

NY Forward – Capital Region - Greenwich

Subject	MINUTES LPC Meeting #4	Date	Wednesday, September 24, 2025
Place	Junior-Senior High School 10 Gray Ave.	Time	6:00-8:00pm

Distribution **Local Planning Committee**
 Amanda Hurley, Mayor (co-chair)
 Laura Oswald (co-chair)
 Jenness Bivona-Laval
 Michael Conlin
 Emily Crawford
 John Mattison
Sarah Murphy (asbent)
 Jack Pemrick
 Teri Ptacek
 Julie Sipperly
 Aaron Kendall
John Paris (absent)

State Team
 Matthew Smith, DOS

Consultant Team
 Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold
 Isabel Mulay, Buro Happold
 Daniel D'Oca, Interboro

Public
 ~13 individuals

Meeting Summary:

Please see 'GW_LPC Meeting 4_Slides_record' for the presentation shared during the meeting which parallels the discussion summarized below.

Action items are called out in ***bold-italic highlight***

Welcome and Agenda

Matt (DOS) welcomes the group to the fourth NY Forward LPC meeting. He briefly overviews the meeting agenda and reminds the room that these meetings are open to the public but not intended to be public interactive workshops.

He then briefly overviews the meeting agenda.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Hurley (LPC Co-Chair) provides brief opening remarks thanking everyone for their commitment.

Code of Conduct

Matt (DOS) reads the Code of Conduct preamble, and reviews key points from the Code of Conduct that LPC members are expected to abide by. Recusals on file are reviewed and LPC is invited to note any further necessary recusals.

Updates: Planning Process & Engagement

Ian (BH) review of what's been done so far and what is on the horizon (see slides).

Dan (Interboro) provides synopsis of engagement done since LPC-3 meeting, including review of the results of the 2nd Public Workshop, the Sign Campaign, and the Online Projects Review Survey. The full raw data is being made available to the LPC members, and project-specific comments are being shared during the project evaluation section of this meeting. Noted that comments were predominantly positive.

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) reviews the Downtown Vision, Evaluation Criteria, and summary of the projects as received from the Open Call. The map of projects is reviewed and then initial evaluation results are shared.

Each of the submitted projects are reviewed in turn, with Isabel (BH) presenting the results of the LPC evaluations, Dan (IB) reviewing the public feedback, and Ian (BH) presenting any sponsor updates and inviting the LPC to provide any additional comments or questions for each project in turn.

A. Restore and Reimagine Village Hall

- Confirmed that the proposed NYF scope is just for the original front portion of the building, removal of the rear portion of the building, and the construction of a new ADA-compliant entry. A full reconstruction of a community facility on the footprint of the removed rear wing would be a "Phase II" project for which the Village put in a BRICS application. The results of the BRICS application should be known by November.
- Shared that a structural engineer was asked to inspect the building to inform the viability of rehabilitating the rear wing – they issued a report that states that the building would not be economical to salvage and that demolition and reconstruction would be recommended. It further notes that the building is not safe for occupancy and that a specific portion of bowing masonry should be shored on an emergency basis. **Consultant team will share that full report with the LPC.**

B. Transform Downtown Streetscape

- Mayor reports that we should have an answer about being able to incorporate sewer laterals into the project by the next LPC meeting.

C. Revitalize Mowry Park and Gazebo

- No specific comments noted.

D. Enhance Greenwich Commons Park

- Question about funding commitment to additional upkeep, especially considering the bathrooms. Sponsor in attendance and answers that yes it would be incorporated into the budget and folded into existing maintenance contracts that they manage.

E. Expand the Battenkill YMCA Branch

- Confirmed that the YMCA reduced its ask to \$1m, and that the additional \$2.55m in match would come from BRICS, a capital campaign or other sources – it is not confirmed and available funding at this time, but anticipated.
- Discussed the YMCA membership fee structure – there are significant financial support programs offered, and a meaningful percentage of users at the Greenwich branch access services at no charge.
- Discussed the variety of childcare options in the Village and how increased coordination might be helpful for families.
- Addressing the public feedback that they want a pool – the Sponsor opined that the budget for an indoor pool would be north of \$10m, and so they are not considering it.
- Discussed that the YMCA youth basketball programs are very well subscribed in Greenwich and would easily occupy the proposed new space.
- Sponsor states that the goal is to expand from basically a fitness center now to something that can serve a broader array of community members and programs.

F. Rebuild Mixed-Use Building at 126 Main St.

- Discussed parking again – there are discussions about a shared parking arrangement with 132 Main St.
- Discussion about 1-BR versus family-sized apartments. Some LPC members noted that this project and others seem to be heavy on 1-BR apartments. Observed that Sponsor had conducted a market study that demonstrated significant demand for small apartments. Observed that existing housing stock is heavy on single-family homes, so small rental apartments help diversify the mix, giving recent grads and retirees somewhere right-sized, allowing homes to be more available for families.

