Commission and incorporating elements observed within New Paltz and on historic “Main Streets” throughout Upstate New York.
- Greater building setback from Mulberry Street with more than a 2,250 SF, or 63%, increase in front yard and associated landscaped area including creation of a “community space” there complementing the expanded plaza along the building’s North Chestnut Street frontage.
- Modified parking configuration and related landscape improvements.
- Maintenance of the existing bus stop pull-off area and shelter.
- Strengthened linkage with the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail.

A number of other off-site vehicular and pedestrian / cyclist improvements are also proposed, in the spirit of a “Complete Streets Policy” adopted by the Village Board of Trustees in 2013 and responsive to project-specific input in the promotion of “inter-modalism” received from the New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee.

The on-site modifications both improve the design and reduce the scale and intensity of Zero Place and, while remaining in conformance with all other Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District standards as established by the Village Board on October 15, 2015, additionally bring the Project into conformance with buffer requirements associated with parking lots. The combination of a down-sized Zero Place and the proposed off-site improvements depicted on a Preliminary Roadway Improvement Plan both facilitate vehicular traffic movement and respond to the Planning Board’s concerns regarding pedestrian / cyclist safety in the vicinity of the Zero Place development.

The Applicant has turned to both local sources, such as the Village Historic Preservation Commission and the New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee, and other communities in

an effort to integrate within Zero Place both the design elements found on successful “Main Streets” and to compare Zero Place to other mixed-use developments. In doing so, the Applicant has both observed the character of those “Main Streets” and examined mixed-use buildings developed within long-established business districts and locations where mixed-uses are emerging in either the development or redevelopment of corridors like NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) or in response to interest in bringing additional life and strengthening an existing downtown area. Throughout this work, the Applicant has observed the extent to which these examples, both long-standing and more recent, have either incorporated, or in the Applicant’s view failed to adequately incorporate, “complete streets principles”.

In doing so, the Applicant has expressed belief that Zero Place can serve as a model for sustainable, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development within the Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use (“NBR Zoning”) District and the hope that other projects, regardless of their scale, which follow will incorporate similar, if not enhanced, design considerations.

The Applicant has further not “put on blinders” and considered only what is occurring on its 1.45-acre combined parcel, but has also addressed the physical context within which Zero Place is occurring --- witness not only the off-site safety improvements proposed but also the linkage with the Rail Trail; the enhanced Mulberry Street approach to the Huguenot Street neighborhood; the landscaping across the frontage of the parking lot, and wrapping around along a portion of the site’s northerly boundary, visually connecting Zero Place with NBR Zoning District development that might occur immediately to the north; and, in the case of the design plan for Mulberry Street between Route 32 and the Rail Trail, connection between Mulberry Street with other NBR District development that might occur immediately to the south.

In addition to the particular concerns stated by the Planning Board in the Scoping Document the Applicant has noted several points of contention raised within the public record while the Planning Board has been conducting environmental review of the Project in its role as designated SEQRA Lead Agency. These points of contention are addressed by the Applicant in an Addendum to this Full EAF Expanded Part 3.

- Criticism of the Visual Analysis conducted by BOLDER Architecture.
- Assertion that Zero Place will have an adverse impact on the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District.
- Speculation that the installation or operation of planned geothermal wells might result in migration of contaminants associated with prior use of the development parcel.
- Questioning of the characterization of Zero Place as “a zero-energy living concept”.

Section A

This Section of the Full EAF Expanded Part 3 addresses the Application and supporting documents considered by the Planning Board in completing the Full EAF Part 2 and preparing the Full EAF Expanded Part 3 Scoping Document. As such, it provides a basis for understanding the extent to which the Applicant has throughout the past months modified Zero Place in response to concerns expressed by the Planning Board. In addition, a Project Location Map is included which depicts as an overlay to the Village of New Paltz Zoning District Map, the locations of the Zero Place site, the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District and certain recreational and open space resources that have been mentioned during the course of the Planning Board's work.

Project Description / Proposed Action

The initial submission to the Village of New Paltz Planning Board of an Application for Site Plan Review / Special Use Permit for the Zero Place occurred on March 1, 2016. Since the initial submission the Application was first updated on March 22, 2016, to reflect acquisition of the project site situated at the southwest corner of NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) and Mulberry Street by Net-Zero Development LLC, and has evolved during the pendency of administrative review to include the following supporting documents constituting a complete application and being the set of documents considered by the Planning Board in its completion of Full EAF Part 2 and preparation of the above-cited Scoping Document, both of which are annexed hereto by reference.

- Existing Conditions Plan prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016, the former submitted to the Planning Board on February 17, 2016, and the latter on May 3, 2016.
- Site Plan for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 20, 2016, the former submitted to the Planning Board on February 17, 2016, and the latter on July 21, 2016, and supported by the following nine engineering drawings:
 - Grading & Utility Plan, dated February 16, 2016;
 - Drainage Plan and Lighting Plan, each dated February 16, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016;

- Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Details and Stormwater Details, each dated May 2, 2016; and
- Site Details, two drawings, each dated February 16, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016.
- Traffic Impact Study for Zero Place prepared by Maser Consulting P.A., dated January 26, 2016, updated Table 2, and related correspondence including letter of March 1, 2016, to Barton & Loguidice and memoranda of June 7, July 21 and September 2, 2016, to David Shepler, as each then submitted to the Planning Board.
- Zero Place Landscape Plan / Rendering prepared by Maser Consulting, P.A., dated February 16, 2016, and revised to March 22, 2016.
- Summary of Phase I and Phase II ESAs of AHC LLC Property prepared by The Chazen Companies, dated April 19, 2016, and submitted to the Planning Board on May 3, 2016.
- Stormwater Management Report for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach and Eggers, dated April 26, 2016, and submitted to the Planning Board on May 3, 2016.
- Zero Place Visual Analysis prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 3, 2016, and submitted on that day to the Planning Board.
- 3D Methodology for Visual Analysis prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 15, 2016, and submitted to the Planning Board on May 17, 2016.
- Zero Place Design Narrative prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 24, 2016, and submitted on that day to the Planning Board.
- Zero Place Design Considerations and Renderings, compilation by David Shepler, dated June 21, 2016, and presented on that day to the Planning Board.
- Zero Place Building Floor Plans prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016, with the former submitted to the Planning Board on February 17, 2016, and the latter on July 27, 2016.
- Zero Place Building Elevations prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016, with the former submitted to the Planning Board on February 17, 2016, and the latter on July 27, 2016.

- Zero Place Roof Plan prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 3, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016, with the former submitted to the Planning Board on May 10, 2016, and the latter on July 27, 2016.
- Zero Place Dumpster Plan prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated March 22, 2016, and submitted on that day to the Planning Board.
- Traffic & Parking Plan for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated July 18, 2016, revised and submitted to the Planning Board on July 21, 2016.
- Full EAF Part 1 for Zero Place certified by Barry Medenbach, Design Engineer, dated June 14, 2016, and revised to July 21, 2016, with the former submitted to the Planning Board on June 15, 2016, and the latter presented on June 27, 2016.

Either the initial or latest revised version of each of the above documents, as considered by the Planning Board prior to issuing the above-cited Scoping Document, is referenced as **Exhibit A-1** through **Exhibit A-16**.

These Exhibits and all other elements of this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 may be viewed in their entirety at **www.zeroplace.com**.

Any additional information that may have been presented during the pendency of administrative review by the Planning Board, including response to any other comments that may have been offered on the above documents and any informal discussion of Project modifications that may have occurred, is either incorporated, as pertinent, in this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 or otherwise superseded by this Expanded Part 3.

Project Location and Environs

The Zero Place development site consists of two adjoining tax map parcels situated on the west side of NYS Route 32 within the Village of New Paltz, being TMP 86.26-1-14.11 (0.76-acre) and the TMP 86.26-1-14.21 (0.69-acre) which will be consolidated into a single 1.45-acre development parcel.

The northern 0.76-acre lot contains an existing 62-space parking lot with entrance from NYS Route 32 and an existing bus shelter with bus pick-up lane. The parking lot was constructed by the Village in 2008 and operated as a “park and ride” service which has since been discontinued. The southern 0.69-acre lot to the north of the Mulberry Street / NYS Route 32 intersection contains concrete slabs, pavement remains and a freestanding sign associated with the former tire service and auto repair building (“STS Tire Center”) which was destroyed by fire earlier this decade and since demolished.

The development parcel lies wholly within the Village's Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District and is bounded on the north by the Lands of Stoute & Annastas, on the east by NYS Route 32, on the south by Mulberry Street and on the west by Lands of the Village of New Paltz, the Villages land being part of a linear corridor 66 feet in width and occupied by the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail. Both the land to the north and lands opposite the development parcel on NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street are likewise classified within the NBR Zoning District.

The Rail Trail corridor and lands beyond the Rail Trail to the west and immediately opposite the Zero Place site are zoned within the Village's Historic (H) Zoning District. The lands opposite the Zero Place site are developed for single-family homes with frontage and shallow front yards on Huguenot Street. Each of the five lots located there is approximately 300 feet in depth and characterized by extensive woodland area within at least its rear 150 feet. Each of these single-family homes is located at least 264 feet from the proposed Zero Place building. An additional single-family dwelling, contemporary in design and approximately 150 feet from the proposed Zero Place building, is under construction on the opposite side of Mulberry Street just to the west of the Rail Trail.

It is noted the Village's Historic (H) Zoning District extends substantially beyond the boundaries of the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District. The Landmark District envelopes a three-block stretch of 12 buildings, principally along Huguenot Street and in part Broadhead Street. The Landmark District is neither contiguous nor otherwise reasonably adjacent to the Zero Place site, lying at its nearest point 807 feet south and west of the development parcel and then extending farther to the south a distance of approximately 1,270 feet.

The Zero Place site is also similar, if not greater, distances removed from recreational and open space resources within its environs, these being Moriello Park and Mill Brook Preserve to the northeast of Route 32 and the 56-acre Nyquist-Harcourt Wildlife Sanctuary along the Walkkill River to the west of Huguenot Street.

See **Exhibit B-0, Project Location Map**, which depicts as an overlay to the Village of New Paltz Zoning District Map, the locations of the Zero Place site, the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District and the above-noted recreational and open space resources that have been mentioned during the course of the Planning Board's work.

Principal Project Components

As depicted or otherwise described within the Application and the above-cited supporting documentation, Zero Place, as previously considered by the Planning Board prior to completion of the Full EAF Part 2 and call for a Full EAF Expanded Part 3, involves the following principal components:

- Building and Site Improvements. The re-development of the combined parcel, in accordance with the requirements of the Village's NBR Zoning District, with the construction of a LEED-certifiable, net-zero-energy, four-story flat roof mixed-use building housing retail and residential uses and the undertaking of related site improvements, including but not limited to implementation of storm water best management practices including proposed subsurface stormwater detention chambers, installation of approximately 20 close-loop geothermal wells to depth of 300 to 400 feet below grade, landscaping, pedestrian ways, and site lighting.

The originally proposed building is depicted at an overall length of 206 feet, a maximum width of 93 feet, and a ground floor footprint of 17,330 SF for retail use and with three upper floors for residential use, being an overall gross floor area of 69,320 SF. A total of 48 residential units, including 24 one-bedroom units and 24 two-bedroom units, with a total of 72 bedrooms, are indicated. After subtracting first floor area devoted to the entry lobby and office for the upper floor apartments and utility / service area, a net leasable retail area of 14,500 SF remains. While it might be otherwise configured through modification in the location of non-bearing demising partitions, the retail area is shown as divided among seven users, with individual spaces ranging from 1,390 SF to 3,350 SF, and averaging 2,071 SF.

Development of a 2,130 SF rooftop terrace in the building's northeasterly corner and the installation of a combined 192 kW sun energy photovoltaic system on the rooftop and the building's southerly-facing elevation are also proposed. As the Building Plan evolved and updated submissions were made to the Planning Board, the rooftop terrace was re-located from the northwesterly corner of the building.

The proposed building ranges from 43'-8" to 44'-8" feet in height to allow for drainage of storm water with the building's 664 SF elevator / stairwell enclosure extending an additional 15'-4" feet. In combination the enclosure and adjoining rooftop solar thermal installation occupy 775 SF or approximately 4.5% of the total roof area. Again, as the Building Plan evolved and updated submissions were made to the Planning Board, the overall building height of the four-story building was reduced to the extent practicable from its initial 49'-8", first by three feet by removal of a parapet and then by another two feet by adjustment of interior ceiling heights, to 44'-8".

Proposed signage is limited to a wall-mounted building street address identification sign and a total of 100 SF of other wall-mounted signs, consisting of ten wall signs, each 10 SF in surface area and mounted above each of the ten entrance doorways to Zero Place.

- Parking. Adaptive re-use of the existing parking lot with modifications providing for six additional parking spaces and reconstruction of the curb line along a portion of the NYS Route 32 frontage for seven on-street parallel parking spaces. Five additional on-street perpendicular parking spaces are also depicted along the Mulberry Street frontage, being three standard spaces and two for handicapped-only, bringing the total number of proposed parking spaces to 79.
- Utilities. Service by underground connection to existing municipal water supply distribution and sanitary sewage collection / treatment systems and franchise utility networks.
- Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Improvements. Upon authorization by the pertinent agency, or agencies, of jurisdiction, installation of related traffic safety improvements including crosswalks with curb ramps in the vicinity of the existing bus shelter and site access driveway, at the site access driveway and both across NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street at the intersection of these streets, curbing along Zero Place's NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street frontages, and pavement re-striping of the Henry W. DuBois Drive intersection with NYS Route 32 to facilitate turning movements there.

Conformance with NBR Zoning District Standards

The proposed development, as previously considered and depicted within both the Site Plan, Building Floor Plans and Building Elevations, is in conformance with all area and bulk standards applicable to new development within the NBR Zoning District.

Demonstration of this conformance includes each of the following comparisons of the standard and the proposed Project:

- Minimum lot area, 10,890 SF where 63,013 SF exists;
- Minimum lot width at building line, 50 feet where 437 feet exists;
- Minimum front yard, 0 feet plus area for sidewalk and related pedestrian amenities where 16 feet is proposed;
- Minimum rear yard, 10 feet where 16 feet is proposed;
- Minimum side yard, 0 to 15 feet maximum where 12 feet is proposed;
- Maximum lot coverage, 85% where 80% is proposed;

- Maximum building height, four stories and 50 feet where four stories and 44'-8" are proposed,
- Maximum height exception for rooftop appurtenances, not more than 10% of roof area where 775 SF, or 4.5%, is proposed;
- Required number of parking spaces based upon the Village Zoning Code's guideline of 0.5 spaces per bedroom and one space per 500 SF of commercial use, total of 65 spaces required where 79 spaces, or more than 120% of the required number of spaces, are proposed.

As noted earlier, a single issue that was presented during the Planning Board's review is a question as to whether a minimum required landscaped buffer, being three feet, must be provided as the adaptive re-use with other modifications of the existing parking lot occurs.

The proposed re-development, as described in the Application and depicted within the Building Floor Plans, is also consistent with the use standards applicable within the NBR Zoning District. As set forth within the Village of New Paltz Zoning Code Use Schedule, both residential uses limited to either multifamily dwellings or apartments above the first floor and a broad list of some 55 business uses, including a restaurant but not a bar or tavern, are authorized within the NBR Zoning District by special use permit.

