

20/20 VISION
VILLAGE OF WILLIAMSVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN
COMMUNITY PLAN COMMITTEE

APPROVED MEETING NOTES – MARCH 27, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Community Plan Committee Attendees: Charles Akers, Steve Appler, Mary Carr, Kim Giannelli-Calos, Paul Iskalo, Brian Kulpa, Pastor Timothy Madsen, Walter Pacer, Victor Paquet, Charles Rizzone, Wesley Stone, David Vitka, Kate Waterman-Kulpa

Absent: David Brody, Thomas Claxton, Todd Nelson, Carolyn Schlifke, Edward Zabel

Consultant/Town/Village Staff Present: John Behan, Lawrence Bice, Steve Ferranti, Joelle Guy, Dan Howard, Lynda Juul, Sally Kuzon, David Versel

Village Board Members: Mayor Lowther, Trustee Geary, Trustee Sweeney

Residents/Other Attendees: Christopher Church (NYS DOT), Thomas Frank

Wally Pacer introduced a new member, Chuck Akers, to the committee.

Lawrence discussed the fact that the consultant are looking for approval tonight on the guiding principals of the plan, and not necessarily the detail specifically given. This allows the committee to move forward and show a range of options to the community.

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES

On motion by Chuck Akers, seconded by Pastor Madsen, the meeting notes of February 27, 2007 were approved.

Unanimously carried.

DISCUSSION OF ECONOMIC ANALYSES (DEVONOMICS)

David Versel of Devonomcis discussed his market analysis of the Main Street Business District. There isn't a lot of pressure for office development in the Village. There is a strong demand for retail, but the supply can't meet it due to the size and age of units, as well as traffic concerns.

Paul Iskalo asked how the comparable villages were chosen. Mr. Versel explained that they were chosen based on comparable scale and having somewhat of a similar amount of

traffic going through the community (no other Village has truly the same amount as Williamsville).

Williamsville can attract more retail. However, there is little support for additional dining or personal services. This is because Williamsville is not a destination. Office demand is maxed out. There is still some additional demand for lodging. There is a strong demand for high density residential housing; however garage parking would be required.

David then reviewed the questions he posed to the committee in his summary (see attached).

1) What pedestrian improvements (at which locations) will have the greatest impact on improving the walkability and village feel of Main Street?

Brian Kulpa suggested bulb-outs and the intersections to make the street feel less wide. Additional planting of street trees would also act as a buffer from the high velocity of traffic. He suggested bulb-outs at Cayuga & Main, Mill & Main, Reist & Main, and Los Robles & Main. Evans was also suggested. Paul Iskalo asked what the limiting factor was – why not do bulb-outs at all intersections? Cost would be the limiting factor. Brian Kulpa stated that he felt the central village was the place to start, and then work out to the entire village.

Chuck Akers commented on bulb-outs and trees. More green makes Main Street more user-friendly. The problem is that Main Street is a state road, and any plans for change will be made way down the road. Space must be taken from somewhere, but what are the options?

Steve Appler suggested that a way to connect the parks safely for pedestrians would be beneficial.

Vic Paquet suggested two locations – Riest & Village Square Lane, and at Village or Town Hall at Spring Street. Neither of those locations have a light currently. Why not put in two bridges? He would like to put that up for public comment. People cross there all the time. It is unsafe. A tunnel under the bridge has also been discussed.

2) What special events can and should be held in the Village and which entity will take responsibility for planning and marketing such events?

Mary Carr felt some events are coordinated with business & retail (i.e. the Gardenwalk). She thinks the Village needs somebody who can coordinate events, but not necessarily a full-time marketing person. The village has the Meeting House which could be used. She works at UB, and somebody could coordinate with them for literary events, poetry readings, etc. The other thing is to coordinate with the schools better for a jazz fest or some type of event like that. UB has a great music courses, and the high schools do as well.

Kim Gianelli-Calos stated that the Youth & Rec. Committee coordinates with the local schools for some events. David Versel asked if the audience is geared for the Village only, and not for those outside the community. The response was that they are geared for the Village. David stated that he is trying to look at events that will bring people in from the outside to spend money in the Village.

Brian Kulpa liked Mary Carr's idea of coordinating with UB. He stated that UB is trying to double its size. Drawing in student and faculty groups would be great for the Village. Mary stated that the English department has 50 faculty and most live downtown.

