

NY Forward – Capital Region - Schuylerville

Subject	AGENDA LPC Meeting #3	Date	Wednesday, August 14, 2024
Place	Saratoga Town Hall 12 Spring St, Schuylerville	Time	12:00-2:00pm
Distribution	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Dan Carpenter, Mayor (co-chair) Michael Lyons (co-chair) Pam Pradachith-Demler Jamie Rock Todd Shimkus Greg Connors Caitlin Johnson Lori Schultz (<i>absent</i>) Cindy Wian Alex Zuis (<i>absent</i>) Nathan Kocak	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, DOS Mary Barthelme, HCR Katherine Stephens, HCR Greg Wichser, DOT Region 1	<u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Mauricio Vasquez, Buro Happold Daniel D'Oca, Interboro
		<u>Public</u> Cory Heyman +4 individuals	

Meeting Summary:

Please see 'SV_LPC Meeting 3_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 third New York Forward LPC meeting. He briefly overviews the meeting 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 shares his excitement about the submitted projects.

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. LPC is invited to submit any further necessary recusal forms. Paper copies are offered, and digital versions are to be shared following the meeting.

Updates: Planning Process & Engagement

Dan (IB) review of what's been done so far, survey results, and what is on the horizon (see slides).

- Project info will be featured on the Instagram page.
- Engagement station will be introduced at the next workshop.

Projects Evaluation Criteria

Ian (BH) reviews the process and timing of evaluating the projects that have been submitted through the Open Call.

- Do we evaluate the small projects that were submitted? No, evaluation is for just the primary projects.
- Do we get community feedback on the projects?

The consultant team will share the revitalization goals, survey results, and project evaluation form on the sharepoint so the LPC can review and provide comments.

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) reviews some high-level analysis of the projects received: 15 primary projects total, from 13 distinct sponsors, with \$6.6 million requested of New York Forward funds, leveraging over \$10.3 million in total investment.

Mau (BH) presents each of the submitted projects in turn, with discussion among the LPC for each. The intent here was to broadly familiarize the LPC with the projects submitted.

1. Champlain Canalway Recreation Hub Connector
 - a. Noted that DOT commits \$600K towards the replacement of the bridge.
 - b. Observed that project also satisfies the public amenities goal.
2. Village of Schuylerville Community Center
 - a. Noted that project comes out of the Fort Hardy Park Masterplan.
 - b. Clarification that the \$2M is pulled from the master plan community estimate, which doesn't include site work.
 - c. Does this project include a gym? The project does not include plans for a gym on site.
 - d. Are there other funding options being explored? Do communities partially fund? Noted that LWRP could be explored as a potential funding source.

- e. Discussion about how the community center interacts with the baseball fields in terms of construction sequencing. Mayor states that Village is able to construct ballfields with its own funds, but new Community Center has to be built before they're able to tear down the old one and make space for the new ballfields. In the interim, only 1 field that's currently active would be impacted.
3. Village of Schuylerville Wayfinding
 - a. No specific comments noted.
4. Champlain Canal Mosaic Landmark
 - a. Clarified that the mosaic is already built, the funding needed is to build the platform where it will rest on.
 - b. If this doesn't get funded, will it still be installed? *Consultant team will confirm with project sponsor.***
5. Broad St to Canal St Walkway
 - a. Project intends to prevent car traffic on the alley and make it a pedestrian walkway.
 - b. Noted this private project had no sponsor match and the walkway had a minimal part of the total project cost. If there is State money going into this project, there should be public easement.
 - c. Does it require two project sponsors due to the location of this project? No, but if the project proposes any work across the property line, the other property owner would need to provide permission.
 - d. *Consultant team will request site plan from project sponsor.***
6. Canal Square Gateway Revitalization
 - a. What is the proposed expansion for commercial activity? Primarily enclosing portions of the existing deck space.
 - b. Noted that the total NYF request on the "Submitted Projects" table does not match the value on the slide - *Consultant team will update the total request on the project slide to reflect accurate number.***
7. Dovegate Inn Accessibility
 - a. Is the site not ADA compliant? There is an existing ADA entrance, but requires patrons to enter the dining room via the kitchen.
8. Guest Carriage House
 - a. Noted that this private sponsor has not proposed any match – requirement is minimum 25%.
 - b. *Consultant team will request better visuals from project sponsor and confirm that a match will be added.***
9. Inn at 9 Gables
 - a. Noted the project would require expanding the NYF boundary, which the LPC has agreed to.
10. Old Saratoga Motor Inn Renovation
 - a. Observed that the total project cost estimates are low.
 - b. Unclear whether new build or renovation is proposed – most LPC members under the impression that Sponsor intends to renovate an existing structure just south of the motel structure.
 - c. Can the sponsor provide a business case for the need of NYF funds? LPC is interested in receiving this from all commercial sponsors.
 - d. *Consultant team will request site plan and clarify project cost***

11. Revolution Café Renovation

- a. Does this project go through HCR? Or is this primarily a commercial project, which would go through ESD? HCR can reimburse at project milestones, while ESD would typically reimburse all upon completion.
- b. Noted short term rentals are not currently approvable under current zoning in Schuylerville – but Mayor indicates that there is an initiative to update this language in the zoning code, and expects short-term rentals to be permissible by the time this project would make it in front of the planning board.
- c. Observed that the proposal could be modified to be long-term apartment units instead of STR's. **Consultant team will raise this possibility with the Sponsor.**

12. The Schuyler Building

- a. Observed and confirmed that Sponsor's application indicates the intent to build for senior housing, which provides for relaxed parking requirements as well as access to additional funding programs.
- b. Observed the apparent corner in the proposed sketch where there isn't a street currently – observed that this sketch follows an historic photo of the original hotel, which included a driveway up the hill in this location. It is likely that this will not in fact be part of the new site plan.

13. Village Automotive Modernization

- a. Noted the application is currently incomplete – does not positively indicate the actual scope proposed, only outlines potential scopes that could be merited.
- b. Consultant team will work with sponsor to develop this application.**

14. Yacht Basin Event Barn

- a. Observed that the property is currently on the market for sale.

15. 144 Broad St Renovations

- a. No specific comments noted.

Small Project

Ian (BH) presents an overview of the small projects. Discussion about where these fit into the overall process, and reiterating that an administrator would have to be identified that could manage the process of awarding and overseeing these grants.

Public Comment

Noted that in addition to the upcoming public workshop, project sponsors will be invited to discuss projects in greater detail during LPC-4.

Ian (BH) highlights that project evaluations includes a section where LPC can request supplemental materials from project sponsors.

Next steps

LPC evaluations are due by September 4th. This allows the consultant team 2 weeks to incorporate the results into the materials for the LPC-4 meeting on 9/18.

Closing Remarks (LPC Co-Chairs)

No specific comments noted.

END OF SUMMARY