

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

**Minutes
Meeting of June 27, 2013
At Village Hall – 85 Main Street**

Present: Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Cathryn Fadde, Marie Early, Michael Reisman, Dick Weissbrod

Absent: Anthony Phillips

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:05 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong distributed a financial report showing \$24,318 expended on consulting, and \$750 expended on Drake, Loeb for legal work. An additional \$2,000 had been set aside for miscellaneous expenses of which \$704 expended to date. There is one hour of consulting work (\$90) which has not yet been billed. Remaining in the budget (from the \$27,000 DOS grant) is \$1,139. There is a holdback requirement of 10%, from the State, or \$2,700, until the completion of the LWRP – that is, the State will not reimburse the last \$2,700 until the LWRP is completed. So the DOS funds are exhausted until the LWRP is completed. The Greenway grant of \$6,000 will be used to supplement the expenditures made to date (recognizing the \$2,700 holdback).

Armstrong reported that Jaime Ethier had attended the June 18 Village Board meeting, and that a good discussion ensued during that meeting. Jaime has some follow-ups due back to the Special Board including State reviews of any laws the Village is contemplating enacting, and the standing of the LWRS and of the work so far on the LWRP. Armstrong also said that the Village Board expects to replace the Village Attorney. Lastly, he said Anne Impellizzeri is working on the required quarterly report (2Q13).

Minutes, April 11, April 25 and May 9 Meetings

Impellizzeri made a motion to approve the April 11 minutes. The motion was seconded by Cathryn Fadde and approved unanimously (Michael Reisman abstained since he did not attend that meeting).

Michael Reisman made a motion to approve the April 25 minutes. The motion was seconded by Dick Weissbrod and approved unanimously (Impellizzeri and Fadde abstained since they did not attend that meeting).

Impellizzeri made a motion to approve the May 9 minutes. The motion was seconded by Reisman and approved unanimously (Karen Doyle and Fadde abstained since they did not attend that meeting).

Report of Planning Board Liaison

Dick Weissbrod reported that there is a new member of the Planning Board – Anne Impellizzeri, and that her appointment has been approved by the Village Board. He also said that the Planning Board has written to the Village Board recommending that the Planning Board be the lead agency for the Butterfield SEQRA. The Village Board has rescinded their motion to be lead agency which means that the Planning Board will assume the lead agency role.

Review of LWRP financing and Grants: Applications, Options and Issues

For context, Armstrong stated that Jaime has recommended that the Village apply for a second, separate grant and contract with the State to implement the changes to the Village's code required to implement the LWRP. That new contract would require a Request For Proposals process with open bidding. The state's deadline for receipt of Consolidated Funding Applications (CFA) for 2014 grants is August 12, 2013. Armstrong said he has information on workshops on the CFA process if anyone wanted to attend. It was pointed out that if an application misses the August 12 deadline, or if the application is not chosen for a state grant, the next opportunity for a state grant from almost every agency would be in the summer of 2014 for the grant cycle in 2015. Impellizzeri recommended that the Village Board take the lead on this and prepare and submit any grant application, since zoning is the responsibility of the VB; she also said that she would be willing to help the VB in creating/writing the application. She pointed out that a budget would need to be included in the CFA and, at this point, a reasonable budget amount is unknown but could be estimated by experienced professionals. The state grant would require matching funds, in-kind services or volunteer time from the Village. The work required to draft the zoning code would require the work of professionals and not volunteers, so one of the challenges would be if the Village is awarded a state grant, how would the Village match the grant monies? Reisman asked what the Village Board wants to do - does the VB want to do a comprehensive reform of the zoning code, do they want to do something less dramatic, or do they not want to do anything at all? Resiman felt that this is a fundamental question. Armstrong responded that it was not really clear from the session with Ethier, although Ethier owes the VB some answers that would directly relate to the question, so Armstrong recommended waiting until the VB receives Ethier's responses. Impellizzeri described the CFA as consisting of approximately 90 questions, of which the first 30 are fairly standard information about the Village. Armstrong described the difference between the CFA submitted for the LWRP and a CFA submitted for zoning work as the former used significant material from the LWRS process (calendar, tasks, etc) while the latter is a very different process where the SB has no previous experience to call upon in

constructing the CFA. Armstrong pointed out that there is a potential for volunteer hours being generated by recording bulk and setback requirements (a part of Form Based Zoning) in Village neighborhoods potentially in partnership with the HDRB.

