

Minutes

NBR Review Committee

Wednesday 22 March 2017, 5 p.m.

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

Behan Planning and Design: Senior Planner Michael Allen_present

1. Chair Jo Margaret Mano opened the meeting at 5.05pm.

The meeting began with Public Comments.

Mary Etta Schneider (Historic Huguenot Street) noted that that Historic Huguenot Street area was contiguous to the NBR zone. Since the NBR zone stated mission is encouraging mixed use, HHS needed protection from adverse impacts. She stressed other American places (like Charleston) with historic districts embraced and celebrated their heritage, but New Paltz was not. She asked the committee to carefully examine the issues of excessive building height, and making sure new buildings were compatible with the neighborhood, community character and in "height, scale, mass, architectural rhythm, siting and materials." Traffic is also a concern as the structures of the historic houses are threatened increasingly by heavy traffic. Overflow parking from the NBR district due to limited parking requirements can threaten already stressed HHS parking and neighbors along Huguenot Street. Noise and glare impacts from roof decks allowed in the current NBR are also significant potential problems.

Michael Reade (President of the Wallkill Valley Rail Trail Association) noted the importance of transportation issues, including bicycle and pedestrian concerns in the NBR district, and thoughtful planning was imperative for the safety and welfare of the community. He cited important community Transportation-Land Use studies done in 2006 that addressed these concerns and suggested plans.

Cara Lee (20 year New Paltz Village resident) thanked mayor Tim Rogers and the Village Board for funding the opportunity to re-examine the NBR zoning regulations with a view to employing design-based zoning more responsive to environmental and neighborhood concerns. She stressed the need for zoning that is sensitive to the size and shape of land parcels in the zone, environmental limitations and available infrastructure. This approach would allow the Village to achieve the mission of increased density and mixed-use development here, without proposed growth outstripping resources while maintaining New Paltz' community character. She cited the 2013 adoption of Town of Lloyd's Gateway Zoning District and its thoughtful design/form based zoning, responsive to community concerns while supporting appropriate mixed-use growth,

spurred by the Walkway over the Hudson linking regional rail-trails. She stated this is a key time for New Paltz to take a leadership role in crafting far-sighted rules like Lloyd's that chart a thoughtful future.

She supplied a detailed document, with 4 key concerns to help the committee focus on major concerns in zoning the Route 32 North corridor: Building Scale, Parking and Traffic, Design Standards, Sensitivity to Environmental and Historic Assets. She also listed significant community assets that relate to the North Chestnut/Rt.32N corridor that should be integrated into holistic community planning for this zone, and deserve consideration for the committee: Historic Huguenot Street (a National Historic Landmark) and NPV Historic Zoning District, Wallkill Valley Rail Trail, the Historic Downtown, Moriello Park, Millbrook Preserve, Nyquist/Harcourt Sanctuary, and proposed Empire State Trail route.

Another comment was received by email from Mary-Jo Johnson (New Paltz Village resident), prior to the meeting, outlining concerns about wetlands and flooding in the NBR and adjacent area, how their impact will be addressed, and if an overlay is used to identify them, how that will be addressed in the zoning code. Another concern was the control of light and noise impacts from uses in the NBR, when those generated from commercial uses conflicted with residential. She was concerned on the new NBR impact of existing commercial uses (essential to village residents) if those uses needed to make future modifications that might now be prohibited. The footprint of the NBR, expanded in Oct 2015 from a proposal in Sept. 2015 (without notifying residents) means zoning districts in the northern sector don't conform to lot lines, causing confusion as to uses/regulations in the zone. (Digital copies of supplied comments are appended to the minutes distributed to committee members).

2. The minutes of the February 21, 2017 meeting were amended and approved.

3. Consultant Michael Allen (Behan Planning and Design) then explained his familiarity with the community and previous work with New Paltz Village, particularly on the B-3 (North Chestnut) corridor. (Found on NP Village Website under *Public Records-Resources* as: http://www.newpaltzville.org/download/archives/planning_zoning_resources/zoning_recommendations/B3-District-Zoning-Recommendations.pdf)

He went over the Scope of Behan's contracted responsibilities for this part of the NBR Review committee's work-detailed in the agenda, and in previous documents (see agenda).

