NY Forward – Capital Region - Greenwich

Subject	MINUTES LPC Meeting #5	Date	Wednesday, October 29, 2025
Place	Junior-Senior High School Media Room 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 (absent)
Emily Crawford
John Mattison
Sarah Murphy
Jack Pemrick
Teri Ptacek (absent)
Julie Sipperly (absent)
Aaron Kendall
John Paris

State Team
Matthew Smith, DOS
Gina DaBiere-Gibbs, DOS
Mary Elise Rees, ESD

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

Public
~25 individuals

Meeting Summary:

Please see 'GW_LPC Meeting 5_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 fifth 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) thanks everyone for their engagement and participation so far. Notes to the LPC that their job at this meeting is to determine which projects get sent to the State for final funding decision – so this represents their last opportunity to shape those decisions.

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 throughout the process (see slides).

Submitted Projects

Ian (BH) presents updates and changes provided for each of the submitted projects in turn, with discussion among the LPC for each. Note that in the "challenges" section of each project, budget and timeline is not generally noted, unless there is a particularly unusual amount of risk – some level of budget and timeline risk is an unavoidable characteristic of all capital projects. See slides for information presented. Summarized below are project-specific comments and discussions made by the LPC throughout the meeting:

A. Restore and Reimagine Village Hall

- Confirmed that the notification date on the pending BRICKS grant application is supposed to be by mid-November.
- Some discussion about why such a big portion of the NYF should be requested for a municipal building. Observed that in addition to core municipal functions, the building also hosts community groups and events, a function that is increasingly difficult with the deteriorating state of the building. Also observed that given the cost to restore the building, it is not clear how this would be funded except thru NYF. The potential BRICKS-funded expanded version of the project would only add more major community space, which is in alignment with the Village Hall Task Force from a couple years ago that surfaced the community's priorities for future uses of the building.
- **LPC confirms unanimously that this project should remain in the slate.**

B. Transform Downtown Streetscape

- Question about burying the electrical lines as part of this project – Mayor's response that currently it is not, but they will continue trying to get it incorporated, pending time and cost challenges. Work won't happen until 2027 or 2028, so there's time left to keep trying.

C. Revitalize Mowry Park and Gazebo

- No specific comments noted.

D. Enhance Greenwich Commons Park

- Support expressed for the public restroom component in particular.

E. Expand the Battenkill YMCA Branch

- Question from public about whether the plan is to add a story – currently that is not the plan, the renovation and addition will all remain single-story.
- Some discussion about a pool – again confirmed that this is not in the proposal and would be massively expensive. Sponsor observed that a pool did not even rank very highly in their market survey of what people want to see at that branch.
- Some comments to the effect that the YMCA is a relatively well-resourced organization and would be able to find funding elsewhere, and that the $1m NYF ask is a significant portion of the overall NYF award.
- Some discussion about the location of the project somewhat outside the original NYF boundary – general feeling that it is not within the walkable core. Some discussion about whether the positive impact of this project would actually be felt in the downtown area, or simply by the Town/Village at large.
- **LPC confirms by a 2-6 vote (1 recusal, 3 absent) that this project should be removed from the slate.**

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

- No specific comments noted.

G. Renovate 72 Main Street

- Question about how deep the parcel goes – understanding from those present is that it ends roughly where the gravel lot is currently. *[Note: this is confirmed, the lot is between 175-180' deep, with the rear line roughly corresponding to the far extent of the existing gravel parking area.]*

H. Improve the Library's Backyard

- Question of how the proposed library shelter is different from the Mowry Park gazebo – answer that the library space is much quieter and more intimate, with less traffic noise. Programming would also be quieter and more intimate like author talks and other things the library currently does inside, with Mowry Park continuing to host things like concerts.

- Question from public about how many people fit under the covering, referring to the consultant rendering. Answer is that somewhere on the order of 10 people could fit comfortably under the shelter in the rendering, but that the rendering is only indicative and the size, shape, capacity, etc. are likely to change over the course of the actual design process.

I. Upgrade the Rough and Ready Museum

- Question from public about how the expanded hours that are cited as a benefit for this project will be funded – is if from NYF? Answer is that no, NYF funds are capital expenses only, so any impact to operating expenses would have to be figured out separately by the Sponsor. Also observed that current hours are extremely limited, and the capital project proposes to provide heat to a currently un-heated space – speculating that even the expanded hours would be within the capability of an all- or mostly-volunteer staff.

