

4.0 Height Waivers

Building Height Waivers

The buildings listed in Table ES-3 were identified in the April 3, 2008 MDP submittal to the Town of Amenia as appropriate for waivers from the Town’s 35-foot limitation on height of structures in the RDO, Section 121-18(C)(10)(b).

Table ES-3, “Buildings Requiring Height Waiver”

Building	Height Proposed
Hotel (R-1)	70’
Spa (R-2)	52’
Banquet (R-3)	36’
Clubhouse	42’
CR-1	48’
CR-2	42’
C-3	48’
C-4	40’
C-5	44’
C-6	44’
C-7	44’
C-8	48’
C-16	40’
CR-17	48’
S-2	48’
S-6	48’

All of these buildings except S-2 and S-6 are located in the resort core. S-2 and S-6 are located in Block E, the closest block southeast of the resort core. The Traditional Neighborhood Alternative, as defined by the MDP, is partly based upon clustering of buildings within a core area. Most of these buildings are located behind the existing treed knoll that partially screens views of these buildings from DeLavernge Hill. All of these buildings, except S-6 are located behind the proposed extended treed knoll that partially screens views of these buildings from DeLavernge Hill.

Section 121-74 of the Town Zoning Law defines Height as follows:

“Building height: The vertical distance measured from the average elevation of the finished lot grade at the front of the building to the highest point of the ceiling of the top story in the case of a flat roof; to the deck line of mansard

roof; and to the mean height level between the eaves and ridge of a gable, hip or gambrel roof.”

Zoning Law section 121-18 C.5 provides for a 35 foot height limit on buildings in the RDO Zoning District. Zoning Law section 121-18 C.10.b specifically authorizes the Planning Board to grant waivers of the 35 foot height limit as follows:

“The Planning Board may waive the 35-foot height limit provided:

1. A visual impact analysis is performed in the course of SEQRA review, to ensure:
 - a. That no significant views are adversely impacted
 - b. Any impacts on views are mitigated to the maximum extent practical, and
 - c. That the building is sited to minimize visual impacts by taking advantage of natural topography.
2. No building shall be more than five stories in height, counting the stories from average grade at the front of the building, and excluding any story contained within a roof.
3. No waiver shall be granted without consultation with fire officials, who shall, if appropriate, make a recommendation to the Planning Board that the applicant provide equipment necessary to ensure adequate fire protection.”

The following narrative discusses each building in the context of each provision. Each building narrative follows the format above. Each building for which a waiver is sought is also shown in a visual representation which shows the impact on the viewpoints from which it is seen. The pictures are those which were part of the overall visual analysis as part of Appendix G, with the identification of each building superimposed. The narrative below is based on analysis of the updated photo simulations, mitigated panoramic images, included in the FEIS.

Hotel R-1 (70’):

1. The hotel was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. The hotel is partially seen from viewpoint 2 and 7.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** In Photo Simulation 2 and 7 the hotel is partially visible. Comparing the view with the construction (the "mitigated"¹ view) with the "Existing" view, shows

¹ The "Mitigated" photographs in the visual analysis represent the views after construction as proposed by the applicant, using earth toned colors, natural roof colors, and incorporating vegetation and other natural screening. The Planning Board required inclusion of a "unmitigated" view, showing the buildings as white, with no screening. It is acknowledged that the Applicant is not proposing to construct the "unmitigated" project.

that the portion of the hotel seen from these 2 viewpoints does not dominate the view, does not obscure any portion of the line of sight to the distant hills and fields. The roof of the hotel will be natural in color. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.

b. Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the hotel façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen the hotel façade and roof from viewpoint 2 and 7.
- ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 2 to screen or partially screen some remaining visible portions of the façade and roof of the hotel from viewpoint 2.
- iii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 18.
- iv. Utilize existing topography to reduce the height of the building by stepping down the building and placing all back of house functions in the lower level per cross section MDP SP-12
- v. Placing units in the building’s roof space to reduce the visual impact of the massing of the hotel as it relates to height.
- vi. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning the Hotel, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and the Hotel was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.

- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
 - v. The Hotel is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
 - vi. In plan view, the hotel is sited behind the treed knoll (proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It is noted that from viewpoint 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 the Hotel is not visible and from viewpoint 2 and 7 the Hotel is partially visible. From viewpoints 1 and 2 the longest axis of the hotel (east wing) is designed somewhat parallel to the viewpoint axis to increase the area of the hotel that is blocked by the treed knoll. From viewpoint 7 the longest axis (east wing) has been designed parallel to the eastern vegetation of the site which serves as a buffer and minimizes or reduces the portions of the building that are visible from this viewpoint.
 - vii. The First Floor Elevation (FFE) of the hotel is proposed at 590', the proposed height is 70', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 660'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge Hill would be an estimated 110', at a minimum, above the point to which the height of the hotel is measured to.
 - viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint
2. **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the Hotel is 4 stories in height across the front or north elevation. This is determined by reviewing SP-12 and A-2 of the MDP. The lobby is a 2 story height and then there are 2 more stories. It should be noted that there are 4 floors above grade at the front of the hotel with the top floor contained within the roof.
3. **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

Spa R-2 (52’):

1- The Spa was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. The Spa is seen from viewpoint 7.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** The Spa is only partially seen from viewpoint 7 on the attached photo simulation. From this viewpoint only the roof and parts of the facade are partially visible. The roof will be a natural color. The façade will be earth toned. Viewpoint 7 is a distance of approximately 4,600’ feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are discussed in the following sections.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the Spa façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen the Spa façade and roof from viewpoint 7.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 18.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. **Siting the Building:**

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning the Spa, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and the Spa was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.

- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. The Spa is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, the spa is sited behind the treed knoll (proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 the Spa is not visible and from viewpoint 7 the Spa is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of the spa is proposed at 590', the proposed height is 52', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 642'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge hill would be an estimated 128', at a minimum, above the point to which the height of the spa is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the Spa is 2 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-2 of the MDP.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

Conference/Banquet R-3 (36'):

1- The Banquet was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. The Banquet is not seen from any of the viewpoints.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Portions of the Conference Banquet might be seen from viewpoint 2 in the mitigated version.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the Conference/Banquet façade and roof to be seen from viewpoints 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and partially screen it from viewpoint 2.
- ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 to partially screen any visible portions of the façade and roof of the Conference/Banquet from viewpoint 2.
- iii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 18.
- iv. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning the Conference/Banquet, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and the Conference/Banquet was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so that upon extending the treed knoll the Conference/Banquet would not be visible from DeLavergne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the Conference/Banquet is 1 story in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-2 of the MDP.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

Clubhouse (42')

- 1- The Clubhouse was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. The Clubhouse is not seen from any of the viewpoints.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Portions of the clubhouse might be seen from viewpoint 2 in the mitigated version.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
 - i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the Clubhouse façade and roof to be seen from viewpoints 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and partially screen it from viewpoint 2.
 - ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 to partially screen any visible portions of the façade and roof of the Clubhouse from viewpoint 2.
 - iii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 18.
 - iv. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures
 - c. **Siting the Building:**
 - i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
 - ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning the Clubhouse, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
 - iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and the Clubhouse was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so that upon extending the treed knoll the Clubhouse would not be visible from DeLavergne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.

- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- 2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the Clubhouse is 1 story in height across the front elevation.
 - 3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

CR-1 (48'):

- 1- Building **CR-1** was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. **CR-1** roof and façade are partially visible from viewpoint 7.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building **CR-1** is only partially seen from viewpoint 7. From this viewpoint the only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoint 7 is a distance of approximately 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
 - i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the **CR-1** façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen CR-1 facade and roof from viewpoint 7.
 - ii. Subdued tones for the roof per "Architectural and Landscape Character" booklet, page 18.
 - iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the "at grade" space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning CR-1, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernge Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and CR-1 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. CR-1 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, CR-1 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 CR-1 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 CR-1 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of CR-1 is proposed at 590', the proposed height is 48', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 638'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge hill would be an estimated 132', at a minimum, above the point to which the height of the CR-1 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b CR-1 is 4 stories in height across the front elevation.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

CR-2 (42'):

1- Building CR-2 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Building CR-2 is not seen from any of the viewpoints.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building CR-2 is not seen from any of the viewpoints in the mitigated version.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the CR-2 façade and roof to be seen from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. **Siting the Building:**

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning CR-2, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and CR-2 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. CR-2 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernne Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, CR-2 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from

viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 CR-2 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 CR-1 is partially visible.

- vii. The FFE of CR-2 is proposed at 587', the proposed height is 42', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 629'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge hill would be an estimated 141', at a minimum, above the point to which the height CR-2 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

- 2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b CR-2 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-1 of the MDP.
- 3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C3 (48):

- 1- Building C3 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Building C3 is partially visible from viewpoint 7.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C3 is only partially visible from viewpoint 7. From this viewpoint only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoint 7 is a distance of approximately 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
 - i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C3 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen C3 façade and roof from viewpoint 7.
 - ii. Subdued tones for the roof per "Architectural and Landscape Character" booklet page 10.
 - iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the "at grade" space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:

1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C3, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C3 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C3 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavergne Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C3 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It is noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 C3 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 C3 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C3 is proposed at 595', the proposed height is 48', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 643'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavergne hill would be an estimated 127', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C3 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the C3 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-1 of the MDP.