4. Mr. Allen noted in the Scope there were 3 next steps to the NBR Review Committee 's work:

- 1) Reviewing the current NBR zoning and making findings about problems and possible changes,
- 2) Preparing for the public workshop and the materials for that meeting, and 3) Behan Planning

preparing a detailed recommended approach for redoing the zoning with design guidelines/form based codes.

5. Mr. Allen explained the public meeting to be held in late April would involve an interactive New Paltz Village community workshop employing a visual preference survey and using 3-D computer modeling to query community residents on their preferences for different scenarios for building form, height and setbacks. In this way participants can envision a "streetscape" of buildings plus street that can inform zoning provisions. He noted that 3 stories had been previously judged "about right" by this community. The goal in planning is finding a "Goldilocks solution" for each unique community on a continuum from broad design guidelines to strict form based codes.

6. Mr. Allen asked committee members to consider what were the most important changes made in the former B-3/now NBR zone since 2007. (Note the Design Guidelines formerly incorporated in the 2013 North Chestnut Gateway were removed in the 2015 NBR rezoning. The B-3 District became the North Chestnut Gateway district in July 2013 and then an expanded footprint became the current NBR in October 2015. This recent history described in the committee's emailed digital resources in a document titled Design Guideline History in the B3/North Chestnut Gateway/NBR zone previously distributed to committee members.

A table in his agenda considering some of the zoning changes will be considered in future NBR Review committee meetings. Mr. Allen distributed large 11" x 17" colored air photos of the NBR zone and a similar sized Village Zoning map.

7. Mr. Allen then asked for comments from committee members.

- Don Kerr noted the footprint of the now-NBR zone was changed in October 2015 from the initial change proposed in September 2015, and that too was a change from the previous B-3 zone, and such changes needed consideration. The increased allowed building site coverage in the 2015 rezoning should require increased parking requirements.
- Floyd Kniffen stated that the size and massing of allowed buildings in this zone should be comparable to other village locations at 3 stories.
- Dennis Young noted that a current NBR parking requirement of 0.5 parking spaces per unit was a really low requirement in a community like New Paltz, and a more realistic ratio due to New Paltz' specific issues was important. He stated the reduced setback in the 2015 NBR rules posed safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. Large visual impact changes were allowed by the zoning changes. Raising impervious surface coverage to 85% was also high, and some adjustment for pervious surface could be included.

8. Mr. Allen asked if other than Zero Place, were there any proposed developments

upcoming, recognizing there was a current 6 month moratorium for the NBR zone? Committee members cited the former Napa Auto Parts site as a probable future proposal for development. Allen will produce picture "mock-ups" and a Birds' eye view to show what build-out might look like in the current NBR and thus consider how to buffer negative impacts.

9. Others issues raised by the committee members and by the public in attendance included the importance of the WVRT to this NBR zone and other transportation issues (bicycle/pedestrian/parking/traffic etc) and comprehensive consideration of the general streetscape and connectivity-including sidewalks, bike lanes, curbs, curb-cuts and landscaping etc.)

Mulberry Street is the key linkage to the Hudson Valley Rail trail in Lloyd and thus to the Walkway over the Hudson, and is slated to be connected in Kingston (as well as to the south) in the future state-wide Empire Trail. Route 32N is a designated state bike route by DOT. Access to the WVRT should be limited to clear access points with appropriate safeguards. Parking for users of the WVRT is in limited supply and provisions should be made for that public amenity.

Another major issue of concern is the availability and capacity of water and sewer infrastructure in servicing the NBR zone. New development north of Tributary 13 would have to install new sewer lines, and pump stations. The Village is currently searching for new water sources, and the sewage treatment plant has peak usage spikes that approach capacity during storms with heavy precipitation.

10. The next NBR Review committee meeting will be Tuesday April 4th at 5.00 to 6.30pm in the Village Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.21pm.