

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING
SPECIAL BOARD for a
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PLAN**

**Minutes
Meeting of May 26, 2011
At Village Hall, 85 Main Street**

Present: Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice-Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Marie Early, Cathryn Fadde, Anthony Phillips, Michael Reisman

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong thanked everyone for their contributions to the May 14 Community Workshop. He reported that although few people attended the Special Board's tour of the Village Garage site on Saturday, May 21 from 1 to 2pm, the conversations that were had were quite productive; a second tour may be considered. He also reported that at the Village Board meeting on May 24, the Village Board discussed the Comprehensive Plan and decided to go back to Ted Fink and ask him to review the objectives and public comments to determine what changes to the objectives might be appropriate and report back to the Village Board.

Armstrong said there are some topics that will be deferred to future meetings: whether or not to proceed with Phase 2 of the LWRP; whether to schedule additional workshops (similar to the May 14 Workshop); additional discussions on the technical content of the mapping work.

Anne Impellizzeri pointed out that the drawings are still being displayed at the Village Hall, and that comment forms are available there as well, which provides opportunity for additional input, which may be considered a substitute for additional workshops. She also pointed out that there will be additional public discussion on the 3 sites at Special Board meetings tonight and in June.

Minutes of April 28 meeting

Karen Doyle made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2011 meeting. Cathryn Fadde seconded the motion. All Special Board members voted in favor of the motion with Impellizzeri abstaining, because she did not attend that meeting..

Treasurer's Report

Cathryn Fadde distributed the Treasurer's Report. Any unspent money from the New York State grant will move to the 2011 – 2012 budget.

Impellizzeri noted that there was consideration of asking for a budget amendment with the State. She distributed a Budget Amendment Proposal containing the DOS approved budget and a Preliminary Amended

Budget. The Preliminary Amended Budget takes into account requirements from the Department of State. She is still working on refining the Preliminary Amended Budget. Impellizzeri reported that the State has agreed with \$15/hour for volunteer time.

Marie Early made a motion to accept the Treasurer's Report. Michael Reisman seconded the motion; it was approved unanimously (Treasurer's Report is attached).

May 14 Workshop records

Armstrong said that he has seen the notes from the three breakout groups.

Armstrong said that most comment forms were received on May 14 with a few additional forms being received afterwards. Comment forms will continue to be accepted until the end of June; the drawings will also be displayed at the Village hall until the end of June. The comments will be placed on the website. Early will transcribe the comment forms.

The PowerPoint presentation made at the May 14 Workshop is over 20 megs in size; it may take a while to load such a large file from the website. Early will modify the presentation to remove the jpegs, place the jpegs in separate folders on the website, and insert links in the presentation to the photos in an effort to make the PowerPoint file smaller which should make it quicker to open.

Marathon Discussion

Armstrong read letters from Jeff Anzevino of Scenic Hudson, and residents Judith Rose and Peter Henderson, all of whom were unable to attend the May 26 Special Board meeting. The letters voiced the writers' opinions and concerns relative to the Marathon conceptual plan. (Letters are attached and made part of these minutes.)

a) 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 Hefferenan: 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.

Future Land & Water Use Map Discussion

Armstrong distributed a document containing the consolidated comments on the FLAWUM. Armstrong said that a FLAWU map guides zoning, it does not change zoning. After some discussion it was agreed that the 2 lots on Marion should be changed back to residential, and the 2 lots on West Street should be changed back to Parks and Recreation. There was discussion on the two lots on Wall Street between Chestnut and Marion but no agreement was reached. Members were asked to review the document circulated by Armstrong and respond by June 10.

Public Comments

A question was asked as to the purpose of the Executive Session.

Executive Session

Impellizzeri made a motion to go into Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Fadde and approved unanimously.

Fadde made a motion to exit Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Doyle and approved unanimously.

Possible vote on Recommendations

Fadde made a motion to recommend to the Village Board that Stephanie Hawkins and Dick Weissbrod be appointed to fill the vacancies on the Special Board. The motion was seconded by Doyle and approved unanimously.

Impellizzeri noted that both candidates are well qualified, and that significant effort was made to reach out for additional candidates.

Adjournment

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--|--------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---------------|---------------|
| EVENT SUPPLIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| TRAINING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| MISC. REIMBURSED EXPENSES | | | | | | | | | | | | | 81.34 | | 81 | |
| RECLASSIFIED FARMERS MKT | | | | | 159.90 | | | | | | | | | | 159 | |
| Other Costs Totals | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 159.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 81.34 | | 241 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 41.00 | 3,756.22 | 4.71 | 0.00 | 2,283.34 | 1,542.20 | 170.24 | | 0.00 | 2,718.85 | 0.00 | 518.96 | 7,363.24 | | 18,398 | |
| | CONSULTANT BALANCE: | | | | | | | | TOTAL | | | | | | | 18,398 |

From: Jeff Anzevino [mailto:janzevino@scenichudson.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2011 10:40 AM
To: Michael Armstrong (m.j.armstrong@att.net)
Cc: 'Rita Shaheen'; 'Steve Rosenberg'; 'Mark Wildonger'
Subject: comments on Marathon site

Scenic Hudson is writing to provide comments on the Special Board's conceptual plan for the Marathon property.

We understand that a meeting will be held on Thursday night May 26. The conceptual plan will be discussed and the public will be given the opportunity to provide comment on the conceptual plan. Unfortunately, staff is unavailable to attend the meeting. However, because The Scenic Hudson Land Trust is an adjacent property owner and the West Point Foundry Preserve (WFPF) is a significant historic site listed on the National Register of Historic Places, we appreciate this opportunity to share with you our thoughts on the concepts under consideration for the Marathon property. As you know we are before the Planning Board for site plan review of improvements we wish to make at WFPF.

