

ENVISION BREWSTER
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 8, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor Jim Schoenig
Deputy Mayor Christine Piccini
Trustee Tom Boissonnault
Trustee Mary Bryde
Trustee Teresa Stockburger
Councilman Bob Cullen – Town of Southeast
Rick Stockburger – Planning Board
Richard Ruchala – Zoning Board of Appeals
George Gasper, AIA – Resident
Bob Dumont – Business Owner
Joe Czajka – Hudson Valley Pattern for Progress

Absent: Jack Gress – Coalition for a Better Brewster

Meeting began at 7:00 with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Joe Czajka started the meeting with a report about the Organization Meeting held on Sept. 25 and stated that the meeting went well. He stated that the meeting terminated around 9:00pm and that the plan is to keep meetings to no more than two hours. Mr. Czajka provided a Comprehensive Plan Summary. See this Summary for a list of potential developers to be included in the charrette.

Developer Charrette - see report presented by Mr. Czajka for outline of PACE University participation and objective. PACE University is very interested in helping Brewster with any development planning and activities. Mr. Czajka contacts are Megan and Tiffany.

The initial plan is that Megan would host this charrette and there would be invites from the EDC to developers. PACE would write the script.
Estimated cost: \$1050.

Instead of pushing to hold the charrette on October 21, it is recommended not to rush, and hold off for a later date in order to get as many developers as possible invited. The best approach is to invite all and be as inclusive as possible. This is a public process and it's important to spread a wide net and to keep the charrette above board.

PACE would also follow up with developers after invites were distributed to ascertain how many would attend.

Discussion revolved around considering the last week in October or the first week in November for the charrette and it was suggested that each board member provide 3 nights in that time frame to advise of their availability to determine the date.

By the end of Wednesday, Oct. 9, Tiffany said she'd have compiled questions for developers which would be based on what the Village wants to see.

Further discussion explained the purpose of the charrette.

- . It is a meeting for discussion and to open up the process.
- . It is not a meeting for the Village to demand what it wants.
- . It is a meeting where the Village should establish what it wants to see in the Village and where it would like to see those things located..
- . Goal should be to explain the Village's vision.
- . Obtain any issues or barriers by the developers.

Further discussion revolved around location for the charrette.

- . Mr. Czajka suggested the school and said he would talk to Megan about location.

Mr. Stockburger stated that the meeting should be recorded.

Mr. Czajka asked about having the charrette at the hospital since they lend out their space for free and he will talk to Megan about that.

Mr. Boissonnault asked if the charrette would be recorded.

Mr. Czajka stated that PACE will provide an assessment report of the charrette.

Mr. Stockburger stated that he thought it was important to ask developers to look at the current zoning chart and ask them what they would want to see. The Village could then consider rezoning. He also suggested that the zoning chart be included in the invitation. Also want to make sure that developers' recommendations are in line with the vision of the Village.

Mr. Schoenig asked if this Board was going to show the SEQR to show that the Village is serious about wanting to execute this plan.

Mr. Stockburger stated that the developers should provide feedback on what is do-able economically in the Village.

Mr. Czajka suggested having large scale maps of the Village with zoning at the charrette.

- . Mr. Folchetti stated that he has such maps and can provide them and suggested that the committee will probably want all types of maps at the charrette (i.e., topographical, pole and matrix from 1998, etc.).
- . Mr. Stockburger asked if this could be distributed electronically.
- . Mr. Folchetti said yes, but stated that he needs to know exactly what is requested and in what size.
- . Mr. Czajka stated that 24" x 36" size would be great.

Mr. Folchetti mentioned GEIS and asked if counsel is needed to advise about that.

Mr. Czajka stated that he would get a comprehensive list of maps to Mr. Folchetti.

Various messages to developers were cited:

- . Should the entire Village be included or only certain areas?
- . Mr. Shoenig stated that it should be the entire Village --- from Borden's Bridge through North Main Street, including the school and this side of Marvin Avenue (north side), but excluding the south side of Marvin Avenue as this belongs to DEP.