Required Permits, Approvals and Compliance Determinations

In addition to Site Plan and Special Use Permit approvals by the Village Planning Board under the Village Zoning Law, the other permits, approvals and/or compliance determinations identified by the Applicant as required for undertaking the Project are the following:

- Completion of environmental review by the Village Planning Board under Article 8 of the NYS Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617.
- Subdivision Approval by the Village Planning Board under the Village Subdivision Regulations for proposed consolidation of TMP 86.26-1-14.11 (0.76-acre) and the TMP 86.26-1-14.21 (0.69-acre) into a single 1.45-acre development parcel and, as may be pertinent, for an adjustment in the easterly boundary of the consolidated parcel to provide for a small, 0.041-acre, "taking" of additional right-of-way that may be required by NYSDOT. The purpose of the taking would be to incorporate the land occupied by the proposed re-located public sidewalk along a portion of the NYS Route 32 frontage of Zero Place within the highway right-of-way.

- Issuance of a Curb Cut Permit and/or Highway Work Permit by the NYS Department of Transportation under Section 52 of the NYS Highway Law for proposed improvements within the NYS Route 32 right-of-way.
- Offer of Dedication by the Applicant of the land subject of the above-cited “taking” by NYSDOT.
- Issuance of a Curb Cut Permit and/or Highway Work Permit by the Ulster County Department of Public Works under Section 136 of the NYS Highway Law, there appearing to be present a matter of dual jurisdiction in that the section of NYS Route 32 in the vicinity of Zero Place is reputedly maintained by the UCDPW.
- Approval of an Easement Agreement by the Village Board of Trustees under the Village Code for connection with the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail, for the discharge of storm water to Village drainage infrastructure, and for access so as to be able to maintain both the discharge points to the Village drainage facilities and the existing storm water quality basins constructed as part of development of the former “park and ride” lot.
- Approval of an Easement Agreement with the Village Board of Trustees granting the Village access to the wooden pedestrian bridge connecting between the parking lot and the Rail Trail and addressing responsibility for maintenance of the bridge.
- Approval by the Village Board of Trustees and/or Village Department of Public Works under the Village Code of water supply and sanitary sewage connections.
- Issuance of a Curb Cut Permit by the Village Department of Public Works under Section 4-412 of the NYS Village Law for improvements within the Mulberry Street right-of-way.
- Execution of an Affordable Housing Agreement with the Village Board of Trustees.
- Issuance of Building Permits and Certificates of Compliance / Occupancy by the Village Building Department under the Village Code, Village Zoning Law and Sections 377-383 of the NYS Executive Law (Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Control Act).
- Regulatory Oversight for Site Remediation Compliance by NYS Department of Environmental Conservation under NYS Environmental Conservation Law Articles 7 and 8, 17 and 70.

Ownership and Management Considerations

The Applicant intends to retain ownership and be responsible for the management and maintenance of Zero Place. As a general rule, in the interest of the community and the residents of Zero Place, the Applicant does not intend to enter into lease agreements with any businesses with hours of operation extending beyond 11:00 p.m. and in the interest of Zero Place's residential tenants to require deliveries to those businesses occur within the hours of 7:00 a.m. through 8:00 p.m. In addition, use of the parking lot will be managed by providing one resident parking permit per dwelling unit and establishing a 2-hour parking limit for retail customers and other any non-resident users. To the extent deemed required by Net-Zero Development in monitoring the 2-hour parking limit for non-resident use a program providing temporary permits for residential visitors may also be instituted.

Section B

This Section of the Full EAF Expanded Part 3 addresses the four potential environmental impacts identified by the Planning Board, upon its completion of the Full EAF Part 2, as requiring consideration within an EAF Part 3. These potential impacts while in many ways overlapping were separately identified, as they are on the Full EAF Part 2 form provided by NYSDEC, to fall within the categories of Impact on Visual Character and Aesthetic Resources, Consistency with Community Plans, Consistency with Community Character, and Impact on Traffic and Transportation.

Potential Impacts and Related Mitigation Measures

For each of the categories of potential impact the below discussion sets forth the “particular concerns” stated by the Planning Board, presents requested “analysis” and considers related “mitigation measures”. While doing so, the Applicant has set forth through the Full EAF Expanded Part 3 a modified Site Plan, a modified Landscape Plan, and modified Building Floor Plans and Building Elevations for Zero Place incorporating not only to the extent reasonable and practicable mitigation measures noted by the Planning Board but also its own stated desire to further enhance its project as a model for pedestrian-friendly, sustainable mixed-use development within the NBR District.

Visual Character and Aesthetic Resources

Particular Concerns

The particular concerns stated by the Planning Board were the following:

- i. The Project is located in close proximity to the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail and will be visible by individuals engaged in recreational or tourism-based activities.*
- ii. The Project may be partially visible from the Historic Huguenot Street section of the Village. More significantly, the project site is along Mulberry Street and the Rail Trail, both of which serve as entryways into Historic Huguenot Street.*

- iii. *The Project will be partially visible from select locations along Huguenot Street and from several nearest neighbors.*
- iv. *There may be an adverse impact due to the lack of similarly-scaled projects in the area.*

Analysis

The Planning Board requested the Applicant undertake the below analysis to permit the Planning Board to more fully assess its concerns:

- i. *The Applicant shall provide information about regular users of the Rail Trail to assist the Planning Board in understanding how the project will integrate and connect with this local resource. The Applicant is referred to the Water Street Market project as a successful example of integration with the Rail Trail.*

The Applicant understands the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail is a 23.7-mile rail trail and linear park that runs along the former Wallkill Valley Railroad stretching from Gardiner through New Paltz, Rosendale and Ulster to the Kingston city line. The Rail Trail serves as an off-road walking, jogging, hiking and cycling corridor enjoyed by local residents, visitors, commuters and recreationalists, including at certain times and locations cross-country skiers and even horseback riders. Within the vicinity of the Zero Place development the Rail Trail occurs as a straight, gravel or stone dust surface pathway within a 66-foot wide corridor owned by the Village of New Paltz. This corridor adjoins the rear property line of the combined development parcel on its east and the rear property line of lots, generally some 300 feet or more in depth, fronting on Huguenot Street.

Further, the Applicant has expressed its understanding of the importance to the community of integrating and connecting the Zero Place development to this local resource and further considers the presence of a readily-accessible Rail Trail a key amenity for its mixed-use development. As clear evidence of this understanding the Applicant notes it reached out to the Wallkill Valley Land Trust more than a year ago and was pleased to receive the annexed letter of January 20, 2016, from the Land Trust.

See **Exhibit B-1, Letter from Wallkill Valley Land Trust.**

Observations Concerning Water Street Market

In that the Planning Board characterized the Water Street Market project as a successful example of integration with the Rail Trail, the Applicant examined how the Water Street

Market, though unlike Zero Place exclusively a commercial development, has achieved this integration. In particular, the Applicant noted the following:

- The proximity of Water Street Market to the Rail Trail, being approximately 15 feet at its nearest point from the centerline of the Trail.
- The provision of three pedestrian connections between Water Street Market and the Rail Trail, these beyond the south and north ends of the Market and at a single central location.
- The somewhat enhanced surfacing of the Rail Trail in the vicinity of Water Street Market.
- The incorporation of bike racks conveniently located in relationship to the Rail Trail.

In addition, in its observations of Water Street Market, the Applicant noted the length of Water Street Market as it parallels the Rail Trail, being approximately 270 feet, and the two-story building's height to be approximately 31 feet from ground to peak of roof and 35 feet from Rail Trail to roof at its principal pedestrian access location.

See **Exhibits B-2.1 through B-2.5, Water Street Market.**

- ii. The Applicant shall provide information and visual analysis of similar projects that are visible within 5 miles of the project.*

Prior Visual Analysis of Zero Place

As earlier noted, the Applicant has undertaken prior visual analysis of the Zero Place development.

In summary, the Visual Analysis, performed during February through April 2016 and conducted in consideration of a building 46'-8" in height instead of the reduced 44'-8" height thereafter proposed, demonstrated under "worst case" winter time conditions the following:

- General 360-degree Viewshed. The Zero Place building's geographical visual footprint is modest, primarily due to surrounding tree density, homes and buildings, and topographical variation. More specifically, the building will be clearly visible along NYS Route 32 from about Broadhead Avenue on the south north to the former Town Hall site and along Mulberry Street from its intersection with NYS Route 32 to the Rail Trail and, due to proximity, from the Rail Trail along the length

of the Zero Place site. The building will also be visible, though heavily screened by existing trees and other natural vegetation, from adjacent areas, principally to the west of Zero Place, though this visibility will not extend to Huguenot Street except as cited below.

- From Huguenot Street and the West. The Zero Place building will be visible to all those with properties abutting that portion of the Rail Trail adjoining the Zero Place site but is substantially screened, or obscured, by intervening trees and other natural vegetation and will never be visible above the trees. Property owners on the west side of Huguenot Street and beyond will not see the Zero Place building except as occurs in the cases of a portion of the rear of the building due to a gap in the trees between single-family homes located at 130 and 134 Huguenot Street and the southerly edge of the building as one looks toward NYS Route 32 from the Huguenot Street / Mulberry Street intersection.

As shown in earlier-cited **Exhibit B-0, Project Location Map**, none of the locations from which the Zero Place building may be viewed are within the bounds of either the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District which is, as previously noted, situated at its nearest point 807 feet to the southwest of the Zero Place site or the Nyquist-Harcourt Wildlife Sanctuary.

- From Moriello Pool and the East. The expanse of trees behind Stewart's Shop and throughout the surrounding area obscures view of the Zero Place site and building. Standing in the upper parking lot of the Moriello Park the Zero Place building will be virtually impossible to see through the intervening trees and other natural vegetation. The intervening trees likewise cause the Zero Place site and building to be virtually impossible to see from the Mill Brook Preserve.
- From the North. Significant tree and other natural vegetative cover obscures views of the Zero Place site from the buildings immediately north. The Zero Place building and site will however be visible along NYS Route 32 as far north as the former Town Hall property.
- From the South. The Zero Place building is least obscured directly from the south due to the lack of any intervening trees or other natural vegetation. The building does nevertheless fall out of view from most southerly locations south of Henry W. Dubois Drive.

See earlier-cited **Exhibit A-7, Zero Place Visual Analysis**, and **Exhibit A-8, 3D Methodology for Visual Analysis**.

Updated Visual Analysis of Zero Place / Modified Design

The above prior Visual Analysis might with a single exception have been considered substantially transferable to consideration of the modified Site Plan now presented by the Applicant. The exception involves the diminished view of the Zero Place building that occurs from the Huguenot Street and Mulberry Street intersection due to the re-siting of the building 18 feet to the north.

As shown on **Exhibit B-3.1**, View of Zero Place from Intersection of Huguenot Street and Mulberry Street, re-location of the Zero Place building some 18 feet to the north will cause the southerly edge of the building to no longer be visible at the left (northerly) side of one's eastward-facing view from this intersection.

The Applicant has nevertheless re-visited not only the above-cited view but also other views presented in the prior Visual Analysis in consideration of the reduction of 23 feet, or slightly more than 11%, in the length and mass of the east and west elevations of the Zero Place building.

See **Exhibits B-3.2 through B-3.4**

These updated views further illustrate how the reduction in length and mass of the Zero Place building reduces the extent of building observed in any manner from either the Rail Trail or North Chestnut Street.

Further, in response to a comment made by the Ulster County Planning Board in its review letter of August 3, 2016, to the Planning Board, being annexed here as **Exhibit B-4**, the Applicant has also undertaken additional analysis to confirm that the proposed rooftop solar array has no adverse visual impact on sensitive sites located at higher elevations including but not limited to the Mohonk Tower which is both located 3.75 miles distant and experiences a heavily screened view due to the height of trees directly to the west of Zero Place.

Observations Concerning Other Buildings within New Paltz

By way of example and without effort to undertake an exhaustive inventory, the Applicant has observed a number of mixed-use, commercial and institutional buildings throughout the community with height comparable to or greater than proposed at Zero Place. Among these are the following:

- The "Flat Iron Building" the intersection of Church and Main Streets, measured to be some 38 feet to its roof brackets and 40.5 feet to its peak when viewed in its three-story Main Street elevation and some 46 feet to its roof brackets in its Church Street elevation.

- The “Jack’s Rhythms Building” on Main Street, measured when viewed in its three-story Main Street elevation to be 37 feet in height to its peak and appearing to have a fourth story window in its side elevation.
- The Reformed Church within the Landmark District on Huguenot Street, measured at a height of 44 feet to its first peak and an additional 36 feet, a total of 80 feet in height, to the top of its tower.
- The Hampton Inn at South Putt Corners Road, measured to be 45 feet in height to its peak.
- Van Den Berg Hall, the most prominent building at the downtown SUNY at New Paltz Campus, adjacent to Hasbrouck Park, measured to be 52 feet in height to its roofline and 66 feet to its roof peak, with additional features extending to 80 feet.
- Numerous buildings on the new SUNY at New Paltz Campus.

See **Exhibits B-5.1 through B-5.7.**

In terms of mass, the Applicant has also observed the Hampton Inn, various buildings on both the old and new SUNY at New Paltz Campus, and even Water Street Market with overall mass greater than Zero Place. In addition, when viewed in their composite, the continuum of adjacent buildings along Main Street present to the viewer an overall mass substantially greater than Zero Place.

More specifically, in comparing the overall mass of Zero Place and Water Street Market, the following observation has been made by the Applicant:

- While less in height at 35 feet, Water Street Market is however a far longer complex, being some 270 feet in length as it parallels the Rail Trail compared to Zero Place’s 183 feet length. Upon translating these dimensions to a vertical plane, one finds the visual effect of the mass of Water Street Market to be experienced along the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail throughout a 94,500 SF vertical plane and Zero Place throughout a lesser vertical plane of 74,400 SF or 79% of that experienced at Water Street Market.
- Moreover, as earlier depicted in Exhibits **B-2.1** and **B-2.5**, Water Street Market lies substantially nearer the center-line of the Rail Trail, being 15 feet distant from its centerline while Zero Place is proposed at a distance of not less than 50 feet from its centerline. Due to this far greater proximity to the Rail Trail, Water Street Market extends a longer shadow on the Rail Trail. In addition, Water Street Market is not screened from the Rail Trail, as is Zero Place, by trees and other foliage.