- 1) The developer of this site should provide a pedestrian connection along the east side of the Marathon site to a point opposite the former haul road. Our plan for WFPF no longer includes upgrading the haul road for seasonal vehicular access to WFPF. Rather it will be designed for pedestrian access into WFPF as Foundry Hill Trail.

The pedestrian connection could be created in one of two ways. Preferably, an eight-foot wide pervious trail would be created within a vegetated 30-foot buffer in width or more. If this is not feasible, a sidewalk of at least six-foot in width should be provided. The drawings seem to indicate a pathway all the way to the end of Kemble

Ave. This will not be possible due to an almost 15% grade. Instead Scenic Hudson is constructing the Foundry Hill Trail that will separate cars from pedestrians. Given that the Village, Scenic Hudson, and others are looking to mitigate traffic impacts in this area, we will encourage pedestrian access and access via train at WFPF. Hence, the trail -- or at minimum -- a wide sidewalk would be preferable. The sidewalk should be buffered from Kemble Avenue by a three-foot planting strip with street trees.

2) The four homes along the bluff at the south end of the property pose potential adverse visual impacts when viewed from WFPF's Foundry Cove Marsh and marsh trail, which is an important pedestrian link connecting Cold Spring Station to WFPF. Hence, we suggest that no homes be located at this location.

These homes, which would surround the historically and archeologically important Kemble House ruins and bluff, would destroy the relationship between the site of the former home and its view of the marsh.

If the Village decides that these homes must be sited at this location, at the very least a conservation easement should be provided along the bluff of sufficient width to screen the homes from view from both the trail and the marsh. The easement should be at least 100 feet wide and prohibit the removal of vegetation.

Aside from the conservation easement, in the area in which the homes would be built, a Waterfront Bluff Overlay Zoning District should be established to provide strict standards for building siting, design, and exterior colors, building materials, and vegetation management.

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

Rose
7 Marion Ave, Cold Spring, NY
8453238336
jrose@aya.yale.edu

May 25, 2011

To The Special Board

I regret that I am missing this meeting. I have to say, that I was whole heartedly dismayed to see the plans that you presented for the Marathon property. They appeared to have totally disregarded several years of efforts of the Waterfront and Open Space working group, as well as failing to take into account data collected in a resident survey and in several community meetings. I still have all this information, and if I need to go back and collect it for you I will.

For the record, no where in any of our data was there support for the density shown in the presented sketches. If you really intend for plans for the site to reflect the voice of Village residents, you will remove the bulk of the houses shown. One of the recommendations of the committee was for a cluster development overlay. I sincerely hope that the board considers allowing land use solutions such as that, which will enable the developer to build the 10 or 11 houses he is allowed under the industrial zoning, while leaving as much of the property as open space as possible.

Stepping out of my role on that committee, and speaking as an adjacent landowner, I do not support its rezoning to residential. That will only open the door to far more density than the Village can stomach. I also strongly suggest that in your sketches, the four houses located at the end of the property towards the cove be removed and that land be designated to be permanently undeveloped and potentially donated to Scenic Hudson. If individual owners are allowed to buy those end properties, the landowners will inevitably remove trees and build tall houses to try to create their own views, and thus the Foundry Cove State Area of Scenic Significance will be severely compromised.

An additional message to Mr. Kearney and son who were observed trespassing on my property after the meeting last week. Next time, should they wish to visit or have a tour, they are welcome to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Judith Rose

11 Marion Ave
Cold Spring, NY 10516

Village of Cold Spring
Attn: LWRP Special Board
85 Main Street
Cold Spring, NY 10516

May 25, 2011

Dear Members of the Special Board,

The conceptual drawing for the Marathon site presented to the public by the board disregards much of the research and analysis done earlier in the comprehensive planning process. Additionally, no-one at the last year's public forum suggested putting the village garage in the middle and surrounding it with dense mixed use development including, as was reported in Philipstown.info, "residential development ... commercial and office space to small retail, apartments and possibly three story buildings." Where did this idea come from? What people did say over and over was to protect the ridge overlooking the marsh, yet the drawing shows four large houses on the ridge.

The other overwhelming concern of people at last year's forum was the impact of additional traffic coming into the area. I challenged the board in a comment posted on Philipstown.info prior to the May 14 meeting to present a plan for a vehicular access that would mitigate their concerns but none was forthcoming. Likewise, I challenged the board to demonstrate how a development like the one in the drawing would be tax positive, since this was one of the "guiding principles" noted in the draft comprehensive plan. Again, this was not addressed.

My own view on what is appropriate for Marathon is "as little as possible." The owner has an obvious desire to build residential units. With 11.8 acres zoned I-1 he can, as of right, build 11 single family homes. Part of the site ("the pedestal") is off limits due to contamination, and the portion above the VOC plume is also most likely undevelopable, so realistically the maximum would be 8-10. That should be the starting point for negotiations.

In return for him agreeing to leave the ridge in its current undeveloped state, we grant him more density on the remainder of the site. Perhaps he's permitted to cluster 10 homes on smaller lots and add a couple of commercial units while preserving large areas of open space – something along those lines. To present a drawing showing approximately 25 single-family houses, including four on the ridge, plus numerous townhouse/apartment units, plus to be talking 3 three story buildings, etc. is absurd. It's all the owner could wish for and more, and represents what for me would be close to a worst case scenario.

Sincerely,



Peter Henderson

Signed,

Michael Armstrong