Paul Iskalo suggested doing something like what Buffalo Place did downtown promoting a concert series. That would help to pull from the region. You would just have to be careful not to compete with other events in the area. He asked if a business improvement district (BID) would be a group that would help with organizing in the area. David Versel thought a BID or Main Street Program would be good for promoting special events and acting as an intermediary between business and government.

Kate Kulpa said she would like to see several events, such as a farmer's market (Sally Kuzon let everyone know there is currently one being developed in the Village). Kate also thought an arts festival in Island Park run by an artist group, or a haunted walk were good ideas.

Chuck Akers pointed out that there are a lot of little events in the Village. It's the advertising and marketing that is not there.

Wally Pacer suggested making better use of the Mill in the future.

3) How can the water mill's potential redevelopment support the need for an "anchor" use in the village while still meeting its community objectives?

Vic Paquet thought multiple uses would be the best potential. He suggested it serve as a gateway to the park. The mill is currently very separate from the park. The parks also need restrooms. A small information center in the corner of the mill would be helpful.

Brian Kulpa suggested that the history of the village isn't told anywhere. The mill could be turned into a museum or a place where that story could be told. The story of the escarpment could be told as well. A marketing strategy could be built around the mill. The mill should be the face of the Village.

Kim Gianelli-Calos thought it would be a good place to run educational events and talks for children and adults.

Paul Iskalo felt that whatever is done there needs to be inviting to the public, as well as an amenity to the park.

David Versel stated that the problem with the mill is that it needs a lot of improvements. The cost per square foot is high to improve this building. The Meeting House is also already owned by the Village and is under-utilized. If the Village is going to take this on, something has to really be in mind that will have a lot of usage.

Wally Pacer asked if he has seen any comparable buildings and what their uses are. David Versel thought that a train depot is a similar. It typically has office space on the second floor and a museum on the first floor.

Kate Kulpa suggested potential grants and fund raising where the use of the mill can be as a mill. Economic sources can come from other places. Something as simple as a cider mill could be the use.

Steve Appler looked at Mayer Brothers in Lancaster. He thought that fresh baked goods would help.

Chuck Akers suggested having Sweet Jenny's in the same building.

Steve Ferranti talked about a cider mill in Binghamton where they make fresh donuts and have small plays.

David Versel also saw that most of the machinery is in tact. This is an opportunity to have a functional cider mill and use it as an educational opportunity.

Wally stated that it was used as this in the past. Chuck Akers thought the sluiceway collapsed, and was not repaired by the previous owner. He stated that there are ways of fixing that through plastic piping that will not break down.

The figure to restore the building is \$640,000. Selling the out buildings has also been discussed.

Chuck Rizzone asked if \$600,000 is an exorbitant amount of money to restore the mill. John Behan thought the property is very rare, and is in the heart of the village. David Versel thought maybe there was a connection with the University. Maybe the University would want to own the mill. John Behan suggested that to promote the use of the historic buildings, personnel infrastructure may have to be put in place. The village isn't setup to do this.

Chuck Akers talked about Elmwood Ave. and thought that a non-profit could be setup to do the activities to do this.

Brian Kulpa felt that two or three case studies of similar buildings need to be done. Not so much what the buildings are used for, but who they are run by. How was the work funded? He mentioned sites such as the 1810 Hull House in Lancaster, the Lancaster Opera House, and the Guarantee building.

John Behan asked how important it is for the mill to be a working entity. The committee agreed that it's very important.

Paul Iskalo commented on the idea of selling off buildings in order to raise funds. He thought that this was a very short-sighted thing to do. The Committee agreed with this. Other structures could be removed for additional space to support whatever could happen at the mill property.

John Behan reiterated that what he was hearing was that the Committee wants the mill restored. David Versel asked if this is a project that the Town of Amherst Historical Society would want to partner with the Village on. Steve Appler thought the location of the Historical Society hurts it. The mill could be used to promote the Historical Society, or the Meeting House.

Chuck Akers commented that the Amherst Museum is going through some internal issues. There are people on the Town Board who want to get rid of it. If it's gone in 10 years, where are we?

Brian Kulpa thought you'd almost be better off starting with a new non-profit to focus on the restorations. Organizing one group to run all of that may not be feasible.