Mitigation Measures

The Planning Board requested that the following mitigation measures, and any others suggested by the Applicant, be presented and analyzed:

- i. Reduce the visual impacts of the building at the access points to the Rail Trail.*
- ii. Decrease the height, mass, scale and/or intensity of use of the building in order to open up opportunities for re-siting the building and other features in the site plan.*
- iii. Set the building farther back from the Rail Trail.*
- iv. Incorporate landscaping into the site plan that will reduce potential visual, lighting, and sound impacts.*

As earlier stated, the Applicant has collectively addressed the above mitigation measures through preparation and commitment to implement a modified Site Plan, Landscape Plan and related Building Plans, both Floor Plans and Elevations, providing for the following:

- Reduction of approximately 11% in building length.
- Reduction of approximately 10% in building mass, footprint and gross floor area.
- As previously discussed, overall height of the 4-story building was reduced to the extent practicable from its initial 49'-8", first by three feet by removal of a parapet and then by another two feet to 44'-8" by adjustment of interior ceiling heights.
- Reduction of more than 40% in leasable retail floor area and two fewer residential units, the reduction in retail area providing for a 21% decrease in combined peak hour shared parking demand and a 35% decrease in vehicle movements attributed to Zero Place at the PM Peak Hour.
- Enhanced building design both responsive to input voluntarily sought from the Village Historic Preservation Commission and incorporating elements observed within historic "Main Streets" throughout Upstate New York.
- Greater building setback from Mulberry Street with more than a 63% increase in front yard and associated landscaped area including creation of a "community

space” there complementing the plaza along the building’s North Chestnut Street frontage.

- Modified parking configuration and related landscape improvements, principally for visual impact but with additional, albeit limited, noise attenuation.
- Strengthened linkage with the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail through the creation of greater and more engaging public space and the addition of public restrooms, including a separate gender-neutral restroom (see details below).

Modified Site Plan, Lighting Plan and Landscape Plan.

More specifically, the modified **Site Plan** and **Lighting Plan** for Zero Place, each prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, and the related modified site-wide **Landscape Plan and Rendering** by Maser Consulting, all dated February 1, 2017, and respectively being **Exhibits B-6.1** and **B-6.2** and **Exhibits B-7.1**, reflect the Applicant’s consideration of the mitigation measures suggested by the Village Planning Board and depict the following:

- Reduction in Building’s Square Footage. A proposed four-story Mixed Use Residential and Commercial Building, with a building footprint of 15,670 SF and a total gross building area of 62,680 SF, these square footages represent a reduction, respectively, of 1,660 SF and 6,640 SF from that previously proposed.
- Reduction in Building’s Length. A building 183’-2” in length and 93’-4” in maximum width, being 23 feet shorter than previously proposed.
- Re-siting More Distant from Mulberry Street. Re-siting of the building some 18 feet to the north from that previously proposed, providing for a substantial additional setback of 18 feet from the Mulberry Street right-of-way, now ranging from 29 feet to 61 feet distant, with associated opportunity for increased landscape area and creation of a “community space”, conveniently accessed by bikeway, public sidewalk and the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail, between the Zero Place building and Mulberry Street.

In addition to the substantially greater setback from Mulberry Street, building setback is increased to 17 feet is maintained from the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail right-of-way and 50 feet from the centerline of the Rail Trail, being about one foot greater than previously proposed. The setback from the centerline of the Rail Trail is some 35 feet greater than the setback from the centerline of the Rail Trail observed at Water Street Market and depicted on earlier-cited **Exhibits B-2.1** and **B-2.2**.

- Creation of Community Spaces. Two “community spaces”, pedestrian-friendly and readily accessible by the public, are integral components of the Zero Place development. Accordingly, the Applicant has complemented the site-wide Landscape Plan and Landscape Rendering with “key plans” more clearly depicting the proposed improvements within these pedestrian spaces.
 - Route 32 Plaza. The previously-proposed plaza along the Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) frontage has been enhanced and includes among other features sidewalks, seating, street trees and pedestrian-level down-lighting provided by five pole-mounted “Urban Series” 80 watt LED fixtures. The design of this streetscape complements the architecture and achieves a synergy between the building and the street relationship in an aesthetic and practical solution. The design comfortably accommodates the various pedestrian users of the space (both public and private) as well as integrating bicycle parking and potential outdoor eating and/or a small exhibits area within the space.

See **Exhibit B-7.4, Key Plan: Route 32 / North Chestnut Street Plaza and Streetscape.**

- Mulberry Street Plaza. Another plaza is now proposed along the Mulberry Street frontage of Zero Place, with street trees, ornamental trees and other landscaping, a courtyard with permeable pavers, low walls and associated benches for seating, pedestrian-level in-wall lighting being 5.3 watt step fixtures, a single pole-mounted “Urban Series” 82 watt LED fixture, and a special feature, being a pedestal to accommodate a rotating exhibit of sculpture by local artists.

See **Exhibit B-7.2, Key Plan: Mulberry Street Plaza and Streetscape** and 3D renderings presented as **Exhibits B-13.3 and B-13.4.**

- Public Restrooms. Supporting both community plazas, the retail stores, and users of the Rail Trail, Zero Place proposes three public restrooms in the center of the first floor, accessed from the Mulberry Plaza corner. These restrooms will include a male, female, and gender neutral / family restroom. The restrooms will be available to all during retail hours.
- Additional Modifications to Parking Lot. Adaptive re-use of the existing parking lot continues with a number of additional modifications that include each of the following:
 - Landscape Buffers.
 - Creation or enhancement of a landscaped buffer not less than three feet in width throughout the periphery of the parking lot, thus eliminating the only

potential obstacle previously existing to declaring Zero Place a “variance-free project”.

- Extension of the parking lot to the south by approximately five feet to accommodate continuation of the Route 32 landscape buffer along the northerly edge of the parking lot.
- Removal of existing pavement where necessary and installation of a landscape hedge within a six- to seven-foot-wide buffer along the northerly edge of the parking lot.
- Landscape plantings, including a hedge row and street trees, to complement the maintenance of six healthy trees (being Honeylocust and Bradford Pear) to both separate the parking lot from the pedestrian zone along NYS Route 32 and to screen the view of headlights within the parking lot from traffic on Route 32.

See additionally, in the matter of proposed landscaping between the parking lot and Route 32, **Exhibit B-7.3, Key Plan: NYS Route 32 / Parking Lot Landscape Buffer** and the 3D rendering presented as **Exhibit 13-1**.

- Site Lighting. Maintenance or re-location of existing light poles and installation of LED “Urban Series” fixtures providing, as shown on the above-cited **Exhibit B-6.2, Lighting Plan**, down-lighting at an overall level of 2.0 to 3.0 foot-candles within the parking lot and, with the exception of the immediate vicinity of the site access driveway, no greater than 0.4 foot-candles at the Route 32 sidewalk or either the northerly or westerly property line.
- Pavement / Parking Lot Configuration. Seal coating and/or resurfacing, as required, and re-striping of the parking lot with perpendicular vehicular parking spaces and access aisles in accordance with Village and industry standards.

Collectively, these modifications result in both the addition of five new parking spaces, bringing the total within the on-site parking lot to 67 spaces, two of which are handicap-only, and a parking lot which is effectively screened from both NYS Route 32 and its adjacent public sidewalk and bike lane, landscaped throughout and safely, though not excessively, down-lighted.

- Other Parking Improvements. Complementing the modifications of the existing parking lot are the following additional parking improvements:
 - Route 32 Parking. As previously proposed, removal of existing curb and reconstruction of the curb line along the NYS Route 32 frontage of the Zero Place building to accommodate seven on-street parallel parking spaces in addition to a proposed 6-foot bike lane and expanded public sidewalk.

In the matter of the proposed development of seven on-street parking spaces along the NYS Route 32 frontage, the Applicant has reviewed this proposal with the New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee (BPC), the Village Board and NYSDOT's Permit Engineer.

- The New Paltz BPC stated in paragraph 1 of its memorandum of July 1, 2016, to the Planning Board, *"We are in favor of the proposed plan for parallel parking on 32, given that the applicant's proposed design allows for a 6-foot shoulder between parking areas and traffic lanes. We feel that if a 6-foot shoulder exists, the parallel parking area would increase driver awareness, serving as a signal to inbound motorists that they are entering an area of increased population density."*

Moreover, the on-street parking spaces occupy only a portion of Zero Place's frontage between its site access driveway and Mulberry Street. As recommended by the BPC in paragraph 2, bulb-outs (curb extensions) are provided at either end of the proposed parallel parking area to *"offer a safe area for pedestrians waiting to cross the street, and a safe vantage point from which to look for – and be seen by – oncoming cars."*

See **Exhibit B-8, Bikeway Pedestrian Committee Memorandum to Planning Board.**

- The Village Board voted on October 26, 2016, *"to support the idea of parallel parking on Route 32 / North Chestnut in front of the proposed Net Zero apartment complex, while deferring to the Village Planning Board regarding consideration of what is an adequate level of parking"*.
- NYSDOT's Permit Engineer subsequently advised the Applicant through e-mail of November 17, 2016, *"The Department has reviewed the revised plan provided along with the Village's support of the parallel parking and has determined that parallel parking along Route 32 will be permitted by the Department"*.

See, respectively, **Exhibits B-9.1 and B-9.2.**

The Applicant further notes on-street parking is present at many other areas throughout the community including, as three examples, parking on both sides of Main Street throughout the older business district, parking on one side of Route 32 nearer Main Street, and on-street parking on both sides of streets such as North Front Street, a principal vehicular access to the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District. Photographs of this location are presented as **Exhibit B-9.3.**

- Mulberry Street Parking. Provision of two on-street parallel disabled-only parking spaces along the Mulberry Street frontage of the Zero Place building instead of the five perpendicular spaces previously proposed at the location.

These two spaces provide greater access to the disabled for use of the retail stores and the Mulberry Street Plaza.

These additional parking improvements bring the total number of parking spaces now proposed by the Applicant to 76, being three fewer than previously proposed.

In the matter of required number of parking spaces based upon the Village Zoning Code's stated guideline of 0.5 spaces per bedroom and one space per 500 SF of commercial use, a total of 53 spaces are now required while 76 spaces, or more than 140% of the required number of spaces, are now proposed.

- Pedestrian and Cyclist-Oriented On-Site Improvements. Related site improvements throughout the Zero Place development, including landscaping, street furniture --- including bike racks and benches --- pedestrian ways, site lighting and linkages to the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail, all as enhanced from the previous site plan submission.

Concerning these features, the following is noted:

- Linkages to the Rail Trail. The linkages to the Rail Trail are three in number, (1) at the southerly Mulberry Street end of Zero Place via both public sidewalk and bike lane to be installed by the Applicant, (2) at a location near the middle of the Zero Place building where gravel (or stone dust) access is proposed to the Zero Place site including for use of its public restrooms, and (3) in the north of the Zero Place site where opportunity for access via an existing footbridge will be assured through easement agreement.
- Bike Racks. The number of bike racks proposed, being six in number and varying from six to ten bicycles in their individual capacity, are able to accommodate a total of 50 bicycles, thus meeting the industry standard of one bike space per residential unit and one per 10 required commercial parking spaces.
- Wall Seating, Benches and Other Street Furniture. Wall seating, benches and other street furniture, including such utilitarian features as trash receptacles, have been located within the plaza areas and elsewhere on the overall site-wide Landscape Plan and associated key plans.
- Pavement Types. Pavement types are varied throughout the Zero Place site to differentiate use, including asphalt on-site parking lot, on-street parking spaces and bike lanes, concrete sidewalks both within and adjacent to the Zero Place development, employ of permeable pavers within the community space and sculpture court and as a two-foot wide border between the public sidewalk and curbing, and gravel (or stone dust) surfacing to blend other access between the site and the Rail Trail. Both sidewalk width and the type of adjacent

landscaping also vary to distinguish public areas of Zero Place from the ground level residential entrances at the northwest and west of the building.

- Site Lighting. Site lighting at the non-intrusive levels depicted by the photometric measures shown on the earlier-cited modified **Lighting Plan, Exhibit B-6.2** is proposed. Lighting for the parking lot and both plazas has been earlier noted; other LED site lighting, consisting of six 16 watt bollard and a single 39 watt bollard each 42” in height, is proposed to illuminate the pedestrian walkways at the rear, or west, of the Zero Place building. The limited level of illumination at this location will not generally exceed 1.0 foot-candle along the walkways and be in the range of 0.2 to 0.4 foot-candle at the westerly property line adjoining the Rail Trail.
- Loading Dock and Service Area. Maintenance of the 12’ x 35’ loading dock, as previously re-located from the Mulberry Street side of the site in response to concerns expressed by both the Planning Board and New Paltz Bicyclist and Pedestrian Committee, in a service area at the northwest corner of the Zero Place building, with access exclusively provided through the Zero Place parking lot. A 12’ x 26’ brick-faced dumpster / recycling materials enclosure with sliding gate and a 6’ x 20’ generator pad are also located there. As shown on **Exhibit 7-1, Landscape Rendering**, the service area will be extensively screened from the Rail Trail and the westerly property line by a mix of evergreen plantings.
- Other On-Site Improvements. Other site improvements including, but not limited to, implementation of storm water best management practices including proposed subsurface stormwater detention chambers and the installation of approximately 20 close-loop geothermal wells to depth of 300 to 400 feet below grade, all as previously proposed.
- Utilities. Service by existing municipal water supply distribution and sanitary sewage collection systems and franchise utility networks, all being underground and as previously proposed.
- Dimensional Parameters.
 - Lot Coverage. Maintenance of overall lot coverage, being the aggregate of all impervious areas, at 80.3%, thus substantially below the NBR District maximum coverage standard of 85%, despite the addition of hardscape within the “community space” and the reduction in area of the Zero Place site by approximately 1793 SF, or 0.041-acre, to account for an anticipated dedication of additional right-of-way to NYSDOT.

- Building Coverage. After accounting for the anticipated dedication of additional right-of-way to NYSDOT, reduction in building coverage from 27.4% to 25.6%.
- Site Disturbance. After accounting for the anticipated dedication of additional right-of-way to NYSDOT, overall site disturbance remains 0.93-acre, as previously proposed. See **Exhibit B-6.1.1, Site Disturbance Map.**

Modified Building Floor Plans.

The related modified Building Floor Plans prepared by BOLDER Architecture and dated February 1, 2017, conform to the above-cited Site Plan and provide for the following:

- Occupancy of Upper Floors. Residential occupancy of the upper three floors, with 14 apartments (six one-bedroom units and eight two-bedroom units) on each floor, being two fewer apartments on each floor than previously proposed.
- First Floor Occupancies. Mixed retail and residential occupancy of the first floor, with a total of 8,200 SF of retail floor area among six retail units, four apartments (three one-bedroom units, and one two-bedroom unit), residential entry lobby and manager's office, egress corridor, utility / service areas, and public restrooms both serving the retail uses and easily accessible by users of the Rail Trail, including a gender neutral / family restroom.

While it might be otherwise configured through modification in the location of non-bearing demising partitions, the retail area is shown as divided among six users, with individual spaces ranging from 1,000 SF to 1,630 SF, and averaging 1,367 SF. This reduction in average square footage from 2,071 SF, as previously depicted, to 1,367 SF is consistent with the type of small-scale business establishments anticipated as Zero Place tenants.

- Rooftop Elements. At the northeast corner of the building a 2,130 SF roof terrace and enclosed elevator / stairwell, with the roof of the enclosure and the balance of the flat roof of the building in combination with its southerly-facing wall supporting a 531-panel, 173 kW SunPower helix photovoltaic system (or equal) and a solar thermal system.

The rooftop enclosure and adjoining solar thermal installation continues to occupy only 775 SF of roof area, now being 5.0% of the total roof area, and be set back 29 feet from the front NYS Route 32-facing easterly elevation and 37 feet from the side northerly elevation facing Zero Place's parking lot, thus limiting its visibility.

