

NY Forward – Capital Region - Cambridge

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #5	Date	Tuesday, October 24 th , 2023
Place	Village Offices, 56 N Park St	Time	5:30-7:30pm
In Attendance	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Carman Bogle, Mayor, Co-Chair Linda MacFarlane, Co-Chair Christina Becker Chris Crucetti Sue Preece Kathleen Quinn Renee Bouplon Alane Ball Chinian James Sweeney Laura Oswald Connie Brooks Chris Callahan	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, NY DOS <u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Nada Haddad, Buro Happold Laura Lourenco, EDR <u>Public</u> Sarah Ashton Allan Morrison Donna W	

Meeting Summary:

Please see "CB_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***.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Bogle delivers brief opening remarks.

The public website (www.CambridgeNYF.com) and email address for comments and questions (CambridgeNYF@gmail.com) is shared.

The Agenda for the meeting is reviewed briefly.

Code of Conduct

Code of Conduct preamble is reviewed. Recusals on file are noted and LPC is invited to submit any further necessary recusal forms.

Updates: Planning Process

Review of what's been done so far, and what is on the horizon. (see slides)

Submitted Projects: Updates and Amendments

Review of projects under consideration – general summary, amendments and updates, benefits, and challenges/risks. (see slides)

Final Vote on Slate of Projects

Review of agreed downtown vision and the evaluation criteria table that includes local goals, program goals, and effectiveness criteria. (see slides)

LPC is instructed to cut 200-300k to reach target zone of \$4-4.5m for the slate of projects. Floor opens for discussion.

- A. Old Firehouse
 - a. Brief discussion on feasibility and whether this should be a private use. Reiterated points made at prior meeting that this immediate public use is the best opportunity to rehabilitate this building and return it to service, given unusual layout and necessary structural remediation. Future attempts to find a private buyer of this property (and add it to the tax rolls) are likely to be much more successful after the proposed work is completed, which delivers a viable, structurally sound building.
 - b. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed.**
- B. Owlkill Trail
 - a. Concerns raised:
 - i. Only 0.55 miles for \$250k – observed that other Trails are actually more expensive (e.g. the Empire State Trail), but also observed that there are meaningful differences between those major mixed-use trails with fairly long-span bridges included, and this proposal for a simple walking path.
 - ii. Passes by DPW, ugly area to walk through.
 - iii. Cost could increase due to wetlands regulations.
 - b. Support of project:
 - i. Community is excited about the trail.
 - ii. Connects the village with nature.
 - iii. Others voice support.
 - c. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed.**
- C. Varak Park
 - a. No substantive comments, general support expressed for the Project.
 - b. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed**
- D. Lumberyard
 - a. No substantive comments, general support expressed for the Project.
 - b. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed.**
- E. Community Kitchen at the Co-Op
 - a. No substantive comments, general support expressed for the Project.
 - b. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed.**
- F. Library Building Additions – F₁ and F₂
 - a. LPC strongly supports both projects, agrees with Sponsor that the F₁ project to build the community room is the priority.

- b. **LPC agreed to recommend both of these Projects for funding, as proposed, with the Gazebo project (G) folded into F₁.**
- G. Gazebo
 - a. **LPC agreed to fold this project into the library project F₁, the Community Meeting Room phase** – the scope, budget and grant request would remain unchanged, but would be contracted thru the Library.
- H. Varak Building Rehabilitation
 - a. Extended discussion on the project overall, as well as the five separate scopes proposed.
 - b. General agreement that upgrades to elevator and ADA compliance would help to increase the utilization and economic impact of this property.
 - c. Question about value of the exterior rehabilitation work:
 - i. Is it economically impactful for the Village?
 - ii. Could it be funded via Historic Tax Credits?
 - iii. Suggestion that the cupola work would be the most impactful to the downtown aesthetic and feeling of a place that's cared for.
 - d. **LPC agreed to recommend portions of this Project for funding, totaling \$500k grant request:**
 - i. Remove fossil-fuel fired boiler from scope (non-compliant with program decarbonization requirements).
 - ii. Remove window replacements from scope (spec submitted likely to be non-compliant with historic district regulations).
 - iii. Remove wooden building re-siding from scope – not considered to be economically transformative, and potentially better to do in conjunction with future window replacements.
- I. Rice Mansion Rehabilitation
 - a. Concerns raised:
 - i. Funding a private residence – 3rd floor of property is observed to be residential use.
 - ii. Speculation that AirBnB reservations may not available to everyone (in contrast to a standard B&B).
 - iii. If turned into non-profit museum, then removed from tax-roll – and this is the single biggest property in the Village.
 - iv. A house museum already exists in the Village, is there really a need for another one?
 - v. In evaluation matrix, the summary goals are all marked "yellow," didn't score "green" overall in any section.
 - b. Support of project
 - i. Exterior needs refinishing, improves look of the Village – important to the general sense of revitalization and preservation.
 - ii. Observed that this is the only project offering overnight accommodations, which have been observed to be severely lacking, not only in the Village, but the entire County.
 - c. **LPC agreed to recommend portions of this Project for funding: the exterior rehabilitation and the carriage house hospitality conversion.**
 - i. Interior room renovations removed from scope.
 - ii. Project will be treated as a private sponsor, not a non-profit.
- J. Re-build 18 W Main St
 - a. LPC strongly supports re-building this historic house.
 - b. **LPC agreed to recommend this Project for funding, as proposed.**

Consultant team will confirm with sponsors of (G), (H), and (I) whether they accept the modifications proposed above. Once these answers are received, final ballots on the confirmed slate will be distributed to the LPC for formal adoption.

Public Comment

Thanks given to the committee for their work.

END OF SUMMARY