

**“Riverfront” Forum, April 24, 2010**  
**Cold Spring Special Board for a Comprehensive Plan**

Summary from Facilitator of two conversations:

Our charge was to talk about active and passive uses of the property; including eating establishments, performance venues and boating.

Some common themes that emerged:

- 1) The park needs to be developed in context with both its view and its history (meaning that active recreation which has nothing to do with water, views or history should be located elsewhere) and..
- 2) there was consensus across both groups to support a storage building for “Building Bridges Building Boats” and
- 3) although the residents of Cold Spring missed Dockside Restaurant, the current access to the full property with its peace and quiet is universally enjoyed and..
- 4) This is our last undeveloped stretch of waterfront property- we need to be very gentle and careful in its development.

Specifics:

1. The village has not yet signed a management agreement for the property but once it does a full plan will need to be filed. There is no budget currently to pay for development.
2. All acknowledged that a more full planning process will need to take place with far more resident input as well as state approvals
3. Access to the property (which is currently through private property will need to be solidified.

Eating Facilities:

The majority of the participants recalled that when Dockside had a restaurant they used the property far less, and because weddings and other outside activities were held there, they avoided the property on weekend evenings. They now relish the quiet access to the riverside. One participant reminded folks that many generations of residents loved using the restaurant but the majority said that they would prefer to support existing Main Street establishments now and keep the park as a park. Several had concerns about raising funds to build a facility and the concern that the ones there before all had financial challenges, so keeping a healthy tenant could be difficult.

While all agreed that picnic tables for family gatherings would be an excellent addition to the park, there was no consensus on what type of food vendor would work. Some liked

carts, others did not. Some visualized a serve only type café (food prep done elsewhere) of the sort often seen on parks and at museums. A recommendation was to go out to the catering/restaurant people in the community and see what they think they can do, and ask for business plans.

### Recreations, Boating and Fishing

A repeated theme was that the residents now enjoy passive use of the property and would like to see the peacefulness remain. Benches, picnic tables, areas to allow for adhoc games such as Frisbee and badmitten were welcome. It was noted that a skateboard area is needed but that one should be located elsewhere.

There was consensus across both groups to support a storage building for “Building Bridges Building Boats. All participants felt that the program’s link to history and the water made it fully compatible with the property. They also supported having permitted storage for resident’s kayaks and canoes (which have not been welcomed at the boat club.) Discussions included a floating dock and mooring facilities, all which would have minimal impact on the site.

Places for fishing from shore were supported. One person hopes to see a store carrying fishing gear included in the vendor plans.

No one in either group wanted motorized boats on any type. It was felt that the Boat Club should be used, and that once motorized boats were allowed, the peacefulness of the property would be lost both due to the noise, and the increased traffic. Trailer storage would be needed which would also take up more of the flat areas now used for passive uses such as Frisbee playing, strolling and dogwalking.

### Performances

Both groups felt that the property should allow performances so long as noise control mitigation and regulations are in effect. One group would entertain seeing a permanent bandshell, the other liked the idea of just bringing in a temporary stage as was done several times last year.

### Weddings and Receptions

One group felt that a place for a tent should be designated, with permitting and fees for people wanting to have receptions. They did not feel however, that parking should be provided for large groups- that arrangements should be made to shuttle attendees in from other parking areas. The other group was very opposed to having receptions, feeling that the noise mitigation would be difficult if not impossible (memories of loud music from Dockside at night) and that there are many other local venues for receptions. Allowing a

private use which includes music to take up a large area of the park was felt to not be compatible with the peacefulness and location of the space. They did not feel that any revenues from it would offset the loss of use. Both groups emphasized that very strict regulations and enforcement on the noise issue would be critical.

#### Vegetation and Shoreline treatment

Both groups would like to see a natural setting with erosion control not just riprap. Native plants and low maintenance plantings were suggested. A small area of wetlands as OSI proposed was found to be compatible. Designing it to be used for school groups was suggested.