

NY Forward – Capital Region - Schuylerville

Subject	MINUTES LPC Meeting #5	Date	Thursday, October 17, 2024
Place	Saratoga Town Hall 12 Spring St, Schuylerville	Time	6:00-8:00pm
Distribution	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Dan Carpenter, Mayor (co-chair) Michael Lyons (co-chair) (<i>absent</i>) Pam Pradachith-Demler Jamie Rock (<i>absent</i>) Todd Shimkus Greg Connors (<i>absent</i>) Caitlin Johnson Lori Schultz Cindy Wian Alex Zuis (<i>absent</i>) Nathan Kocak (<i>absent</i>)	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, DOS	<u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Dan D'Oca, Interboro
		<u>Public</u> Cory Heyman +17 individuals	

Meeting Summary:

Please see 'SV_LPC Meeting 5_Slides_Record' for the presentation shared during the meeting, which parallels the discussion summarized below.

Action items are called out in ***bold-italic highlight***

Welcome and Agenda

Ian (BH) welcomes the group to the 5th NY Forward LPC meeting. He briefly reviews the agenda and reminds the room that these meetings are open to the public, but not intended to be public interactive workshops.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Carpenter (LPC Co-Chair) welcomes the LPC and public, and thanks everyone for their support and involvement throughout the process.

Code of Conduct

Ian (BH) reads the Code of Conduct preamble, and reviews key points from the Code of Conduct that LPC members are expected to abide by. The list of LPC members recused for each project is presented.

Updates: Planning Process

Ian (BH) reviews what's been done so far and what is on the horizon (see slides).

- Project info is on the Instagram page and the NYF website.
- Review of engagement with each project and potential project pairings from the workshop and online engagement.

Community Engagement

Dan (Interboro) reviews the engagement results throughout the process, including the Engagement Table, website traffic, Instagram highlights, online project review survey, and a summary of overall public interest for each project.

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) presents updates and changes provided for each of the submitted projects in turn, with discussion among the LPC for each. Note that in the "challenges" section of each project, budget and timeline is not generally noted, unless there is a particularly unusual amount of risk – some level of budget and timeline risk is an unavoidable characteristic of all capital projects.

- A. Reconnect the Old Champlain Canal Under Ferry Street
 - a. Question from public concerned that it's a large budget for a project that only connects a small piece of canal with the turning basin, not the whole stretch of canal. Mayor responds that this project is just a starting point towards a comprehensive vision, and that rebuilding this bridge/culvert also provides significant pedestrian improvements. Todd adds that opening the canal for water recreation is an exciting economic development improvement in tandem with the Trail, and that work on planning has been a long-term project, and the build-out will be a long-term project. Noted that the areas of contamination in the canal bed are now known, which is a necessary step prior to dredging.
 - b. Question about pedestrian safety given the heavy traffic on this road. Mayor answers that it's a state road, so not under Village control. At the time of the Empire State Trail buildout, they put in the crosswalk but determined the flashing lights weren't warranted by the data – but this is likely the change soon after better documenting traffic on the trail. This project also includes other pedestrian safety enhancements, like the grade-separated sidewalk, in addition to the wayfinding project providing clearer directional and safety signage.
- B. Build a New Village Community Center
 - a. Question about the floorplan – what is included beyond the main gathering space? Mayor answers that the 8,000sf includes office, storage, kitchen, bathrooms, and meeting spaces – a full service facility.