John Behan again asked the committee about all of the buildings. The entire committee felt that all of the buildings should be kept for now. There may be other opportunities in the area. The benefits are not just with the mill, but extend beyond.

4) Is the village willing to offer density bonuses or financial incentives for affordable housing, shared parking or other items that serve the public good?

Brian Kulpa felt there are a lot of Main Street parcels that don't have a lot of depth to them. If you want the built-up feel of three stories plus, you will have to modify the zoning code to address parking issues. You will have to allow for shared parking strategies. He doesn't see a way around this.

Paul Iskalo agreed with this. Ideally everyone would park underground. However, this is cost prohibitive. You can do this in larger cities, but need to strike a balance. Adding these elective incentives is a very positive approach. You could have incentives for underground parking. This could occur in certain spots.

Chuck Rizzone asked David to define "affordable housing" and "shared parking". Affordable housing is something that a working family can afford. It is housing that is available to young families just starting out who don't have many housing options – roughly \$150,000 or less. The Village may feel that the market should dictate this and not the Village Board.

David Vitka talked about affordable low-cost housing for seniors, and what was done at Our Lady of Victory. Shared parking is a situation where retail is on the first level and

housing is on the upper levels. Parking is available for retail during the day and for residents at night. The theory is to have complimentary uses. Also larger pooled parking between businesses instead of many smaller parking lots.

Mary Carr talked about incentives she read about in the paper. David Versel stated that when he talks about affordable housing, he is not talking about welfare housing. He is talking about a market for families making \$50,000 per year. Incentives such as less required parking or additional floors could be offered for developers who offer more affordable housing.

John Behan talked about looking not just at Main Street, but off Main Street as well.

Chuck Akers commented that the Village is one square mile. Does it need every housing style that there is? What is it that we like about the village? We don't have to be everything to everyone.

Paul Iskalo stated that one of the goals the committee felt was important was diversity. Mechanisms to put this in place are important. We're not necessarily talking about having people move here, but giving people who already live here the option to stay here.

Brian Kulpa said he would like to see a count of assisted living or skilled nursing facilities we currently have, including senior housing. He hasn't seen it broken out. David Versel thought that Blocher Home was the only housing like this, but there is also the housing across from the cemetery. Is there a chance for affordable housing with a similar density? He feels we need to be more specific about what incentive is. This will be gotten into down the road.

Vic Paquet thinks housing on and off of Main Street should be looked at separately. If you compare single family houses to Amherst, there is a lot more diversity and more affordable housing. The older, smaller houses are more affordable. The question is when you renovate or tear down - does this make the housing unaffordable? We need to address the singles that want to grow with their house and stay there.

- 5) *Given the identified need for more retail and residential uses (but not office uses), should the current commercial zoning classification system be altered?*

Steve Appler felt that if we want to have a viable business district, we have to let businesses come.

Lawrence asked about form. It seems it's more the look and feel than the use.

- 6) *How should the village encourage higher density retail and residential development along Main Street without negatively impacting nearby residential neighborhoods?*

- 7) *Question 7 was skipped due to time constraints.*

8) *Could building demolition with façade preservation be allowed?*

Mary Carr felt it would have to be on a case by case basis. David Versel felt specific criteria was needed to write the rules. Hamburg does this now. It might be good to take a look at what they've done.

Brian Kulpa felt form-based could be very restrictive or can add flexibility.

John Behan asked what the committee would think about someone coming in, taking advantage of the market, demolishing some buildings and building a suburban style type of national chain retail use. In other words, do you want single-story suburban type of chain? Do you want to restrict that as a village and say no to that?

The committee as a group stated that they do not like the Calico Corners/Talbot's/Ed Young's type development with parking in front.

Paul Iskalo stated that he feels it's difficult when something isn't in the code, and the developer comes in front of the Board. The Board wants to compromise. He feels the more that is put down on paper, the more clear it is, and the more firm it is what will be built in the future.

Chuck Akers talked about the businesses across from Starbuck's. What will be there in 15 years when those buildings aren't there any longer? How do you stop development such as Walgreen's? David Versel stated that many Walgreen's are on the first floor of a multi-story building. They can go in the ground floor in front, with structured parking behind.

Brian Kulpa felt the façade needs depth, character and detail. You have to take it a level beyond.

