

## NY Forward – Capital Region - Kinderhook

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #3	Date	Thursday, August 10, 2023
Place	Van Buren Hall, 6 Chatham St	Time	6:00-8:00pm
In Attendance	<b><u>Local Planning Committee</u></b> Mike Abrams, Mayor, Co-Chair Matthew Nelson, Co-Chair Kevin Monahan Julia Joseph Ann Birckmayer Brad Lohrenz Tracey Pratt Bill Laraway Michael Tucker <i>Darren Waterston (absent)</i> <i>Gert Doriot (absent)</i> <i>Kenneth Neilson (absent)</i>	<b><u>State Team</u></b> Matthew Smith, NY DOS  <b><u>Consultant Team</u></b> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Yara Eliyan, Buro Happold Daniel D'Oca, Interboro  <b><u>Public</u></b> Renee Shur Mark Browne Dorene Weir <i>(and approx. 7 others who did not sign in)</i>	

### **Meeting Summary:**

Please see "KH\_LPC Meeting 3\_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](http://www.KinderhookNYF.com)) and email address for comments and questions ([KinderhookNYF@gmail.com](mailto: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. Paper copies are offered and digital versions were shared by email prior to the meeting.

### Updates: Planning Process & Engagement Activities

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

Overview provided of local outreach conducted during farmer's market on 7/8.

- Review of agenda, format, participants, and comments received.

- Analysis of comments revealed focus on improving Village infrastructure, parks and open space, community gathering, bike and walkability, and parking.

### Vision, Goals, and Strategies

Review of Vision and Goals as agreed to by the LPC at the prior meeting, followed by discussion on proposed Revitalization Strategies (2 mapped to each Goal).

- Question about whether name-checking Samascott Orchards in the strategies excludes other businesses?

### Project Evaluation Criteria

Ian (BH) reviews the process and timing of evaluating the projects that have been submitted through the Open Call.

- Reminder that projects will not be “ranked” – each is to be judged on its own against the criteria.
- The completed evaluation forms will NOT be shared with the public, or even with the LPC. These will be confidential in order to ensure honest and complete feedback. The consultant team will aggregate the feedback and present findings at the next LPC meeting.
- Question about whether members should express their own personal opinion, or represent the community in some way – general agreement that this is a balance that’s up to each member to calibrate for themselves – observation that all LPC members were nominated and selected because of their role in the community and their unique perspectives.

Discussion around the Small Project Fund.

- Observed that there seem to be a lot of proposed projects that might fit this category.
- Question about structuring it as a revolving loan fund rather than a grant program – this seems to be acceptable with the State and details would need to be figured out.
- Columbia County Economic Development Corporation (CEDC) identified as the most likely local administrator for the fund. Mike Tucker (LPC, CEDC) agrees to continue conversations with the Mayor regarding. Says that a loan fund couldn’t be 0% interest, but they can keep it quite low. Similar to the HCR Main Streets program.
- Confirmed that \$300k is the max amount to allocate towards this fund, but the LPC can decide to allocate less.

### Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) reviews some high-level analysis of the projects received: 24 projects from 16 unique sponsors representing about \$6.6 million in grant funding requested.

Yara (BH) presents each of 24 submitted projects in turn, with discussion among the LPC for each. The intent here was to broadly familiarize the LPC with the Projects submitted while gathering initial reactions and feedback.

1. Albany Ave Pedestrian and Bike Improvements
  - a. Question about whether the project can move forward without NYF funding – in this case, Mayor reports that the project is moving forward regardless, that the NYF funding is sized and intended to be the local match for the TAP grant, and that without NYF funding the Village would simply have to bond for that amount, which may result in higher taxes.

2. Renovation of 2 Broad St
  - a. Question about whether doing façade renovations is transformative for revitalization efforts? While this is an open question that can be debated, the purpose of the small project fund is to allow the ability of smaller facades projects to be pooled together – what may not be transformative by itself could be if part of a larger effort that reaches more of the community.
3. Modernizations at 1 Albany Ave
  - a. This project and the next one are both small projects next door to each other proposed by the same Sponsor. It is noted that asks of this size are typically deferred to a small project fund.
  - b. Some Committee members observe that they've seen this property listed for sale – State policy would require Sponsor to hold the property after grant award for some amount of time, usually 5 years.
  - c. Are roofs eligible? Yes, there's nothing excluding roofs from the program, but it may be hard to argue that it's "transformative" as a standalone project – perhaps better included in a small project fund.
4. Renovation of 3 Albany Ave
  - a. See above.
5. Re-Construction of 4 Broad St
  - a. Observed that rendering and site plan are not fully consistent – site plan shows new building with its façade at the street line whereas rendering shows considerable setback.
  - b. Question about intended use of the building – application is not entirely clear but suggests mixed-use with commercial ground floor and residential above.
6. Vanderpoel Green: Geothermal and Community Footpath
  - a. Question about portion of funding going to the geothermal vs the footpath and whether other sources have been identified.
  - b. Confirmed that the purpose of the walkways is to connect to the EST/AHET.
7. Redevelopment of 16 Hudson St.
  - a. Confirmed that this property was recently for sale, and the Sponsors are the new owners.
  - b. Cost numbers are unclear and require clarification from Sponsor.
8. Library Green Energy
  - a. Potentially better for a small project fund, also potentially eligible for other sources of funding, especially NYSEDA or National Grid.
9. Daycare at McNary Center
  - a. Questions about the church as the Sponsor – if project moves forward, Sponsor has indicated ability and willingness to setup a separate non-profit entity to manage the daycare, in partnership with an experienced operator – ie, the daycare would be open to all and non-ecclesiastical.
  - b. Observed that there used to be a daycare in this space and shortly prior to closing, ecclesiastical observations were introduced, resulting in reduced enrollment.
10. Rock Shop Restoration and Mural
  - a. Observation from state/consultant team that this size project would usually be deferred to a small projects fund. One Committee member suggests that even though it's small, the property is prominent and the proposal could therefore still be seen as having a catalytic effect, given the public-facing, community-oriented programming.
11. The Old Pharmacy Rehabilitation
  - a. Confirmed that the use proposed is commercial ground floor and residential above, exact tenants and number of units tbd.
  - b. Observation that this was purchased by Sponsor and then left to sit vacant for years – while this has been negatively viewed by some members of the public, it is also observed that the building was found to be structurally unsound, requiring a thorough re-build.

