

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
 NOVEMBER 25, 2014 - DRAFT
Comprehensive Plan Committee Members

Name	Position	Email address
Jim Schoenig	VOB Mayor	jschoenig@brewstervillage-ny.gov
Christine Piccini	VOB Deputy Mayor	dpiccini@aol.com
Tom Boissonnault	VOB Trustee	TJBVOB@gmail.com
Mary Bryde	VOB Trustee	MBryde314@gmail.com
Terri Stockburger	VOB Trustee	tp.stockburger@verizon.net
Peter Hansen	VOB Clerk/Treasurer	phansen@brewstervillage-ny.gov
Bob Cullen	Town of Southeast Councilman	rcullen@southeast-ny.gov
Jack Gress	VOB Zoning Board, Coalition for a Better Brewster	jackgress@verizon.net
Richard Ruchala	VOB Zoning Board	rrr845@gmail.com
Rick Stockburger	VOB Planning Board	rstockburger@verizon.net
George J. Gaspar	VOB Planning Board, Resident (architect by profession)	gjgaia48@gmail.com
John Folchetti	VOB Engineer, Consultant to Committee	John.Folchetti@jrfa.com
Anthony Mole	VOB Attorney	am@herodesmole.com
Bob Dumont	Business	Bob@thebowlcompany.com
Paul Hesse	Patterns for Progress	phesse@pfprogress.com
Barbara Barosa	Putnam County Planner	Barbara.Barosa@putnamcountyny.gov
Meghan Taylor	EDC President	meghan.taylor@putnamcountyny.gov
Harold Lepler	Covington	haroldlepler@gmail.com
Larry Nadel	Covington	nadels@comcast.net
Don Rossi	Covington, Legal Council	dmrossi@hoganandrossi.com

Members present November 25, 2014	Members absent November 25, 2014
Jim Schoenig	Joe Czajka
Christine Piccini	Meghan Taylor
Mary Bryde	Harold Lepler
Tom Boissonnault	Bob Cullen
Richard Ruchala	Don Rossi
George Gaspar	Rick Stockburger
Barbara Barosa	John Folchetti
Jack Gress	Peter Hansen
Larry Nadel	Bob Dumont
Anthony Mole	Terri Stockburger
Paul Hesse	

Mr. Schoenig led the Committee in the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Schoenig made a motion to open the Comprehensive Plan meeting. This was seconded by Ms. Piccini and passed unanimously.

Ms. Piccini stated that Paul Hesse is officially on the Committee.

Motion to accept the November 12, 2014 meeting minutes

Ms. Piccini made a motion to accept the amended minutes from November 12, 2014.

Amendments include:

Page 4, third paragraph: Change the word “document” to “chapter”.

Page 4, fourth paragraph: Delete the last sentence, “Mr. Hansen felt the promotion of an historic district belongs elsewhere”.

Page 5, third from the last paragraph: Correct spelling of Merkel Park to Markel Park.

This was seconded by Ms. Bryde. Passed with one abstention by Mr. Gaspar.

Meeting discussion revolved around the *BREWSTER: Comprehensive Plan Recommendations* document beginning on page 5 (original document) with Highway Commercial section.

Main Street Business/Residential section: Recommendations

- . Delete Main Street

Highway Commercial section: Recommendations

- . Add a statement that says the sign ordinance needs to be addressed to reflect the needs of this highway/commercial area.

Discussion:

- . Ms. Piccini reminded the Committee of the discussion that started at the end of the last meeting. In particular, that there was agreement that business/highway/commercial one zone made sense, automotive uses in that one zone made sense --- didn't need to break it down into little pieces and this followed with their recommendation to go with one zone.
- . Mr. Hesse asked about monument signs and Ms. Piccini responded that they are allowed.
- . Mr. Ruchala commented that signs are needed along sidewalks.
- . Mr. Mole agreed that on Main Street this would make sense, however, on the roadways/sidewalks approaching the Village other types of signs might be needed.
- . Ms. Piccini stated that they need to revisit the sign laws and zoning.
- . Mr. Gress commented that the sign ordinance doesn't address that section of the Village and also suggested revisiting the law for the new highway B1 district, and disagreed with the removal of signs. Mr. Gress added that the sign ordinance isn't broken down by zone and that the Committee should consider re-establishing a better sign ordinance.
- . Mr. Gress also stated that he would like to see the section that talks about removing signs deleted. The signs that are currently present shouldn't apply to the entire Village.
- . Ms. Piccini agreed that the highway/commercial area is much different than a downtown area, and that the sign ordinance needs to be addressed.
- . Ms. Piccini suggested adding a statement that says the sign ordinance needs to be addressed to reflect the needs of that district. Mr. Gress agreed with this.