John Behan felt that in order to achieve the pedestrian scale that we want, we have to deal with cars due to lack of public transportation. In order to encourage the walkable village, cars have to be put somewhere. The trade-off is more parking provided by the village, or parking on residential side streets. This is a trade-off in exchange for making the village viable.

9) *Is there any possibility of expanding the size of commercial zoning districts so that main street lots are deeper?*

Chuck Rizzone lives on a street with a Rite-Aid and a hotel. There is a parking lot and a salon. People are parking on the street. If this was re-done, and the hotel was put on the street with parking behind, would it intrude further into the street? Probably not.

Steve Appler felt that if the businesses are built side to side, retail is closer to Main Street, and parking can be put behind. He doesn't understand how businesses behind

survive when you can't see them from Main Street. This also provides alleyways for trucks to pull in for truck delivery. This would get the trucks off Main Street where it is inconvenient to deliver. You are not driving through residential neighborhoods.

Paul Iskalo felt that some areas have problems and it varies block by block. The Hampton would still have the curb cut on Los Robles, but the hotel would be up front. In other areas commercial is very tight with no land or parking behind them. It's hard to make that type of area vibrant. You can't have dead zones in between the live zones. That abrupts the activity.

David Versel asked if we are willing to state where this line is drawn. Or is it up to the developer?

Brian Kulpa felt that we have to define this. Mill & Main, Garrison & Main, etc. we have to identify it otherwise it is left up to negotiation.

The existing residences also need to be protected according to the committee.

Chuck Rizzone felt that a four-story hotel doesn't fit with the character of the village. Mary Carr stated that it started as three stories, but the project was held up, the developer claimed that it has to be four stories to be viable, and the Village Board gave in to the developer.

Dave asked again if the committee is willing to write the rules – it appears that they are.

Brian Kulpa lives around the corner from the hotel. He feels that having a four-story hospitality facility on Main Street is great. Those people also utilize local businesses. People are not going to lose their homes. They can sell or not, and will probably earn an increased property value. It's their choice to leave.

Lawrence gave a summary statement for confirmation by the committee.

It is economically viable to pursue a more traditional Main Street pattern, but we need to improve parking and make a more pedestrian-friendly environment.

Dave Versel thought that national chains like Williamsville because of the really high traffic count. If you want to make this more of a village, you may not always have those high traffic counts. With that in mind, you need to use the plan to do what the market wants. He sees an opportunity that you won't have in 10 years to re-shape how the Village is used.

Paul Iskalo felt that if you have two-story buildings, they should be able to be occupied on the second floor. If you don't want to make that mandatory, then put some incentives in place to encourage that.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (SRF ASSOC.)

Steve Ferranti explained that they used the Vision Statement as the starting point for their project. He reviewed the current zoning, as well as what the committee had come forward with for the future at the last meeting he attended. Currently there is a C-5 core surrounded on both sides by C-4 (less intense). In the future, C-5 is envisioned along all of Main Street.

The requirements of the C-4 and C-5 zones were discussed. Projects can be federally funded. You would try to meet all the design guidelines for federal funding. If there is a standard you can not meet, it must be well documented. The pedestrian realm is generally 12' wide, at a minimum. In the Village, there are some areas that only have 8'.

Steve asked what the priority areas are for the committee.

Brian Kulpa suggested the area where the park touches Main Street (between Mill and Spring Street).

Mary Carr suggested Ellicott Street because it goes to Garrison Park.

Kate Kulpa suggested the area across from the cemetery. People park at the cemetery and cross to get to businesses across the street.

Vic Paquet felt that we could go several blocks off Main Street as well. There are areas where there aren't any sidewalks. Also, the pathway that was suggested several months ago. The pedestrian way on the bridge is a little narrow too.

Paul Iskalo asked if there was a way to connect the parks under the bridge at water level. It seems it would make sense. Doug Brackett felt there were safety issues during high water conditions.

Steve Ferranti then reviewed the various options (see hand out).

Paul Iskalo was in favor of adding bike lanes, but didn't feel this may be the wisest use of 10'. He thought the space could be better used with different alternatives.

Mary Carr would like to see that space used to improve the pedestrian realm.