Weissbrod stated that the LWRP is “stuck” until zoning is resolved. Impellizzeri said that she had had a conversation with Greenway and their response was that the SB could use funds from the Greenway grant to apply to zoning changes, that use of the money could be deferred with extensions if necessary. Reisman suggested that the SB send a letter to the VB asking for the VB position on these zoning changes; he also brought up the fact that Cold Spring had a contract with the State to complete the LWRP. Armstrong pointed out that the State can grant extensions to the contract. Weissbrod made a motion, which was then supplemented by Reisman, to authorize Armstrong to draft on behalf of the SB a letter to the VB summarizing its options with respect to the CFA grant program for which the deadline is August 12 pursuant to which the VB could apply for funding for expert services in connection with reform of the Village’s zoning code and other codes changes. Weissbrod asked that the wording include enhancement of the building code. The original motion was seconded by Marie Early. Weissbrod requested that the building code be included in the changes. The vote on the motion was 6 people in favor of the motion without the building code, one person (Weissbrod) opposed. The original motion passed.

Armstrong stated that the old contract with GreenPlan is linked to the LWRP but it can be broken; the financial obligation to GreenPlan has already been fulfilled.

LWRP Document Discussion

The status of the LWRP document follows: 1) The HDRB made extensive comments on the document; the SB has never discussed those comments. Armstrong said that he personally felt that many of the comments were very good and deserve consideration for inclusion, while others comments he did not support. Options include leaving the LWRP as it is, or discuss the HDRB comments for potential inclusion. 2) Jaime Ethier has provided comments on the policies – such as should there be code changes for water based activities. Jaime’s comments have not been discussed by the SB. 3) Armstrong had concerns about the Summary section after Issues and Opportunities, provided by Michele Greig; these should also be considered. 4) Impellizzeri identified the Federal and State Actions sections: Jaime has written Part A for the SB, Part B is the application to Cold Spring. Impellizzeri felt it would be good for the SB to review these sections for consideration as well. 5) Impellizzeri also identified Section 7 (local commitment) which she has drafted, also for consideration. As for finances, Impellizzeri felt that many of these five items do not require professional expenditure. It was agreed that the SB would suspend any future use of GreenPlan and to hold the Greenway monies in reserve for whatever use the VB identifies. Impellizzeri made a motion “With much appreciation, the SB recommends the work with GreenPlan be suspended and that they not be asked to do any more work at this time.” The motion was seconded by Reisman and unanimously approved.

Armstrong said that he has a Word document of the LWRP draft that is current. He'll circulate that to SB members. Impellizzeri said that in the second quarter report she is preparing, she had identified a date by when the I&A and the policies would be completed – August 1. She will modify the report, removing the projected completion date for the policies and will identify no further projection for Projects. She recommended that no further work be done on the policies (item #2 above) because they may require professional assistance. Weissbrod recommended addressing the HDRB comments (item #1 above). Impellizzeri felt that Section 7 should be addressed as well (item #5 above). Impellizzeri also suggested addressing Section 6 (item #4 above) but it was felt that GreenPlan involvement may be required so this will not be addressed.

Reisman has not reviewed the 5 year report on Marathon but he does not believe any changes are required. Armstrong will communicate to GreenPlan.

Schedule Discussion

It was agreed that the next SB meeting would be August 8 at 7:30 pm. At that meeting, items #1 and #5 will be discussed (HDRB and Section 7). Impellizzeri will circulate Section 7.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Doyle and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

Mike Armstrong