

Town of New Paltz Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Wednesday August 19th 2015 7:30PM - 9:30PM at the Community Center

Commissioners attending: John Orfitelli (Chair), Caryn Sobel, and Dawn Elliott

Agenda

1. Public Comment
2. Joint Town/Village HPC Master Plan
3. Mohonk Preserve Foothills Project
4. Review/Approve Minutes from
 - August 2014
 - June 17, 2015

Minutes

Meeting was called to order at 7:45pm by motion from Caryn Sobel, seconded by John Orfitelli, motion carried.

1. **Public Comment:** No public comments were received.
2. **Joint Town/Village HPC Master Plan:** John Orfitelli provided an update to the action items discussed at the joint Town-Village HPCs meeting in June, namely,
 - John Orfitelli scanned and distributed (via link to Dropbox) the scope of services and cost estimate (\$25K) provided by Neil Larson, for creation of a Historic Preservation Master Plan for the Town and Village, as well as, other relevant documents regarding various incentive programs.
 - John Orfitelli contacted SHPO about undistributed CLG funds that might still be available for start-up purposes and the timetable for the upcoming CLG cycle. Lorraine Weiss indicated that funds were available and encouraged submission of a grant proposal. As suggested by Lorraine, John contacted Mark Castiglione, the Acting Executive Director of Hudson Valley Greenway, to discuss possible grant money that could be applied to a SHPO grant as part of the match. Mark indicated that the Historic Preservation Master Plan project would qualify for State grant funds which involve a 50% match from the community.

Based on the SHPO 60/40 and HV Greenway 50/50 funding models along with the use of Dave Gilmour as the planner from the Village, John Orfitelli created the following funding scenario for covering the \$25K expense associated with for the proposed Neil Larson contract. The total grant request of \$27,778 would be written to include work by Neil Larson and Dave Gilmour. SHPO would contribute \$60% or \$16,667 and require a match of 40% or \$11,111. A second grant from Hudson Valley Greenway would then be applied to cover the match, namely, 50% or \$5,556 cash with a match of 50% or \$5,556 from the Town and Village. The Village portion of the match would be paid through services provided by Dave Gilmour. The Town would contribute \$2,778 in cash. The total cash

Funding Senario			
	Neil	\$25,000	
	Dave	\$2,778	
	Total	\$27,778	
		↓	
SHPO	60%	\$16,667	Cash
	40%	\$11,111	Match
		↓	
HVG	50%	\$5,556	Cash
	50%	\$5,556	Match
		↓	
Village	50%	\$2,778	Dave
Town	50%	\$2,778	Cash
Total Cash		\$25,000	Neil

amount from this scenario to be paid to Neil Larsen would be \$25,000.

Lorraine Weiss asked if SHPO funds could be used to match a HV Greenway grant (inverse of the above). Mark Castiglione stated that this was possible, however, the grants from Greenway are typically not more than \$10K so using HV Greenway as the primary source would not be sufficient to fund the total needed for this project.

Finally, Lorraine agreed to review the proposal from Neil Larson and while the funding scenario is certainly viable, suggested the funding be broken down into a detailed budget with tasks detailed for both Neil and Dave.

The consensus by the Commission was that before proceeding further with a grant proposal, it was critical that both the Town and Village boards be presented first with the idea for creation of a Historic Preservation Master Plan along with incentives for property owners of designated landmarks. Also, the Commission agreed that the objective and scope of the proposal by Neil Larsen needs further review by both the Town and Village HPCs.

A joint Town-Village meeting is being proposed by Dan Torres for September at which both Town and Village HPCs would provide an overview of recent activities. This venue would be an excellent opportunity for introducing the HP Master Plan and expose the need for incentives. John Orfitelli agreed to create a PowerPoint presentation for the Town HPC along the following outline:

- Overview of Commission
- Mohonk Project
 - Landmark Designation
 - CoA
 - Foothills Project
- Stone House Grant
 - Experience/Feedback
 - Need for Incentives
- Joint Town-Village HP Master Plan

3. Mohonk Preserve Foothills Project

John Orfitelli provided the Planning Board with a scope of work and rates for consulting services by Neil Larson, Larson-Fisher Associates, to support both the Planning Board and the HPC in an historic landscape impact analysis of the Foothills Project. It is expected that Mike Calimano and the Planning Board will utilize Neil Larson as the consultant on the Foothills Project Review.

The following email by George Lithco to Neil Larson and Ken Wersted outlines the next steps leading to the initial public hearing at the Planning Board meeting on Wednesday, September 16 at 7:30.meeting with the Mohonk Preserve:

I believe the Chairman would like the Planning Board members to have your reviews a week or so before the hearing, if possible, so they have ample opportunity to consider them. As you know, this application is the subject of public interest, with many of the interested members of the public advocating for the project to receive a positive SEQRA determination. It meets the criteria for designation as a Type I action for a couple of reasons, most notably, that the action is located on lands designated as an historic landscape.

There is a rebuttable presumption that a Type I action may have a significant adverse impact and so requires preparation of an impact statement. The Board will have to consider the information provided by the applicant, the nature of the action and the EAF to determine if there it does have the potential for one or more significant adverse impacts. In doing so, the Board will be relying on the technical review by its consultants. The traffic review issues are more familiar to the Board.

I think there is need for Neil to provide overview and context to the Board – and the public - for the process and procedures he will be using to evaluate the potential impact of the action, and how the Board should evaluate the importance and magnitude of those impacts in making its determination of whether the impacts may be so significant as to require an EIS. Should the Board determine that the action is not likely to have a significant impact, it will need to make a reasoned elaboration of the basis in the record it relied upon in reaching that conclusion.

The hearing will likely be kept open to allow the applicant to address comments from the public and the Board, as well as provided additional information. I anticipate that would likely result in another round of review memos for the continued hearing. During that time, both the Ulster County Planning Board and the HPC may also meet and consider the Preserve application, as well as the B2R application.

Ken/Neil – the initial topic you should address in your reviews is the completeness of the application. If information is lacking or inadequate, it should be identified so that the applicant can cure the deficiency.

Kelly/Dave – I think there's been 3 or 4 MP site plan submissions so far. To keep the record clear (or at least as clear as possible) and make sure everyone – including the public - is looking at current plans and documentation, I think it would be helpful if you could maintain a current plan and documentation submission registration sheet for the Preserve application, and – whenever it is submitted – the OSI application. I will send Kelly a suggested framework next week.

Neil – since you will be a resource for both the Planning Board and the Historic Preservation Commission, and the issues are not that familiar in the land use process, it might be beneficial to schedule a call with Mike and John, to coordinate the nature and scope of the review work you will be doing for each.

4. Review/Approve Minutes from

- **August 2014**
- **June 17, 2015**

The June 17th minutes will be amended to reflect changes to the joint meeting minutes provided by the Village that clarify references to persons providing information. The minutes from June along with those from August 2014 (awaiting addition notes from Dave Gilmour) will be reviewed and approved in September.

Motion to adjourn was made by Caryn Sobel, seconded by John Orfitelli. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:35pm.