See **Exhibit B-10, Building Floor Plans.**

The overall effect of the modified Building Floor Plans is to reduce retail floor area from 14,500 SF to 8,200 SF, to reduce the number of apartments from 48 to 46 while providing four highly-accessible first floor residential units, and to provide convenient public restrooms for, among others, retail customers and those persons using the Rail Trail.

Among the 46 residential units, one of the ground floor one-bedroom units will be “Type A” fully-accessible handicapped unit while the other three ground floor units will be constructed as “Type B” units in accordance with Uniform Building and Fire Prevention Code requirements. In addition, five residential units within the Zero Place building will be managed as “affordable units” as required by the Village of New Paltz.

Modified Building Elevations

The modified Site Plan, Lighting Plan, Landscape Plan and Building Floor Plans are complemented by modified Building Elevations prepared by Bolder Architecture and dated February 1, 2017. The modified Building Elevations similarly reflect the Applicant’s consideration of the mitigation measures suggested by the Village Planning Board and depict the following:

- The above-cited reduction in the length of the Zero Place building from 206 feet to 183 feet.
- Maintenance of building width at 93’-4”, as previously proposed, with continuing center area offset of 10 feet on both the east and west elevations narrowing the building through its center section to 73’-4”. The effect of these offsets is to visually break the elevation into three components, creating visually an experience not unlike seeing three separate buildings side-by-side, though not aligned in their facades, within a traditional “Main Street” setting.
- Maintenance of building height ranging from 43’-8” to 44’-8” to allow for drainage of storm water, with the building’s elevator / stairwell enclosure occupying 664 SF and extending an additional 15’-4” feet, as previously proposed.
- Façade design eliminating the faux balconies earlier proposed and incorporating a palette of materials and features that have been vetted with the Village Historical Preservation Commission (HPC), including but not limited to the following:
 - The use of red brick cultured veneer and the combination of this brick with sage-colored clapboard.

- The incorporation of stone accents at the base of the building.
- The employ of a more consistent window pattern with fewer window sizes and more vertical alignment (characterized during discussions with the HPC as “factory look”).
- The employ of arched window openings on the third story throughout the north, east and west elevations to complement straight lintels elsewhere.
- The employ of a first-level sheltered canopy throughout the retail portion of the building and similar treatment of residential entry areas.
- Incorporation of roof brackets beneath the building’s generous five-foot overhang.
- Dating the year of the building just under the roof at the north entranceway and/or incorporation of a cornerstone in the building’s construction.
- Proposed signage limited to a wall-mounted building street address identification sign and a total of not more than 100 SF of other wall-mounted signs, consisting of some six wall signs each 10 SF in surface area mounted above each of the proposed retail doorways, and wall signage mounted above the northerly lobby entrance to Zero Place as well as the westerly entrance facing the Rail Trail.
- Building-mounted lighting limited to two wall-mounted 24 watt LED down-lighting fixtures, one at the rooftop enclosure and the second at the residential entry at the north of the Zero Place building, and canopy-recessed 13.2 watt LED soffit lights where required for pedestrian safety.

See **Exhibit B-6.2, Lighting Plan, B-11, Building Elevations, and Exhibit B-12, Correspondence with Village Historic Preservation Commission.** Note: Two presentations were developed and presented to the HPC, the 2nd of which provided the revised concept following the HPC’s input. Due to their length, they are not provided in this report.

Renderings of Modified Zero Place Development

The overall character established through these modifications is shown by the following “3D’ renderings of Zero Place as it has now evolved at a reduced scale, with additional pedestrian amenities and with an enhanced site and building design consistent with the

Village's and Applicant's shared vision for the Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District:

- View looking southwest from the east side of Route 32. This view depicts how a pedestrian on either side of Route 32 or a motorist or bicyclist traveling south on Route 32 would experience Zero Place. The range of views here, where only an abandoned "park-and-ride" lot and the concrete building slab and identity sign remnants of the former STS Tire business are experienced today, would be principally of portions of the north and east elevations of the architecturally-articulated Zero Place building of earth-tone colors with blue canopy accents and a pleasant intervening streetscape including a bus shelter, evergreen and low plantings, street trees, pedestrian-level lighting, pedestrian walkways and a clearly-defined access driveway to a landscape-buffered parking lot.
- View looking northwest from the east side of Route 32 beyond Henry W. DuBois Boulevard toward the Mulberry Street / Route 32 intersection. This view depicts how a pedestrian on the east side of Route 32 or a motorist or bicyclist traveling north at this location would experience Zero Place. The view here, once again where only an abandoned "park-and-ride" lot and the concrete building slab and identity sign remnants of the former STS Tire business are experienced today, would be principally of the south and east elevations of the Zero Place building, with solar panels on the south elevation complementing the blue canopy accents of the architecturally-articulated earth-tone building. The street trees, benches, pedestrian-level lighting and pedestrian walkways along Zero Place's Route 32 frontage would be experienced as well as a side view of the Mulberry Street Plaza. The visual effect of the "step-back" of ten feet in the central portion of the building's east elevation would be evident in both its reduction of building scale and creation of an expanded plaza at the location of this recess.
- View looking west from the southeast corner of the Mulberry Street / Route 32 intersection. This view depicts how a pedestrian, bicyclist or motorist approaching Route 32 from Mulberry Street to the east would experience Zero Place. The view here is of the southerly one-third of the Zero Place elevation and a side view of the south elevation, all as discussed above. Noteworthy here is the effect of the substantially greater setback from Mulberry Street now provided and the resulting opportunity to create a significant, compelling and inviting "community space" there. Looking to the west one experiences both the sculpture court and "seatwall" nearer the Mulberry Street / Route 32 intersection and then beyond a plaza with wall / bench seating, both being surfaced in pavers to separate these areas from adjacent concrete sidewalks, and lawn area. Two bollard lights and a single pole-mounted fixture adjacent to the handicapped parking spaces appear in the view as well as pedestrian / bicyclist improvements such as the presence of a bike rack and both the striping of crosswalks and bicycle lanes on roadway pavements.

Proposed street trees and ornamental trees and shrubs are shown within the expanded setback area; the prominence of both an existing arborvitae hedgerow and mature trees along and beyond the Rail Trail is also evident.

- View looking at Zero Place from the south side of Mulberry Street. This view depicts how a pedestrian on the south side of Mulberry Street or either a motorist or bicyclist glancing to the north while traveling west on Mulberry Street would experience Zero Place as discussed above. Within this view the continuation of less extensive concrete sidewalks and more expansive lawn area to the rear, or west side, of Zero Place begins to be experienced.

See, respectively, **Exhibits B-13.1 through B-13.4.**

Conformance with NBR Zoning District Standards

The proposed development, as modified and depicted within above-cited Site Plan, Landscape Plans, Building Floor Plans and Building Elevations, remains in conformance with each of the below area and bulk standards applicable to new development within the NBR Zoning District.

- Minimum lot area, 10,890 SF where 63,013 SF now exists, being reduced by 1793 SF to 61,220 SF in anticipation of additional right-of-way dedication to NYSDOT;
- Minimum lot width at building line, 50 feet where 437 feet exists;
- Minimum front yard, 0 feet plus area for sidewalk and related pedestrian amenities where 17 feet is now proposed, being an increase of one foot;
- Minimum rear yard, 10 feet where 17 feet is now proposed, being an increase of one foot;
- Minimum side yard, 0 feet where 29 feet is now proposed;
- Maximum lot coverage, 85% where 80.3% is now proposed;
- Maximum building height, four stories and 50 feet where four stories and 44'-8" continues to be proposed,
- Maximum height exception for rooftop appurtenances, not more than 10% of roof area where 5.0% is now proposed;

- Required number of parking spaces based upon the Village Zoning Code's guideline of 0.5 spaces per bedroom and one space per 500 SF of commercial use, total of 53 spaces now required where 76 spaces, or more than 140% of the required number of spaces, are proposed.

Landscaped buffers exceeding the minimum requirement of three feet are now also provided throughout the perimeter of the modified and adaptively re-used parking lot.

The proposed re-development, as depicted within the modified Building Floor Plans, also remains consistent with the use standards applicable within the NBR District. As set forth within the Village of New Paltz Zoning Code Use Schedule, both residential uses limited to either multifamily dwellings or apartments above the first floor and a broad list of some 55 business uses, including a restaurant but not a bar or tavern, are authorized there by special use permit.

Required Permits, Approvals and Compliance Determinations

In the matter of required permits, approvals and compliance determinations, all remain as stated earlier in this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 in the matter of the earlier Zero Place proposal.

Consistency with Community Plans

Particular Concerns

The particular concern stated by the Planning Board was the following:

Although the application is not inconsistent with the Village's adopted Comprehensive Plan, a question remains as to whether a building of this scale --- which includes this maximum height coupled with a footprint in excess of 17,000 square feet --- is, nevertheless, appropriate at this particular location. Also, the height of the building is greater than that recommended in two planning documents, the B-3 District Zoning Recommendations (1997) and New Paltz Transportation / Land Use Project (2006).

Analysis

The Planning Board requested the Applicant undertake the below analysis to permit the Planning Board to more fully assess its concern:

The Applicant shall assess how the project fits architecturally, and in its scope and density, in comparison to other mixed-use developments of comparable size. This may require looking in other communities. The Village’s Planner has noted there is an inherent conflict between the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and the NBR zoning.

In that Zero Place is the first project proposed under NBR Zoning District in implementation of the Village’s vision for redevelopment of NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) to transform this highway commercial / light industrial corridor into a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use business and residential environment, the Applicant has turned to other communities in an effort to compare Zero Place to other mixed-use developments of comparable size. In doing so, the Applicant has examined mixed-use buildings developed within long-established business districts and locations where similar mixed-uses are emerging in either the development or redevelopment of corridors like North Chestnut Street or in response to interest in bringing additional life and strengthening an existing downtown area.

As to any consideration of the two planning documents cited by the Planning Board, the Applicant notes the recommendations set forth in both documents as to height limitations were only recommendations, never implemented and effectively superseded by the legislative acts of the Village Board in establishing the two-part height limitation of four stories and 50 feet for development within the Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District when adopting the NBR District Zoning Amendment.

Observations of Older “Main Streets”

A few of examples of mixed-use occupancies within longer-established areas are illustrated in the annexed photographs of the following communities, each economically viable and appreciated by residents and visitors alike, the first previously presented earlier in discussion with the Planning Board of “key design elements” and the latter being the first two added at the time of preparation of this Full EAF Expanded Part 3:

- East Market, Village of Rhinebeck in Dutchess County.
- Warren Street, City of Hudson, in Columbia County.
- Broadway and Church Street, City of Saratoga Springs in Saratoga County.

See **Exhibit B-14.1 through 14.3, Photographs of Older “Main Streets”**.

Each of these communities are marked by walkable, pedestrian-friendly centers with a blend of business and residential occupancies, often occurring on the upper floors above retail uses. While in each of these settings broad sidewalks, benches, street trees and courtyards provide for the presence of a pedestrian-friendly environment and a compelling gathering space or two, all recognize the role of the automobile in our lives. In each of these cases, on-street parking -- either parallel or near-perpendicular spaces -- is present as are off-street parking areas. In each instance through the use of either low walls or landscaping efforts have been made to separate and screen these off-street parking areas from pedestrian ways. Building height varies -- though generally three or more stories -- with zoning-based height limitations ranging from 40 feet in the Village of Rhinebeck to 70 feet in the City of Saratoga Springs.

The buildings are for the most part of sturdy materials -- oftentimes brick and stone -- and individually consistent with respect to features such as their windows and somewhat articulated in their overall design as in the case of both The Algonquin, an historic 150 feet long, five-story mixed-use retail / residential structure at 507 Broadway and The Washington, a 105-foot long, 60,000 square feet, four-story mixed-use retail / residential infill building constructed earlier this decade a block to the south at 422 Broadway in Saratoga Springs.

Entrances also tend to be well-defined, commercial signage restrained and both building identity and dating of construction expressed. These components are particularly strong in the case of both the recessed retail entrances and the apartments' entrance at The Algonquin.

In all of the cases noted, whether in Rhinebeck, Saratoga Springs or Hudson, on-street parking is present while both the density of development can be readily observed to exceed that proposed at Zero Place and the extent of landscaped area is generally less. Street trees and pedestrian-level lighting adjacent to sidewalks are in each instance somewhat prominent with the former not also contributing shade at a pedestrian level but also reducing as the trees reach skyward the perceived scale or mass of structures. At both The Algonquin and The Washington in Saratoga Springs --- despite the presence of a broadened sidewalk some 16 to 20 feet in width with an adjacent 8 to 10 feet wide planting strip to the curb --- there however appears to clearly be a missed opportunity for installation of a bench or two.

Other guidance is offered by another recent building in Saratoga Springs, the five-story mixed-use retail / office Mabey Building constructed at 31 Church Street, one block to the west of Broadway, in 2006. It too exhibits the same strong materials and the articulated design qualities observed in the other buildings.

A couple of other examples of pleasant “Main Streets” with similar design characteristics are shown by **Exhibits B-14.4 and 14.5**, through streetscape photographs of Main Street

in the Village of Walden, Ulster County, and Market Street in the City of Corning, Steuben County.

The Applicant's Planning Consultant notes that in retrospect this present-day assessment of what is a "pleasant 'Main Street' is probably not unlike those one that would have been made by our fathers or grandfathers in viewing Main Street: the Heart of the American Town, a portfolio compilation of 49 loose plates of photographs of Upstate New York communities taken in the 1960's by a late acquaintance, Milo V. Stewart, and published by the New York State Council for the Arts in 1971. This portfolio includes photographs of "Main Street" buildings and associated streetscapes in 20 or so communities including, among others, the City of Troy in Rensselaer County, the Village of Bath in Steuben County and the Village of Cazenovia in Madison County. While the strength and character of the buildings is evident architecturally, there clearly was then a greater emphasis on automobiles, parking meters and 30-foot high street lights and a lesser emphasis on those amenities, such as street furniture, street trees, pedestrian-level lighting, outdoor plazas and bicyclist accommodations, we appreciate in more recent "Main Street" settings. Clearly, there was some 50 years ago little thought given to "complete street principles" as we speak of them today ---- being an example, as later discussed in this Full EAF Expanded Part 3, of how community character is not a static condition but instead evolves over time.

Observations of Mixed-Use Development in Emerging Corridors

To complement its observations of mixed-use development as traditionally found on older "Main Streets", the Applicant also examined a number of newer mixed-use projects within Upstate New York corridors, each as discussed below and reputedly based upon the community's interest to implement neo-traditional development techniques there.

Upon doing so, the Applicant concluded the following whether in consideration of the previous proposal for Zero Place or the modified project set forth within this Full EAF Expanded Part 3:

Zero Place incorporates far more extensively pedestrian and cyclist-friendly features than in any of the examples presented, is more reflective of the qualities historically experienced on "Main Street" in the employ of sturdy materials and sound design, and unlike all of the examples incorporates innovative technology, a heightened concern for sustainability and employ of complete street principles.

Zero Place, while also within an emerging corridor, is not of the far more substantial scale being constructed elsewhere under the "neo-traditional" banner. In both its building and site design and its blend of small-scale retail uses and residential units it is clearly far more to the scale of "Main Street" – as historically experienced within

Upstate New York communities and as envisioned by both the Village Board and Net-Zero Development LLC --- than the “neo-traditional developments” being designed and delivered within highway corridors by developers elsewhere.