- . Mr. Gaspar stated that restrictions can be implemented without eliminating the signs.

Professional Business section: Recommendations

No changes.

Research, Office and Light Industrial section: Recommendations

- . Rewrite section to state that the new area to be business/residential/research and allow R&D back into business/residential on Main Street, as well. Light manufacturing stays in place where it is.
- . Change to B3 with R20 in it.

Discussion:

- . Mr. Nadel stated that he thought precluding residential uses on the eastern section, east of Marvin Ave. could be problematic. Too much light manufacturing in that area could cause traffic issues, and thought some type of residential (town house type) could be incorporated in that area, otherwise it might languish in turning part of the gateway into redevelopment. Mr. Ruchala agreed.
- . Ms. Barosa responded that it would have to be zoned differently.
- . Ms. Piccini asked if the recommendation would then be for two separate zones: research/light industrial and retail/business/residential.
- . Mr. Gress would like to see B1 on all of Main St.
- . Ms. Piccini reminded the Committee that it is stated that retail would be permitted with special exception at both ends.
- . Mr. Ruchala stated that the Village is too small to have all these different zones and this would just make it harder and harder for developers.
- . Mr. Nadel recommended extending business/residential section beyond Marvin Ave.
- . Ms. Barosa responded that this wouldn't allow for the R&D and that residential is already included.
- . Mr. Mole stated that residential could be allowed through special use permit in that area in order to maintain more control in that area.
- . Mr. Boissonnault asked what kind of control was needed; didn't want to scare developers away.
- . Mr. Mole responded that this would require another layer of approvals.
- . Mr. Nadel suggested including town houses.

- . Mr. Gress responded that B1 includes all but R&D.
- . Mr. Ruchala added that R&D is more sophisticated today.
- . Mr. Gress reiterated that there are too many references to special exception use permit. He also stated that he is generally against special exception use permit and suggested that the economic value would dictate the direction in order to get the best revitalization.
- . Mr. Mole suggested including what type of use specifically.
- . Ms. Piccini summarized by saying that the recommendation would be to leave light manufacturing separate from the East End district; leave it the way it is in the North End; and discuss what is required in the East End. Also, add back residential.
- . Ms. Piccini suggested a permitted use, not special exception use.
- . Mr. Ruchala commented on the current “dirty sites” in the Village: gas stations doing repairs, Greg Werner’s welding shop, and the column shop.
- . Mr. Ruchala also commented that the Committee is trying to micromanage; the money will dictate the development.
- . Mr. Gress stated that he was okay adding town houses, although at the last meeting it was called new housing.
- . Ms. Barosa asked about limiting to town houses versus calling it a residential section, which could include residences over retail stores.
- . Mr. Gaspar suggested that this could also include condominiums, and that town house is just an ownership term.
- . Mr. Gress added that this could include condos, multi-family houses, coops or town houses.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that the statement could simply say housing opportunities, without defining.
- . Mr. Nadel recommended including R&D in number 2.
- . Mr. Mole asked when they’re talking about business/residential do they mean residences over retail on the same lot or side-by-side on two different lots. Mr. Nadel responded that it could be both.
- . Mr. Ruchala suggested that this should be less complicated with less restrictions, as one never knows what a developer might propose.
- . Ms. Piccini added that the reference in number 2 talks about also allowing free-standing residential, and because it talks of “also” it implies there is the other residential, as well.
- . Ms. Piccini summarized by saying that they will rewrite to state that the new area to be business/residential/research and allow R&D back into

business/residential on Main Street, as well. Light manufacturing stays in place, distinct. (People were looking at a map to clarify this).

- . Ms. Barosa stated that this doesn't fit on Main Street. Ms. Piccini responded by saying that the way they are defining R&D they don't expect to have a laboratory with chemicals being mixed; but cautioned about how to restrict from this not happening.

- . Mr. Nadel commented that economics would dictate whether it would fit there or not.

- . Ms. Barosa stated that it would be okay to have two different zones, although the setbacks and density will need to be different.

- . Mr. Hesse suggested that the paragraph can be left the way it is, just add residential in the R&D section.

- . Mr. Ruchala restated that it has to make economic sense, and that the Village can't control everything and needs to leave some latitude.

- . Ms. Piccini clarified that the light manufacturing area is the area across from and north of Kobackers.

- . Mr. Ruchala named four lots there: Kobackers, Burke Oil, Red Fox, the Church.

- . Mr. Gress suggested the removal of number 2 completely and stick with B1 and B3 zones and incorporate residential. Business and residential should be allowed on Main Street.