Mr. Boissonnault suggested including Williams gas station (even though it's not in the blight study) because it's available and the houses behind it are available.

Mr. Stockburger mentioned that the Lobdell house is not included, but should be.

Mr. Czajka asked Mr. Folchetti if he had DEP maps.

- . Mr. Folchetti said that this would be a tax map. He also stated that if the land/area borders water, DEP owns it, except DPW garage.

Mr. Czajka asked Mr. Folchetti if maps could show parcels and Mr. Folchetti stated that he would take this from the county site.

Mr. Czajka revisited the subject of questions for the developers.

- . Should we be asking for any ideas or be specific?
- . Should we be asking for their financials (not at the charrette)?

Ms. Bryde suggested that the Board should do some research on the developers on the list.

Mr. Folchetti suggested that the developers need to come to the table and advise what would be profitable in order for the Board to make a decision on whether any suggestions are acceptable.

- . He also stated that we already danced this dance in 2003-2004 and nothing happened.
- . He stated that we're now asking these developers what can they build/recommend that the Village wants to see, and if they propose nothing viable, it's time to get another list of developers and conduct other charrettes.

Mr. Ruchala stated that the developers need to advise what would be profitable to the Village.

.Mr. Folchetti added, and what could the developers make the Village look like.

Mr. Stockburger reminded the Board that when the original zoning was done, it included condos, clusters and medium and lower cost apartments.

Ms. Puccini added that we should be asking what would work for the developers to recommend.

Mr. Stockburger suggested having a section-by-section description from the developers of what they would need.

Mr. Folchetti stated that the developers will need to advise what frontage they'd need, what footprint they'd need and what square footage they'd need and how much they could undertake and still make money.

Mr. Stockburger reminded the Board that originally the consideration was to include residential and commercial.

Ms. Bryde suggested that the Board needs to do its homework.

Mr. Stockburger stated that after the charrette, the Board would be in a better position to evaluate.

Mr. Gasper stated that he was at a loss on how to comment. As an architect, his first question would be, what has the Village done to prepare the developers, and suggested that the Village needs to tell the developers what they want first, not have the developers do the planning for the Village.

Mr. Schoenig stated that the reason the Board is starting with the developers is because the members of the Board can't say what would or wouldn't work. So, it was thought to have the developers make those recommendations and say what would work for them in the Village. And if it

works, the Village would decide if it's something that they could embrace and support.

- . Mr. Folchetti stated that the former approach was already attempted.

Mr. Gasper recommended that the comprehensive plan be shown to the developers and ask them what would and wouldn't work. He also stated that the Board needs to know with whom the developers are going to work.

Mr. Stockburger suggested asking the developers, What would you like to build here?

Mr. Gasper stated that he knows these developers and they could handle that approach. (For example, both Bob Morini and Harold Lepler own lots of properties in the Village).

- . Would their viewpoints change if the subject were presented to them in this way?
- . Suppose a proposition was made including Bob Morini's property which wasn't what he had in mind. Would he change his viewpoint on how to develop his property?

Mr. Folchetti added that, that's the point. He stated that the VOB has a Village Viewpoint document.

- . For example Mr. Morini already has property in the Village. Would it make sense for him to tear down to rebuild? There's a different incentive for those who already own property in the Village. But there needs to be an economic incentive.
- . Is there enough economic incentive to change the streetscape?
- . Would Morini's idea meet the Village's eight objectives?

Mr. Stockburger stated that we need the developers to present plans to develop in phases.

- . They need to show their ROI over a few years.
- . They would need to present the overall plan.
- . Could we do eminent domain? Prefer not to do eminent domain, but have developers make deals to develop comprehensively.
- . Need to ask developers what size property would they need?

Mr. Folchetti stated that the redevelopment can't be done parcel-by-parcel.

