

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING  
SPECIAL BOARD for a  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PLAN**

**Minutes  
Meeting of December 2, 2010  
At Village Hall, Main Street**

**Present:** Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Marie Early, Cathryn Fadde, Marshall Mermell, Michael Reisman, Catharine Square

**Absent:** Anthony Phillips

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm.

**Remarks of Chair**

Mike Armstrong stated that a response had been received from the Planning Board, 2 responses had been received from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) , and one response had been received from the Historic District Review Board (HDRB); all have been distributed to Special Board members via email from Mary Saari. In addition, a letter to the Special Board has been received from Frances Pergamo, and a petition to the Village Board had been received regarding the Lunn Terrace Link and the private road through Forge Gate.

The Village Trustees have requested comments from the Special Board on the subjects of proposed changes to the zoning laws for fence height and the definition of ½ floors. Armstrong requested that members of the special Board forward their comments on these two zoning changes to him by Dec. 6 so that he can consolidate comments and then discuss the consolidation at the meeting on Dec. 9.

Armstrong asked Scenic Hudson for some copies of the book “Revitalizing Hudson Riverfronts” (published last June) for reference in preparation of the LWRP. Armstrong has 2 extra copies if anyone wants one. Anne Impellizzeri is checking to see if the book is available in a compressed version online (PDF format) and if she can download it.

A FOIL request has been received from Jan Thacher requesting a copy of the spreadsheet developed for the reconciliation process discussed at the October 28 meeting.

**Minutes of September 23, September 30 and November 8, 2010 meetings**

After a discussion, there was a change recommended to the September 23 minutes. Anne Impellizzeri made a motion to accept the September 23 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Cathryn Fadde and approved unanimously. Karen Doyle made a motion to accept the September 30 minutes. The motion was seconded by Marshall Mermell and approved unanimously. An error was identified in the minutes from November 8.

Impellizzeri made a motion to accept the November 8 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Doyle. Armstrong clarified that the Farmers’ Market expense (\$159 in the 2009 – 2010 budget and

discussed at the November 8 meeting) was incorrectly classified by the village. The expense was for ads in the Putnam County News & Recorder in May 2010. This expense has been brought forward and recoded to the Special Board in the 2010 – 2011 budget as an expense. Armstrong noted that this is an unplanned expense not covered by the Special Board's 2010/2011 budget. Armstrong also provided a response to a comment from the November 8 meeting regarding maps in the Comprehensive Plan. Some maps are noted as “Source – Putnam County”, that is, the data was provided by Putnam County. The maps themselves were generated by Katrina at Hudson Highlands Land Trust, which is also noted on the maps; therefore the maps are correct. The vote on the November 8 minutes were in favor Impellizzeri, Doyle, Marie Early, Fadde, Mermell, Michael Reisman and Catharine Square; Armstrong abstained since he was absent from the November 8 meeting.

### **Treasurer’s Reports for September and October, 2010**

Early pointed out that the September Treasurer’s report had been discussed at the September 23 meeting and had been approved unanimously; the Treasurer’s report is attached to the minutes from the September 23 meeting. The October Treasurer’s Report was discussed. Fadde also prepared and presented the November Treasurer’s Report. Armstrong asked if anyone had any problem with reviewing the November Treasurer’s Report as well. No concerns were voiced. Fadde pointed out that there are still some expenses pending. There was a question as to the charges for Grey Printing; the charges were for the flyers that were printed and tri-folded by Grey; volunteers placed the flyers in plastic bags (the bags were donated) and distributed them door to door. The postcards printed by Grey (\$261) were reflected in an earlier report. The postage for mailing the postcards is in two expenses (\$112 and \$38) in 2 different months. The labels were produced by Mary Saari and volunteers affixed the labels and the postage. Early made a motion that the Treasurer’s reports for September, October and November be accepted. The motion was seconded by Mermell and approved unanimously.

### **Policy on accepting further public comments**

Armstrong noted that a number of comments have been received from the public after the October 21 Public Hearing and the Special Board has begun the reconciliation process. Comments have also been requested and received (as noted earlier) from the Planning Board, ZBA and the HDRB. Kathleen Foley from the HDRB had asked for additional time to provide a statement concerning lands held by religious institutions. She has been working with Armstrong to draft a statement for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan; the email containing that statement has been forwarded to Special Board members. The topic was discussed.

