

NBR Review Committee

6/27/17 5.00-6.30pm
Village Hall

MINUTES

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

1. Public comment. Stana Weisburd (New Paltz Town Planning Board alternate) commented on the recent Town of New Paltz Gateway informational meeting and contrasted it with the Village of New Paltz' NBR Public Workshop, and noted it was hard to find information, videos and minutes for the NBR Review Ad Hoc Committee. Chair Mano noted the reasons for differences between the 2 meetings, and said more of the committee's records were hopefully going to be available soon, as posting these meant more work for the New Paltz Village staff. The NBR meeting dates are posted on the Village calendar.
2. The 6-13-17 Minutes were approved unanimously. Sue Wynn motioned the approval and Dennis Young seconded.
3. Michael Zierler was welcomed as a new member of the committee representing the Village Planning Board, and Bill Murray was thanked for his contributions as a former member. Bill Murray is now a Village Trustee.
4. Jo Mano summarized some of the decisions reached in deciding to divide the current NBR zone into 2 different parts. The southern section, which extends from Broadhead north to Tributary 13 (Mill Brook) on both sides of Rt32N and includes the Stewart's property, will be referred to as Mixed Use Residential (MUR) to distinguish it from the current NBR and clarify discussions.
5. Jo Mano noted that the northern section of the NBR zone (from Tributary 13 northwards to the Village boundary on the west side of Rt. 32N only) is very different, with a variety of current uses --Institutional/ Educational (Gateway Andretta Center, BOCES) Commercial (Yaun Plumbing Supply, Agway, Scrub-

A-Dub Car Wash, Franz Auto Repair), Office (Access Counseling) and Residential uses) many of which are now non-conforming to NBR zoning. This northern section might be better suited to a phased development approach, based on availability or connection to central water and sewer service (similar to Portland's Growth boundary, or Ramapo Town's past landmark phased growth plan). The recent extension of the current (western) Village Gateway zone to include the former flood zone on Plains Road was cited as an example of how there could be a similar future extension of the proposed MUR. Available infrastructure is necessary to support the increased density currently planned for this part of the NBR. It was suggested a return to the previous zoning which allowed I story commercial made more planning sense until infrastructure was in place or required of a developer, as part of an overall plan, or amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

The committee discussed other key issues for the northern zone: the need to require a designed complete street and continuous streetscape with a gradual transition to the zero setback street frontages in the MUR section. In the northern zone, on street parking might not be needed because of larger lot sizes and parking could be behind buildings. ROW issues would need to be coordinated with NYDOT as well as more pedestrian street crossings to accommodate increased residential uses. A transportation plan, including implementation of the adoption by New Paltz Village in 2013 of a Complete Streets policy, is badly needed. It was noted that there was supposed to be UCWP grant money to fund such a transportation plan, but nothing had materialized so far. The bridge over Tributary 13 (Mill Brook) needs to be extended westward, or a bike/ped. bridge put in here for safety reasons.

6. The committee then focused on the southern section (now designated MUR) which has available infrastructure and is suited to handle mixed use with greater density, and additional residential on upper floors. It can be viewed as an extension of the Downtown Village core-which is already a district with mixed-use.

The committee began discussing potential permitted and prohibited uses in this southern section of the current NBR-to be called Mixed-Use Residential (MUR). The materials studied included the current New Paltz Village Use Schedule A, Existing NBR Zoning text, the Town of Lloyd Gateway District Permitted and Prohibited Uses and Supplementary standards (part of 2013 Lloyd Zoning text) and the City of Poughkeepsie Gateway District text. Interpretation of the large scale aerial photo being used to study the NBR district has to be interpreted carefully as the white lot lines do not show

actual lot boundaries correctly, particularly in the MUR area, where "lot lines" are shifted westward. Small lot sizes on some properties mean on-site parking is any issue, and it was suggested smaller lots might be better suited for all office uses rather than requiring upper floors be residential. Perhaps requiring a minimum of 2 stories and maximum of 3 stories and 40' to allow for peaked roofs would be a more flexible metric.

