

NY Forward – Capital Region - Kinderhook

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #4	Date	Thursday, September 27, 2023
Place	Van Buren Hall, 6 Chatham St	Time	6:30-8:30pm
In Attendance	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Mike Abrams, Mayor, Co-Chair Matthew Nelson, Co-Chair Kevin Monahan Julia Joseph Ann Birckmayer Brad Lohrenz Tracey Pratt Bill Laraway <i>Michael Tucker (absent)</i> Darren Waterston Gert Doriot Kenneth Neilson	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, NY DOS <u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold <u>Public</u> <i>Approx. 31 individuals, including:</i> Kristy Silvia Dorene Weir Donna Leisi Liz Cottingham Catherine Zack Michael Susi Daniel Bopp Wendy Bopp Jim Digioia Lorraine Punnett Mark Browne Sandra Tolosa Astrid Montagano Bevis Zotaj Richard Byrne	

Meeting Summary:

Please see "KH_LPC Meeting 4_Slides_record" for the presentation shared during the meeting, which parallels the discussion summarized below.

Action items are called out in **bold-italic highlight**.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Abrams (LPC) delivers brief opening remarks.

The public website (www.KinderhookNYF.com) and email address for comments and questions (KinderhookNYF@gmail.com) is shared.

The Agenda for the meeting is reviewed briefly.

Code of Conduct

Code of Conduct preamble is reviewed. Recusals on file are noted and LPC is invited to submit any further necessary recusal forms.

Updates: Planning Process & Engagement Activities

Review of what's been done so far, and what is on the horizon. (see slides)

Noting that this LPC-4 meeting had originally been scheduled for 9/20 and was moved back to 9/27 – discussed necessity of moving back LPC-5 originally scheduled for 10/18 due to lack of lead time to properly engage with Sponsors and prepare materials – 10/25 is not available, so proposed some alternate dates, and all agreed on 11/1.

Overview provided of the second Public Workshop held on 9/5, which focused on the submitted projects.

- Review of agenda, format, and participants.
- Overview of comments revealed particular public interest in the village green, rothermal park, and McNary childcare proposals. Conversely, there were 12 projects that received less than 5 responses.

Submitted Projects

Review of agreed downtown vision and the evaluation criteria table that includes local goals, program goals, and effectiveness criteria.

Overview of projects provided, with summary analysis as well as tabular presentation of evaluation results.

Discussion of each project in turn, which included LPC evaluation results by criteria as well as LPC comments, public comments, and summary of updates provided by Sponsor.

- A. Restore the Building at 2 Broad St
 - a. No comment.
- B. Upgrade the Building at 1 Albany Ave
 - a. No comment.
- C. Revitalize the Building at 3 Albany Ave
 - a. Short discussion about whether a property being listed for sale prevents it from being funded through NYF – while not automatically a disqualifier, it is again noted that the State contracts will contain clawback provisions for any award dispersed prior to an Owner selling the property before the requisite hold period is reached.
- D. Rehabilitate the Mixed-Use Property at 6 Hudson St.
 - a. No comment.
- E. Reconstruct the Demolished Building at 4 Broad St
 - a. Discussion about the design and site plan – rendering shows building setback, but siteplan shows historic location at streetwall – consultant team believes that Sponsor intends the latter, as the siteplan and plans that were received are the most recent information from the Sponsor and would be consistent with the idea of rebuilding the fire-destroyed building.
 - b. Noted that this project has not begun any formal approvals process.
- F. Install a Community Footpath and Geothermal Upgrades at the James Vanderpoel House
 - a. Question about whether bikers would be allowed to ride thru – understanding is the Sponsor would rather avoid this.
 - b. Suggestion to remove geothermal from scope as it is not additive to the public-facing revitalization goals.