Early made a motion to that the Special Board cease accepting public comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan effective today, December 2, 2010 keeping in mind that there has been over a one month period since Public Hearing and there is additional opportunity to comment at the second Public Hearing by the Village Board. The motion was seconded by Reisman. Square disagreed and stated that the Special Board should never be closed to public comments. Impellizzeri pointed out that continuing to accept comments could distort the work on the Comprehensive Plan. The vote was 6 in favor (Armstrong, Doyle, Early, Fadde, Impellizzeri, Reisman), 1 opposed (Square) and 1 abstention (Mermell).

### **LWRP discussion; status of 2010 reimbursement application, review of tasks, setting calendar**

Impellizzeri reviewed the Project Status Form (from August 23) and the current proposed dates. The materials reviewed are the same materials reviewed at the November 8 meeting. The materials have been

reviewed with the consultants to determine if the dates were realistic. Impellizzeri did not have the full task descriptions, but they are in the RFP that was sent out to all the consultants and to the Special Board. The materials indicate when it is expected and where a written deliverable is required. Impellizzeri pointed out that all the community outreach activities in 2010 need to be included. She pointed out areas and dates that will need to be changed or which are inaccurate requiring additional research.

New tentative dates were identified. Percentages (of tasks completed) were also updated. Clarification was provided as to the meaning of “plan”. A flow chart or project plan or PERT chart would be very helpful to understand the entire process. Translation from “LWRP-speak” to plain English would also be quite helpful. It would be a learning experience if the Special Board did this translation and charting themselves. Impellizzeri pointed out that reading through the RFP would assist all members in better understanding the tasks and the process itself. Task 18 is the last task involving consultants. Those tasks that are marked “complete” have been approved by the state. It was felt that those tasks that have been submitted to the Department of State (DOS) should be marked as less than 100%; there was a question as to whether the Target dates need to allow time for DOS review. We need to use the convention used by the DOS; Impellizzeri will follow up with the DOS to determine what their convention is. Impellizzeri felt that the updates made will essentially result in the December status report.

### **Appendix and Reports for Review – Streets, Transportation, Business and Parking data sets**

The content of the Appendix had been agreed to in the November meeting. The materials on the web have been reviewed. Armstrong identified 2 reports that are not yet complete – Public Transportation and Streets and Sidewalks. Armstrong distributed updated versions of those 2 reports. He also distributed two data files – Main Street businesses and Parking. Armstrong updated the Streets and Sidewalks report with parking information, missing sidewalks, payment in lieu of program in the Village, and parking fine revenue. Impellizzeri suggested that everyone review these documents and reach agreement that these are Drafts, subject to amendment and improvement, and then put these on the web and include in the Appendix. Public Transportation needs to be updated with ridership information from Metro-North and some other minor changes. Approval of the Draft Public Transportation report is not being sought. It was pointed out that the Public Transportation report refers to the “gazebo” and not “bandstand”, and that needs to be corrected. The data files are the parking space count and occupied spaces as of 2008, and the Main Street businesses with square footage and categories as of August, 2010. No updates are expected for either of the two data files. Members are requested to get any comments back to Armstrong by noon December 8. Mermell said he wanted to have policy driven documents. Impellizzeri went through the content of the Appendix and the current status. An updated Appendix will be circulated by Impellizzeri on Monday. Emergency Services will be sent out to everyone by Monday; comments should be sent back by noon on Dec. 8.

### **Discussion of Standing Board Comments**

One feedback from the Planning Board was that the Comprehensive Plan was too ambitious. Armstrong said that he felt it was appropriately ambitious for a 20-year period but fiscally conservative and responsible. Some major expenditures must be addressed, particularly in the infrastructure area (water system, sewer system, dams). The Plan addressed methods of raising money to fund these projects yet at the same time control taxes. Some items in the Plan are ambitious (the Riverwalk loop with causeway) but not including them in the Plan may mean that they would never be addressed. Prioritization will be important; grants can be sought to mitigate the cost to the Village. Mermell said that he feels that the Plan needs a Land Use and Zoning section which

would address many of the comments, and that if this was a policy document the Plan would address most of the comments. Doyle pointed out that the Planning Board provided a consolidated response to the Plan. The ZBA letters were not consolidated. Mermell said that he feels the Planning Board comments are very strong comments and need to be taken under serious advisement, and that they are serious and inform the problem of communication of the document and that they need to be addressed. Impellizzeri pointed out that some of the projects can be done in a phased manner and as grant money is available.

