

NBR Review Committee

6/13/17 5.00-6.30pm

Village Hall

MINUTES

Members Present: Jo Margaret Mano, Dennis Young, Don Kerr, Sue Wynn, Brad Barclay. Absent: William Murray, Jacob Lawrence, Floyd Kniffen.

1. Public Comment.

Michael Reade had submitted a letter to the Committee, commenting on one of the Behan NBR recommendations related to the WVRT (South End #16 on p.6). This suggested that the WVRT could be used as a bike bypass for Rt.32 N, so that a bike lane might not be needed.

Reade pointed out that Rt,32N is already a designated (and signed) State bicycle route, and northbound cyclists would encounter additional hazards in crossing the road to access the trail. He supported instead the requirement for protected bike lanes, buffered from the traffic lanes by parked cars, the latest innovation in specifying safety-conscious bike lanes. This arrangement prevents collisions with drivers opening their doors, and provides greater protection. This would conform to the Complete Streets policy adopted by the Village in 2013.. It would also encourage cyclists to shop at the businesses expected in the NBR zone, as well as in Downtown New Paltz. Mr. Reade summarized his letter for the Committee and explained protected bike lanes, citing guidelines from NATCO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) and Massachusetts DOT as well as Dutchess County studies. The committee discussed the possibility of different streetscapes in the northern and southern sections of the NBR and the need for a wide ROW to accommodate the Complete Streets enhanced cross-section of the road to include traffic lanes, protected bike lanes, sidewalks and landscaping. There is greater latitude in the northern section. The committee will research the specifics of the ROW on Rt.32N.

Rahdi Serdah explained his preliminary proposed design for the former Napa building on Rt. 32N, and was concerned about the number of parking spaces, particularly those required for retail uses, given the

narrow footprint of the 0.6 acre lot. The committee explained their recommendations were preliminary at present, it had suggested a range from 200 to 500 feet per retail square footage plus 1 space for the owner/operator, and there was also a ratio that reduced parking requirements for shared parking. The committee is still researching setback allowances on the west WVRT side as well as many other details for their recommendations on a revised NBR code. The committee noted they welcomed input from citizens with concerns about the NBR and held a public comment period before each meeting.

2. The minutes were approved unanimously, Dennis Young moved approval and Brad Barclay seconded.

3. Jacob Lawrence could not attend, but sent some ideas about the material on the agenda. He would like to see a continuous Rt. 32 N streetscape throughout the NBR zone, including a sidewalk, landscaping and a bike lane, with business frontage near the street. He would prefer parking in the rear of buildings, wants to limit asphalt parking lot coverage and hopes to continue discussion on shared parking allowances. He supports preserving as much green space as possible, particularly vegetation along the WVRT. He notes buffering with vegetation areas next to Mill Brook (Trib. 13) is important since this have a direct effect on water quality and volume.

4. The committee discussed using graphic dimensional diagrams (similar to Town of Lloyd's Code's Gateway Mixed Use District Dimensional Standards --100 Attachment 6). These graphic diagrams supplement zoning text and percentage allowance figures with a plan diagram showing typical frontage, setbacks, lot depth, lot coverage and parcel layout. The committee agreed this "form based" methodology clarified these standards and made them easier to understand for developers, planning boards, village officials and the public and agreed to use this approach. Barclay noted the diagrams need to represent percentages of landscaping and other coverage correctly.

5. The committee resumed discussing the Behan recommendations, based on input from the public workshop. So far, the committee agreed to allowing 3 stories throughout the new footprint of the Rt.32N

corridor, with the possibility of requiring 2 stories minimum to 3 stories maximum in the northern section.

5. Front/Rear Setbacks. The committee resumed discussion about setbacks. We have decided rear setbacks need to be greater on the west NBR border (the WVRT) side to safeguard the Trail corridor by preserving natural vegetation and adding buffer plantings. This setback will be greater North of Tributary 13, to buffer the stream corridor that will reduce erosion and runoff and preserve water quality. More data on stream protection buffers will be collected.

The committee has agreed that access to the WVRT will be limited to street intersections in the NBR because of liability and ADA issues. (The WVRT ROW is 66 feet).

Front Setbacks on the Rt.32N side south of Tributary 13, should be smaller (0-10' setbacks) with a broad sidewalk and well-designed furnishing area between building facade and curb, provided with planters, benches, street lawn etc, Here the building facade should be inviting to pedestrians with 70% glazed shopfront to provide visual interest.

North of Tributary 13 the front setbacks from Rt.32N could be slightly larger, to make a gradual transition as one enters the Village from the Town. A coherent facade front should be maintained. The committee agreed it was essential to require a well-designed Complete Streets Rt. 32N cross-section with protected bike lanes, landscaped tree lawn and sidewalk with benches, and other street furniture such as trash cans and planters. Streetscape dimensions may be constrained by Rt.32N ROW distances. The committee will do more research on the Rt.32N ROW distances and Complete Streets NATCO guidelines in determining if on-street parking is appropriate and the necessary requirements.

Side yard Setbacks. Setbacks of 0-15' are appropriate (as in current NBR) as well as required connections to adjacent properties when there is zero setback, by using stubs .

6. On-street parking on Rt.32N. This can be used a traffic calming device and as a buffer to protect a bike lane between the curb and parking lane. This "Protected" bike lane approach is now recommended by NATCO. This may be an approach in the southern section of the NBR, depending on the width of the ROW of Rt.32N. We will research this ROW. to see if

there are maps with the Town Assessor, Village Planner or NY DOT. The committee will revisit parking location in the northern section of the current NBR, after more data is collected.

7. Northern section recommendations. The committee will modify the height limit in the northern section to allow a minimum 2 to a maximum of 3 stories. Maximum lot coverage requirements in this area may not need be revised, since with the increased stream buffers required adjacent to Tributary 13, plus required landscaping and green spaces these requirements would supersede a percentage calculation.

8. The question raised by Behan about maximum density in the NBR was discussed. The calculated density for the current proposed Zero Place development on 1.45 acres (46 dwelling units, 8200sq ft of retail) yields a calculated density of 31.8 dwelling units and 5655 sq. ft of retail per acre, much higher than the rest of the Village. However, if a higher parking requirement is used in the future, the density question may be moot. New urbanism and form based zoning deals more with the form and appropriateness of the resulting development and less with the older metrics of bulk and use specifics.

The committee will continue to work on developing general design guidelines for form-based zoning, and revisit suggestions for these and parking location specifics in the northern part of the NBR, as well as streetscapes in the NBR after collecting more specific background data.

9. Don Kerr asked committee members if they had received any complaints about the NBR Review Committee's process in the Public Workshop or its work on the NBR. Jo Mano noted that the Village Planner, had voiced his concerns about the purpose of the NBR Review Committee and the choice of slides in the workshop presentation, but that was the only complaint she had heard. No other members had received complaints.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 6.30pm.