Mr. Ruchala stated that there need to be barriers set up and would like to see market-rate housing, unless there is a compelling reason to go otherwise, particularly since the Village already has senior housing. We can reconsider later, but for now, we should emphasize market-rate housing.

Mr. Czajka asked about redevelopment of existing housing.

- . Mr. Stockburger responded by saying that if we are redeveloping Main Street, people might say, I could tear down while others rehabilitate existing housing. As values increased, others would join in the renovation.

Mr. Gasper asked about federal and state tax credits for rehab construction or revitalizing historic structures.

- . Mr. Folchetti reminded the Board that you need to de incentivize the developers doing this.

Mr. Czajka reminded the Board that we're looking for gentrification. He also stated that displacing and the relocation of residents must be fairly dealt with according to Fair Housing.

Mr. Stockburger stated that they want a plan that the public could see and look at and pick at.

Mr. Czajka then stated other purposes for the charrette.

- . To find out what the developers' specialties are, what are their past experiences.

- . To find out which ones can work together. (Mr. Folchetti stated that they'd all fight.) We want to prevent that as much as we can.

Mr. Dumont suggested asking developers, what makes sense to them and where? If we gave you carte blanche, what would you do and where? However, with certain limitations, so they know they can't have anything

they want. Do we have a proposal of, let's say, five lots and who can do it?

- . Mr. Stockburger stated that they already tried that approach and nobody would touch it.

- . Mr. Stockburger also stated that they already tried a lot-by-lot approach and the developers said they wouldn't work that way, either.

Mr. Dumont suggested presenting developers with five properties together that we deem most attractive and lump them together and ask them what they could do with this?

Ms. Piccini asked about presenting three to five parcels together and asking what they could do with that and where would they execute that in the Village. She thought the proposal to the developers would be what size parcel do you need to develop something profitable? The developers could present their idea to the Board and the Board could decide.

Mr. Folchetti reminded the Board that today, 2013, is a very different time than 2004 and that now there is potential for urban renewal and ED and there is a capacity in the market today, due to available assistance.

- . Mr. Ruchala added that there are properties available now that weren't available then.

Mr. Dumont stated that when someone comes in and says to the developers, What can you do with this? it gets them to focus.

Mr. Folchetti stated that areas need to be highlighted and targeted.

- . Ms. Piccini stated that developers may see certain highlighted areas and be able to state what is economically viable. If the Board leaves it too open, the developers may not focus. On the other hand, some lots may not be large enough for the property to be economically viable for them to develop.

Mr. Stockburger stated that he was hesitant to suggest taking over somebody's property.

. Mr. Dumont added that this could pose a public relations issue. Better idea is to have a vision for the developer to follow-up on.

Mr. Schoenig stated that the Board could suggest particular parcels and the developers may say none are good.

Mr. Czajka reiterated that the theme to developers should be: We are looking for market-rate housing to support existing and additional retail, and to grow the Village and take care of any blight that's out there.

Mr. Boissonault asked how fast can developers pull plans together? And, we need to figure out what they need from the Board. We need to figure out what questions they need answered from us.

Mr. Folchetti talked about the controlling factor --- the waste water treatment plant. Therefore, he doesn't think that market-rate housing is the way to go because we'll never return away from residential zoning once it's implemented. And, we'll be ignoring offices and retail businesses in the future and setting ourselves up for a fall.

Mr. Czajka reiterated looking for office, healthcare facilities and retail space. He also asked about getting information on how many residential units could be supported with the current waste water system.

. Mr. Stockburger stated that we'd first have to deduct existing current usage.

Mr. Folchetti stated that the first week in November would be a better date for the charrette.

. Time is needed to do the calculations. Currently the Village is metered and if the calculations can be done, we could show the potential to the developers, show them the capacity, and show them the barrier component.

Mr. Dumont asked about what 90,000 gallons/day get in residential housing.