7. The committee discussed how putting permitted and prohibited uses in the MUR zoning text and use schedule would clarify those issues for applicants/developers, the Planning Board and the community. While the current NBR zoning process was envisioned to be flexible, it has proved confusing. The committee discussed preliminary options on permitted and prohibited uses in the MUR, but will study the issue further and continue deliberations at the next meeting on July 11. The 2013 Lloyd Gateway zoning was used as a guide (as suggested by UCPB in the 2015 zoning referral letter). The potential MUR permitted uses on buildings fronting on Rt.32N should have first floor uses limited to retail and service businesses, general and professional offices, restaurants, artisanal and cultural uses. The first floor facing away from Rt.32N may have apartments, perhaps with a special use permit. Upper stories may be residential or perhaps occupied by any of the permitted uses.

Prohibited uses in the MUR would include drive-in or drive through facilities (due to traffic concerns), self-storage units, banks, motor vehicle sales, and rentals, gas stations, car washes, and perhaps other uses not specified as permitted. Concerns were voiced over allowing liquor and 24 hour deli stores in the MUR. Some smaller lots might require less parking if a building was 100% office uses.

Brad Barclay explained the characteristics of the Poughkeepsie Gateway district and how that 2013 zoning aimed to reclaim an older industrial zone for new uses, encouraged by the proximity of the Walkway Over the Hudson and Dutchess Rail Trail.

Committee members agreed the Lloyd Gateway zoning regulations were more relevant to those needed for the MUR. The need for supplementary standards, and specific requirements suitable for special permit uses will be revisited in future meetings.

8. Setbacks were reviewed. So far, for the MUR (southern section of current NBR) we have agreed to recommend zero front setbacks if a broad sidewalk, tree plantings and street furnishings are provided, plus accommodations for a

protected bike lane and on-street parking if the ROW is sufficient. Side yards should be 0-15 feet with stubs provided to permit shared parking in and access to adjacent properties. In the MUR, rear setbacks are 10' minimum. (Note: These are the current NBR setback regulations in this district, so essentially no changes are recommended for the MUR, just clarifications).

However, north of Tributary 13 (Mill Brook) rear setbacks have to reflect the need to buffer that stream to protect it, prevent erosion, and maintain existing vegetation. This is particularly important because climate change will bring increased intensity of storms and rainfall with consequently increased runoff. This will require more resilient protective measures. Brad Barclay shared Dutchess County's *Greenway Connections* Stream Corridor Protection guide <http://www.co.dutchess.ny.us/EnvironmentLandPres/streamcorridor.pdf> The committee discussed the hydrologic situation in this western edge of the northern section of the BNR, including the intermittent drainage in swales adjacent to the WVRT prism, and the culvert and drainage ditches from Rt. 32N which drain into Mill Brook, and their protection. The guidelines recommend a 60' wide stream protection corridor, which would require a 30' setback from the stream center-line in this northern section for a rear setback for lots fronting of RT.32N. Since some parts of this area are in the 500 yr floodplain, each site may have hydrologic limitation above and beyond of the setback requirements. Mitigation measures and green infrastructure should be employed in site plans to reduce runoff.

9. The committee discussed a recommended streetscape for the future RT.32N corridor in terms of available ROW, which is roughly a minimum of 50' wide, although wider in some places. This corridor should maintain streetscape continuity. In the southern part of the current NBR (the MUR) a parking lane adjacent to the south-bound traffic lane can serve to make a "protected" raised, bike lane. Bike lane safety considerations should minimize conflicts with pedestrian and auto traffic. The westward expansion of the bridge over the Mill Brook would mitigate the severe traffic hazards this narrow bridge creates, especially for a bike lane. A possibility of a bike/ped. bridge over the Mill Brook at this point was discussed as a possible future plan. The committee agreed there is a pressing need for a comprehensive transportation and traffic plan for the Village of New Paltz.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 6.37pm