David Vitka asked if there was a safety issue with a 7' parking lane with a bike path. The bike could be forced out into traffic by someone opening a door. Steve Ferranti commented that this is a common design standard. These numbers were used to meet certain criteria from national standards.

David Versel suggested that discussion centered on not just plowing snow, but removing snow. Snow can take up 4'. It currently is not removed. He stated that other locations,

such as downtown Buffalo, take the snow off the street and cart it away so there are not snow banks. This is something that is very commonly done by business improvement districts. Chris Church of the NYS DOT commented that a typical minimum for snow storage is 5' on each side. The DOT does not have the manpower or equipment to do this. Steve Ferranti stated that the challenge we have is the competing uses of the space.

Vic Paquet suggested that having a bike path for one mile doesn't make any sense if it doesn't continue into the Town. Lawrence felt that the greenway off Main Street could be used.

Paul Iskalo suggested tying the greenway into a bike lane out further in the Village, near the border of the Town. The question is from the Village to Young's road – there probably won't be any change there for another 10 years.

Paul Iskalo felt that alternatives 2 and 3 are both far better than what we have today. Alternative 2 seems to have more of a traffic calming aspect than alternative 3. This could have more of a dramatic impact. If an exit on Young's Road happens in 10 years and there is less traffic, then this may not be so important. Wider sidewalks would be more important at that time.

Steve Ferranti commented that we need to look at long-term, not short-term or medium-term. We need to see which one is easier to build upon in the future. Should we change the curb lines now, or should we change the median treatment in the middle and leave the curb lines the same? Then in 10 or 20 years if traffic is reduced, the curb-lines can be moved. Is this a better investment? Is it more prudent?

Dave Vitka stated that different treatments were discussed in the past for the core vs. outside the core. Steve Ferranti felt this should be discussed. There are other areas that are not constrained. There is more flexibility for a wide median treatment that could be a gateway treatment.

Brian Kulpa commented that he's not certain we would benefit from a reduction of driveway access on Main Street. If there were better entrances and exits this would help. Second, he wasn't sure if alternative 2 showed the whole story. The street trees are gone. Steve Ferranti stated that this was not intentional. What's important is landscaping opportunities. For the public meeting the street trees should be shown.

Steve asked if the committee felt that options 2 and 3 seemed to be rising to the top over option 4 with the bike path. This seemed to be the case.

David Versel commented that another constraint is cost.

Chris Church of the NYS DOT commented that when you move curbs, you move drainage. This increases the cost. If you're adding a median which fits into the current setting and the curbs don't have to be moved, you may be able to leave the existing

pavement. The bulb-outs may require something with drainage, but can be designed so the drainage runs through.

Lawrence commented that if you do the median now, you may get lower traffic in the future. This may not be as much of a priority down the road. Steve Ferranti stated that maybe you could add to the pedestrian realm then.

Dave Vitka asked about mid-block bulb-outs to increase the pedestrian realm (i.e. in front of restaurants, etc.). Steve Ferranti stated that it makes it difficult for plowing. They tend to be more problematic than not.

Vic Paquet stated that sidewalk width is a trade-off between options 2 and 3. This can be increased in areas where there are parking lots. Steve Appler stated it could also be a design guideline that to build you have to be 4' back to increase the pedestrian realm.

Chris Church commented that once you go to an option where you move the curb, you are probably looking at a total road reconstruction. Shorter term opportunities would be within what you currently have. A median could possibly be put in by just cutting that pavement out and putting in the median. This would be relatively cheap. Once you start playing with drainage it becomes much more costly.

Doug Bracket stated that the major difference in his mind is the pedestrian space. The median in option 3 doesn't seem to really be traffic calming. What does it really do for us? Steve Ferranti stated that part of it is traffic calming. There is an option in the road that you have to pay attention to, so you can't intuitively go as fast. It also serves as an access management tool. Accidents are most severe from left turns. A median ensures that all driveways are a right in and a right out. A u-turn is then made at an intersection or signal.

Chris Church commented that from a business perspective, some businesses have lost or gained business depending on the location. He doesn't think this would happen in the Village because there are a large number of signalized intersections. Steve Ferranti felt that from a merchant standpoint, the Village merchants have heavy traffic 13 hours a day in both directions.

Dave Versel stated that the types of businesses affected by this are the ones that are dependent on traffic. The Village seems to want less of these businesses.