Further, most views of Zero Place are not marred visually by the presence of overhead utility lines across either its Route 32 or Mulberry Street frontages, as is the unfortunate case in many other settings.

Among the mixed-use projects examined, discussed below and illustrated in accompanying photographs were the following:

- The Springs on Weibel Avenue, City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County.
- Ellsworth Commons on NYS Route 9, Town of Malta, Saratoga County.
- City Center along Sixth Avenue, City of Troy, Rensselaer County.

See **Exhibits B-15.1 through B-15.3.**

The Springs, a recent mixed-use development in Saratoga Springs, is for the most part marked by gable-roof buildings with a blend of commercial space intended for small-scale retail, office and personal service users on the first floor with residential occupancy on the upper two or three floors. Three of these mixed-use buildings, either three- or four-story in configuration and individually being between 180 and 320 feet in length, line the east side of Weibel Avenue, with a single expansion of sidewalk and the placement of a number of wooden benches between two of the buildings. The buildings have substantially expanses of glass and stone veneer on their first floor, with exclusively clapboard, either earth-tone or barn red, above. Residential units have recessed balconies and have in the case of one of the buildings access to a pergola-covered rooftop terrace. The buildings are quite near the highway right-of-way with both public and private sidewalks, street trees at a 35-foot interval and pedestrian-level lighting at an 80-foot interval, overhead power lines and even some on-street parking, extending along their roadway frontage. Site driveways, one between two of the buildings and another at the southern edge of the development provide access to on-site parking lots which serve both the three frontage buildings and additional large multi-family structures to their rear.

The development, locally characterized as a “neighborhood center”, has occurred in accordance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance standards for its “Transection District” including front setback of 0 to 12 feet, which appears to be exceeded, maximum building height of 50 feet (except for rooftop appurtenances which in this case include mechanicals and cupolas), and minimum roadway frontage coverage of 70% by building facades. The latter requirement appears to account for the visually massive three-building aggregate of nearly 700 lineal feet of building façade within less than 1000 feet of roadway frontage.

Ellsworth Commons, a somewhat similar recent mixed-use development along Route 9 in the Town of Malta, has been occurring at an accelerated due to the establishment of Global Foundries facilities in the community. This development likewise includes both multi-use roadway frontage buildings and both large parking lots and multi-family structures to the rear.

The frontage building provide a blend of commercial space on the first floor with residential occupancy on the upper three or four floors. The buildings range up to 360 feet in length and combine in their front elevations some stronger materials while in large part being clapboard throughout all other elevations. As in the case of The Springs, while street trees and pedestrian-level lighting, each in this case at 40-foot intervals, have been employed, prominent within the Ellsworth Commons frontage are the overhead power lines.

It is understood this development has occurred for the most part in accordance with Downtown Design Guidelines adopted by the Town in 2003 including such standards as limited front setback, maximum building height of 54 feet (except for rooftop appurtenances), parking to the rear or side of buildings, use of natural building materials, creation of landscaped areas and encouragement of outdoor eating areas and other gathering spaces, traffic calming features including creation of a pedestrian and bicyclist friendly environment, and location within ¼ mile of a transit stop.

No special features for accommodating bicyclists appear present and the only landscaped area which is accessible to commercial users and residents exhibits limited plantings, only a few benches, and is most prominently marked by a monument-type identity sign for the complex and flag display oriented to Route 9.

Both of these developments, while intended within their communities to be carrying out a “neo-traditional agenda” appear to be present-day examples of the projects large-scale developers offer, do not appear to reflect the design qualities historically experienced in village and small city settings or incorporate in large measure emerging considerations for creation of more pedestrian-friendly environments or emerging technologies and associated concern for sustainability. While no doubt constructed in conformance with applicable building and energy requirements, neither of these developments appear to have progressed an additional step toward sustainability through incorporation of a solar energy component. Further, as so evident in the photos presented, both are marred visually by the presence of overhead utility lines along their frontages. Both serve for the most part as the antithesis of the vision and image of the project Net-Zero Development, LLC, proposes to carry out.

City Center, a more visually pleasing, though again large-scale and not entirely responsive to a concern for sustainability or complete streets principles, example of a neo-traditional development is found in the City of Troy where Sixth Avenue was extended less than 10 years ago to create downhill of the Rensselaer (RPI) Campus and bridging between the established downtown area and Prospect Park a new neighborhood with a

scenario of mixed-use buildings with small-scale retail spaces on the first floor and residential occupancy on the upper four floors. At City Center a single building, 320 feet in length and brick and stucco in material, occupies each side of the perhaps 360 length of extended Sixth Avenue. One of the buildings is continuous throughout its five floors while the second is open for about 30 feet at its ground floor to provide vehicular and pedestrian access to parking areas at the rear of the building.

The development has occurred in accordance with the City's Zoning Ordinance design standards for its "T-5 Urban Core District", as drafted several years ago by an interdisciplinary firm of planners, architects and landscape architects. The standards include limited maximum setbacks, maximum building height of six stories or 80 feet, opportunities for outdoor cafes, plazas (which the City states "*shall not be fenced or walled off*" and "*may be used for outdoor seating, artwork or other streetscape elements*") and residential stoops, and design criteria including minimum 50% glass area for first floor storefronts intended principally for retail and personal service uses with office occupancies also allowed. Following the statement "*despite the pedestrian-oriented character of the T-5 Urban Core District, automobiles will have to be accommodated*" the City identifies as acceptable forms of parking on-street parking, public parking lots and private parking lots. The City also recognizes the role for shared parking, stating "*Some uses ... need spaces at different times*".

The buildings and related site improvements at City Center create a complete and more "Main Street-type" streetscape, including storefronts with substantial glass area, a vehicular way (42 feet in curb-to-curb width) with a 26-foot wide shared cartway accommodating both vehicles and bicyclists, on-street 8-foot wide parallel parking spaces on both sides, and concrete sidewalks 10 feet in width. An additional 5-foot brick accent strip is present, with lamp posts and street trees with grates between, each occurring at a 50-foot interval.

Despite the opportunity presented by the design standards, there do not however appear to be any outdoor plazas or specific accommodations for bicyclists present. Further, as in the case of The Springs and Ellsworth Commons, it is not evident that any onsite facilities for capturing the sun's energy are present though the presence of flat roofs at City Center would appear quite capable of supporting a rooftop solar energy system not unlike that proposed at Zero Place.

Village Planner's Observation

As concerns the Planning Board's observation, both here and repeated later under the heading "Consistency with Community Character", "*The Village's Planner has noted there is an inherent conflict between the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and the NBR zoning*", the Applicant opines that there is no "inherent conflict" between the community's vision for redevelopment of the Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) corridor as

a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use environment of small-scale retail uses and residential units as embodied within the NBR Zoning District regulations and proposed by Zero Place. The “inherent conflict” is the one which has long been present and continues today between the current highway commercial / light industrial character of the corridor and nearby residential neighborhoods.

Mitigation Measures

The Planning Board requested that the following mitigation measure, and any others suggested by the Applicant, be presented and analyzed:

Re-position the building on the lot and/or decrease its height or otherwise alter its scale or intensity of use.

As noted earlier, the Applicant has prepared and is committed to implement the modified Site Plan, Landscape Plan and related modified Building Plans which reduce the scale and intensity of Zero Place. These Plans depict, among other features, the following:

- Reduction of approximately 11% in building length from 206 feet to 183 feet.
- Reduction of approximately 10% in building footprint from 17,330 SF to 15,670 SF.
- A commensurate reduction of approximately 10% in building mass and gross floor area from 69,320 SF to 62,680 SF.
- Re-positioning of the building on the site to allow for both a southerly extension of the existing parking lot by five feet to accommodate buffer landscaping to the north and east.
- Expansion of the landscaped area at the south of the Zero Place building by 18 feet so as to provide ample opportunity for creation there of a “community space” complementing the plaza along the building’s Route 32 frontage.
- A reduction of more than 40% in net leasable retail floor area from 14,500 SF to 8,200 SF with related reduction in both the number of individual commercial spaces from seven to six and their average floor area from 2,071 SF to 1,367 SF..

As previously noted, this reduction in retail floor area substantially reduces the intensity of use at the Zero Place site, marked for example by a reduction in traffic generation by 35% from 130 vehicle trips (one-way movements) to 84 vehicle trips

at Peak PM Hour, and parking demand under “extreme demand factors”, as discussed within the Updated Parking Analysis later presented, by 21% from 86 spaces to 68 spaces at the peak hour of parking demand.

See later discussion of “Traffic and Transportation” and related **Exhibits B-18, Traffic Impact Study, Revisited Level of Service**, and **B-19, Zero Place Parking Analysis with Modified Building and Site Plan**.

- Two fewer residential units.

In summary, the modified plans exhibit a reduced intensity of development, enhanced building design, increased landscaped area, modified parking configuration and strengthened linkage with the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail. The modifications, while remaining in conformance with all other Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District standards, additionally bring the Project into conformance with buffer requirements associated with parking lots.

Consistency with Community Character

Particular Concerns

The particular concerns stated by the Planning Board were the following:

- i. The Applicant does not have the necessary buffers around its parking area as per the NBR zoning.*
- ii. Although it is within the allowable maximum measurements under the new zoning, the project is not sensitive enough to the architectural scale and character of its neighbors. In particular:*
 - (1) As proposed, the building fills the entire project site, which when coupled with it being notable taller than other buildings in the area makes the building overwhelming.*
 - (2) The proposed rooftop deck is a new feature for the neighborhood and may result in its use having sound and lighting impacts.*

Analysis

The Planning Board requested the Applicant undertake the below analysis to permit the Planning Board to more fully assess its concern:

- i. The Applicant shall assess how the project fits architecturally, and in its scope and density, in comparison to other mixed-use developments of comparable size. This may require looking in other communities. The Village's Planner has noted there is an inherent conflict between the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and the NBR zoning.*
- ii. The Planning Board has determined that there will be no SEQRA significant adverse environmental impacts from noise and lighting of the rooftop deck, but the Planning Board will require during its site plan review further analysis of these issues, and corresponding plan modifications and/or mitigation measures, if appropriate. If the Applicant chooses, an evaluation of the potential aural and visual impacts of a rooftop deck is appropriate.*

Community Character

The Applicant has considered the overall issue of "community character" and has recommended the Planning Board consider in its evaluation the following expression by Zero Place's Planning Consultant:

"Community character is neither a static condition nor is it a single element. Community character builds upon the past, recognizes the present and embraces a collective vision for the future. A community's character evolves through time as its residents, its community leaders, and those who might want to live, work and invest in the community do so in the present and plan for its future. Just think about the changes that have been experienced in New Paltz beginning more than 300 years ago with the Huguenot settlement and continuing through time to the present village and townscape, as experienced within its neighborhoods, on Main Street and in its other business areas, and including such major development as first the older downtown and now the more suburban SUNY at New Paltz campus. Just as each of these areas has evolved since beginning with a single project carrying out a vision --- be it large or small --- so too will the area encompassed by the Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District.

As a foundation for that evolution it is noteworthy that Zero Place is not only consistent with the vision for redevelopment of the NYS Route 32 corridor embraced by the

Village Board in establishing the NBR Zoning District but also by of a group of local visionaries, joined together as Net-Zero Development, LLC. These gentlemen seek to carry out a development which blends new technology, a concern for sustainability and an overall greater emphasis on accommodating pedestrians and cyclists, with themes borrowed from the past including the mix of retail and residential use and the incorporation of building and site design elements and materials found locally.

It should be appreciated a first building --- or any first action in any walk of life --- occurs as much, if not more, in a broad vision for the future, as embraced in this case by the Village Board in its creation of the Neighborhood Business Residential Mixed-Use District and echoed by Net-Zero Development, LLC through their on-going investment, than in its present physical setting. One might say that for both parties there is present a 'leap of faith' that North Chestnut Street will experience a better future as a vibrant, mixed-use community."

As for the specific areas of analysis requested by the Planning Board, the Applicant has observed, as discussed earlier and repeated by reference here, the characteristics of mixed-use development on "Older Main Streets" and within the "Emerging Corridors". The Applicant has complemented here those observations concerning other areas in Upstate New York with both its earlier observations concerning the Water Street Market and the below observations of other buildings found locally within either the Town or Village of New Paltz.

Prior Discussion of Design Considerations

On June 21, 2016, the Applicant submitted to the Planning Board a compilation of annotated photographs depicting "design considerations" which guided the project architect, civil engineer and landscape architect in early planning for the Zero Place development.

Key design elements highlighted on a photograph of New Paltz Main Street included the presence of decorative roof brackets, a mansard roof, a combination of both curved and straight window heads, variations in building face (materials and lines, including a mix of clapboard and brick), and on-street parking for access to retail. Another photograph of the Old Barnaby's on North Chestnut Street highlighted such features as window grilles, gooseneck building lighting, once again curved window heads, and a stone and brick façade. Elements of this local vocabulary were integrated by the project team in the overall design for Zero Place, a design which has further evolved to the modified Building Elevations presented within this Full EAF Expanded Part 3 upon, as stated earlier, vetting with the Village Historic Preservation Commission.

See **Exhibits B-16.1 and 16.2.**

The Zero Place project also turned early in the process to the Village of Rhinebeck for design guidance. As highlighted on a photograph of Rhinebeck's East Market Street, many similar elements --- decorative roof brackets, rounded window heads, variations in building face (materials and lines, including a similar mix of clapboard and brick), and on-street parking for access to retail. Also observed in Rhinebeck was the presence of tall trees to break up the streetscape.

Yet another annotated photograph of the intersection of Church and Main Streets in the Village of New Paltz illustrated how local buildings there four stories in height and capped by a sloping roof were broken up as to their mass and height by tall trees and landscaping.

See, respectively, **Exhibits B-16.3 and 16.4.**

Mitigation Measures

The Planning Board requested that the following mitigation measures, and any others suggested by the Applicant, be presented and analyzed:

- i. Re-position the building on the lot and/or decrease its height or otherwise alter its scale or intensity of use.*
- ii. Add landscape buffers that meet or exceed the requirements of the NBR zoning around all parking areas.*

Repeating from above discussion of mitigation measures in the matter of Consistency with Community Plans, the Applicant has prepared and is committed to implement a modified Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Building Floor Plans and Elevations which reduce the scale and intensity of Zero Place.

In summary, these Plans depict, among other features, a reduction of approximately 11% in building footprint from 17,330 SF to 15,670 SF, thus occupying approximately 25% of the Zero Place site, and related re-positioning of the building on the site to allow for both a southerly extension of the existing parking lot by five feet and expansion of the landscaped area at the south of the Zero Place building by 18 feet so as to provide opportunity for creation there of a compelling "community space", a commensurate reduction of approximately 10% in gross floor area from 69,320 SF to 62,680 SF, a reduction of more than 40% in net leasable retail floor area from 14,500 SF to 8,200 SF with related reduction in both the number of individual commercial spaces from seven to six and their average floor area from 2,071 SF to 1,367 SF, and two fewer residential units.

