

**Village of Hastings on Hudson  
Waterfront Rezoning Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**March 8, 2018**

Hastings Public Library- Orr Room

WRC Committee Members Present

1. Katey Stechel
2. Meg Walker
3. Kate Starr
4. Danielle Galland
5. Thomas Asher
6. Shannon Rooney
7. Richard Bass
8. Morgen Fleisig
9. Spencer Orkus

1. Chair welcomes the public
  - a. Offers agenda and materials for the public
  - b. Notes that committee is complete except for Katey Stechel, who is traveling
2. Chair offers update on Project Manager Search
  - a. Robust uptake on call for proposals – four finalists offering different sets of experience
  - b. Commits to making hire before April WRC meeting
3. Meg Walker notes that BP reached out to discuss
4. Richard Bass reviews the waterfront work to date and presents findings from previous reports:
  - a. Commonality across all proposals: mixed use development, preserving views, preserving historic character, sustainable development, integrate new development into upland community
  - b. Previously, for the Waterfront plan, there was an assumption that there would be no cost to acquiring land and there was an assumption that 250 units would cover the costs of the development
    - i. No projection of impact on costs to school given that there was no assumption of uniform unit size
  - c. We have land outside the waterfront site – the parking lot and land north of the contaminated site – not part of these reports
  - d. According to the Comp Plan, land should be tax positive – Comp Plan consultant stated that for residential use, only luxury housing meets this criteria; non-profit development, such as a university, does not; commercial development would.
  - e. Create promenade, encourage interim uses – consider as a phased development

- f. Preserve view of Palisades and the NYC skyline
  - g. Waterfront infrastructure committee
    - i. The Infrastructure Committee "peeled the onion", but eliminating portions of the waterfront, such as view corridors, contaminated areas, waterfront walkway, etc., leaving approximately 25 acres. Assuming 15% lot coverage for development and the Consent Decree height limit, would determine the level of development, in square feet. If that level is determined to be too much, then further limit the height/number of stories.
5. Meg Walker presented shore line development plan and consent decree:
- a. Consent Decree seeks 100 feet from mean low tide shore line
  - b. Deteriorating bulkhead in the BP shoreline
    - i. DEC seeking more resilient and green shoreline, beyond what the shoreline committee initially sought
  - c. PCBs are deep at the north-most point so they cannot be removed without risk of leaching into the water and adjacent areas – this area will need hard boundaries
  - d. Public needs and wants
    - i. Central plaza
      - 1. Ferry terminal
      - 2. Café restrooms
      - 3. Optional small marina
    - ii. Passive recreation
      - 1. Walk/bike trails
      - 2. Access to natural areas
    - iii. Programmatic elements
      - 1. Boathouse
      - 2. Playground
      - 3. Flexible land
    - iv. Natural Elements
      - 1. Storm water retention pond
      - 2. Connection to existing creek
    - v. South site programming
      - 1. Beach
      - 2. Fishing pier
      - 3. Natural areas and enhanced ecology
    - vi. North – tide marsh
    - vii. Daylighting stream (northern point)
    - viii. Hard edge on northwest corner and a concrete surface – ferry station? More public uses that are community oriented. Close to train station so
    - ix. Tidal marsh land by exaction area
    - x. Look at Long Dock Park in Beacon as a model – resilient design and draws natural feel to design

- xi. Soft shoreline poses problems with waves however; a longer slope will be required to mitigate wave action
  - xii. Permitted uses – ferry terminal, boating, parks, etc. (ensure that we don't preclude uses)
  - xiii. Groundwater pumping and remediation on north shore
- e. Broader committee takes up presentations:
  - i. Spencer Orkus notes committee should require future developers to contract environmental impact analysts
  - ii. Asks if we have a transportation study – (one completed in 2000 and one subsequently)
- f. Additional comments by group:
  - i. We have three different owners, plausibly leading to three different developers, which means that we need to use code to ensure that there is equity and continuity across the phased developments
  - ii. Institutional uses don't pay taxes; our taxes have gone up because the waterfront isn't carrying its weight. With focus on education, cultural uses (as was favored in 90s) we lose tax revenue – a tradeoff
  - iii. We need to look at the various plans and see where there is overlap and conflict between previous plans in terms of objectives and design elements
  - iv. What view corridors need to be preserved – what uniformity needs to be present (green roofs)
- 6. Committee held conversation around developers and planning consultants
  - a. Mark Lester was hired to work on development strategy for BP – he contacted mayor last fall and Meg Walker more recently
  - b. BP seeks to sell property to company that will do remediation and integrate design and remediation
    - i. Two developers now identified who cannot yet be disclosed
    - ii. They will submit bids on April 20
      - 1. Will have a developer on board by July
        - a. Conditions will be set (rezoning, etc.)
        - b. Long term remediation in perpetuity is BPs responsibility
      - 2. DEC wants more tests first before they accept any final remedial plans but developer should be on board to be involved in this process
      - 3. Morgen – expressed concerns about who the developer is and whether we need to accept BPs determination
      - 4. Spencer – the Village Trustees' power lies with the zoning
      - 5. Exxon Mobil – is likely to want to work with the developer
      - 6. Third property was acquired by entity which does not seek to develop it themselves (we need to figure out who acquired this third property)

- iii. Land value created might be entirely needed to pay for infrastructure – i.e. possible that there is no way to capture land value for other development needs
- c. John Nolan – we need a formalized agreement with him
- d. Compiling list of planning consultants
  - i. Planner is key consultant that we require asap – SOM, WXY, Local Office,
  - ii. Environmental consultant with focus on hazardous materials – Rue (?) with which we have previous relationship and knows the site and one of the best
  - iii. Financial analyst (U3)
  - iv. We need to disclose potential conflict of interests using google docs
  - v. Form based zoning
- 7. Committee discussed idea of allowing Hunter design studio to explore ideas for waterfront development
  - a. Concern that student needs might place undue burden on committee members
  - b. Enthusiasm for idea of asking Hunter students to work with HoH high school students on design
- 8. Chair opened floor to public
  - i. Parking for everyone – all parking for train station should be set immediately adjacent to the train station and below ground
  - ii. If not for desire for tax revue should we develop anything at all on waterfront other than parkland?
    - 1. We could bond and buy the 100 million dollars of 42 acres
    - 2. Leave zoning on the Anaconda property as is – leave as industrial
    - 3. Consent decree – elevate property to get out of 500-year flood plain but sloping
    - 4. Concern expressed that wet lands don't provide public space
    - 5. Consent decree: BP will maintain the land but 30-foot corridor of trails belong to village ---
    - 6. Can we zone in an incremental, As-Of-Right fashion?
    - 7. Historical markers (indexes) of past uses – signs and bricks that invoke industrial past
- 9. Chair closes meeting