- . Mr. Mole stated that the desire is not to make the zoning so complex that it's difficult to do; therefore, make the setbacks and overall dimensional requirements fit most of the district.

- . Ms. Barosa stated that it is already zoned R20 and what would happen is that it would be changed to B3 with R20 in it.

- . Mr. Ruchala stated that they should make things that exist more conforming. Problem is that currently everything is pre-existing, non-conforming, which inhibits moving forward in the Village.

- . Ms. Piccini responded that as they move forward that will be the target of the urban revitalization plan; to be able to remediate some of those issues.

Recreation and Open Space section: Recommendations

The goals that were mentioned earlier need to be included in this section.

Residential: Neighborhood Residential and Low Density Residential section: Recommendations

- . Leave this section as it is with the exception of:
Fourth paragraph, first line: delete “low-density” and delete the last sentence “With a density of two dwelling units per acre, single family homes on one-half acre lots or clusters of single family homes or town houses could be built at a density of two units per acre”.
- . Include incentive zoning to encourage cluster development to the west of the Metro North tracks.
- . Recommendation matches that we have R20 zones already stated, and we’re not undoing any of that, and it still gives us the ability to develop it.

Discussion:

- . Ms. Barosa stated that this area west of the tracks wouldn’t be changing.
- . Mr. Gress stated the area west of the tracks is an R20 zone and the property itself will limit what will be done there.
- . Mr. Gress also stated that he would like to encourage more cluster development in the area to provide incentives, e.g., two units/acre may not be sufficient. Would like to see a statement giving some leeway and more incentive.
- . Mr. Ruchala asked if there was a chance of closing the railroad crossing and going out via route 6. He was also interested in making Brewster an express stop.
- . Mr. Ruchala asked about putting development of the west side of the railroad track into the Comp. Plan.
- . Mr. Schoenig stated that the Village never would lose the train station.
- . Ms. Barosa referenced the Village engineer’s report, Revised Natural Environment and Infrastructure, that discusses the ongrade crossing, not being able to expand the platform.
- . Mr. Schoenig stated that the platform will never be extended.
- . Ms. Piccini asked if the road closed might it be extended, or was this strictly dollar driven. Mr. Schoenig responded, Yes, dollar driven, and didn’t think it would happen.
- . Mr. Gress stated that the paper road did exist at one time and that this was researched in 2006 by the Village Board.
- . Ms. Bryde asked how this would happen.

- . Mr. Gress stated that in the pre-1900 maps the road did exist. Further research into the deeds and the selling of the property never was conducted, but that's what would be required.
- . Mr. Ruchala stated that Leibel was having conversations about it.
- . Mr. Gress stated that this would be a plus to the Village. And that development of this property would change considerations.
- . Mr. Ruchala stated that an overhead walkway could be built. No need for whistles with overheads.
- . Ms. Piccini summarized that the recommendation matches that we have R20 in that area already, and we're not undoing any of that, and it still gives us the ability to develop it.

Townhouse Development section: Recommendations

Delete this section.

Public Buildings and Facilities, including the Garden Street School: Recommendations

Maintain the section but delete the use descriptions.

Discussion:

- . Ms. Piccini stated that depending on the timeline, the Garden Street School may not be included if it no longer remains public space.
- . Mr. Nadel stated that Mr. Callahan is working on a buyer.
- . Ms. Piccini asked about keeping the listing of housing options.
- . Mr. Mole recommended changing the title.
- . Ms. Barosa recommended deleting the uses for the Garden Street School.
- . Ms. Piccini asked about deleting the entire section.
- . Mr. Gaspar stated that it wouldn't be a school much longer.
- . Ms. Piccini stated that calling it a public space doesn't mix, and that there are many questions on this section. Currently, it's school district property.
- . Per Ms. Barosa, many sections and itemizations not included.
- . Mr. Gress recommended removing the section.
- . Ms. Barosa recommended keeping it in, but not describing the uses.
- . Mr. Gress and Mr. Gaspar agreed with this recommendation.

Traffic, Transportation and Public Facilities Plan section:

Recommendations

- . Strengthen the gateway (Route 6/Main Street) and not move it.
- . The Oak Street/Main Street intersection needs to be addressed.
- . Include three gateways.
- . Strengthen wording on loading/unloading zones and associated times.