**Public Comments**

Questions/comments from the public included: What are reconciliation meetings? What is the process that is followed in the reconciliation meetings? What will be the product from the meetings? Is there a schedule? Has the Special Board received further public comments? The Special Board cannot say on October 21 that comments are closed and then say on December 2 that comments are closed. The Special Board should think about how it addresses and responds to public comments. How does the public know that comments are still being accepted? It was pointed out to the public that the petition was to the Village Board, not to the Special Board. Other than that, one letter was sent to the Special Board.

**Adjournment**

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Square and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marie Early, Secretary

Treasurer’s Report – October, 2010

**Cold Spring Comprehensive Plan Special Board Project Budget 2010-2011**

	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	2010/11
<b>CONSULTANT FEES AND SERVICES</b>								
GREENPLAN		3,755.00			1820.00			5,575.00
HHLT - MAPPING								0.00
<b>Consultant Fees/Services - Greenplan Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3,755.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1,820.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5,575.00</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>								
<b>Supplies &amp; Materials</b>								

PRINTING								0.00
PHOTOCOPIES								0.00
POSTAGE		1.22			42.44			43.66
MISC. SUPPLIES								0.00
								0.00
<b>Supplies &amp; Materials Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>42.44</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>43.66</b>
<b>Media/Marketing/PR</b>								
ADVERTISING								0.00
LEGAL NOTICES	41.00		4.71					45.71
DIRECT MAIL - POSTCARDS					261.00			0.00
								0.00
<b>Media/Marketing/PR Totals</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>261.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>306.71</b>
<b>Other Costs</b>								
VIDEOTAPING								0.00
FACILITY RENTAL								0.00
EVENT SUPPLIES								0.00
TRAINING								0.00
MISC. REIMBURSED EXPENSES								0.00
RECLASSIFIED FARMERS MKT					159.90			159.90
<b>Other Costs Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>159.90</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>159.90</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>3,756.22</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,283.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6,085.27</b>
								<b>6,085.27</b>

Treasurer's Report – November, 2010

**Cold Spring Comprehensive Plan Special Board Project Budget 2010-2011**

	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	2010/11
<b>CONSULTANT FEES AND SERVICES</b>								
GREENPLAN		3,755.00			1820.00			5,575.00
HHLT - MAPPING						975.00		975.00

Consultant Fees/Services - Greenplan Totals	0.00	3,755.00	0.00	0.00	1,820.00	975.00	0.00	6,550.00
---	------	----------	------	------	----------	--------	------	----------

## EXPENSES

### Supplies & Materials

PRINTING						395.00		395.00
PHOTOCOPIES								0.00
POSTAGE		1.22			42.44			43.66
MISC. SUPPLIES								0.00
								0.00
<b>Supplies &amp; Materials Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>42.44</b>	<b>395.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>438.66</b>

### Media/Marketing/PR

ADVERTISING								0.00
LEGAL NOTICES	41.00		4.71					45.71
DIRECT MAIL - POSTCARDS					261.00			0.00
								0.00
<b>Media/Marketing/PR Totals</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>261.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>306.71</b>

### Other Costs

VIDEOTAPING								0.00
FACILITY RENTAL								0.00
EVENT SUPPLIES								0.00
TRAINING								0.00
MISC. REIMBURSED EXPENSES								0.00
RECLASSIFIED FARMERS MKT					159.90			159.90
<b>Other Costs Totals</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>159.90</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>159.90</b>

<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>3,756.22</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,283.34</b>	<b>1,370.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>7,455.27</b>
-----------------------	--------------	-----------------	-------------	-------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------	-----------------

**7,455.27**

CONSULTANT BALANCE:

MISC. BALANCE:

Signed,

---

Michael Armstrong