The modified Site Plan also provides for a further reconfiguration of the existing parking lot from that previously proposed to provide for both a landscaped buffer not less than three feet in width around all parking areas. In addition, where potential for glare caused by the headlights of vehicles moving within the Zero Place parking lot might affect motorists on NYS Route 32, the introduction of natural vegetation is proposed to both mitigate this effect and provide a visually-pleasing landscape buffer separating the parking lot from the pedestrian zone including the public sidewalk and bus shelter along Route 32.

iii. Present an alternative design with no rooftop deck.

The Applicant has considered this mitigation measure and prepared an alternative design with no rooftop deck. While the Applicant understands the Planning Board may further consider issues of lighting and noise associated with this building feature during its continuing site plan review process, the Applicant believes implementation of this alternative design is not necessary for either conformance with Village of New Paltz Zoning Code or in the interest of public health, safety or welfare and would detract from Zero Place by eliminating a proposed residential amenity from the Project.

See **Exhibit B-17. Alternative Plan: Rooftop.**

In support of this contention the Applicant has considered the Planning Board's concern and notes the following:

- The proposed rooftop deck was previously re-located from the northwesterly to the northeasterly corner of the building to address concern expressed by the Planning Board regarding the potential visibility of the rooftop deck, including associated lighting, from both the Rail Trail and the more distant residences to the west, the nearest of which being approximately 264 feet from Zero Place.
- A lighting plan has been prepared for the rooftop deck which includes the installation of single wall-mounted 24-watt LED light fixture on the easterly and northerly elevations of the rooftop enclosure. This fixtures will create, as shown on earlier-cited **Exhibit B-6.2, Lighting Plan**, lighting level of a maximum of 4.5 foot-candles, providing illumination within an area of approximately 3000 SF in the northeasterly area of the rooftop and being less than 20% of the full rooftop, ranging from 0.2 to 2.0 foot-candles.
- The management of Zero Place is committed to specifically providing within apartment lease agreements opportunity for private use of the residents and a limited number of guests of the rooftop deck subject to restrictions including limitation on hours of rooftop use and prohibition of the use on the rooftop of

portable lighting and/or devices for amplifying sound after 8:00 p.m. in contravention of the Village's noise standards.

- Elimination of the rooftop deck would not result in any reduction in the height of the stairway / elevator enclosure in that convenient access to the rooftop for periodic inspection and maintenance, as may be required, of the solar installations is desirable. Were less convenient access to be implemented (as shown in Exhibit B-17, Alternative Plan: Rooftop) with the elimination of elevator access, a reduction of approximately five feet in height might occur in the small portion of the enclosure devoted to the elevator. This will have little, if any, effect on any distant view that might be experienced of this rooftop appurtenance.

Traffic and Transportation

Particular Concerns

The particular concerns stated by the Planning Board were the following:

- i. The proposed parking configuration along Mulberry Street appears to present safety hazards with potential for conflicts among automobiles, pedestrians, and cyclists. Influential factors include right-of-way and property characteristics, existing conditions of the road environment including pavement width, intersection configurations, proposed layout and specifications for bicycle lanes, sidewalks, crosswalks, and traffic controls.*
- ii. Left Turns in and out of the project's parking lot are likely to be difficult and impact traffic moving north and south on Route 32.*
- iii. Traffic impacts along Henry W. Dubois Drive and State Route 32 resulting from the retail and residential components of the project will likely increase.*
- iv. Parking on Mulberry Street might lead to Huguenot Street being used as a shortcut or way to avoid Route 32.*
- v. There appears to be insufficient parking to accommodate residents, guests, service vehicles, shoppers, shop owners, and employees.*
- vi. On-street parallel parking along Route 32 appears to present safety concerns for cyclists.*

- vii. *Countywide plans call for key bicycle route linkage between the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail and the Hudson Valley Rail Trail, utilizing Henry W. DuBois Drive and Mulberry Street. The project site plan has the potential to generate safety hazards to cyclists along these linkage roadways.*
- viii. *Safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists across the parking lot to access the Rail Trail.*

Analysis

The Planning Board requested the Applicant undertake the below analysis to permit the Planning Board to more fully assess its concern:

- i. *The Applicant shall analyze the pedestrian and cyclist traffic to assess how they will be impacted by the Project. Analysis should define and describe analytical standards used.*
- ii. *The Applicant shall study the traffic flow and trip generation associated with the Project, define existing and projected volume-to-capacity ratios on Route 32 and Henry W. DuBois corridors, and present gap analysis findings.*
- iii. *The Applicant shall study the traffic flow and traffic impacts from comparable mixed-use projects, and analyze how the traffic movement would work at the location.*
- iv. *Analyze parking needs more thoroughly, including under scenarios with specific retail uses. Provide data on the number and configuration of parking spaces provided at other mixed-use developments.*
- v. *Analyze the Project's compliance with a Complete Streets policy, if the Village adopted such a policy. The Village Planner shall determine if such a policy was adopted by the Village and, if so, will provide the Applicant with the policy.*

Vehicular Traffic.

Initial Analysis.

Maser Consulting has undertaken in accordance with accepted methodology both “intersection capacity analysis” and “gap analysis” to assess the probable traffic impacts associated with the Zero Place at its previously proposed scale, being 14,500 SF of retail space and 48 apartment-type dwelling units, on both intersections within the immediate vicinity of the development site and for the intersection of Zero Place’s intended driveway and NYS Route 32.

The Traffic Impact Study for Zero Place prepared by Maser Consulting P.A., dated January 26, 2016, presented both “capacity analysis assessment” of the NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) intersections with Henry W. DuBois Drive and Mulberry Street under 2016 Existing Traffic Volumes, 2021 No-Build Traffic Volumes and 2021 Build Traffic Volumes and “capacity analysis assessment” of the connection of the Site Driveway with NYS Route 32 under 2021 Build Volumes.

The results of the “capacity analysis assessment” were as follows:

- The intersection of NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) and Henry W. DuBois Drive was found to be currently operating at a Level of Service “C” or better during the AM and Midday Peak Hours with the PM Peak Hour experiencing a Level of Service “D”.

The desirability of re-striping the Henry W. DuBois Drive approach to provide a separate left and right turn lane was noted under both the 2021 No-Build and Build scenarios. With this re-striping the intersection will continue to operate at a Level of Service “C” or better during the AM and Midday Peak Hours under future conditions with the PM Peak Hour continuing to experience a Level of Service “D: or better.

- The intersection of NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) and Mulberry Street was found to be currently operating at a Level of Service “C” or better during each of the Peak Hours. Upon re-computation using the 2021 No-Build and Build Traffic Volumes a Level of Service “D” or better is expected to be experienced during each of the Peak Hours.
- The connection of the Zero Place site driveway with NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street) was determined under 2021 Build Traffic Volumes to experience at the driving approach to Route 32 a Level of Service “B” during the AM Peak Hour, a Level of Service “C” during the Midday Peak Hour and a Level of Service “D” during the PM Peak Hour.

See earlier-cited **Exhibit A-3, Traffic Impact Study** and related communications including, in particular, updated Table No. 2, Level of Service Summary Table, **Exhibit A-3.2a, Table 2 for Traffic Study**.

Updated and Additional Analysis.

The Traffic Impact Study was re-visited by Maser Consulting in January 2017 in consideration of the modified Building Floor Plans depicting 46 dwelling units and a total of 8,200 SF of retail area, 1,000 SF of which is proposed to be occupied by a restaurant. Under this scenario, the improved Levels of Service under the 2021 Build Condition experienced at the above locations due to the down-sizing of Zero Place are as follows:

- At the intersection of NYS Route 32 and Henry W. DuBois Drive, under the 2021 Build Condition Level of Service is maintained but improved with reduced vehicle delay within its previously calculated LOS.
- At the intersection of NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street, under the 2021 Build Condition Level of Service is maintained but improved with reduced vehicle delay within its previously calculated LOS.
- At the connection of the Zero Place site driveway to NYS Route 32, under the 2021 Build Condition Level of Service is upgraded from LOS “D” to LOS “C” during the PM Peak Hour.

In summary, downsizing Zero Place has resulted in an improvement within the Level of Service experienced at each of the locations analyzed under the 2021 Build Condition and upgrading from LOS “D” to LOS “C” of the condition experienced at the site driveway.

See **Exhibit B-18.1, Traffic Impact Study: Revisited Level of Service Analysis.**

In response to a comment made by the Ulster County Planning Board in its August 3, 2016, review letter to the Planning Board, earlier cited as **Exhibit B-4**, Maser Consulting also undertook a “gap analysis” for traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site driveway connection to NYS Route 32 (North Chestnut Street). In order to identify the gaps available on Route 32 the traffic engineer referenced video data collection counts at the Mulberry Street intersection with NYS Route 32 and the gap acceptance of vehicles turning left onto Mulberry Street as well as for left, through and right turn movements exiting from Mulberry Street at Route 32.

The gap data was summarized for the Peak PM Hours between 3:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. and presented on Figure 1A, Vehicle Delay Summary Location Map. As shown, the average vehicle delays for all movements ranged from 2 to 14 seconds, which was deemed by the traffic engineer to be representative of delays for Levels of Service “C” or better.

Maser Consulting concluded there are acceptable gaps available on Route 32 for both entering and exiting left turn movements at this location and stated similar gaps would be available in the vicinity of the Zero Place site driveway. Further, in consideration of the expected volume turning left entering and exiting the site driveway as previously indicated

within the Traffic Impact Study, the traffic engineer expressed the opinion acceptable gaps would be available at the site driveway under future conditions.

Further, in a February 3, 2017, memorandum to PLANNERS EAST, Philip Grealy, P.E., again re-visited the adequacy of left turn movements at the Zero Place site driveway and stated:

“Left Turn Considerations

The traffic analysis of the currently proposed Zero Place development was completed based on the procedures of the Highway Capacity Manual utilizing the SYNCHRO software as required by NYSDOT. Based on the analyses, the results of which were summarized in Table No. 2, the Zero Place driveway connection to Route 32 is expected to operate at a Level of Service ‘C’ or better during peak periods. The analysis accounts for those vehicles entering and exiting the site and turning onto and off Route 32 (North Chestnut Street). Note that during the highest peak hour (PM peak highway hour), the site is expected to generate in the order of 25 left turns exiting and 51 left turns entering. These volumes are similar to those for driveways for other commercial uses located on Route 32, such as Kwik Mart and Stewarts.”

See earlier-cited **Exhibit A-3** for Maser Consulting memorandum dated September 1, 2016, above-cited **Exhibit B-18.1** and further **Exhibit B-18.2**.

Adequacy of Parking

Initial Analysis.

As relates to parking and access Maser Consulting presented its initial review of the Site Plan for Zero Place, as revised to July 20, 2016.

At that time Maser Consulting affirmed the project engineer’s calculation of the number of parking spaces required to comply with the guideline set forth within Village Code, being 65, in consideration of its proposed 14,500 SF of leasable commercial space and 48 dwelling units. The traffic engineer further opined that based on information published by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and the Institute for Traffic Engineering (ITE), the 79* parking spaces depicted on the Site Plan is a more reasonable number based upon industry standards.

In consideration of the mixed-use occupancy of Zero Place, Maser Consulting also prepared a “shared parking analysis” to account for time of day demands for the proposed commercial and residential uses. In conducting this analysis the traffic engineer

employed ITE-based parking standards of 1.0 space per dwelling unit and 2.65 spaces weekday and 2.97 spaces Saturday per 1,000 SF of retail use, each being substantially greater than the requirements set by the Village Code. The details of this hour-by-hour analysis were presented in Tables No. 1P, Weekday, and No. 2P, Saturday. Based upon this analysis, the traffic engineer concluded the proposed 79* on-site and off-site parking spaces should accommodate peak loadings while not resulting in excessive parking for the site even though the number of spaces exceeds Village Code requirements.

See earlier-cited **Exhibit A-3.4** for Maser Consulting memorandum of July 21, 2016.

Later Maser Consulting completed additional specific analysis based upon the anticipated occupancy of 1,000 SF of the 14,500 SF of retail area by a café/restaurant. Under this circumstance, the traffic engineer opined the proposed number of parking spaces, 80*, would be adequate throughout the day on a Saturday but could be six spaces short of the Weekday evening peak between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m.

**Note: There was present in earlier submissions a discrepancy as to the total number of parking spaces provided. While the number was initially 80, this number was reduced to 79 upon re-location of the loading zone space from Mulberry Street at the south of Zero Place to its parking lot at the north.*

See page 2, earlier-cited **Exhibit A-3.5** for Maser Consulting memorandum of September 2, 2016, and related Tables No. 1R and No. 2R.

Updated and Additional Analysis.

More recently, in consideration of the “concern” expressed by the Planning Board and the modified Site Plan and Building Floor Plans now proposed, the Applicant and Maser Consulting have collaborated in the preparation of the **Zero Place Parking Analysis** with Modified Building and Site Plan presented here in its entirety as **Exhibit B-19**.

In summary, this “parking demand analysis” includes the following components and related results in consideration of the 76 parking spaces depicted on the modified Site Plan:

- Re-accomplishing the above-cited “parking analysis” performed by Maser Consulting on September 2, 2016, but with a reduction in retail space from 14,500 SF to 8,200 SF, two fewer residential units and the elimination of three of the previously proposed five parking spaces on Mulberry Street retaining there only two handicap-only spaces.

As shown on Table Set 1. Parking Demand with New Building Design, the available parking supply (76 spaces) more than meets the parking demand across all times of day for both weekdays and weekends. A peak demand for 71 spaces is

experienced between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and for 64 spaces between 12:00 and 1:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

Further, if adjusted from the prior analysis to account for the observation that a vast majority of locally-owned, non-food-related business close by 6:00 or 7:00 p.m., the peak hourly weekday demand is reduced to 64 spaces. See Appendix A. Survey of New Paltz Stores.

As shown by this analysis, between the hours of highest demand, there are five additional parking spaces available. Further, if adjusted to reflect the above-cited local condition, there are some 12 additional spaces available.

- Repeating the above analysis but replacing the general residential ULI-based distribution of demand across hours by the observed demand at Mulberry Square apartments for both weekdays and weekends. In undertaking this analysis both local conditions and demographics were taken into account and the ULI-modeled residential parking demand factor substantially validated.

As shown on Table Set 2. Parking Demand Adjusted for Observed Parking at Mulberry Apartments, the available parking supply (76 spaces) more than meets the parking demand across all times of day for both weekdays and weekends. A peak demand for 68 spaces is experienced between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and for 64 spaces between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

Further, if likewise adjusted to account for the observed condition that a vast majority of locally-owned, non-food-related business close by 6:00 or 7:00 p.m., the peak hourly weekday demand is reduced to 60 spaces, this occurring during the two-hour period between 7:00 and 9:00 p.m.

As shown by this alternative analysis, between the hours of highest demand, there are eight additional parking spaces available. Further, if adjusted to reflect the above-cited local condition, there are some 16 additional spaces available.

- Turning the analysis around to show the level of parking supply available (76) for the retail uses (8,200 SF) at Zero Place and comparing that supply to the number of parking spaces (79) and retail area (16,000 SF) present at Water Street Market.

