
TOWN OF NEW PALTZ- PLANNING AND ZONING FOR THE ROUTE 299 GATEWAY AREA

TOWN OF NEW PALTZ
ULSTER COUNTY, NEW YORK
ROUTE 299 GATEWAY COMMITTEE



To: Town of New Paltz Route 299 Gateway Committee
From: Michael Welti, AICP – Senior Land Use Planner – Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C.
Re: December 18, 2017 Committee Meeting - Summary Notes
Date: December 19, 2017

Meeting Location: Village Hall
Meeting Time: 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm
Meeting Attendees: Committee: Susan Blickstein, Amanda Gotto, John Orfitelli, Matt DiDonna, Laura deNey, and Neil Bettez
Consultant: Michael Welti, AICP (Barton & Loguidice)
Others: Scott Butler and Jon Cohen

Summary Notes

This was the sixth meeting of the Route 299 Gateway Committee for the Town of New Paltz Route 299 Gateway Planning and Zoning project. The meeting was attended by the members of the Gateway Committee, the Barton & Loguidice consulting team, and others (see above).

The meeting was primarily dedicated to the following agenda items:

- Welcome and Agenda Review
- Recap – Meeting notes from November 20th
- Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Recommended Zoning
- Next Steps
- Public Comment
- Wrap-up and Adjournment

Welcome and Agenda Review – Mr. Welti reviewed the agenda.

Recap

The draft meeting notes from the November 20th meeting were circulated to the Committee in advance of this meeting. There were no comments about them and no revisions were suggested.

Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Recommended Zoning

The Committee began discussion of the latest version of the Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Recommended Zoning that was sent to members last week. Mr. Welti noted that the current draft now consists of all of the components of an eventual report that the Committee will submit to the Town Board in January – a Draft Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Gateway Corridor and recommended zoning language for three Gateway Overlay Zones. The Committee was pleased to see all of the various pieces that have been discussed over the last few meetings coming together in one document; and though revisions and refinements are still needed, it recognized that a tremendous amount of work has been completed.

There was a brief discussion about the project schedule. It was noted that the Town Board will likely consider an extension to the moratorium beginning in early January. The extension would give the Town Board time to adequately review and eventually adopt the Committee's recommendations. To keep the process moving, the Committee's report to the Town Board should be submitted by the end of January so that a public presentation of the recommendations can be delivered at a Town Board meeting in February. The Town Board could hold a joint meeting with the Planning Board for the purpose of this public presentation of the Committee's recommendations, but this has not yet been decided.

The Committee began its review of the draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Mr. Welti noted that the recommendations in this section are based on the Plan Concepts that the Committee identified over the summer and refined at the October meeting. As previously discussed, the Committee's main finding is that the Study Area is not a single thing as the current B-2 Zoning suggests, but should instead be viewed as containing several character areas. The plan concept reflects this and the recommendations are organized into five subareas.

It was suggested that a short summary of the Existing Conditions report (which is attached as an appendix) should be inserted after the description of the Planning Process and before the Plan Concepts are introduced.

There were several comments/suggestions pertaining to the Main Street Mixed Use area. In terms of the objective for this area, it was suggested that the Mill Brook should be identified as a resource that traverses this area. Additional language about landscaping plans and the types of green infrastructure practices that could be employed should be incorporated into the list of desired design and development characteristics for this area. It was also noted that the text underneath the graphic from the Ulster County Community Design Manual on page 6 should be removed or refined to better reflect conditions in New Paltz. Finally the Committee briefly discussed whether the recommendations for this area could be applied to the rest of the B-2 Zoning District heading west to the Village line. It was explained that this was not currently possible for two reasons: because it is outside of our Study Area and because the desired character of the corridor west of the Study Area might actually be

somewhat different than what is proposed for the Mixed Use Main Street area and would need to be further studied.

In reviewing the Gateway Business area there was some discussion about whether language regarding the IDA's use of PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes) agreements should be added somewhere. It was noted that the economic impacts of projects and the fiscal impacts of PILOT agreements are not always well understood.

In reviewing the Gateway Hamlet area it was noted that the desired design and development characteristics should include mention of a limitation on the size of buildings to ensure that they are appropriately scaled for the hamlet. The need to provide a better definition of height in the zoning was also suggested.

The Committee discussed the recommendations for the Residential area along Brouck Ferris Boulevard and South Ohioville Road. It was suggested that the reference to the wetlands in this area should be strengthened. There was also discussion about whether the recommended residential zoning should be R-1 or A-1.5.

The Committee reviewed the recommendation regarding the Resort Development area. The Committee requested that the detailed and flowery language from the applicant's DEIS be removed and replaced with a more general summation of what is proposed. In general, the Committee continues to support the notion of the more limited version of a resort now described as the "preferred alternative" in the applicant's DEIS but it recognizes that the Planning Board still has much work to do in terms of its review of the proposed project. The Committee will simply highlight the broad aspects of the proposal that make sense in the context of the Gateway Study and continue to note additional characteristics recommended in the Gateway Study that should be applied to the Resort Development area.

The Committee discussed transportation issues in the Corridor and asked that the implementation section include a suggestion that the Town work with the Ulster County Transportation Council to find funding for a more comprehensive transportation study of the Corridor. The study should focus on safety for all users – similar to what is currently being studied on Route 9W – and should consider ways to have developers pay their share of transportation mitigation needs in an equitable manner (such as a Generic Environmental Impact Statement).

Before turning its attention to the draft zoning language for the three Gateway Overlay Districts, the Committee decided that the individual members should continue to review the draft and provide comments/suggestions to Mr. Welti by January 8th. When emailing comments to Mr. Welti, members should cc: one another so that everyone on the Committee has the benefit of reading the other members' comments. Mr. Welti will send a revised version of the Draft to the Committee on January 22nd.

In terms of the Zoning language, the Committee made some suggestions about the front yard setback and building height requirements for Gateway Overlay District 1. There was considerable discussion about the shared parking provision in the current

draft. The Committee requested that some additional reductions in the parking requirements for common uses be provided for the Overlay Zones and that a provision be added that allows the Planning Board and developers to bank parking when that seems appropriate.

Next Steps

The Committee did not schedule another meeting. Instead it agreed to provide comments to Mr. Welti as discussed earlier and to wait for a final draft.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Wrap-up and Adjournment

The meeting was completed and adjourned at about 7:00 PM.