- b. Question about how operating and maintaining the facility will happen? Mayor answers that it's an open questions and that they have been actively working to figure out a positive arrangement, including conversations with community groups and outside communities.
 - c. Question about where the proposed site falls in relation to the flood plain, and whether there's a plan around that. Answer is that yes, the entire park is within the special flood hazard area (1% annual chance), and that the design process will have to take that into account when setting the first floor level, grading the site, and selecting resilient materials.
 - d. Confirmed that the cost estimate is intended to account for the entire capital project, including the building, grounds, and some pedestrian improvements to connect to Ferry Street Bridge.
- C. Enhance Signage and Wayfinding around the Village
- a. Question about the timeline for the project. Answer is that it would not be very long, likely within a year, maybe two.
- D. [previously removed]
- E. Pedestrianize the Alley Connecting Broad and Canal Streets
- a. Confirmed that the scope includes the alley pedestrianization, façade improvements, and boiler replacement.
 - b. Confirmed that the proposal for the alley is to completely remove vehicular access through this alley permanently.
- F. Renovate the Canal Square Building
- a. No specific comments noted.
- G. Improve Accessibility at the Dovegate Inn
- a. No specific comments noted.
- H. Reconstruct Carriage House for Rental Housing
- a. No specific comments noted.
- I. Convert 7 Broad Street into the Inn at 9 Gables
- a. No specific comments noted.
- J. Expand the Old Saratoga Motor Inn
- a. No specific comments noted.
- K. Renovate the Revolution Café and Convert Upstairs into Housing
- a. No specific comments noted.
- L. Construct a New Mixed-Use Building at the Hotel Schuyler Site
- a. Discussion about the proposed parking locations – the plan seems to include an existing residence. General agreement that the sketch must be drawn a bit too far north.
 - b. Observed that the provided site plan sketch shows a much smaller building than anticipated, and what appears to be shown in the sketch. Confirmed that it is consistent with the floor area needed for the proposed program. Mayor also observes that leaving a larger side yard to the north allows more optionality for future development onto the Verizon lot.
 - c. Discussion about the match funding – confirmed that Sponsor has provided demonstration of availability, but the project does rely on multiple sources of funding that necessarily can't be committed at this point in the project (e.g., the HCR subsidy) – this is noted under "challenges" for this project.

- M. Renovate the Village Automotive Building
 - a. LPC member notes appreciation for the significant amount of new information this sponsor has provided over the course of the process.
 - b. Conversation about how much control the Village has over the aesthetics – Mayor notes that this building is outside the historic district, so this would be limited to planning and zoning guidelines, which primarily address signage.
- N. Expand the Tiny Home Rentals at the Schuyler Yacht Basin
 - a. Question about how the units are moved in response to a flood – the ones pictured seem too big? **Consultant will follow-up with sponsor for clarity.**
 - b. Clarified that the sponsor still expressed intent to do the event barn project, but not as part of the NYF program.
 - c. Clarified that the units will be short-term rentals.
- O. Modernize 144 Broad Street
 - a. No specific comments noted.
- P. Expand Kickstart Café
 - a. Confirmed that the extension would remove 3 parking spaces.
 - b. Confirmed that plan includes expansion and rearrangement of both the kitchen and the dining area.
 - c. Discussion about ownership of the property – the business that is applying to NYF currently rents their space from a landlord, but is in the process of trying to buy the property. LPC clarifies that their intent in moving this project forward is to support this specific business in their expansion plans, and want to be sure that a NYF award would not result in a rent increase that drives them out.

LPC Q&A

Discussion around the Small Project Fund.

- Confirmed that the \$300k would come out of the \$4.5m if awarded.
- There are 4 projects proposed that could be eligible for the Small Project Fund – they are being maintained as full project applications and also being listed as demonstration of interest in the Small Project Fund – that way they have a chance for direct funding, but are also accounted for in support of the Small Project Fund.
- Reminder that the Small Project Fund would be locally administered, and would constitute a separate process open to all eligible projects/sponsors. The local administrator usually sets up a small committee per HCR guidelines – it's not just the Mayor deciding (for instance). The process is much more streamlined than the full NYF planning process.
- Reviewed some of the parameters that will be suggested in the SIP, and ultimately decided upon award during contracting with HCR.
- **LPC confirmed that the Small Project Fund should be included in the recommended slate of projects, at \$300k, with the other parameters to be discussed further.**

Discussion around the slate of projects.

- Confirmed that sponsors that require additional information, such as demonstration of matching funds, will provide the necessary info, ideally prior to submission of the SIP, but certainly prior to signing a contract with a State agency.

- Timing of awards is likely to be sometime during Q2 of 2025. These vary widely depending on the communities in a region, the complexity of their proposed projects, and the logistics of scheduling the announcement event. Consultants submit the final SIP by end of year 2024, which begins the State review.
- The SIP will focus on the local goals set by the LPC when presenting all of the project profiles – the State will nonetheless consider the full range of goals, including State program goals and effectiveness criteria.
- **LPC takes final vote on slate of projects, which includes all as presented, with no eliminations.** Consultant team will distribute formal ballots for record.

Public Comment

Question around if Sponsors are required to maintain ownership of their projects. Answer is that yes, it is a reimbursement program so Sponsors are required to finish work before receiving reimbursement, and additionally there is a clawback provision, typically 5 years.

Next steps

Consultant team will follow up with project sponsors for needed information and work to finalize the project profiles that will go into the Strategic Investment Plan to be submitted to the State by end of the year. **There will not be a sixth LPC meeting.**

Closing Remarks (LPC Co-Chairs)

No specific comments noted.

END OF SUMMARY