

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

**Minutes**

**Meeting of January 23, 2014  
At Village Hall – 85 Main Street**

**Present:** Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Cathryn Fadde, Marie Early, Anthony Phillips, Dick Weissbrod

**Absent:** Michael Reisman

**Also in attendance:** Stephanie Hawkins, Village Board liaison to the Special Board

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm.

**Remarks of Chair**

Mike Armstrong opened the meeting with a report on finances. Thus far, half of the \$21,646.50 (due to be reimbursed) has been received by the Village. There appears to have been a mix-up regarding the matching volunteer hours and the second half will be applied for shortly. An additional \$6,000 from the Greenway grant remains untapped as agreed. Anne Impellizzeri pointed out that timesheets are very important at this point and Armstrong added that hours certified on timesheets will be required to claim the 50% match for the Greenway grant. Impellizzeri also stated that retroactive volunteer hours qualify and pointed out that counting hours spent in meetings would be a minimal effort from special board members. Armstrong said these hours can be claimed back to January, 2013.

Armstrong said that the Philipstown Town Board has initiated an 5-year review of the Town Comprehensive Plan to determine if any changes are necessary.

Armstrong also said that the Dockside consultants made a presentation on Dockside on Jan. 16 (on the topic of Dockside shoreline stabilization), and heard community concerns and suggestions. After the meeting, a member of the Special Board requested that it be clarified that the Dockside consultants are specifically consultants for the design for stabilization of the Dockside shoreline. At that meeting, it was mentioned that the attorneys for the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) had reviewed the draft contract between the Village and OPRHP; New York State had changed the form used for such agreements and so an update will be expedited. The cost of developing the design plan has been funded (\$75,000). The estimate to do the Dockside construction for shoreline stabilization, using one of the new techniques, is estimated to be between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.

The Village Board has agreed to send a letter to the DEC supporting the demolition of the Boat Club building. Armstrong proposed adding an agenda item for the meeting to discuss the possibility of setting up a Special Board working group to develop recommendations for the Boat Club site. There were no objections to revising the agenda to add this topic.

Armstrong said that he had submitted a Letter to the Editor to the PCNR on January 12, 2014 concerning the grant to update the Zoning, the statement in the Comprehensive Plan relative to Zoning code change, and the position of the Special Board relative to developing the grant proposal. He read the letter (see attachment at end of minutes), and then identified a modification made to the letter as published, and stated that he had objected to the modification made by the PCNR and stated that the PCNR rejected his objection.

### **Minutes, August 8, 2013 and October 24, 2013 Meetings**

Approval of the October 24, 2013 minutes was deferred to the next meeting since there were insufficient attendees from the Oct. 24 meeting at the January meeting. The minutes from the August 8, 2013 meeting had been updated based on feedback from the Oct. 24, 2013 meeting. Impellizzeri made a motion to approve the Aug. 8, 2013 minutes. The motion was seconded by Cathryn Fadde and approved unanimously

### **Report of Planning Board Liaison**

Impellizzeri reported that the Planning Board has been going through the SEQRA process and reviewing the drafts of the Expanded Environmental Assessment Form for the Butterfield project. She pointed out that the concept of “environment” under SEQRA is quite broad, ranging from things like village character to open space to storm water. The PB is headed to the determination of “significance” – are there any serious adverse environmental impacts. The PB may arrive at its determination of “significance” at its next meeting on Feb. 5. The PB then plans to address the B4A amendment and send any comments on it to the Village Board. Marie Early asked if there was any assessment in the EEAF of any impact to walkers along Route 9D and asked Impellizzeri to identify where, in the EEAF, such impact is addressed.