- G. Preserve the Property at 16 Hudson St.
 - a. Still not clear what's being proposed here – Sponsor addresses question and reports that he wants to perform a study with the community, but intends some combination of co-working space and gathering space, along with exterior improvements, creating jobs.
- H. Make Green Energy Updates at the Kinderhook Memorial Library
 - a. No comment.
- I. Renovate the McNary Center to Accommodate a Child Care Center
 - a. Discussion about how many children could be accommodated at this facility – should be about 30-40 to start with, potentially up to 50-70 once the infant license was obtained (different OCS regulatory category than preschool children).
- J. Upgrade the Building at 9 Hudson St for Affordable Housing
 - a. Discussion about definition of affordability – Committee would like some clarity from Sponsor about which program would be pursued and which income levels served.
 - b. Opinion expressed that workforce housing is preferred over deep affordability/supportive housing – this aligns with Sponsors narrative provided to date.
- K. Restore the Feed and Seed Building
 - a. No comment.
- L. Revitalize the Old Pharmacy
 - a. No comment.
- M. Install a Kitchen and Restaurant at the Old Dutch Inn
 - a. Committee reminded that they have private access online to the full suite of information submitted by all Sponsors, not just what's in these slides – this project includes a pitchdeck that has information on the business plan and intended fitout for the space.
- N. Restore the Façade at the Anna Peckham House
 - a. No comment.
- O. Redevelop the Mixed-Use Property at 22 Chatham St
 - a. Committee unclear on number of residential units being proposed.
- P. Restore the Building and Install Murals at the OK Rock Shop
 - a. No comment.
- Q. Make Albany Ave Pedestrian and Bike Infrastructure Improvements
 - a. Discussion about how the design has evolved – reported that the current iteration under consideration does NOT include a dedicated bikelane, but rather a shared facility.
 - b. Discussion about impact of project bonding on taxes, if grant does not move forward.
 - i. Mayor reiterates that the project MUST move forward regardless, as it is paired with a separate project to replace extremely outdated water/sewer infrastructure that runs under the street. Goal is to avoid raising taxes, but project is a must.
- R. Restore the Village Historic Bandstand and Install Public Restrooms
 - a. Confirmed that Village DPW would maintain the restrooms, and would not be a major burden.
- S. Redesign the Village Green to Become Pedestrian Friendly
 - a. Noted that there will be a special stakeholder session to discuss this project (and Rothermal) to determine a consensus moving forward.
- T. Install Lighting at Village Square
 - a. Committee agrees with observation that this proposal could be expanded to more places than just the limited run on Broad St.
 - b. Observed that the small grant amount would be a burden to administer through a State contract – suggested that this be folded into either the Bandstand project or the Village Green project.
- U. Create a Village of Kinderhook Marketing Campaign
 - a. This project was dropped by sponsor, likely ineligible.
- V. Reconfigure and Improve Rothermal Park
 - a. Idea proposed to mix/match EWF and rubber playground surfaces to achieve project goals in a cost-effective way – will be explored with consultant team.

- b. Opinion offered that Rothermal is the only major Village park, and it's primarily serving baseball/softball leaves out a lot of potential users – would like to see modifications targeted to expand user base.
 - c. Reported that splash pad must be removed from scope due to lack of water/sewer infrastructure onsite.
- W. Renovate Van Buren Hall
- a. No comment.
- X. Make Infrastructure Improvements Along Albany Ave.
- a. Noted that this project is ineligible due to lack of Sponsor site control.
 - b. Also noted that the ideas presented had been discussed extensively as part of the ongoing Village efforts along Albany Ave regarding the water/sewer infrastructure and bike/ped improvements.
- Y. Renovate the Building at 3 Chatham St
- a. No comment.

Project Evaluation

Project summaries presented that lay out all the projects in tabular format with “traffic light” scoring against each criteria category: local goals, program goals, and project effectiveness. Projects are organized into “tiers,” with those projects receiving 2 or more green lights in Tier 1, those projects receiving 2 or more red lights in Tier 3, and others in Tier 2.

Extended discussion about appropriateness of public grant money going to private landowners / business owners. Some on Committee feel that it is categorically inappropriate and that these dollars should all go towards public works – there have also been significant comments from the public to that effect. The state/consultant team acknowledges that this is a valid opinion, but that programmatically, DRI/NYF is intended as an economic development / revitalization program and that these grant monies are generally directed, in part, to private enterprise in order to catalyze further activity and revitalization – as is articulated in the state goals for the program. Committee is free to use its judgment, but is encouraged to consider that public benefit can be derived from the private sector.

Committee discusses which projects can be dropped from consideration. All agree that those projects marked as potential “small projects” should be dropped from consideration (A,B,C,D,H,L,N,Y). All further agree that the NYF boundary should remain as drawn, and therefore the Feed and Seed project (K) is ineligible.

Committee agrees to continue developing all the remaining projects. See comments by project above.

Briefly confirmed that a Small Projects Fund will be included – discussions with Columbia County EDC as the Local Program Administrator are ongoing.

Consultant team will organize further outreach and coordination with sponsors to further develop the projects for a final vote at the 5th meeting.

Public Comment

Did the Village consider a ramp instead of a lift at the bandstand? – Yes, but the ADA slope on a ramp would result in much too large of a structure, rendering it infeasible for that location.

Confirmed that the daycare proposal would be open to the public, no ecclesiastical limitations (per State contracting requirements).

Some defense of Rothermal Park's current configuration and how it serves a broad audience – it has an adult exercise area, and the splash pad idea would help solidify its status as a regional destination.

END OF SUMMARY