Discussion:

- . Mr. Gress recommended NOT starting the gateway at Oak St. He stated that the Borden Bridge is the gateway and recommended strengthening it, not moving it. He also recommended improving the Oak Street/Main Street intersection (make it a 90 degree street)
- . Ms. Piccini recommended the Borden Bridge gateway be made more attractive.
- . Mr. Ruchala stated that Railroad Avenue is also a gateway and commented that more people see it than one thinks. Cited that this is the entrance that realtors recommend. Suggested posting a sign, "Welcome to Brewster".
- . Mr. Gress asked about putting the roadway in front of Kobackers as a gateway and the response was, No.
- . Ms. Piccini stated that she would like to see the three gateways.
- . Mr. Gress asked where the gateway from Railroad Avenue starts. Response was around Veterans' Park.
- . Mr. Schoenig confirmed that this would be where the flag is situated.
- . Ms. Piccini asked about speed bumps near Wells Park and Oak Street and about one-way streets. Response was that these are not part of this document.
- . The Committee agreed that they didn't recommend one-way streets.
- . Mr. Ruchala stated he'd like to see an entrance coming from Marvin, along the river and have it glide into the Borden Bridge gateway.
- . Ms. Piccini asked about closing traffic behind old town hall and Mr. Nadel stated waiting until the TOD information is finalized.
- . Mr. Ruchala talked about a water fountain installation.
- . Mr. Gress asked about incorporating this into the TOD district and the response was, Yes.

- . Mr. Gress brought up the subject of loading/unloading zones and that this needs to be corrected.
- . Ms. Barosa responded that this is what they are suggesting (e.g., 7am-11am timeframe and restriction to certain areas on Main Street).
- . Mr. Gress asked if that meant that they would designate where the loading zones would be.
- . Mr. Nadel commented that it would be reasonable to have a loading zone and refuse collection plan in the redevelopment.
- . Mr. Gress commented that any new building would include loading zone specs.
- . Mr. Mole commented that parking during that loading and unloading timeframe would be prohibited.

Downtown Plan: Recommendations

Page 11: Delete number 2.

Page 11: Update historic district section.

Discussion:

Page 11: Mr. Gress asked what historic income properties there were in the Village; everything is currently not-for-profit.

Page 12, third paragraph: Mr. Gress asked about the details for what is blighted. Ms. Barosa responded that the new data states that 57.4 percent is considered fair and poor conditions. Ms. Piccini added that the revised Blight Study will be distributed shortly.

Page 14, second paragraph: Mr. Gress asked about details on the Downtown Center incentives. Ms. Barosa stated that they are described earlier in the document. Mr. Gress asked about incentive provisions and Ms. Barosa responded that they are described in the Downtown Center section.

Page 14 mention of FITT to Grow NY program – Mr. Gress asked if there had been any headway in Peekskill and Ms. Piccini responded that there was nothing to report now, and that it falls under the same category as the Garden Street School and would be deleted if it doesn't move forward.

Discussion moved to the *BREWSTER: Implementation Plan* document.

- . Mr. Ruchala asked about fire protection, height restrictions, limitations, etc. Ms. Piccini responded that this information will be provided directly to VHB for incorporation into the document.

- . Mr. Nadel summarized by saying they can support six stories, but it has to be considered as to how they will reach those six stories; and one of the keys is having proper geometry. They also say that it would require that power lines be buried underground along Main Street. He added that the current zoning doesn't work for that. This needs to be remedied otherwise there won't be any fire protection.

- . Mr. Gaspar stated that everything is being driven by NYS Fire Regulations.

- . Mr. Ruchala reminded the Committee that in 2007-2008 there was talk of putting the wires underground.

- . Ms. Piccini also stated that the fire department requires bases in order for them to steady themselves before they could fight the fires.

- . Ms. Piccini also stated that part of the site plan review has to have fire department review.

- . Mr. Ruchala asked if there was a quote for burying wires.

- . Mr. Schoenig responded that the suggestion was to put pavers in the middle of the sidewalks when redoing the sidewalks.

- . Ms. Barosa stated that the Implementation Plan document needs to be updated based on the Comprehensive Plan recommendations as it needs to conform.

- . Mr. Ruchala asked about historical designation. Response was that historical designation can occur after the fact; something can always be designated historical.

Ms. Piccini reminded the Committee that the next meeting would be on Dec. 10, 2014: 7pm – 8:30pm.

- . Market Study *should* be updated and ready for review. Mr. Goman may or may not be present. *Might* be accepted at this meeting.

- . Blight Study *may not* be ready for review at this meeting.

Ms. Barosa recommended that VHB come to the first January meeting.

Market Study and Blight Study need to be accepted by the Comp. Plan Committee before they can be presented to the Village Board and accepted as official documentation to be part of the groundwork and documentation for the Comprehensive Plan.

Dates for upcoming Comprehensive Plan meetings:

January 14, 2015

January 28, 2015

February 11, 2015

February 25, 2015

Village Board meetings expected to be held on:

January 7, 2015

January 21, 2015

Mr. Gress made a motion to close the meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Nadel and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.