Paul Iskalo felt that the traffic calming aspect would far outweigh any other issues.

Chris Church felt that alternative 3 would probably be outside of the current capital plan (which is 13 years out). Their expenditures are planned out for that period of time. Alternative 2 would probably fall within the plan. This is a factor to consider, but other factors can be more important.

Mary Carr asked where the funding would come from. Chris Church stated it would typically be 80% federal and 20% state funding. On smaller projects it is easier to use 100% state funding.

Pastor Madsen stated he hears that alternative 2 is more practical and do-able, but that people like alternative 3. He asked about alternative 2 with a narrower median. Steve Ferranti thought this was a valid point. The pedestrian road is of utmost importance.

Chuck Akers felt that the wider median makes it easier to cross, and would increase patronage of the stores.

Mary Carr asked about handicap accessibility. If a median is raised, how is it handicap accessible? The consultants stated that they are not promoting crossing at the medians. At the same time, they don't want to ignore the fact that people jay-walk.

Steve asked if all alternatives were presentable to the public. Mary Carr felt that alternative 4 should be discarded, with the greenway shown to account for bicycle traffic. Pastor Madsen asked if anyone supported alternative 1; no one was in favor of this. The committee was in favor of alternatives 2 and 3.

Paul Iskalo stated that alternative 2 gives traffic calming and is fiscally responsible. If in 15 years traffic is different, we may be able to keep the wide median and reduce the lane and increase the public realm.

The committee asked if we should show phasing of alternative 2 as just stated. Wally suggested showing what the committee considered and what they came down to.

The committee in full agreed to endorse option 2.

The option of a signal at Spring Street with one-way or two-way traffic was discussed. This would give a pedestrian crossway at the state recommended distance of 600'.

Brian Kulpa asked if Spring Street was made one-way, would Rock Street be changed to one way out? This probably would not be safe, and traffic would probably be directed to Cayuga Road. He also asked about an apron instead of a bulb-out to accommodate larger vehicles if there is two-way traffic. It was felt that this could be done. Cayuga would also have to be improved for better traffic management.

Steve Ferranti also touched on parking. There is a deficiency. If we optimize the shared parking, the deficit can be reduced. Mary Carr asked about giving tax incentives for shared parking. This can be written into ordinances. The consultants are estimating that the parking shortage could be reduced by 15% to 30% by using shared parking.

LAND USE (BEHAN PLANNING)

Lawrence reviewed the mill concepts that have been seen in the past.

Doug Brackett then introduced some new concepts.

Kate Waterman-Kulpa thought there were some historic homes along Cayuga where the parking structure is shown. Lawrence stated that they are zoned commercial currently. If for some reason there was development in that area, it could add parking. It could be moved around between structures that should remain.

Brian Kulpa felt that the idea of an enhanced streetscape with some building development makes a lot of sense. It would have to be small facilities, but could be some type of artisan community.

Paul Iskalo asked why a future building site next to the mill was ruled out. Doug Brackett stated that it's part of the park.

David Vitka asked if the side with the parking structure took away from Rock Street (down to Glen Ave.). It does take away the road. Parking could be single level at the street, but also takes some of the park land. It's not quite big enough to make a structure work.

Paul Iskalo stated that if he had to trade historic looking houses for park land, he'd take park land. There could possibly be a blending in there, and shouldn't be written off. Doug Brackett thought there were many opportunities for development there.

Brian Kulpa felt that if there was a trade off, a high density project could fund street enhancements or mill enhancements. Doug bracket felt it also reinforced the streetscape on both sides of the street. A good option would be a restaurant where you could dine on a balcony and look down into the park.

David Vitka liked the parking garage at street level that is hidden going down Rock Street.

Mary Carr asked how you would acquire the land to do something like what was shown. She knows about eminent domain, but how else? The property is owned by the back side of the Main Street properties. Brian Kulpa stated that the facilities could be moved somewhere else. A balance of surface parking on the west side of N. Cayuga could also be beneficial. A parking ramp could also possible be put behind the carriage house.

Paul Iskalo felt that the parking ramp behind was a little too far away from the core of the Mill and Main Street. A concept presented in the past was a parking ramp behind the Eagle House. You would have to negotiate with those property owners. It's also in a core area. You would have to trade parking in the ramp for surface parking. If you encroached into the park maybe 30' or so, the parking ramp could support that as well. There seems to be some synergy there, as well as something to barter with. David Vitka felt it helped by using the grade in favor of accessibility.