### **Formation of a working group for Boat Club Site**

Dick Weissbrod asked what the working group would do. Armstrong responded that thus far, the Village Board has identified the need for public restrooms and possibly a control panel for the West Street pump station there. The concept here is that the SB has \$6,000 from the Greenway grant that could be used to engage someone to facilitate a series of public meetings that would elicit a consensus on what use(s) there should be on this site (similar to what was done for Dockside and the Village Garage site). The CP has

a set of 3 principles of what should be done with the site and a series of general recommendations; copies were distributed. The working group would work on the development of a concept plan which would be shared with the village more than once to obtain community input and then come up with a consensus for what should be on that site. There was discussion on the proposal. Early made a motion that the SB form a Boat Club site working group composed of SB members, Village Boat Club members, and Village residents (7 to 9 people) to research the Boat Club site, identify available options, and obtain community feedback on those options and then present the options and recommendations on the site to the Village Board. Karen Doyle seconded the motion which was approved unanimously. It was emphasized that the timing of this task is that it is meant to be completed so that the report serves the process of cleanup and development of the site. The SB agreed that Anthony Phillips and Impellizzeri would be the SB members on the working group. The goal would be to have the report ready by the end of May.

### **LWRP Archiving**

The objective would be to provide a document to the public which would provide a framework for what the LWRP would eventually be, to assist those who eventually revive the work to complete the LWRP, and which would be helpful to the Village code writers.

For the Future Land and Water Uses (Sections IV-A), the LWRS section was distributed. Armstrong proposed that what was in the LWRS be put in the LWRP. There were one set of changes – in the LWRS document, references to the LWRS (Strategy) were changed to references to the LWRP (Program). Armstrong stated that the importance of this section is that it should be used as the basis for the changes to the code and thus should be included in the draft of the LWRP. Armstrong also pointed out that every page in the draft LWRP would contain the disclaimer “This is not an approved LWRP” and the watermark “DRAFT”. Impellizzeri pointed out that references to maps should be changed to “Figure XX” as opposed to a reference to a specific Figure.

For Projects (Section IV-B), Armstrong distributed the Table of Contents (TOC) as it currently appears in the LWRP and the TOC from the LWRS. In earlier meetings, it had been agreed that the Dog Run would be deleted from the list of projects. Armstrong suggested that, in the LWRP Projects section, there be a short paragraph (a placeholder, really, probably using the paragraph(s) from the LWRS) about each project listed, and then a reference to an index (although he probably meant the Appendix) that would contain full reports on each of the projects. (This is the normal technique in an LWRP).

Impellieri suggested that Section VI (federal and state agencies, etc.) Part A, written by Jamie Ethier, should go into the draft. Part B (local implementation) was drafted by GreenPlan and should go into the draft. The memo from Drake, Loeb on boundaries should go into the draft appendix. Section III, the Policies sections, had input

from Jamie as well, and should go into the draft LWRP. His comments should be added to the current draft.

### **Schedule Discussion**

It was agreed that, going forward, the Special Board would meet once a month on the second Thursday of the month; the next meeting will be Feb. 13. The primary agenda item would be progress from the Boat Club site working group.

### **Public Comment**

There were no questions from the public.

### **Adjournment**

Weissbrod made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Phillips and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

---

Mike Armstrong

### **Attachment:**

Tim Greco's article in the January 8 issue of the PCN&R that ran with the headline "Resistance to Rezoning Mounts" misrepresents both the views and the actions of the Special Board regarding the application for grant funding for an update of the Village's zoning code.

On January 10, 2012 the Village Board unanimously adopted a Comprehensive Plan for Cold Spring that, in section 1.3, commits the Village to "...modify the *zoning laws* where appropriate to be consistent with the objectives of this Comprehensive Plan." The

Special Board declined to take the lead on seeking grant funding last summer simply because we believed the work of updating the code was the purview of the Village Board and the Planning Board. It was not, contrary to what the article says, that the Special Board was not “interested in it.” Of course we were!

The code changes are needed to protect the character of this village, as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and the Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy. Provided the terms of the agreement with the State that govern the NYSERDA grant give the Village enough flexibility, surely getting \$75,000 to pay for work we would do anyway is cause for celebration.

Michael Armstrong,  
Chair, Special Board for a Comprehensive Plan/Local Waterfront Revitalization Program