- 3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C4 (40'):

- 1- Building C4 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Portions of C4 are visible from viewpoint 7.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C4 is only partially visible from viewpoint 7. From this viewpoint only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoint 7 is a distance of approximately 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C4 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen C4 façade and roof from viewpoint 7.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. **Siting the Building:**

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C4, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernge Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C4 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.

- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C4 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavergne Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C4 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 C4 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 C4 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C4 is proposed at 601', the proposed height is 40', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 641'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavergne hill would be an estimated 129', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C4 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the C4 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-2 of the MDP.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C5 (44'):

1- Building C5 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Building C5 is partially visible from viewpoint 7.

- a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C5 is only partially seen from viewpoint 7. From this viewpoint only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoint 7 is a distance of approximately 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C5 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen C5 façade and roof from viewpoint 7.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C5, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernge Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C5 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C5 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C5 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 C5 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 C5 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C5 is proposed at 608’, the proposed height is 44’, as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 652’. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830’, 800’ and 770’ respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from

DeLavernge hill would be an estimated 118', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C5 is measured to.

viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b building C5 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-1 of the MDP.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C6 (44'):

1- Building C6 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Portions of C6 are visible from viewpoint 7.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C6 is only partially seen from viewpoint 7. From these viewpoints only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoint 7 is at a distance of approximately 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C6 façade and roof from viewpoints 2, 5, 6 and 8 and partially screen C6 façade and roof from viewpoint 1, 3, 7.
- ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 to partially screen visible portions of the façade and roof of C6 from viewpoint 1 and 3.
- iii. Subdued tones for the roof per "Architectural and Landscape Character" booklet page 10.
- iv. Use of some below grade parking reduces the "at grade" space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C6, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernge Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C6 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C6 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C6 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 C6 is not visible and from viewpoint 7 C6 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C6 is proposed at 619', the proposed height is 44', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 663'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge Hill would be an estimated 107', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C6 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view to distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the C6 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation. This is determined by reviewing A-1 of the MDP.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C7 (44'):

- 1- Building C7 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Building C7 is partially visible from viewpoints 1, 3, 5 and 7.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C7 is only partially seen from viewpoint 5 and 7. From these viewpoints only part of the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoints 5 and 7 are a distance of approximately 1,900' to 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
 - i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C7 façade and roof from viewpoints 2, 6 and 8 and partially screen C7 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 3, 5 and 7.
 - ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 to partially screen visible portions of the façade and roof of C7 from viewpoint 1 and 3.
 - iii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
 - iv. Use existing topography to reduce the visual impact of the building looking from DeLaverny Hill. The building has been designed so the first floor is at grade level towards the west (Higher FFE) and the parking garage is under the building retaining the grade and accounting for the difference between the west elevation (higher FFE) and east elevation (lower FFE). In other words less height is visible from the west side of the building than from the east side. The parking is located on the lower level.
 - v. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C7, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernge Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C7 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C7 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavernge Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C7 is sited behind the treed knoll (Proposed to be extended) just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It should be noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 C7 is not visible and from viewpoint 5 and 7 C7 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C7 is proposed at 622', the proposed height is 44', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 666'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavernge hill would be an estimated 104', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C7 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view of distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the C7 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C8 (44'):

1- Building C8 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review. Building C8 is seen from viewpoints 5 and 7.

- a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C8 is only partially seen from viewpoints 5 and 7. From these viewpoints only the roof and parts of the facade are visible. The roof will be natural in color. Viewpoints 1, 3, 5 and 7 are a distance of approximately 1,900' to 4,600' feet away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.
- b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct the C8 façade and roof from viewpoints 2, 6 and 8 and partially screen C8 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 3, 5 and 7.
 - ii. Extend the treed knoll, as seen in the foreground from viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 to partially screen visible portions of the façade and roof of C8 from viewpoints 1 and 3.
 - iii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
 - iv. Use current topography to minimize the height of the building looking from DeLavergne Hill. The building has been designed so the first floor is at grade level towards the west (Higher FFE) and the parking garage is under the building retaining the grade and accounting for the difference between the west elevation (higher FFE) and east elevation (lower FFE). In other words less height is visible from the west side of the building than from the east side. The parking is located on the lower level.
 - v. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures
- c. **Siting the Building:**
- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
 - ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning C8, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.

- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and C8 was subsequently positioned behind the treed knoll in order to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. C8 is proposed south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3 on DeLavergne Hill and west of viewpoint 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- vi. In plan view, C8 is sited behind the treed knoll just south east of viewpoint 1, 2 and 3; and behind existing vegetation in the eastern portion of the site from viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. These two vegetative buffers work as partial or total impediments from all viewpoints. It is noted that from viewpoint 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 C7 is not visible and from viewpoint 5 and 7 C8 is partially visible.
- vii. The FFE of C8 is proposed at 628', the proposed height is 44', as a result the point to where the height is measured is elevation 672'. Viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 are at elevation 830', 800' and 770' respectively, therefore a person viewing the distant hills from DeLavergne Hill would be an estimated 98', at a minimum, above the point to which the height C8 is measured to.
- viii. No ridgeline or view of distant hills is blocked from any viewpoint

- 2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b the C8 is 4 stories in height across the front elevation.
- 3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

C 16 (40'):

- 1- Building C16 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review.
 - a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building C16 is not seen from any of the viewpoints in the mitigated version.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct Building C16 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. Siting the Building:

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning Building C16, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and Building C16 was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so Building C16 would not be visible from DeLavergne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

2- No more than 5 Stories: Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b Building C16 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation.

3- Consultation with Fire Officials: The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

CR 17 (48’):

- 1- Building CR17 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review.

- a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building CR17 is not seen from any of the viewpoints in the mitigated version.
 - b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**
 - i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct Building CR17 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
 - ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 10.
 - iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures
 - c. **Siting the Building:**
 - i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
 - ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning Building CR17, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
 - iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and Building CR17 was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so Building CR17 would not be visible from DeLavergne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
 - iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- 2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b Building CR17 is 4 stories in height across the front elevation.
- 3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

S2 (48'):

1- Building S2 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Building S2 is not seen from any viewpoint in the mitigated version.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct Building S2 façade and roof from viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per “Architectural and Landscape Character” booklet page 22.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the “at grade” space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. **Siting the Building:**

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning Building S2, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavergne Hill.
- iii. During RAMSA’s Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and Building S2 was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so Building S2 would not be visible from DeLavergne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b Building S2 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

S6 (48')

1- Building S6 was included in the visual impact analysis performed in the course of the SEQRA review.

a. **No significant views are adversely impacted.** Portions of building S6 roof and façade are visible from viewpoint 2. The roof will be natural in color. The façade will be subdued color. Viewpoint 2 is a distance of approximately 3,200' (6/10 mile) away. Other aspects of the visual analysis are considered in subsequent sections.

b. **Mitigation measures (to the maximum extent practical):**

- i. Utilize the existing topography and vegetation to obstruct Building S6 façade and roof to be seen from viewpoints 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and partially screen it from viewpoint 2.
- ii. Subdued tones for the roof per "Architectural and Landscape Character" booklet page 22.
- iii. Use of some below grade parking reduces the "at grade" space that would otherwise be utilized for parking. This accomplishes 2 things as it relates to visual:
 1. Eliminates seeing many vehicles, eliminates many above grade structures for vehicles, and eliminates some above grade parking pavement for vehicles
 2. Allows more room to site buildings in locations to take advantage of the existing topography and thus provide mitigation measures

c. **Siting the Building:**

- i. Eight view points were established by the Planning Board to review the visual impacts of the project.
- ii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process these viewpoints were taken into consideration in positioning Building S6, especially viewpoints 1, 2, 3 from DeLavernne Hill.

- iii. During RAMSA's Master Plan design process the current topography and landscaping were taken into account, and Building S6 was subsequently positioned south of the treed knoll so the visual impact of Building S6 would be reduced from DeLavernne Hill, in an effort to mitigate to the extent practicable any adverse visual impact.
- iv. RAMSA built 2 clay scale models of the site during the Master Plan design phase to evaluate siting of the buildings as they relate to the existing topography and features to reduce visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- v. No ridgelines or views of distant hills are blocked from any viewpoint.

2- **No more than 5 Stories:** Using the methodology as stated in 121-18 C.10.b Building S6 is 3 stories in height across the front elevation.

3- **Consultation with Fire Officials:** The attached letter dated July 31, 2008 from Amenia Fire Dept indicates adequate fire protection.

The following annotated photo simulations are for viewpoints where the above buildings are visible. Viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 are shown because the above buildings are not visible from the viewpoints 4, 6, and 8.

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 1B - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Millbrook Ventures, LLC

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 2A - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 3A - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Millbrook Ventures, LLC

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 3C - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Millbrook Ventures, LLC

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 5C - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Millbrook Ventures, LLC

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 7C - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)

Silo Ridge Resort Community

Amenia, New York



Shot 7D - Mitigated

Note: Building Height is determined from FFE to Highest Elevation (mid-point gable)