G. Renovate 72 Main Street

- Supportive comments on the housing mission of sponsor organization, BCS.
- Discussion about the housing services BCS offers currently, both onsite and at remote locations, and how this project would allow them to serve more people.
- Discussion about the informal shared parking arrangement behind the building and how this project might impact that.
- Question about whether the proposed use would raise zoning issues – answer that it shouldn't, since the proposed use is the same as the existing, and is within the downtown zoning district which allows for the proposed uses anyway.

H. Improve the Library's Backyard

- Again discussed whether the multiple outdoor pavilions that are either existing or proposed might be redundant. Observed the different character of programming that each is specifically meant to address – so taken together the portfolio of them could contribute to a cohesiveness of the area. Also noted that the uses each pavilion addresses are pre-existing programming, not speculative.
- Request that the rendering might be more effective if it were looking at the stage.

I. Upgrade the Rough and Ready Museum

- Discussion about generally the need to upgrade the facility to support regular hours and proper programming – allows the schools to use it more, allows the meeting space to be reserved/rented out, allows the County to advertise it in its tourism promotion materials – Mayor notes the size of the heritage tourism market and opportunity to capitalize on that via this project.

J. Renovate 106 Main St Exterior and Apartment

- Noted concerns about proposed vinyl siding and whether that would really be an upgrade at this prominent location – nicer materials would have a budget impact. This kind of exterior work is noted as a classic Small Project Fund scope.
- Observed that adding a single residential unit is great, but not overly impactful to the downtown.

K. Convert Barn and Construct a Mixed-Use Building

- Again discussed a separate concept for the Village to acquire the parcel and put in a municipal parking lot. This is not what the Sponsor has proposed, nor would it be eligible for NYF funds.
- Noted the Sponsor was informed about reaction to auto shop idea at previous meeting, and they indicated that's still their plan and balked at investing in a larger ground-up development. **Consultant will request the Sponsor to present a proposal that maximizes new housing, does not include auto uses, and responds contextually with its design.**
- Question about environmental issues on the site, there may have been petro storage uses previously. **Consultant will ask Sponsor if they have investigated, and if not, will advise on the necessity of a Phase I assessment for public funding.**
- Also discussed the proposed project budget, observing that it might be too small, even for the proposed new building.

L. Revitalize 28 Main Street

- No specific comments noted.

M. Rehabilitate the First National Bank of Greenwich

- Corrected that the Sponsor is keeping the NYF request at \$350k, and is still working to revise the overall budget.

N. Transform the Eddy Plow Works Building

- Sponsor confirms that they are working through parking with the local planning authorities – have been told they have enough space for 12 parking spaces on their current land. They are considering acquiring the adjacent parcel, but that would likely be outside the timeline of this NYF process.

O. Small Projects Fund

- See section below.

P. Convert the Parish House into Mixed-Use

- Shared that the Sponsor has discontinued efforts to acquire the property, and so this Project is likely to be dropped. Since this news was shared to the Consultant team on the day of the meeting, the Project will stay in consideration for now, and **the Consultant will follow-up with the Sponsor to confirm status.**

Small Projects

Ian (BH) presents an overview of the small project interest letters as received during the Open Call, and then provides an update on additional letters received since LPC-3 meeting. Also noted the individually submitted projects that have scopes and budgets that could be viable for the Small Project Fund. Clarified that these projects will be counted towards the demonstration of interest, regardless of whether they are included as standalone projects in the slate of projects recommended for funding – in the event that they are recommended but not ultimately awarded, they would still be viable candidates for the SPF.

LPC discussed the SPF – no conclusive decision is reached, but the option will remain open for now and factor into the discussion at the fifth meeting. Mayor noted that Village remains committed to pursuing other grant funding sources such as Restore NY, Main Streets, etc.

LPC Q&A

Most discussion is noted in the projects rundown above, and/or in the removal notes below.

Discussion about the potential boundary extension options. Only concern raised was regarding potential objections from property owners who are outside the original boundary and did not apply to the Open Call. In addition to the messaging at the time reinforcing that people near the boundary should submit their project regardless – the extension actually proposed mostly covers single-family houses that would not have been eligible for stand-alone NYF funding in any case.

Public Comment

No public comments noted. Some comments from Sponsors incorporated into project rundown section above.

Projects to be Removed from Consideration

Project P may be removed from consideration, due to the Project Sponsor's efforts to gain site control falling through. This will be confirmed within a week or so of the meeting.

Project J will be removed from consideration, due to its poor overall alignment with the evaluation criteria. In particular, the LPC believes that the exterior upgrades can be accomplished through the potential Small Project Fund or other NY grant programs (such as RESTORE NY or Main Streets), and that the single residential unit being added is not impactful enough to compete with other projects.

Next steps

Consultant team will reach out to all Project Sponsors to inform them of the results of the meeting and provide them with any questions and requests necessary to complete their project profiles for the next LPC meeting.

END OF SUMMARY