- . Mr. Folchetti responded that a 3 bedroom house uses between 350-450 gallons/per day/household, but that depends on conservative use.
- . Today 75 gallons/person/day is general rule of thumb.
- . Bottom line is that this information would have to be provided to the developers.
- . The good news is that what the Village is consuming in water is definable now.

Mr. Ruchala asked about lead platinum and reiterated that if we can explain what amount of water usage there is in a new building, this could serve as an incentive to developers. Emphasized that we want to incentivize as much as possible.

Mr. Gasper stated that the majority of developers will work to lead levels but won't pay to certify. Said that he built a lead qualified structure.

Ms. Piccini asked if there was anything else to address.

Mr. Czajka stated that he'd take back all this information to Tiffany at PACE and that they'd be looking at dates in the first week in November.

Mr. Folchetti stated that he thought that this was too soon because we need to assemble information (e.g., waste water balance for each parcel to see what's been consumed; the 475,000 gal/day capacity; maps). He also questioned what PACE would like to see. Mr. Folchetti suggested waiting until December.

Ms. Piccini asked that if we're waiting until December, does the Board do nothing until then or is there something else the Board can pursue; are there parallel efforts?

Mr. Stockburger stated that PACE said that they'd be able to do updating/census data because the master plan needs to be updated. And that Megan and Tiffany should come back to the Board with whatever else they need.

Mr. Czajka stated that there are other items in documents that need to be updated in the next six to eight weeks. And, that the Board could go through the documents line-by-line. But since the public charrette is conducted after this process, he didn't think there was anything else to do at this time, simultaneously.

Ms. Piccini asked if anything else could be done to move forward with the planner.

- . Mr. Czajka stated that the County won't have money until next year.
- . Ms. Piccini stated that the County shouldn't be the Board's stumbling block and asked if they should look to their own vehicles to move forward.
- . Mr. Czajka reiterated that there really isn't anything else to be done until this stage is completed.

Mr. Gasper asked how long would it take for PACE to do what they're preparing.

- . Mr. Czajka said that it should be within 1-2 weeks.

Mr. Czajka also agreed with Mr. Folchetti about moving out the date to December in order to prepare properly.

- . Mr. Stockburger stated that it would be foolish to rush and have the developers think we're idiots.

Mr. Gasper asked if Tiffany could prepare an interim report.

- . Mr. Czajka stated that once we get the developers' feedback that's what we'll aim for.

Ms. Piccini asked about meeting next Wednesday and do we ask Tiffany to come to our next meeting.

- . Mr. Czajka answered Yes.

Ms. Piccini stated that a meeting schedule needs to be established.

- . Mr. Czajka asked about what the best time period would be.
- . Mr. Schoenig suggested holding meetings on two different days and suggested Tuesday and Wednesdays (Mondays and Thursdays are out and Friday starts the weekend).

Mr. Ruchala suggested November 18 for the charrette.

- . Mr. Folchetti said it was too soon as Peter has things to do before the meeting.
- . Mr. Czajka also stated that the developers need time to do what they need to do.

Ms. Piccini stated that the kick-off would be the beginning of December.

- . Mr. Folchetti and Mr. Stockburger stated that the Board needs to see PACE's package first.
- . Mr. Gasper asked what are we telling them and what do we expect back.

. Ms. Stockburger summarized that meetings would be every two weeks for now.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, Oct. 29 and the meeting following that meeting will be Wednesday, Nov. 13. Meetings will be held at 50 Main Street, Brewster, NY 10509.

And aiming for the charrette for the beginning of December.

. Mr. Stockburger reiterated that the Board needs to have material prior to October 29 in order to review and have feedback/comments at the October 29 meeting. All material would be going out from the EDC.

Mr. Schoenig asked if there were any other questions.

- . There were none.

Mr. Schoenig made a motion to close the meeting. This was seconded by Ms. Piccini and all agreed.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:20pm.

