

# Fishkill Avenue Concepts Committee

Wednesday, October 02 2024, 06:30-08:00pm

City Council Meeting Room, 1 Municipal Plaza, Beacon NY 12508

Present: Yvonne, Olga, Natalie, J.C., Brent, Nick, Garrett

Note taker: Nick

Agenda and Minutes:

## **1. Review previous meeting minutes**

- a. 6:38pm - minutes approved

## **2. Patterns for Progress webinar summary from Natalie**

- a. Webinar covered an Arlington County rezoning initiative from previous years
- b. Discussion covered more flexible zoning and less prescriptive use-based
- c. Making more general use tables - using categories more like "General Food" or "Light industrial - Makerspace"
- d. Future proofs definition in ways that present decision makers may not be able to anticipate currently
- e. Natalie asked during the webinar specifically existing large scale industrial uses
  - i. Think about performance standards - noise, light, - which could help address conflicts between uses
  - ii. "Those uses will disappear as market demand / preferences shift as the perception of highest and best use"
- f. Event was supposed to be recorded, has not yet been shared out

## **3. Presentation of New Paltz Mixed Use Project on Route 32 by David Burke Architects**

- a. 124 residential units plus commercial ground floor mixed use development
- b. Project goals:
  - i. Create a healthy development that promotes green building design, integrates complete streets design, encourage walking / biking / and public transportation
  - ii. Wanted it to be a community destination
- c. New Paltz is encountering similar dynamics with housing shortages, looking to bring activity outside the downtown area and relieve pressure.
- d. Project is located in the "NBR District" - Neighborhood Business Residential
  - i. Encourage residential housing on the upper floors
  - ii. Foster positive relationship residential, service, retail
  - iii. Foster use of transit and lessen usage of cars and parking infrastructure
- e. The maximum sideyard setback was counterintuitive when also considering the need for fire truck access and parking access - only 15'-0" initially and required a variance from City
- f. 5'-0' buffer for the parking to be set back from the property line
- g. Regulations said that the building needed to be at the front yard line - wasn't required for a variance because the City is supportive of the creation of the public plaza

- h. Recently reenacted zoning district (within the last 5 years)
- i. Courtyard is effectively a green sponge with a bioswale that soaks up stormwater before reaching the creek
- j. Green infrastructure was something that the developer was interested in pursuing, not a requirement of the code
- k. Was there a requirement density? Limiting factors were height and parking space requirements - 4th story wasn't of interest when thinking about what would have been allowed by-right.
- l. Affordable housing set-aside is 15% which is a baseline requirement
- m. Connection to the rail trail is also mandated - and will be provided by a bridge over the creek and which connects to the development parking lot
- n. Bike lane is also provided on Rt 32, buffered by on-street parking parallel to the lot line frontage - it appears that State DOT would seek modifications on both bike lane and onstreet parking provisions
- o. No code-based incentive requiring any sort of setback provision that allows for the public space that is being provided along the frontage
- p. David recalls 1.2 parking spaces per unit requirement
- q. Flaw involved not getting key constituents (such as DOT) onboard as part of the process for getting agency approvals
- r. Similar building in the corridor has been open for a year, year and a half and has not filled their ground floor commercial spaces

#### **4. Zoning Subgroup report-out**

- a. Conversation with Jordan Haug (Developer of Conklin and Fishkill Ave)
- b. Original project fit the zoning ordinances as currently allowed, and went out to bid for contractors and is looking to make revisions that will allow the development to financially pencil
- c. Indicated that the City parking updates could give future developers more flexibility to create more units since there will be less parking in the future
- d. Indicated that a fourth floor with further residential units being provided would be something that helps push the project into financial viability
- e. Thinking about the parcels behind the Chemprene plant and also parcels adjacent to the creek - want to confirm that these parcels are also within our scope / purview. Confirmed this is in our purview. Need to spend more time thinking about these parcels and accompanying vision.
  - i. Next steps

#### **5. Review of recommendation structure / reporting**

- a. Discussed previous report structures of Beekman Street and Main Street Access - including purpose, background and history, select policy proposals
- b. Discussed draft recommendation structure to help begin putting goals on paper to clarify areas of narrative writing, further development, etc
- c. Group discussed using this to get a draft set of recommendations in place that can then be used in community engagement to solicit feedback from the public on which proposals are most resonant and priorities

#### **6. 8:05 pm adjourn**