

Marathon Discussion

Stakeholder comments

Ken Kearney, owner of the Marathon properties (two parcels), showed his vision for the Marathon properties. He said that the plan shown on May 14 was more of an urban concept than a suburban concept which is in keeping with the village character; single family homes on one acre was not in keeping with the village character. The live/work area was conducive to small retail/artist/artisans as an extension of Main Street. Other possibilities include a theatre and/or gallery as a gathering place. His approach is a village within a village. The Village Green creates the area as a destination. A balance between residential and commercial provides positive rateables. He believes that his plan will improve property values in the surrounding areas. He said that the Village sewer system in the Marathon area (built in the 1970's) has the capacity to handle the conceptual plans shown. He said that, although traffic and access are always the biggest issues, the conceptual plans identify a village neighborhood that encourages walking to and from the site so that traffic should be a lesser concern.

He showed some different ways of developing the site. In view of the industrial past, he would look at the idea of an industrial "look". He is willing to work with Scenic Hudson on the 4 houses on the ridge. Parking is behind the buildings. Live/work has the second floor as a loft which would be more suitable to adult living only. He is interested in LEED certification. Rain gardens would be used to manage storm water.

- Cynthia Hamm: How are construction trucks going to get in and out of the Marathon site? The only apparent access appears to be Wall Street which cannot handle trucks.
- Tom Rolston: When Marathon was operating with hundreds of workers, the only difference was that Kemble Avenue was a two-way street; obviously, Kemble Avenue would have to be taken back to a 2 way street. It can't be Forge Gate which is a private road.
- Cynthia Hamm: Is Forge Gate going back on the table as a public road?
- (didn't get the person's name, but lives in Forge Gate): Don't underestimate the number of cars – people drive to places within the village
- Elliott Hammond: The impact in the area will be tremendous. It's a quiet area now. I don't want to extend Main Street to a quiet area – Constitution Drive and The Boulevard. We already have a parking problem down there. When the battery plan was there, traffic only occurred at shift changes. This will change Cold Spring immensely. Don't overcrowd the area. We already have a parking problem down there.
- Jan Thacher: I second Judith Rose's and Peter Henderson's comments. Where did this drawing come from? Waterfront and Open Spaces workgroup never proposed anything like this.
- Tom Rolston: Me. It came from me and I was a member of that group too.
- Mike Armstrong: Question to K. Kearney – what do the rateables look like if there are more commercial buildings, for example, research? Ken Kearney : Not sure where the balance is; my risk goes up if there is increased commercial.
- (person didn't identify herself): What are the Village needs for this property?
- Stephanie Hawkins: Why can't the fire house or the post office go there?
- Phil Heffernan: There was a lot of discussion about municipal parking there.

- Tom Rolston: Unless there is a reason to park there, people won't park there. There's plenty of parking available on The Boulevard unless there's a meeting at the VFW.
- Elliott Hammond: It's a great place to provide off street parking with stickers for residents.
- Randi Schlesinger: Not adverse to responsible residential development but the proposal is too dense. There will be too much traffic on The Boulevard. The Boulevard is a lovely, quiet, peaceful street now. I'm concerned about the Lunn Terrace extension threat. A parking lot sounds like a great idea but it will create more traffic. People who live in the proposed development will use their cars. There is a traffic issue. I like the green idea of the proposal. It will take a lot more thought.
- Dick Weissbord: This is an exciting plan – except for the 4 ridge houses. Extremely skeptical about the plume, don't have any facts on this; it is possible the plume is moving since it is 2 feet below the water table.
- Ken Kearney – both the pedestal and the plume must be addressed before anything can be done. No wells can be drilled; can only excavate to a depth of 15 feet in the pedestal area.
- Phil Heffernan – The drawings are interesting, it's an interesting approach. Tough location for entrance and exit. It will have a significant impact to the residents of the area. What can reasonably be done under current zoning (light industry)? Drawings assume a change of zoning.
- Ken Kearney – under current zoning, the best use we see would be to create self-storage buildings; outdoor storage is allowed. For example, on the 7 acre parcel, it permits a 95,000 square foot footprint. With multiple 2 stories and a basement, fully sprinklered with climate control, it could be approximately 250,000 square feet of storage with elevator. With the second parcel, it could increase to approximately 300,000 square feet of storage. Does the market support 300,000 square feet of storage? Probably not right now. But the demand is here. I'm opposed to industry down there. I am opposed to single family houses on one acre lots which would be permitted under current zoning.
- Phil Heffernan: Is the site under the HDRB?
- (didn't get the name, Constitution Drive resident): This will change the character of the Constitution Drive area.
- (didn't get the name): Storage units will devalue existing homes.