

NY Forward – Capital Region - Cambridge

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #3	Date	Tuesday, August 15, 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 <i>Scott Petell (absent)*</i>	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, NY DOS <u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Laura Lourenco, EDR <u>Public</u> Sarah Ashton Donna Wyanbrandt	

Meeting Summary:

Please see "CB_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**.

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. Paper copies are offered and digital versions were shared by email prior to the meeting.

* *Committee Member to be removed due to lack of participation.*

Updates: Planning Process & Engagement Activities

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

Vision, Goals, and Strategies

Review of Vision and Goals as agreed to by the LPC at the prior meeting, followed by discussion on proposed Revitalization Strategies (2 mapped to each Goal).

- For housing, maybe cut out the target demographics noted, or move them into a third bullet.
- Existing rentals are already targeted towards and well serving seniors.
- For tourism, key thing recently seems to be activities and experiences, e.g. hatchet throwing.
- Difficulties biking in the Village already, could be exacerbated by mentioned traffic calming strategies (ie bulb-outs). Pedestrian, bicycling, and vehicular concerns all have to be balanced – Main St is only “car-dominated” during commuting rush hours.
- Interest in micro-transit to recreational offerings such as community forest, tubing on Battenkill.

Project Evaluation Criteria

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

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) reviews some high-level analysis of the projects received: 14 projects from 10 unique sponsors representing about \$5.7 million in grant funding requested.

Laura (EDR) 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. Old Firehouse
 - a. Is the cost realistic? The rendering seems to suggest more than a light fit-out, seems to show new bay doors and windows etc. – these are not included in the written scope or cost estimate.
 - b. If there's a kitchen here being renovated, could that serve the Food Co-Op? Don't need 2 community kitchens almost next door, so these should be coordinated.
 - c. Any matching funds identified? Not yet, and challenge observed in obtaining future grants after give-back of sewer infrastructure grant.
 - d. Are there any code issues with the proposed occupancy? Does it need additional bathrooms, or sprinklers, etc? And is the septic sized to handle it?
2. Owlkill Trail
 - a. Is the trail surface paved, gravel, dirt, or something else? – It's a little t.b.d., but the idea is keep the whole thing permeable given the floodplain location, but to accommodate accessible entrances at key points.
 - b. Observed that trail is proposed to partially travel through private land, and that sometimes there are issues with private landowners getting cold feet about handshake agreements once the legal documents are drawn up. Recommended to obtain binding agreement PRIOR to awarding the project to ensure that it will be built as intended in a reasonable timeframe.
 - c. Additionally, it would be good for the Sponsor to demonstrate an “option B” in the event that the private landowner backs out.
 - d. Could the trail connect to Railroad Ave, which is how you would walk down to the school? Yes!

- e. Observation that this trail would really unlock recreational use of the ample open space downtown by clarifying for people where they can and cannot traverse – currently private vs public space is not well delineated.
- 3. Varak Park
 - a. No specific comments noted.
- 4. Lumberyard
 - a. No specific comments noted.
- 5. Community Kitchen at the Co-Op
 - a. Existing design relies on the church next door transferring a sliver of property, but currently looking at a Plan B, which would require giving up some parking and extending out the back.
 - b. Currently investigating septic system, existing conditions somewhat unknown, budget includes allowance for addressing this system.
- 6. Library Building Additions
 - a. Some discussion about whether this is a “municipal” or “non-profit” project, i.e., is the Village the sponsor, or is the Library? The answer is not clear, as the Village owns the land and the building, but the Library is a separate entity, but they share authority over finances. Additionally, there’s a Friends of the Library group that does fundraising. This question doesn’t particularly affect anything regarding NYF project evaluation, although might need to be figured out a little during eventual contracting. The important thing at this stage is that both the Village and Library are fully on board with the project.
 - b. Clarification that there are 2 options for the extension. Option 1 is shown in the slides. Option 2 involves closing the basement to the public entirely and locating the kids room south of the proposed reading room, and doing the meeting space to the west in a way that’s completely separable from the library so that groups can book it anytime and access with a keycard even when the library is closed.
- 7. Gazebo
 - a. No specific comments noted.
- 8. Memorial Drive Green Space
 - a. Noted that project is aspirational and intended to start a conversation.
 - b. Observed that if the property came into private hands, they could avail themselves of historic tax credits to help fund a renovation of the historic structures.
 - c. What’s the cost of full demo? It’s not in the engineer report, would have to estimate.
 - d. Why not do mixed use? It’s such a big site!
 - i. DPW is a challenging neighbor for residential – but if they hypothetically moved, then that would really open up the site, including the confluence of the Cambridge and Owlkill Creeks where the trail is proposed.
 - ii. This is the only industrial district in the Village.
- 9. Varak Building Rehabilitation
 - a. Yes, it’s sprinklered.
 - b. Couldn’t this include some NYSERDA and/or National Grid funding?
- 10. Rice Mansion Rehabilitation
 - a. Observed that property had recently been marketed for sale, but apparently not on market currently.
- 11. Hubbard Hall Flex Office
 - a. Observed that this project is ineligible as the ask is for only furniture and equipment.
- 12. Hubbard Hall Public Artwork
 - a. Seems like a better fit for NYSCA funding?
 - b. Why not expand the proposal to include murals or other public artwork at multiple locations?
- 13. Hubbard Hall Yellow Brick Road
 - a. Wasn’t this installed not that long ago? If we fund it now, will it just need to be fixed again?
- 14. Re-build 18 W Main St

- a. Couldn't this project pursue historic tax credits as well?

Public Comment

Could the website theme be updated to be mobile responsive?

END OF SUMMARY