

Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development		Fax Info Only	To	Date	#pgs
		Co./Dept.	From		
		Fax #	Phone #		

239 Planning/Zoning Referral - Exemption Communities

Municipality: **Town of Wappinger**

Referring Agency: **Planning Board**

Tax Parcel Numbers(s): **9194330000**

Project Name: **Sikh Temple Amended Site Plan**

Applicant: **Mid-Hudson Cultural Society**

Address of Property: **All Angels Hill Rd, Wappinger, NY 12590**

Exempt Actions:*
239 Review is NOT Required

- Administrative Amendments (fees, procedures, penalties, etc.)
- Special Permits for residential uses (accessory apts, home occupations, etc.)
- Use Variances for residential uses
- Area Variances for residential uses
- Renewals/Extension of Site Plans or Special Permits that have no changes from previous approvals

No Authority to review these Actions

- Subdivisions / Lot Line Adjustments
- Interpretations

☐ Exempt Action submitted for informal review

Actions Requiring 239 Review

- ☐ Comprehensive/Master Plans
- ☐ Zoning Amendments (standards, uses, definitions, district regulations, etc.)
- ☐ Other Local Laws associated with zoning (wetlands, historic preservation, affordable housing, architectural review, etc.)
- ☐ Rezoning involving all map changes
- ☐ Architectural Review
- ☒ Site Plans (all)
- ☐ Special Permits for all non-residential uses
- ☐ Use Variances for all non-residential uses
- ☐ Area Variances for all non-residential uses
- ☐ Other (Describe):

Parcels within 500 feet of:

- ☐ State Road:
- ☒ County Road: **All Angels Hill Road**
- ☐ State Property (with recreation area or public building)
- ☐ County Property (with recreation area or public building)
- ☐ Municipal Boundary
- ☐ Farm operation in an Agricultural District

Date Response Requested: **3/4/2024**

Entered By: **Ogunti, Beatrice**

These actions are only exempt in municipalities that signed an intermunicipal agreement with Dutchess County to that effect.

For County Office Use Only			
Response From Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development			
<p>No Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Matter of Local Concern <input type="checkbox"/> No Jurisdiction <input type="checkbox"/> No Authority <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete - municipality must resubmit to County <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt from 239 Review <input type="checkbox"/> None 		<p>Comments Attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Concern with Comments <input type="checkbox"/> Conditional <input type="checkbox"/> Denial <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete with Comments- municipality must resubmit to County <input type="checkbox"/> Informal Comments Only (Action Exempt from 239 Review) 	
Date Submitted: 2/16/2024	Notes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major Project	
Date Received: 2/16/2024		Referral #: ZR24-042	
Date Requested: 3/4/2024			
Date Required: 3/16/2024	<input type="checkbox"/> Also mailed hard copy	Reviewer: <i>Jara Grogan</i>	
Date Transmitted: 2/29/2024			



DUTCHESS COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

February 29, 2024

To: Planning Board, Town of Wappinger
Re: **ZR24-042, Sikh Temple – Amended Site Plan**
Lot: 919433 All Angels Hill Rd (CR 94) and Old Hopewell Rd (CR 28)

The Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development has reviewed the subject referral within the framework of General Municipal Law (Article 12B, §239-l/m).

ACTION

The applicant is seeking amended site plan approval for construction of a 13,500 sq ft Sikh Temple, for which a larger project scope (20,000 sq ft) was previously approved in 2018.

COMMENTS

We understand that a previous, larger version of this project did receive site plan approval in 2018 and the instinct may be to preserve as much of that plan as possible. However, given the smaller scope of the revised project and the applicant's laudable, eco-friendly objectives of incorporating "green" building and site elements, we view this resubmission as an opportunity to maximize functionality while reducing the environmental footprint of the project. To that end, we suggest consideration of the following:

Wetlands: The site plan shows that the back of the building, part of the parking lot, part of bioretention area #6, and a temporary topsoil stockpile are proposed within the wetland buffer, in addition to tree plantings proposed within the actual wetland. Given the size and topography of the property and the flexibility that affords regarding site layout, the Board should require that plantings be shifted outside the wetland and all other work be shifted outside of the buffer. We note that the layout as proposed would require a wetland permit per §137-6.

Access, Parking, and Circulation:

- We question the need for two separate access points to the property and encourage coordination with Dutchess County DPW to consider potential benefits of prioritizing one or the other. If one entrance is enough to serve the project, removal of the second entrance and driveway would significantly reduce impervious surfaces, which could reduce the necessary bioretention areas.
- The proposed roundabout appears to be a legacy design element from the previously approved, much larger parking lot. In this smaller context, the proposed design would impede natural vehicular circulation and likely cause confusion for drivers. We strongly suggest eliminating the roundabout. The proposed flagpole could be retained and shifted slightly into the yard area, allowing it to be highlighted using landscaping and greenery.
- Pedestrian accommodations such as sidewalks and crosswalks could be provided throughout the parking area. The Board could require a reduction in the number of parking spaces to the minimum requirement per §240-97(A).
- The proposed covered truck loading area and dumpster enclosure could be difficult for large trucks to navigate. Truck turning diagrams (and clearances) should be provided, and other loading/dumpster locations considered to ensure adequate maneuverability for oversized vehicles. There are also several areas on the plan labeled for snow storage that appear functionally difficult for that purpose due to either being set too far back

from the curb for the plow truck to reach, or being located along curved sections that could be difficult to navigate with a plow; these locations should be reconsidered.

- “Providing for alternative vehicles” is noted in the application narrative but no electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure is shown on the site plan. EV charging is most appropriate for locations where vehicles will be parked for at least several hours. If desired for this site (now or in the future), EV charging locations and planned utility work should be shown on the site plan. If charging stations are not planned for immediate installation, the applicant could consider laying electrical conduit now to avoid unnecessary land disturbances in the future.

Landscaping: We commend the use of native trees species and mature sizes indicated on the landscaping plan. Additional landscaping could be added throughout the site, particularly along the Old Hopewell Road and All Angels Hill Road frontages. We also suggest including materials of varying heights such as shrubbery and perennials/annuals and grouping plantings together for a more natural feel. Consideration could be given to incorporating rain gardens to handle some of the stormwater runoff, in place of the engineered detention basins and bioretention areas.

Lighting: The “Photometric Plan” (sheet C-12) includes isometric lines that show the area of coverage for each individual fixture, but do not clearly communicate the cumulative impacts of the proposed lighting. This is of particular concern in the parking area, where the cumulative impact of overlapping light from several nearby fixtures is not clear. The Board may want to request photometric plans showing actual footcandle levels throughout the site to properly inform their review of lighting impacts

Signage and Architecture: No sign details or architectural elevations were provided. Considering the location at a major intersection adjacent to residential areas, the Board may want to request these elements so the visual impact of the project can be properly assessed.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Board rely upon its own study of the facts in the case with due consideration of the above comments.

Eoin Wrafter, AICP, Commissioner
By



Tara Grogan
Planner

cc: Mathew Dutcavich, Stephen Gill, William Trifilo, DCDPW (via email)