As shown on Table Set 3. Available Retail Parking Supply at All Hours, the availability of retail parking at Zero Place throughout all hours of the day ranges between 43% and 71% of the available parking observed at Water Street Market. Given that the retail square footage of Zero Place is only 51% of that present at Water Street Market, analysis reveals that Zero Place offers greater relative parking supply for retail customers than Water Street Market for all daily operating hours from 8:00 a.m. through 9:00 p.m.

Further, as noted in Table 4. Comparison of Zero Place Retail to Water Street Market, this analysis is conservative in that Water Street Market has a far greater number of uses, 25 as compared to five or six expected at Zero Place, and far more food uses, six as compared to one expected at Zero Place.

- Extending the analysis to more extreme retail demand factors, increasing both the weekday and Saturday demand factor from 2.65 to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 SF of retail use and increasing the café / restaurant demand factor from 10.6 to 15.0 per 1,000 SF on weekdays and from 13.5 to 15.0 per 1,000 SF on Saturdays.

As shown on Table Set 4. Parking Demand with More Extreme Demand Factors, the availability of parking at Zero Place (76 spaces) more than meets parking demand across all times of day for both weekdays and weekends. A peak demand for 67 spaces occurs between 12:00 and 1:00 p.m. and is repeated between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and for 68 spaces occurs between the hours of 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. on Saturday.

As shown by this more conservative alternative analysis, during the hours of highest demand, there are eight additional parking spaces available.

Pedestrian and Cyclists

The Applicant has given due consideration to the Planning Board's request that the impact of Zero Place on pedestrian and cyclist traffic be assessed, including without exception its consideration of each of the comments and/or recommendations offered by the New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee in its July 1, 2016, memorandum to the Planning Board. See earlier-cited **Exhibit B-8**.

While there are no analytical measures, such as the trip generation rates applicable to vehicular traffic, to establish how many pedestrian or cyclist trips might be generated due to the presence of 46 apartments and 8,200 SF of net retail area at Zero Place, the Applicant finds it reasonable to project that the Zero Place development will cause there to be substantial additional pedestrian and cyclist traffic within the vicinity of Zero Place, most particularly at the existing bus shelter, on the adjacent Rail Trail, on existing sidewalks and within present bike routes. This occurrence would be consistent with one of the principal objectives of the Village in establishing the NBR Zoning District, that there be more sustainable development within the community less dependent on vehicular transportation and more so on public transit and people-power modes such as walking, jogging and cycling.

The Applicant has incorporated within the modified Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Preliminary Roadway Improvements Plan various on-site and off-site improvements to safely accommodate this additional pedestrian and cyclist traffic. The design of each of

these improvements has occurred upon consideration of industry standards and addressing a wide range of matters as the design of crosswalks, the width and signage of bike lanes, the width of sidewalks, appropriate surface treatments, and the presence of safe lighting levels.

In particular are noted the guidelines for bicycle facility design, including minimum bike lane width (1.5m or 5 feet) and appropriate signage and pavement markings at intersections, set forth by the NYSDOT as Exhibits 17-3, Bike Lane, and 17-4, Bike Lane with On-Street Parking, in its Design Manual, and here as **Exhibit B-20**.

In summary, the proposed improvements are as follows:

- The Applicant will construct or otherwise install the various pedestrian and cyclist-related on-site improvements depicted on the modified Site Plan and Landscape Plans, including sidewalks and other pedestrian surfaces, lighting, signage and street furniture, including benches and bike racks, the latter based in number on the industry standard of one bike space per residential unit and one additional space per 10 commercial parking spaces.

See previously-cited **Exhibits B-6 and B-7.1**.

- Upon authorization by the pertinent agency, or agencies, of jurisdiction, the Applicant will also undertake the following pedestrian and bicyclist-related off-site work and/or improvements:
 - Installation of both NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street crosswalks with curb ramps at the intersection of these vehicular ways, as noted in paragraph 3 of the Bikeway and Pedestrian Committee's July 1, 2016, memorandum.
 - Installation of new curbing and sidewalks across the Zero Place building frontages on both NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street, the latter connecting to the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail. At both locations the curb lines have been set back a sufficient distance to provide a parking lane and a separate shoulder/bike lane.
 - Installation of a bike lane, 6 feet in width, across the Zero Place building frontages on both NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street, the latter connecting to the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail. The proposed bike lane exceeds at both locations the minimum guideline presented by NYSDOT for bicycle facility design.
 - Installation of related pavement markings and signage, as recommended be considered by the Ulster County Planning Board in its August 3, 2016, review

letter to the Planning Board and as deemed appropriate by the NYSDOT guidelines for bicycle facility design.

- Extension of the existing concrete sidewalk along the Zero Place frontage approximately 50 feet to the northerly property line of the combined parcel.
- Resurfacing with “stone dust” of the Rail Trail from Mulberry Street northward for a distance of approximately 450 feet to the location of the existing wooden footbridge which will continue to provide access between the northerly portion of the development parcel and the Rail Trail.
- Performance of normal maintenance as may be required of the existing wooden footbridge.
- Performance of normal maintenance as may be required of both the existing NYS Route 32 crosswalk in the vicinity of the bus shelter and the existing crosswalk at the site access driveway.
- Performance of normal maintenance as may be required of the existing bus shelter.
- While less of a pedestrian or cyclist improvement and more of a vehicular traffic improvement, the Applicant upon authorization of the pertinent agency, or agencies, will also, as noted in the earlier discussion of Vehicular Traffic, re-stripe the Henry W. DuBois Drive approach to NYS Route 32 to provide a separate left and right turn lane, this too being a matter the Ulster County Planning Board recommended be given consideration.

While several of these off-site improvements were previously depicted on the earlier-cited and since superseded Traffic & Parking Plan for Zero Place, presented earlier as **Exhibit A-15**, each of the improvements now proposed is depicted as to location and at least conceptual design on either the Zero Place Modified Site Plan and/or the Preliminary Roadway Improvement Plan for Zero Place prepared by Maser Consulting. See, respectively, **Exhibits B-6.1 and B-21**.

Further, in the February 3, 2017, memorandum to PLANNERS EAST earlier set forth as **Exhibit B-20**, Philip Grealy, P.E., of Maser Consulting offered the following recommendation for consideration by the pertinent agency, or agencies, of jurisdiction:

“In addition, along Henry W. DuBois Drive, the Town has re-striped the roadway to provide a solid white edge line along each side resulting in an approximately 3-

4 foot shoulder area also designated as a bikeway. To supplement that work and to direct bicyclists to and from the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail via Mulberry Street, it is recommended that additional signing be installed to direct bicyclists to turn onto Church Street and connect to Mulberry Street. Parking is restricted along the segment of Church Street between Henry W. DuBois Drive and Mulberry Street and by directing bicyclists this way; it will remove bicyclists from the Route 32 and Henry DuBois intersection when they are traveling to and from the Rail Trail.”

Mitigation Measures

The Planning Board requested that the following mitigation measures, and any others suggested by the Applicant, be presented and analyzed:

- i. Extend or otherwise modify pedestrian crossings to provide safe access to the Rail Trail by pedestrians and cyclists.*
- ii. Modify the plan to address the impacts from left turns into and out of the Project's parking lots from and to Route 32.*
- iii. Modify the plan to address the potential traffic impacts along Henry W. DuBois Drive and Route 32 resulting from the retail and residential components of the Project.*
- iv. Modify the plan to make the size and scale of the building and its uses compatible with the likely parking demands.*
- v. Include safety measures and/or plan alterations to address potential hazards and traffic-related issues associated with parking along or on Route 32 and Mulberry Street.*
- vi. Modify plans to optimize east-west pedestrian and bicycle transit across the site, including in conjunction with any modifications to the landscaping.*

As stated within the above Analysis discussion, the Applicant has in summary addressed the above mitigation measures in the following manner:

- By proposing extended or otherwise modified pedestrian crossings.

- By identifying through “intersection capacity analysis” and “gap analysis” adequate opportunities for safe traffic movements at the Zero Place site driveway including left turn movements turning onto and off of Route 32 during all peak hours.
- By proposing re-striping of the Henry W. DuBois Drive and NYS Route 32 intersection to provide a separate left and right turn lane in the interest of facilitating vehicular movements at the location.
- By modifying the size and scale of the building and its uses to reduce parking requirements and, in consideration of both local conditions and the conservation application of industry standards, demonstrate the adequacy in number of the parking proposed by Zero Place, some 76, to exceed parking demand for the proposed 46 apartments, 1,000 SF restaurant and 7,200 SF of other retail use by at least eight spaces for all Weekday and Saturday hours.
- By down-sizing Zero Place and reducing the intensity of proposed use, particularly in the matter of a more than 40% reduction in its retail square footage, to an extent that improvements in Level of Service under the 2021 Build Condition are experienced at all analyzed locations, including the intersection of NYS Route 32 and Mulberry Street, the intersection of NYS Route 32 and Henry W. DuBois Drive and the Zero Place access driveway. LOS “D” continues only for a single Peak PM Hour movement at the Henry W. DuBois Drive / NYS Route 32 intersection.
- By reducing the number and configuration of the on-street parking proposed along Zero Place’s Mulberry Street frontage from the five perpendicular parking spaces previously proposed to two parallel parking spaces to provide convenient access to the site’s business uses and the proposed “community space” for handicapped persons.

The Applicant has asserted that the presence of two handicapped parking spaces proposed at this location is both of substantial benefit to handicapped persons and would neither create a safety hazard nor cause substantial additional traffic to be either experienced on either Mulberry Street or re-routed into the Huguenot Street neighborhood. To eliminate these handicapped parking spaces would, in the opinion of the Applicant, result in a dis-benefit to disabled persons far greater than the benefit of any additional lawn area or other improvement that might occupy the same 360 SF of land area.

The Applicant has nevertheless prepared, as requested by the Planning Board, an alternative plan for the Mulberry Street frontage which does not include any parking along Mulberry Street. In this case, the total number of parking spaces developed by Zero Place would be reduced from 76 to 74, yet still exceed the parking demand of the proposed 46 apartments, 1,000 SF restaurant and 7,200 SF of other retail

use for all Weekday and Saturday hours. See inset sketch on earlier-cited **Exhibit B-7.2.2, Key Plan: Mulberry Street Plaza and Streetscape (Alternative Plan)**.

In support of its assertion the creation of two handicapped spaces along Mulberry Street will not create a safety hazard, the Applicant has made note of an October 16, 2016, memorandum to the Planning Board from Mike Rizza, the former owner of the Zero Place site and operator of businesses there. Mr. Rizza presents a comprehensive review of the history of commercial uses along Mulberry Street between NYS Route 32 and the Rail Trail, including matters of both access from, and parking along Mulberry Street, and comments that he is not aware of a single incident with other vehicles, pedestrians or bicycles caused by either parking or traffic associated with the former business uses.

See **Exhibit B-22**.

The Applicant further notes the presence of two on-street parking spaces at this location is far less than the condition experienced today on North Front Street, where a principal vehicular access to the Huguenot National Historic Landmark District is marked on both sides of the street by ten on-street parking spaces, four perpendicular spaces at Lagusta's Luscious immediately adjacent to the Rail Trail, additional parallel parking extending the length of North Front to the historical homes, and additional traffic from adjacent parking lots. See the photograph presented earlier as **Exhibit B-9.3**.

- By proposing on the modified Site Plan both a public sidewalk and a dedicated 6-foot bike lane to provide for safe pedestrian and bicyclist movements across Zero Place's Mulberry Street frontage between NYS Route 32 and the Rail Trail.
- By proposing on the modified Site Plan extension of the public sidewalk along Route 32 from its present terminus to the northerly property line of the combined Zero Place parcel.
- By recommending, in concurrence with the recommendation made by the New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee at paragraph 4 of its July 1, 2016, memorandum, that bicyclists be routed away from the Route 32 and Henry W. DuBois Drive intersection when traveling to and from the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail. In order to effect this recommendation additional signage will be required on Henry W. DuBois Drive to direct cyclists to turn right at Church Street, and left at Mulberry Street, before making the crossing at Route 32 to connect with the Walkkill Valley Rail Trail via Mulberry Street. This re-routing will eliminate the right turn movement of cyclists from Henry W. DuBois Drive onto Route 32 and, in doing so, both improve safety for cyclists and permit additional vehicular capacity to be achieved

through the above-noted proposed re-striping of the Henry W. DuBois Drive / Route 32 intersection to provide separate right and left turn lanes.

The additional signage required to effect this re-routing has been depicted by the Applicant on earlier-cited **Exhibit B-21, Preliminary Roadway Improvement Plan**.

- By recommending a bikeway, street trees and curbing to limit, but not necessarily prohibit, driveway access be installed on the southerly side of Mulberry Street from Route 32 to the Rail Trail by either the Village on its own initiative or as part of the Planning Board's consideration of a proposal for development, if one were to be made, of the adjoining parcel thus providing at this location for a fully enhanced gateway to the Huguenot Street neighborhood and, thus, complementing the work proposed to be undertaken on the north proposed by Net-Zero Development, LLC.

The above analysis of vehicular movement, parking requirements and pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, coupled with associated commitments to address various transportation modes by maintaining the existing bus stop and shelter, creating new linkages with the Rail Trail, carrying out specified pedestrian, bicyclist and vehicular improvements off-site, enhancing the Mulberry Street gateway, and providing for landscaped pedestrian walkways and seating areas on-site, are a clear expression by Net-Zero Development, LLC's of its appreciation for, and desire to contribute to, local implementation of the inter-modal "Complete Streets Policy" adopted by the Village Board of Trustees on July 24, 2013.

See **Exhibit B-23, Complete Streets Resolution**.

As described within this Full EAF Expanded Part 3, Net-Zero Development, LLC, has to the extent within its purview recognized that, in words borrowed from the Town of Bethlehem in Albany County*:

"A complete street is a roadway planned and designed to consider the safe, convenient access and mobility of all roadway uses of all ages and abilities including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation riders, and motorists" and applied this principle to both its site design and the planning it has undertaken for off-site improvements within the immediate vicinity of its proposed development."

**Note: The Albany County Town of Bethlehem is considering at this time the adoption of such a policy in the matter of its Delaware Avenue Study Area.*

Conclusion

In consideration of the above commitment by Net-Zero Development, LLC, to go forward within the site plan, special use permit and other permit, approval and compliance processes with the modified plans for Zero Place presented in this Full EAF Expanded Part 3, the Applicant asserts and the Planning Board concurs that the mitigation measures recommended by the Planning Board have been incorporated within the modified plans to the extent reasonable and practicable and that Zero Place, as modified, will cause no significant adverse impacts on any component of the environment, including but not limited to aesthetic and visual resources, consistency with community plans, community character, and traffic and transportation.

ADDENDUM

FULL EAF EXPANDED PART 3

As stated in the Introduction, in addition to the particular concerns stated by the Planning Board in the Scoping Document the Applicant has noted several points of contention raised within the public record while the Planning Board has been carrying out in its role as designated Lead Agency under SEQRA environmental review of the Project.

The Applicant has elected to address the following matters in an Addendum to this EAF Part 3:

- Criticism of the Visual Analysis conducted by BOLDER Architecture.
- Assertion that Zero Place will have an adverse impact on the Huguenot Street National Landmark District.
- Speculation that the installation or operation of planned geothermal wells might result in migration of contaminants associated with prior use of the development parcel.
- Questioning of the characterization of Zero Place as “a zero-energy living concept”.

