

**Village of Cold Spring Code Update Committee
85 Main Street, Cold Spring, NY 10516
September 5, 2018**

Meeting

The Village of Cold Spring Code Update Committee held a meeting on September 5, 2018 at 7pm at the Village office at 85 Main St. Attending were board members: Bonny Carmicino, Norah Hart, Paul Henderson, Anne Impellizzeri, and Michael Reisman; Trustee Marie Early. Karen Doyle was absent.

CALL TO ORDER

M. Early called the meeting to order at 7pm.

MINUTES

P. Henderson made a motion to adopt the 6-27-18 minutes. N. Hart seconded and the motion passed 3-0-1 with B. Carmicino absent and M. Reisman abstaining. However, subsequent to the meeting it was determined that these minutes were not correctly approved; N. Hart was absent for the 6/27/18 meeting.

A. Impellizzeri made a motion to adopt the 7-11-18 minutes. P. Henderson seconded and the motion passed 5-0.

N. Hart made a motion to adopt the 7-25-18 minutes as amended. M. Reisman seconded and the motion passed 4-0-1 with P. Henderson abstaining.

M. Reisman made a motion to adopt the 8-1-18 minutes as amended. B. Carmicino seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

P. Henderson made a motion to adopt the 8-15-18 minutes as amended. N. Hart seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

FEEDBACK/EVALUATION OF AUGUST 22, 2018 PUBLIC MEETING

CUC discussed the public meeting and noted that:

- It doesn't wish to encourage construction of tall buildings at the waterfront that would block views and increase density
- During Phase II, the CUC approved 3-story building on Main St., though it is acknowledged that parking is a downside
- Consensus is that the meeting went well
- An incentive to "green" buildings might be by reducing setback requirements (and allowing a larger lot coverage) to allow thicker walls for increased insulation "as of right." This was suggested by Ethan Timm at the public hearing
- M. Early will document the comments received at the Aug. 22 public meeting and circulate the comments to all members.

- At the first meeting in October, the CUC will review all comments from the Aug. 22 public meeting and all comments received by Sept. 22, and will determine what changes, if any, should be made to the Aug. 22 materials. N. Hart will produce a draft writeup on the comment above concerning permitting thicker walls (and reduced setbacks and lot coverage).

EVALUATE STEEP SLOPE STANDARDS – Discuss proposed response/action to J. Furst comments

During the discussion it was noted that:

- J. Furst's line edits are acceptable.
- Should a review of any steep slope application include review by a civil engineer?
- Would this requirement be something the code enforcement officer can determine (without requiring applicant to engage a civil engineer each time)?
- M. Early will contact two civil engineering firms to find out their costs, and to determine if the proposed standard is reasonable and could be handled by a code enforcement officer.
- J. Furst suggests a limit be set on the extent of excavation without a permit of 2 cubic yards per 100 square feet. CUC agreed that some limit should be set and determined that it could be 1 cubic yard per 100 square feet as "customary landscaping".
- B. Carmicino pointed out that the document identifies "20 feet" in one place and "15 feet" in another; both need to be 15 feet. M. Reisman will update the document for this and the point above.
- J. Furst suggested this section should include a definition of how much of the lot is considered a steep slope. CUC is not inclined to take this suggestion as it could effectively remove all of the buildable area. In any case, there is no ban on building on a steep slope; only a requirement that a permit be obtained and proper steps be taken

EVALUATE FLOODING STANDARDS - Discuss proposed response/action to J. Furst comments

During the discussion it was noted that:

- CUC will delete the section referring to manufactured homes as these are not included, and will update the section on recreational vehicles. N. Hart has developed a new CUC will review side-by-side comparison and will circulate to the CUC for their review for the next meeting.

GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS - Discuss proposed response/action to J. Furst comments

During the discussion it was noted that:

- Standard should make more specific encouragement to follow LEED standards and to give the section "more teeth"
- It agreed with most of J. Furst's wording changes but will seek clarification to certain comments.
- M. Early will work with A. Impellizzeri to determine what changes should be incorporated.

OUTDOOR LIGHTING STANDARDS - Discuss proposed response/action to J. Furst comments

During the discussion it was noted that:

- CUC agrees with J. Furst's suggestions regarding definitions and wording

- CUC not inclined to engage an electrical engineer to review this section
- A “sunset” clause for conformance with the terms of this section is not desirable, but CUC agrees that if a change is made to existing lighting, it must be meet current code
- A prohibition on flashing neon signs will be added
- Public roadway lighting is typically exempt from local municipal ordinances
- CUC disinclined to limit holiday lighting
- CUC consensus that Village projects not be exempt from code
- CUC consensus that ZBA should have jurisdiction over lighting issues

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

B. Carmicino notified the CUC of her intention to step down from the committee citing work and family commitments.

PHASE IV TOPICS

Work of this phase covers procedures and includes:

- Evaluate/Permitting of conservation and facades easements (N. Hart)
- Evaluate/Permitting of outright demolition of existing structures (A. Impellizzeri)
- Evaluate/Permitting of conservation sub-divisions (K. Doyle)
- Amend sub-division requirements (M. Reisman)
- Evaluate adopting waterfront consistency review law (P. Henderson)

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

ADJOURNMENT

N. Hart made a motion to adjourn the meeting. P. Henderson seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 9pm.

Submitted by:
Michael Mell

Marie Early

Date