- c. Question about how much the property is worth – Ian (BH) observes that while these things vary, Sponsor seems fairly sophisticated, so the proposed \$380k match is likely chosen by the Sponsor as the capital investment that is able to be supported by the anticipated operating income.
- 12. Restaurant at the Old Dutch Inn
  - a. No comments.
- 13. Albany Ave Public Improvement
  - a. Observed that Sponsor does not have site control to implement proposed improvements.
  - b. Also observed that proposed improvements are suggested as an enhancement of the ongoing TAP-funded project – this project has featured extensive study and public engagement, and is subject to robust process rules, so major changes to scope are a big ask.
  - c. While everyone present seems to agree with the ultimate desirability of burying the power lines, the logistics and cost of doing so are simply prohibitive and would delay the larger Albany Ave project indefinitely. This work would simply never be able to get started within the 2 year window required by NYF, particularly given the required process and approvals from National Grid.
- 14. Feed and Seed Façade
  - a. Observed that project is outside the current NYF boundary, and that project size would typically be deferred to small projects fund, and that projects submitting to that fund would still need to be within the NYF boundary as set during the current process.
  - b. Observed that property is a private residence, and to the knowledge of the Committee, the building itself is vacant.
- 15. Anna Peckham House Façade
  - a. Question of whether there's historic material behind the asbestos siding.
- 16. Mixed-Use Renovation at 22 Chatham St
  - a. Need more information from Sponsor – no site plan or visualizations provided.
- 17. Exterior Refurbishment at 6 Hudson St
  - a. No comments
- 18. Historic Restoration at 9 Hudson St
  - a. Conversation about what "counts" as affordable housing – Sponsor will have to negotiate income restrictions and enforcement mechanism when contracting with State
- 19. Village Square Bandstand
  - a. General support expressed, but also requested to see if the cost could be brought down.
- 20. Hudson St Green
  - a. Question about parking lost – somewhere on the order of 12 spaces for the full version.
  - b. Question about impact on retailers – Mayor reports that business owners have been engaged and are supportive of the idea, which had actually been proposed by one of the business owners at the first workshop.
  - c. Mayor observed that Village is investigating options for additional parking lots near the Village center, which could make up for lost spots on Hudson St.
- 21. Pedestrian and Gateway Lighting
- 22. Village Marketing
  - a. Matt (DOS) observed that the scope suggested is very small, and may not be eligible. Village marketing projects thru DRI/NYF would typically be a much bigger ask that encompasses a marketing consultant, signage, design/re-branding, etc.
- 23. Rothermal Park
- 24. Van Buren Hall Renovation
  - a. Question about energy efficiency aspects – scope includes converting the space to heat pumps for heating and cooling, which would also allow removal of non-original radiator panels and refurbishment of wood wainscoting.

## Public Comment

Will team assign numerical scores to the evaluation criteria? – No, the alignment of each project will remain qualitative.

Projects will go up on the website as materials are ready – primary forum for public feedback will be the Workshop, but an online commenting platform will also be made available.

Confirmed that the African Burial Ground will not be touched by the Rothermal Park proposal.

Want to make sure that the buildings are activated economically and creating jobs – is it in the criteria? – Yes, it is implied in multiple criteria, although “jobs” is not explicitly listed.

Prevailing wages will only apply to public projects, not likely to apply to others, but each project will need to be discussed during contracting.

Is it possible to pare back pieces of scope in order to right-size projects to fit in the grant? – Yes, the project development process will work with Sponsors to identify the most feasible and impactful near term project to fund through NYF.

Question about awarding only a few big projects, or a bunch of little ones? – It’s a balance that will depend on many factors: the projects taken as a whole should have a transformative impact.

END OF SUMMARY