

- **Potential Rezoning:** Identify and rezone select residential areas for job-creation activities. The largest areas I can think of at first glance are (a) Beacon Correctional Facility (which the State is looking for economic development but is still zoned residential), and (b) the areas around Dennings Point / Craig House (which I understand was looked at for a possible university campus). I am not saying these are the sites to rezone – rather we should look at all possibilities. We should look to adjust certain zoning that currently permits commercial/industrial to requiring them in some circumstances – e.g., for portions of FCD zone within a few blocks of Main Street. We should consider special zoning for uses such as medical/dental offices, which require specialized construction, or other professional offices for small and medium size firms.
- **Road Access:** Plan out a specific connection for a non-residential road from Route 52 to the Beacon Correctional Facility site, and as well from that site to Route 9D or I-84. Good access plans will help attract the best proposals for economic development, and could find funding sources.

3. Fishkill Creek Development (FCD) Zone: Our stated purposes for the FCD zone are to encourage redevelopment of industrial properties and to establish greenways/trails along the creek. We did not cover the FCD in our recent Comprehensive Plan update, and there are certain aspects we should consider updating in light of changes and experience since enactment. We should look to expand our greenway trails, encourage employment-generating uses, and limit development to industrial sites.

- **Proposal:** Review the predicates and main components of our FCD zone to confirm whether they still are appropriate and/or make any changes. This review should include addressing:
 - How density is determined and whether explicit density limits or ranges are appropriate.
 - How the special permit criteria should be applied to determine whether a development concept plan “will fulfill the purposes of FCD District” and “will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the City.”
 - How FCD design standards have worked in practice – including that proposals “must attain high standards of design,” provide view corridors, use high quality architecture and materials, avoid long uninterrupted walls, and be convertible to non-residential use – and consider whether stronger language is required to achieve the desired purposes.
 - Whether job-generating uses should be required as opposed to being optional, especially for portions of the FCD zone within a couple blocks of Main Street.
 - How greenway trails and open space have in practice fit in FCD zone and whether changes are appropriate – especially if a greenway/open space expansion is desired.

4. Greenway Expansion and Tioronda Bridge: The Greenway is a huge asset for our community, and we should expand it. The Comprehensive Plan has a good description of progress on Greenway and other trails. We should work with Greenway representatives to brainstorm how we can expand our trail network, integrate into it our the Tioronda (South Avenue) and Bridge Street bridges, and translate our expanded plans into zoning and funding.

- **Proposal:** Create a Greenway/trail expansion visioning effort. Look specifically at creating a parallel Greenway trail on the other side of Fishkill Creek (from the Tioronda Bridge to Wolcott Avenue), and linking it to other trails and the rest of the Hudson Highlands. Engage resources to search for funding of a bridge at South Avenue that does not require a two-lane vehicular “thoroughfare” bridge. If a two-lane bridge is built at South Avenue, identify an alternative site on Fishkill Creek between South Avenue and Wolcott to build a restoration (or near-restoration)

of the Tioronda Bridge, and integrate it into the Greenway trail network. Plan out how to integrate and fund the Bridge Street span in the trail network.

5. Historic District & Landmark Overlay (HDLO) Zone: We explicitly agreed when adopting our Comprehensive Plan update to revisit our Historic Overlay zoning for additional properties and a review of its mechanics. There are a number of sites where our Historic Overlay zone protections should be extended. I am also concerned with whether our protections work in practice for some situations. As a single example, we have observed development proposals in the HDLO zone that could adversely affect the setting of the Howland Center, one of Beacon's historic jewels.

- **Proposals:**
 - **Additions:** Direct the Building Dept, Planner & Historical Society to quickly review properties for addition to the HDLO zone. The review should include (but is not limited to): North Ave, Lafayette, Edgewater, Bayview, South Ave, Wolcott, Rombout, Beacon, Cliff, Dewindt, W Center, Main, Dutchess Terrace, Church, Willow, Oak, Fishkill, Tioronda, the entire Fishkill Creek Development zone, Churchill, Union, Robinson, Howland, E Main, Schenck, Davis, Falconer, Wodell, Liberty, Washington and Depuyster.
 - **Nearby Impacts:** Require a proposed HDLO exterior alteration or special use permit to review the impact on other HDLO properties; require a finding that the proposal does not adversely affect the historic character of HDLO properties and neighborhood.
 - **Approvals:** Expand the special use permit criteria of "maintaining the architectural and historical integrity" to include not only the structure, but also the historic landscaping, nearby historic properties and any historic district. Direct our Planner to review all certificate of appropriateness criteria for any strengthening suggestions.
 - **Planning Fees/Assessment:** Exempt "small" projects (e.g., five or fewer residential units) from any planning/building fees, where the sole purpose is to obtain a certificate of appropriateness to comply with HDLO zoning law. Request that our Planner and Assessor review the assessment abatement section, to determine whether it has been applied and how best to provide this benefit to HDLO property owners.

6. Planning/ZBA Support: Finally, we need to examine how our zoning and planning laws are executed in practice by our Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and City Council (the latter for special use permits). I have personally attended recent PB/ZBA meetings, and find them overwhelmed at the one extreme, and ignoring legal and professional advice at the other extreme. It must be especially daunting when faced with proposals supported by extensive legal and professional staff. Some combination of training, communication, staffing and legal "teeth" seems clearly in order.

- **Proposal:** Task our Planner or other professional to provide a review with recommendations of the execution of our planning and zoning laws, with a focus on the details of execution and outcome, and on the workings of our boards.
- **Legislation:** Based on those recommendations, enact more specific "teeth" in our planning and zoning laws, and consider turning items that some might argue are a "matter of right" into items based solely on the discretion of the relevant board and in return for provided public benefits.
- **ZBA:** Consider requiring a City Council recommendation (after the Planning Board recommendation) for ZBA actions involving larger (e.g., greater than 10 units) proposals.
- **Studies:** Consider how to objectively review supporting studies (traffic, school impacts), e.g., by developing our own studies, using our own experts or getting appropriate training.