Visual Analysis

There has been criticism expressed, though not by the Planning Board or its advisors, on the Zero Place Visual Analysis conducted by BOLDER Architecture, with the principal focus of the criticism on the methodology and not the level of visibility of Zero Place depicted from selected viewing locations.

In order to include its response in the Planning Board’s record of its environmental examination of Zero Place, the Applicant has included in this Addendum the Letter of October 3, 2016, from David Shepler to the Village Planning Board addressing the comments concerning the Visual Analysis presented by representatives of the Friends of New Paltz.

See **Exhibit C-1**.

In addition, the Applicant has presented the comprehensive Supplement to the prior Visual Analysis, as discussed earlier in this Expanded EAF Part 3.

The Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District

There has been comment offered about the potential significant adverse impact of the Zero Place development on the Huguenot Street National Historic Landmark District.

The below correspondence sets forth the record of communication with the pertinent authority, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP), Division for Historic Preservation, on this matter:

- First, a letter of April 28, 2016, to the Village Planner from Ruth L. Pierpoint, Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation, stating OPRHP had reviewed the Zero Place Mixed-Use Apartments at 87-91 and 93 North Chestnut Street and concluded *“Based upon this review, it is the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation’s opinion that your project will have no impact on archaeological and/or historic resources listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places”*.
- Second, a follow-up letter of May 24, 2016, from The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the Village of New Paltz to Ms. Pierpoint first querying *“whether the determination of no impact described in the letter took into account local ‘landmarking’ as well as listing or eligibility for listing in the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places”* and then stating *“If it was not, we would like to ask that the review be revisited with this new information included and a second determination, whether confirming or changing the first, be forwarded to us”*.
- Third, a response e-mail of July 19, 2016, from Linda Mackey, Historic Preservation Specialist / Survey & Evaluation Unit, NYSOPRHP, to Valerie McAllister, HPC Secretary, stating *“We certainly understand your concerns, but our determination did not take into account locally-designated resources. Our review is triggered by State / Federal involvement, and we can only comment on properties that have been determined eligible for, or are listed in the National Register. The boundaries of the National register-listed district do not extend to the rail line, and the subject property is not located within an eligible historic district. This sounds like a local planning issue, and we encourage the historic preservation commission to work with the Village in addressing any issues or concerns, or even make recommendations to revise the current proposal.”*

See **Exhibit C-2 A through C**.

The Applicant points out that while no review of the Zero Place development is required of the Zero Place development by the Village Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) under the Village Code in that the Zero Place project site is within neither the National Register District nor the locally-zoned “Historic District”, the Applicant has sought input

from the HPC, as cited earlier in this Expanded EAF Part 3, concerning the design of the building, most particularly to assure that the building's design vocabulary appropriately draws upon the typical building features and use of materials found in the community.

Impact of the Geothermal Wells

There has been speculation expressed, though not by the Planning Board or its advisors, that the installation or operation of planned geothermal wells at Zero Place might result in migration of contaminants associated with prior use of the development parcel.

This assertion has been examined by The Chazen Companies in complement to Summary of Phase I and Phase II ESAs of AHC LLC Property dated April 19, 2016, and submitted to the Planning Board on May 3, 2016, and being earlier-cited Exhibit A-5.

Within a letter of October 4, 2016, to the Applicant, The Chazen Companies has both provided a summary of prior subsurface testing that has been conducted on the Zero Place site, first in 1994 / 1995 upon removal of 12 underground storage tanks and later in 2015 / 2016 following the destruction of the building last occupied by STS Tire, and related site sampling data, and considered the site sampling data relative to the planned installation of geothermal wells as a component in the net-zero- energy plan for Zero Place.

Upon doing so, The Chazen Companies stated as follows in its letter:

“Site redevelopment plans include installation and operation of approximately 20 close-loop geothermal wells to depths of 300 to 400 feet below grade. These are typically installed using air rotary drilling to displace geologic material and groundwater upward and out to allow installation of geothermal piping and grout. Installed geothermal wells are closed-loop systems grouted into the formation, with grout media providing thermal connections between the closed-loop and the geologic formation and preventing vertical migration of groundwater upward or downward along the well length.

The available sampling data do not suggest that installation or operation of the planned geothermal wells would result in contaminant migration.”

See **Exhibit C-3, Letter of October 4, 2016, The Chazen Companies.**

Zero-Energy Commitment

Albeit limited, and not by either the Planning Board or the Board's advisors, there has been some questioning of the zero-energy commitment of Zero Place.

In order to include its response in the Planning Board's record of its environmental examination of Zero Place, the Applicant has included in this Addendum the following:

- A brief paper by David Shepler on Zero Place's energy commitments entitled "Zero Place – Setting the Bar for Energy Performance" which appeared (without accompanying graphic) in *The New Paltz Times* on October 20, 2016, and addresses a writer's characterization of Zero Place as "zero energy' magic" and "green washing".
- Energy Modeling Results of Zero Place prepared by Integral Building + Design, dated October 8, 2016, and submitted to the Planning Board on October 11, 2016. This analysis determined, based upon the design of the building, then including 48 apartments and concluded that the total energy use for the apartments at Zero Place will be wholly off-set by the power generation (192 kW) of solar energy on an average annualized basis.

The modified design set forth within the EAF Part 3 provides for a reduction in the number of apartments by approximately 4% from 48 to 46 while the projected power generation of the solar energy system is reduced by a slightly greater 10% from 194kW to 173kW in that there is less of roof area available for mounting solar collectors due to the down-sizing of Zero Place.

Accordingly, the prior assertion that total energy use for the apartments at Zero Place will be wholly off-set by the power generation (192 kW) of solar energy on an average annualized basis must be restated in the Applicant's continuing effort to present full disclosure. Under the modified design, it is more than 95% of total energy use for the apartments at Zero Place that will be off-set by the power generation (173 kW) of solar energy on an average annualized basis. However, this gap in energy production is within modeling margins of error, and Zero Place could find in its operations that it fully achieves its zero-energy goal.

See **Exhibits C-4 and C-5.**

List of Exhibits

Section A

Note: Exhibit section A, which consists of previously submitted documents, is provided online only with links included below. The only exception is Exhibit A-3 regarding traffic.

Exhibit A-1.

Existing Conditions Plan prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016. <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/6-Zero-Place-Current-Conditions.pdf>

Exhibit A-2.

Site Plan for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 20, 2016, supported by the following engineering drawings: <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/2016-07-21-Zero-Place-TC.pdf>

- Grading & Utility Plan, dated February 16, 2016; <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/1-ZP-site-plans-2016-05-02.pdf>
- Drainage Plan and Lighting Plan, each dated February 16, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016; <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/1-ZP-site-plans-2016-05-02.pdf>
- Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Details and Stormwater Details, each dated May 2, 2016; <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/1-ZP-site-plans-2016-05-02.pdf>
- Site Details, two drawings, each dated February 16, 2016, and revised to May 2, 2016. <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/1-ZP-site-plans-2016-05-02.pdf>

Exhibit A-3. (Full prints enclosed in this report)

3.1 Traffic Impact Study for Zero Place prepared by Maser Consulting P.A., dated January 26, 2016, (<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160126-Maser-Traffic-Study-Final.pdf>)

3.2 Related correspondence including letter of March 1, 2016, to Barton & Loguidice, (<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160126-Maser-Traffic-Study-Final.pdf>)

3.2a Updated Table 2, (<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160301-Table-2-for-Traffic-Study.pdf>),

3.3 Memoranda of June 7, 2016, (<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160607-Response-to-Planner-regarding-Traffic-Study.pdf>)

3.4 Memoranda of July 21, 2016, (http://www.zeroplace.com/s/160721PJJ_Shepler-Memo.pdf)

3.5 Memoranda of September 2, 2016 (http://www.zeroplace.com/s/160902PJJ_Zero-Place-Memo.pdf) to David Shepler.

Exhibit A-4.

Zero Place Landscape Plan / Rendering prepared by Maser Consulting, P.A., dated February 16, 2016, and revised to March 22, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160405-Zero-Place-Landscaping-Rendering.pdf>

Exhibit A-5.

Summary of Phase I and Phase II ESAs of AHC LLC Property prepared by The Chazen Companies, dated April 19, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/3-ZeroPlace-ESA-summary-letter-Chazen-2016-04-19.pdf>

Exhibit A-6.

Stormwater Management Report for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach and Eggers, dated April 26, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/6-Zero-Place-SMP-all.pdf>

Exhibit A-7.

Zero Place Visual Analysis prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 3, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/4-Zero-Place-Visual-Analysis.pdf>

Exhibit A-8.

3D Methodology for Visual Analysis prepared by David Shepler and BOLDER Architecture, dated May 15, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/7-3D-rendering-methodology-2016-05-15.pdf>

Exhibit A-9.

Zero Place Design Narrative prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 24, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/Zero-Place-Design-Narrative-2016-05-24.pdf>

Exhibit A-10.

Zero Place Design Considerations and Renderings, compilation by David Shepler, dated June 21, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160621-ZP-Design-Considerations.pdf>

Exhibit A-11.

Zero Place Building Floor Plans prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/1-Zero-Place-2016-07-25.pdf>

Exhibit A-12.

Zero Place Building Elevations prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated January 4, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/Zero-Place-Elevations-Update-2016-07-27.pdf>

Exhibit A-13.

Zero Place Roof Plan prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated May 3, 2016, and revised to July 25, 2016.

<http://www.zeroplace.com/s/Zero-Place-Rendering-and-Rooftop-2016-07-27.pdf>

Exhibit A-14.

Zero Place Dumpster Plan prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated March 22, 2016. <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/20160405-Zero-Place-Plans.pdf>

Exhibit A-15.

Traffic & Parking Plan for Zero Place prepared by Medenbach & Eggers, dated July 18, 2016, revised July 21, 2016. <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/2016-07-21 -Zero-Place-TC.pdf>

Exhibit A-16.

Full EAF Part 1 for Zero Place (circulated to involved/interested agencies) certified by Barry Medenbach, Design Engineer, dated July 7, 2016. <http://www.zeroplace.com/s/2016-07-06-FEAF-rev2.pdf>

Section B

Exhibit B-0.

Project Location Map.

Exhibit B-1.

Letter of January 20, 2016, from Walkkill Valley Land Trust, Re: Walkkill Valley Rail Trail.

Exhibit B-2.1 through 2.5.

Design Relationships: Water Street Market and the Walkkill Rail Trail.

Exhibit B-3.1 through 3.4.

Prior Visual Analysis Re-Visited for Modified Project.

Exhibit B-4.

Review Letter of August 3, 2016, to Village Planning Board from Ulster County Planning Board.

Exhibit B-5.1 through 5.7.

Annotated Photos / Other Buildings in New Paltz

Exhibit B-6.1 and 6.2.

6.1 Site Plan prepared by Medenbach & Eggers and dated February 1, 2017.

6.1.1 Site Disturbance Map prepared by Medenbach & Eggers and dated February 1, 2017.

6.2 Lighting Plan prepared by Medenbach & Eggers and dated February 1, 2017.

Note: Other supporting engineering plans, as set forth as part of earlier Exhibit A-2, will be submitted following conclusion of the environmental review process.

Exhibit B-7.1 through 7.4.

- 7.1 Landscape Rendering prepared by Maser Consulting and dated February 1, 2017
- 7.2.1 Key Plan: Mulberry Street Plaza and Streetscape.
- 7.2.2 Key Plan: Mulberry Street Plaza and Streetscape (Alternative Plan)
- 7.3 Key Plan: Route 32 / Parking Lot Landscape Buffer
- 7.4 Key Plan: Route 32 / North Chestnut Street Plaza and Streetscape

Exhibit B-8.

Memorandum of July 1, 2016, from New Paltz Bicycle Pedestrian Committee to Village Planning Board

Exhibit B-9.1 through 9.3.

- 9.1,2 Correspondence from Village Board and NYSDOT, Re: Parking on North Chestnut Street
- 9.3 Photo, 32N and Front Street Parallel Parking

Exhibit B-10.

Zero Place Building Floor Plans prepared by BOLDER Architecture and dated February 1, 2017.

Exhibit B-11.

Zero Place Building Elevations prepared by BOLDER Architecture and dated February 1, 2017.

Exhibit B-12.

Correspondence with the Village Historic Preservation Commission, Re: Building Design

Exhibit B-13.1 through 13.4.

Renderings of Zero Place prepared by BOLDER Architecture, dated Feb 1, 2017.

- 13.1 View looking southwest from the east side of Route 32
- 13.2 View looking northwest from the east side of Route 32 beyond Henry W. DuBois Boulevard toward the Mulberry Street / Route 32 intersection

13.3 View looking west from the southeast corner of the Mulberry Street / Route 32 intersection

13.4 View looking at Zero Place from the south side of Mulberry Street

Exhibit B-14.1 through 14.5.

Photographs of Older “Main Streets”.

Exhibit B-15.1 through 15.3.

Photographs of Newer Mixed-Use Development in Emerging Corridors.

Exhibit B-16.1 through 16.4.

Annotated Photos / Design Features on New Paltz and Rhinebeck “Main Streets”.

Exhibit B-17.

Zero Place Rooftop Alternative Plan prepared by BOLDER Architecture and dated February 1, 2017.

Exhibit B-18.1 and 18.2.

18.1 Traffic Impact Study, Revisited Level of Service Analysis, prepared by Maser Consulting and dated January 24, 2017.

18.2 “Left Turn Considerations” from Maser Consulting to PLANNERS EAST dated February 3, 2017.

Exhibit B-19.

Zero Place Parking Analysis with Modified Building and Site Plan prepared by David Shepler and Maser Consulting and dated December 28, 2016.

Exhibit B-20.

Excerpts from NYSDOT Design Manual: Bikeway Standards.

Exhibit B-21.

Zero Place Preliminary Roadway Improvements Plan prepared by Maser Consulting and dated February 3, 2017.

Exhibit B-22.

Letter of October 16, 2016, from Mike Rizza to Planning Board, Re: History of Uses of Project Site and Mulberry Street Parking

Exhibit B-23

Complete Streets Resolution, Village of New Paltz Board of Trustees, dated July 24, 2013

Section C / Addendum

Exhibit C-1.

Letter of October 3, 2016, from David Shepler, Re: Visual Analysis.

Exhibit C-2. A through C.

“No Impact” determination on April 28, 2016, by NYSOPRHP and related correspondence between Village Historic Preservation Commission and OPRHP on May 24, 2016, and July 19, 2016.

Exhibit C-3.

Letter of October 4, 2016 from The Chazen Companies, Re: Prior Site Evaluation and Impact of Geothermal Wells.

Exhibit C-4.

Paper by David Shepler entitled “Zero Place – Setting the Bar for Energy Performance”, published in the New Paltz Times on October 20, 2016.

Exhibit C-5.

Letter, Re: Energy Modeling Results of Zero Place prepared by Integral Building + Design and dated October 8, 2016.

Annexed Documents

Full EAF Part 2 Decisions, Village Planning Board, October, 2016

Full EAF Expanded Part 3 Scoping Document, Village Planning Board, January 3, 2017