J. [previously removed]

K. Convert Barn and Construct a Mixed-Use Building

- Confirmed that Sponsor did not answer the inquiry regarding the environmental investigation of the site.
- Confirmed that Sponsor has not yet discussed the project with Village planning/zoning board.
- Confirmed that Sponsor is not willing to relinquish the option to develop the barn into an auto/tire shop.
- Discussion about the budget - $500k for 2 apartments over retail is seen as far too little budget. Public comment that "the days of $150/sf are long gone."
- Opinion offered that project does not have a clear vision – hard to know what they'd be voting for if they were to put it in the slate.
- **LPC confirms unanimously that this project should be removed from the slate.**

L. Revitalize 28 Main Street

- No specific comments noted.

M. Rehabilitate the First National Bank of Greenwich

- No specific comments noted.

N. Transform the Eddy Plow Works Building

- Short discussion about the location a bit outside the boundary. General feeling that this is a technicality and the building is clearly within the walkable core.
- **LPC confirms unanimously that this project should remain in the slate.**

Small Projects

Ian (BH) presents an overview of the demonstration of interest in a Small Project Fund, which includes letters submitted by property owners as well as standalone projects that could be eligible for the SPF if not eventually awarded direct funding.

Discussion about the proposed boundary extension to accommodate all received interest letters, as well as incorporate remaining commercial-zoned parcels near Main St. Some concern expressed about geographically spreading the NYF investment too far, but also acknowledging that the proposed extension is quite minor. Observed the “gerrymandering” to incorporate the Methodist Church and discussed options, primarily to either remove it and stick with Church St as the line, or else expand a bit to incorporate the rest of the buildings fronting that portion of Church St.

Confirmed that interest demonstrated so far does not really support asking for larger than the standard $300k fund. Also discussed briefly the fact of the SPF also being a reimbursement-based program, which sometimes is not clear to Sponsors initially, and could likely cause some attrition once the fund is live and people face the program requirements.

LPC confirms unanimously that a $300k SPF shall be proposed as part of the slate, and that the proposed NYF boundary expansion (see orange line in slides) is adopted, with the modification that all properties facing N Church St (between Woodlawn Ave and Salem St) will be included.

LPC Q&A

Most discussion is noted in the projects rundown above.

The LPC stepped thru each project, giving every member a chance to “nominate” that project for further discussion and potential consideration for removal. Projects A, E, K, N, and O were all nominated and discussed in more detail (discussion and decisions incorporated into notes in above section).

Public Comment

Question about whether the Village streetscaping project will take away any parking spaces – answer from Mayor that it might but that the design isn’t that far along yet, and that the Village will try to minimize any adverse impacts to parking counts – made clear that the priority is that the sidewalks, crosswalks, and curbs have to be made safe and accessible for pedestrians. Trustee in the audience also weighed in with some project history, including that the impetus for the streetscape project was the necessity of replacing the water mains, which requires the streets to all be ripped up for the first time in decades, creating a once-in-a-generation opportunity to also work in these other upgrades.

Question about the back wing of Village Hall being condemned when the fire department moved out – clarified that “condemned” has strong regulatory/legal implications that do not apply – it was simply no longer sufficient to serve as a fire house given the size and condition of the building and the increasing size of fire trucks.

Discussion about funding for Village projects, some concern expressed that Village taxes should not go up in order to pay for these projects. Mayor elaborated on the funding stack for the streetscape project, which includes TIP and AGFTC money, and that none of the Village-proposed projects include a taxpayer match in the budget – it's all grant money or donations.

Sponsor in audience asked about timeframe for reimbursement. Matt (DOS) answers that it depends on the contracting agency, provides some more specifics, and offers that 2-3 months is the current timeframe for DOS.

Impassioned discussion about the need for more housing that is affordable for regular people. Nothing matters if people don't have places to live – they have to move farther and farther out – there are no affordable rentals anymore. Skepticism expressed about whether the units proposed in these NYF projects will be affordable – some discussion about Project F, which included the observation that all of those units will be subsidized affordable, with statutorily-limited rents per HUD AMI guidelines.

Question about whether upcoming zoning changes will effect any of these projects mid-stream. Answer from Mayor and Trustee is that the zoning changes that are likely to be approved will go into effect in January, and that those changes are all geared towards rationalizing the zoning towards the actual situation in Greenwich, to reduce the constant need for variances – there should be no adverse impact to any of the projects in the slate.

Final Vote on Slate of Projects

Entering the meeting, the slate of projects totaled $7.6m and the LPC was asked to confirm a slate within the $6-8m threshold outlined in State guidance.

The approved final slate came in at $6.2m through the following actions:

- Removing **Project E** from the slate: $1,000k
- Removing **Project K** from the slate: $417k

Next steps

Consultant team will follow up with project sponsors for needed information and work to finalize the project profiles that will go into the Strategic Investment Plan to be submitted to the State by end of the year.

Consultant team will distribute ballots to the LPC to formalize the decision on the final slate.

There will not be a sixth LPC meeting.

END OF SUMMARY