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

Minutes
Meeting of May 9, 2013
At Village Hall – 85 Main Street

Present: Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice Chair; Members: Marie Early, Michael Reisman, Dick Weissbrod
Absent: Karen Doyle, Cathryn Fadde, Anthony Phillips
Also in attendance: Stephanie Hawkins, Liaison from the Village Board.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:45 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong reported that the Drake, Loeb bill has been resolved, and the new invoice will be $750, as per the original agreement. He also said that the Village Treasurer has filed the first reimbursement claim against the $27,000 State DOS grant for $21,646. At this point, the Special Board will begin making claims to the Greenway grant. Armstrong distributed a financial report that showed $5,933 remaining for consulting services from the two grants. He also pointed out that we are short of matching hours, so he urged all members to send in their timesheets.

Armstrong said that he, Anne Impellizzeri and GreenPlan had a discussion on May 7 with Jaime Ethier (DOS). DOS said that the LWRP must include all code changes required from the Comprehensive Plan and the Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy. This will be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.

Armstrong asked the members to send him any comments they had on the Dockside RFP as soon as possible; all comments are due in by May 15. The Village has asked for all comments on the amended B-4 zoning by June 4. Armstrong asked the members to send him their comments by May 20 so that the comments can be discussed at the May 23 meeting so that a consolidated response can be sent to the VB.

Minutes, April 11 and April 25 Meetings

The minutes were deferred since there were insufficient members present who would be able to approve them.

Report of Planning Board Liaison

Dick Weissbrod reported that the Planning Board held an organizational meeting; the PB is still waiting for one new member and when that member joins the board, the PB will elect their new chair. The PB discussed the formula/franchise law and will send their comments to the VB. Trustee Hustis met with the PB to discuss the SEQRA review of the Butterfield plan. There was some confusion about aspects of this so Weissbrod said the PB wants to meet with the Village Board to discuss it. The PB asked its members to send their comments on the draft sections of the LWRP to the acting chair. The Dunkin Donuts bond has been received and the PB will establish a sunset date on the plan (potentially 5 years).

Report of HDRB Liaison

Marie Early reported that the HDRB approved: an amended application for a shed at the Butterfield Library; an application for a new door by Jay Siegel and Kathleen Duffet at 12 Rock Street which was approved, however the applicants were asked to revisit the style of the door and come back at a later date for final approval; an application for a fence by Kevin McGrory at 166/168 Main Street; an application for renovation (movement of windows, installation of a French door) by Mark Robohm at 194 Main Street; an amended application for solar panels by Dean Johnston at 6 Church Street.

Review of LWRP Schedule; discussion

Impellizzeri summarized the May 7 conference call held with herself, Mike Armstrong, Ted Fink and Michele Greig of GreenPlan and Jaime Ethier of DOS. She said that the State's requirement will change our direction with the LWRP. Jaime said that he had hoped that zoning in the LWRP could be treated as a project for the future. Bonnie Divine, Jaime's supervisor, said that sometimes communities can do zoning in the future if the zoning has recently undergone major changes. But that is not the case with the Village; as an example, the LWRS current and future zoning maps are quite different. There appear now to be two possibilities: a minimum number of zoning changes which would be required to complete the LWRP or a comprehensive review of zoning which could lead to much broader amending of the zoning. In either case, the zoning amendments must be in the LWRP; they cannot be made later. This led to the question of resources, which at this point, are limited (both money and people). DOS said that other communities readily obtain grant money for doing zoning work; GreenPlan agreed with this. DOS said that there will be a new round of grants in the summer so that funding could be available (those grant funds would be available in the spring). Greenway is another source of grant money with applications due in September, with grant funds being made available in early 2014. Much of the work that would have to be done to amend the LWRP is technical and would be difficult to be fully matched with volunteer labor (all these grants require matching funds/labor or cash). DOS said the LWRS does not have standing on its own but it has been accepted by the State and so it would be a shortcoming in their eyes if the LWRP does not continue what is in the LWRS. DOS

said that the HMP can be included but there is no need to explicitly state HMP. DOS said it is essential to have close cooperation with the VB. DOS also said the LWRP is essentially complete except for the zoning. DOS estimated it is likely to take another two to three years for completion. Jaime was asked if he would attend a VB meeting to describe the situation; Jaime is due to respond on this by May 10.

There was discussion among the SB members on this topic. Michele had sent Jaime a list of seven possible zoning amendments to see if they would meet the requirements. Armstrong had sent a list of questions to Jaime to clarify the required changes; no response has been received yet. So it is possible (but unlikely) that a relatively small list of zoning changes would be acceptable to DOS. Once a response is received, the SB will better understand the scope of required work and what options are available.

Review of LWRP Draft Status, including feedback from standing boards and department heads.

a. Inventory and Analysis, with Issues and Opportunities – HDRB comments have been received; no other boards have sent in comments. Some members said that they hadn't received those comments yet. This topic will be deferred to the next meeting.
b. Policies – no comments other than HDRB on policies; need Jaime's feedback
c. Land and Water Uses and Projects – deferred; some work required on Projects, need clarification from State on zoning implications
d. Implementation Section – need clarification from Jaime
e. Community Outreach Section – drafted, needs SB review
f. Appendix - the glossary, chronology and bibliography had not yet been circulated to members. Early will send out the glossary and chronology sections, update the bibliography with references from Dockside.

Planning for June 8 Public Workshop on LWRP

There was discussion as to the content of the workshop, and if a workshop should be held at this point. Early made a motion to delay the June 8 workshop until a date to be determined in the future. The motion was seconded by Michael Reisman and approved unanimously.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Impellizzeri and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 8:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

_____

Mike Armstrong