

NY Forward – Capital Region – Hoosick Falls

Subject	AGENDA LPC Meeting #3	Date	Monday, August 19, 2024
Place	Hoosick Armory, 80 Church St, Hoosick Falls	Time	3:00-5:00pm
Distribution	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Robert Allen, (Mayor and Co-chair) Brian Williams (Co-chair) Doug Sauer Trish Bloomer (<i>absent</i>) James Monahan Ric DiDonato (<i>absent</i>) Paula Kamperman Gayle Donohue Craig Kennedy Mike Danforth Mike Willemsen Marianne Zwicklbauer Aaron Buzzinski	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, DOS Mike Yevoli, ESD <u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Mau Vasquez, Buro Happold <i>Daniel D'Oca, Interboro (absent)</i> <u>Public</u> <i>8 individuals</i>	

Meeting Summary:

Please see 'HF_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**

Welcome and Agenda

Ian (BH) welcomes the group to the third New York Forward LPC meeting. He briefly overviews the meeting agenda and reminds the room that these meetings are open to the public, but not intended to be public interactive workshops.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Allen (LPC Co-Chair) highlights his excitement about the submitted projects.

Code of Conduct

Ian (BH) reads the Code of Conduct preamble, and reviews key points from the Code of Conduct that LPC members are expected to abide by. LPC is invited to submit any further necessary recusal forms. Paper copies are offered, and digital versions are to be shared following the meeting.

Updates: Planning Process & Engagement

Ian (BH) review of what's been done so far, survey results, and what is on the horizon (see slides).

- For the NYF boundary area, Doug (LPC) raised concern that some members of the community did not apply because their projects fell outside of the boundary. Consultant team emphasized that project sponsors were encouraged to apply regardless of the boundary, if they felt their project aligned with the program intent, and was within a reasonable distance of the boundary.
- Consultant team highlighted that LPC-3 serves as an introduction to submitted projects and no decisions will be made at this meeting.
- Project info will be featured on the Instagram page.

The consultant team will share the revitalization goals, survey results, and project evaluation form on the sharepoint so the LPC can review and provide comments.

Project Evaluation Criteria

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

- Some discussion about the cost effectiveness criteria description – clarified that it is referring to the effectiveness of NYF funding, not public funding generally.

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) reviews some high-level analysis of the projects received: 27 primary projects total, from 20 distinct sponsors, with \$17.2 million requested of New York Forward funds, leveraging over \$19.8 million in total investment.

Mau (BH) 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) Monument Park

- Noted that Hoosick Rising is not a sponsor on this project – ***Consultant team will correct the slides for the record.***
- Discussion on whether the site is considered environmentally safe? This was a former industrial site. Noted the application did include an environmental assessment. Remediation technique was a 2-foot thick soil cap. Responsibility for monitoring contamination and addressing issues will continue to rest with Oak-Mitsui per agreement with DEC.
- Concerns about the high total project cost were discussed.

2) Hoosick Falls Branding & Marketing

- What's the limit of historic district? The current historic district includes the Armory, John St, Classic St, Main St, and west to Church Street. They are looking to extend it because it does not currently include Cheney Library and St. Mary's Academy.

3) Hoosic River Greenway Unification

- Noted that the Army Corp of Engineers levee must stay vegetated – an old proposal had included stone dust but that should be removed.
- Clarification that the total cost of \$575K includes: an artistic mural, a crosswalk, one-way reconfiguration of Water St, a footbridge (the largest expense) for parking lot access, landscaping, and light fixtures under the bridge.

4) Municipal Building Upgrades

- Noted that this is a multi-phase project. Phase I will be ADA renovations at the front to improve access and the restrooms; Phase II is the expansion of the building out the back to give more room to the Village offices and police department while providing a new and more secure Village court space.
- Noted that Phase II of this project is redundant to the Murphy Building Renovation, so only 1 will need to be put forward eventually.

5) Murphy Building Renovation

- Village does not own this property yet, but is in discussion – currently County owned.
- Would be a large space to move the Village police department and Court out of the municipal building, allowing the Village offices to occupy that building in its entirety.
- Would also accommodate the Sherriff's office and a State Police post.
- There's the possibility that the Village could provide some matching funds here, but not included in the application as that would require a vote of the Village Board.
- Comment that the façade aesthetics are lacking and could use improvement.

6) Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements

- Observed that the Village would be self-performing a lot of the work, which should be counted as a Village match. **Mayor Allen will update the project application to reflect this.**

7) Skating Rink Upgrade

- Observed that this project received nearly \$1m in SAM Grant funds – some discussion about the history and status of these funds, which it is believed are sitting at DASNY awaiting distribution.
- **Mayor Allen requests verification of the unreleased funding – this should be included in their application. Consultant will request a statement from the Sponsor.**

8) Woods Brook Redevelopment

- Observed a high project cost.
- Village will investigate other grants for potential match funding.

9) Historical Society Carriage Barn Renovation

- Noted that the Carriage Barn plays an important role in the annual tractor show.

10) Hoosick Armory Modernization

- Noted that currently restrooms are on different floors of the building and the funds would help improve ADA compliance and convert them to unisex.

11) Rescue Squad Improvements

- No specific comments noted.

12) Total Playground Improvements

- No specific comments noted.

13) Woodbridge Heights Accessibility and Weatherization

- Noted that there's numerous funding sources that could be explored for this project, since it is a senior housing facility.

14) Firehouse Restaurant Renovation

- No specific comments noted.

15) Game Store Renovation

- Are there any letters of support from senior center, school, and youth center? Since these are noted in the application. **Consultant team will request these from Sponsor.**
- **Consultant team will check the number of jobs this project will create.**

16) Historic Sweet Shop Restoration

- No specific comments noted.

17) Lower Classic St Mixed-Use Revitalization

- Question about project match and timing – Sponsor is proceeding with key scopes of work that would otherwise hold up the entire project.
- **Consultant will discuss match with Sponsor to ensure it is properly sized and timed.**

18) River St Intersection Signage

- Consultant team highlighted this project is a block away from the boundary and could qualify for the small project fund.
- Observed that this proposal for digital signage seems duplicative of the branding and marketing project – **Consultant will raise this to Sponsor to see if there's possibility for coordination or consolidation.**
- Is there a breakdown for the EV charging stations? This could be eligible for NYSERDA funding.

19) The Sand Bar Expansion

- No specific comments noted.

20) STAY apARTments Redevelopment

- Can the façade be broken out of the projects? Yes, the Consultant team can request Sponsors to break out façade work as its own section in their budgets – but it would be up to Sponsors as to whether they would agree to have the façade work considered separately from other work.

21) Wood Block HoosArt Center Restoration

- Sponsor notes that they are pursuing Historic Tax Credit funding – this has driven some of the design decisions, including the need to incorporate the elevator within the building where it won't impact the façade.
- Sponsor notes the "HoosArt" name derives from historical research of the arts community in the Village.
- **Consultant team will correct the match percentage for this project.**

22) 1 Center St Warehouse Mixed-use Rehabilitation

- Noted that the project estimate seems very low for such a big building that's in such bad shape. Possibly this is due to the specific scope proposed that involves minimal fitout and furnishing – ie, just the "warm shell" for a brewery and a gym.
- Observed that Restore NY would be a possible match or alternate funding source.

23) 1 Mechanic St Warehouse Commercial Rehabilitation

- Noted that the Village may need to recuse if they use their services.
- Discussion about whether the break room and kitchen should be covered by the project sponsor match. Clarified that the grant funds are fungible and allocated to an overall project, not to specific line items – and the proposed match is already almost 50%.
- **Consultant team will reach out to sponsor to determine how many jobs this project will add and update the site photos to show the building they are renovating.**

24) 15 Church St Residential Rehabilitation

- No specific comments noted.

25) 24 Church St Mixed-Use Renovation

- No specific comments noted.

26) 69 Church St Residential Renovation

- Noted that this project is the same property as the Village-sponsored Murphy Building Renovation. The property is currently owned by the County.
- Discussion about the feasibility of converting this structure into housing generally. Further discussion about whether 10 units can fit inside this envelope. Overall, a suite of issues and challenges are noted that would imply the total project cost should be much higher.

27) 114 Church St

- Noted that there is not enough parking to meet the demand for this project, but that the Village-owned adjacent lot, and the work associated with Woods Brook are both opportunities to provide the necessary space.

Small Project

Ian (BH) presents an overview of the small projects and mentions if the LPC decides to pursue the Small Project Fund, it will be part of the \$4.5M in grant funding.

Public Comment

In addition to public workshop, there will be the potential for sponsors to speak about the project.

- Project evaluations includes a notes sections where LPC can request supplemental materials from project sponsors.

Next steps

LPC evaluations are due by September 9th. This gives the Consultant team 2 weeks to incorporate the results into the presentation materials for the LPC-4 meeting on 9/23.

Closing Remarks (LPC Co-Chairs)

No specific comments noted.

Public comments

Historical Society clarified that their proposal includes some match and should be corrected.

Consultant team will review the Historical Society application.

END OF SUMMARY