The issue is cost. Chuck Akers felt that at the VFW Post, you would have to dynamite out the rock.

Conversation centered on the picture with a parking area on N. Cayuga next to 5500 Main Street. This would help relieve some of the pressure on 5500 Main Street. Brian Kulpa felt this made it more of a destination. Paul Iskalo also agreed with the location of the three-story ramp. It sets up for future development on Main Street. Both would like to see some type of hospitality for the park included.

John Behan asked the committee to comment about structured parking in the mill area and what they would like to see. David Vitka asked how much of a parking shortage there is. You probably couldn't support the mill. It doesn't have to be structured, but you need more parking. Shared parking would be a first step (behind the Eagle House). Brian Kulpa felt that taking advantage of the escarpment with the face on Spring Street would be a good situation.

Chuck Akers felt that if above areas are retail stores, why not create a structure from Cayuga all the way over to Main Street? You would have that whole area as additional parking, and it's close to the businesses. It's a good place to hide it. There isn't much residential. It wouldn't be seen from Main Street. John Behan felt that the driving factor would be the owners who want to take advantage of this opportunity.

West stone suggested a parking garage in the front of 5500 Main Street with retail in the front.

Paul Iskalo stated there's also parking behind 5500 Main Street and a ramp could be put there as well.

John Behan felt that plan B would be to find some satellite spot locations to support the mill.

The committee agrees to put the houses back on N. Cayuga, show parking from Cayuga to Spring Street behind the Main Street buildings, as well as in front of or behind 5500 Main Street. John Behan suggested having a small meeting with the existing property owners beforehand. This should probably be refined, and not necessarily introduced at the public meeting next month. It can be shown conceptually with a simple graphic.

LONG STREET

Lawrence Bice reviewed the fine-tuning of Long Street.

David Vitka asked to have the train depot put back in.

Chuck Rizzone asked to put the streets names in, as well as show the overlay of the existing park, as well as the existing properties. Lawrence stated it could be overlaid or an aerial could be shown instead of putting too much onto one document.

Chuck Rizzone asked how we are going to communicate with the public. There will be a press release and a post card. It will be on the web site. All of the consultants will be present at the public meeting.

John Behan clarified the difference between the concepts and ideas vs. this being a project or a plan. This is a way to think about the area and provide guidance if and when it transitions.

Brian Kulpa stated that there have been a number of residents who have expressed concern over the three concepts. They are almost up in arms, and he is trying to explain that this is conceptual. What is happening to my park, why is my street becoming a cross-street? It's almost snow-balling. Mary Carr stated that nobody wants anything to interfere with their neighborhoods. Lawrence will try to take a step back from that so one street is not shown as being a cut through.

Discussion centered on how to present this to the public. Paul Iskalo thought that the approach of why we are doing this needs to be put out there. There is a chimney factory and a contractor's yard. This is proactive. If this isn't looked at now, there will be haphazard redevelopment. It's not necessarily to accommodate more housing. We want to be able to tell people what we think should go there. This is an area for development due to what's there now. Showing the existing condition is worthwhile. The committee has an obligation to the broader community to bring this forward. All of the alternatives should be shown. One option is the existing industrial use.

Paul Iskalo reinforced that someone could purchase the property and put a metal factory in that is zoned for, that could have other issues as compared to possible uses. Sally Kuzon suggested showing an aerial view to show what a large track of land is there.

Lawrence asked the committee to let him know if they think he missed anything.

Vic Paquet asked about April 24th. Do they need to do anything, do they need to come? Lawrence thought it was very important that the committee comes. The consultants are helping, but it's the committee's plan. Walter asked that members encourage friends and neighbors to come. This is the opportunity to get community input instead of hearing it from the committee. There were about 80 people there last time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Thomas Frank, 225C Evans Street

Mr. Frank stated that there is a 20-year horizon for transition of properties. The GBNRTC has Main Street traffic in there for the long-range plan. Also, there is presently an offer of settlement for the NY Power Authority.

Trustee Brian Geary

Trustee Geary thanked the committee on behalf of the Village Board for all their work.

CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 PM.