



**SUMMARY - Draft
Public Design Workshop #2**

June 16, 2010

Dan Leghorn Fire Company
426 South Plank Road, Town of Newburgh, NY
7:00 PM to 9:30 PM

Event Description:

Approximately 25 community members attended a public workshop in the Town of Newburgh for the greater Newburgh study area. The purpose of this workshop was to develop an understanding of residential and commercial growth trends and identify strategies to manage and guide future growth in a manner that considers the existing and planned transportation infrastructure in the region.

Handouts:

- One-page fact sheet with schedule
- Build Out Scenario Summaries
- Newburgh Area Demographics
- Draft Principles of Livable Communities

Welcome:

John Czamanske, Deputy Planning Commissioner of the Orange County Planning Department and Study Project Manager, welcomed the workshop participants and provided the context for the study. Mr. Czamanske reviewed reasons for undertaking the study including increasing traffic, commercial development, plans for Stewart Airport, redevelopment of the downtown Newburgh waterfront, and the need for improved transit. Mr. Czamanske described the nine municipalities in the study area and discussed how the planning effort was being funded and coordinated. It was noted that the study is sponsored by the Orange County Transportation Council (OCTC), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the county, with staff support from the Orange County Planning Department (in coordination with NYS Department of Transportation Region 8).

Presentation (PowerPoint format):

Graham Trelstad of AKRF, the project's lead consultant, provided an overview of study goals and described the progress of the planning effort to date, as well as opportunities for future public involvement. The purpose of the study is to foster sustainable development that integrates transportation and land use planning and balances the need for economic development with smart growth principles. Mr. Trelstad noted that the planning session would involve three components including a discussion of the "build-out analysis" that was used to forecast locations and amounts of future development in the study area, an interactive design exercise in smaller groups, and an opportunity for each group to discuss their ideas.

David Kooris, of Regional Plan Association, provided a discussion of methodology used to develop the build-out analysis and described its purpose. A build-out analysis is a tool

that considers how land can be developed based on the constraints imposed by zoning, existing development, or environmental features such as wetlands or steep slopes. The build-out analysis relied on four scenarios for growth:

1. Unconstrained

The unconstrained scenario shows the amount of growth that can occur under current zoning cumulatively across the nine municipalities being studied. The build-out results for this scenario assume that all land in the study area is fully developed to its zoned potential.

2. Business-as-Usual

This scenario is called “business-as-usual” because it demonstrates the development that might be expected across the study area through 2035 based on population and job growth projections and existing zoning.

3. Smart Growth A

This scenario assumes that growth takes place according to existing municipal comprehensive plans and targeted growth or preservation areas described within those plans.

4. Smart Growth B

This scenario is based on the Smart Growth A scenario, however, under Smart Growth B, additional capacity for growth is assigned to the city and village centers. Smart Growth B also assumes that the study area communities are more successful in steering development away from lands targeted for agricultural or forest protection.

Maps showing the amounts of forecast residential and commercial growth were shown for each scenario. In addition, charts were shown to demonstrate the study area wide effects on land use. The charts demonstrated that the smart growth scenarios placed a greater number of units at transit supportive densities and provided a greater amount of land that could be left as open space. The effects of each scenario were also depicted in terms of roadway capacity and traffic. It was demonstrated that as the area continues to grow, congestion will increase in certain areas depending on the specific locations for new development.

Design Exercise:

Following the presentation, workshop participants self-selected into three groups, each led by two facilitators from the project team. The groups reviewed a document listing “Principles of Livability” and identified concerns, additional goals and ideas for improvements. Gathered around large-scale land use maps, each group discussed the prevailing pattern of low density automobile-dominated development and its effect on land use and traffic congestion. While many workshop participants expressed their preference for a suburban lifestyle, participants recognized that some higher-density centers, or nodes, were necessary to provide opportunities for increased mobility and affordability while simultaneously allowing for large tracts of open space to be protected.

Participants at each table collaborated on potential locations for development of varying densities. Referencing aerial photography of the study area and maps showing existing environmental constraints, participants discussed appropriate areas for future development. Photographs of existing developments from across the region were used

to describe the densities and housing types that were appropriate for each area. Many participants agreed that development should be channeled into existing town centers such as the City of Newburgh and study area villages in order to provide for transit and pedestrian opportunities. However, recognizing that the existing centers could not reasonably accommodate all of the region's forecast growth, participants also identified locations for new development at major crossroads and existing hamlet centers. Following the design exercise, each table presented and discussed their ideas with the larger group. All design suggestions were noted for consultant reference and consideration. Notes from each group are in the Appendix to this summary.

Next Steps:

Consultants will consider various options for more detailed traffic modeling. These traffic models are intended to provide a better understanding of how individual traffic and land use decisions can affect travel patterns and congestion throughout the study area. The traffic models will evaluate key intersections in the study area as well as the Route 300 corridor from the vicinity of Route 207 to Route 52.

- After the traffic modeling effort is completed, the project team will meet with key stakeholders in October, November, and December to discuss potential transportation improvements and land use policy changes.
- A third public workshop, tentatively scheduled for January 2011, will focus on balancing transportation and land use improvements and decisions.
- A final public information meeting will be held in February 2011 to present recommendations.

Appendix

Notes from each table/group participating in the public design workshop:

Table 1

(Facilitators Rob Lane and Charlie Murphy)

Main Concerns and Ideas

- Preserving productive farmland and open space
- Route 17K corridor could develop similar problems as the 287 corridor in Westchester if things continue as they have been going
- I-84 could potentially turn into a trouble spot.
- Sewer and water access were seen as constraints to development, but it was noted that if those issues could be worked out, Transit Oriented Development-style development would work in the region
- How to make the region competitive economically was discussed. With all the vacant office space downstate, there is a need to figure out what qualities make the Newburgh area attractive to businesses.
 - Green tech and Bio Med are possible industries but Agriculture must remain an important industry in this area.
 - The area is airport-accessible on major roadways. Think creatively about industries that are based around airport. (Businesses that need fast access to product. More value added jobs.)
- Higher incomes in the NYC metro area are driving real estate prices and large-lot development
- Very little room for growth in the existing villages, except for conversions of single-family homes to multiple units and/or accessory units.
 - Walden: Relatively affordable, has a high number of commuters and could expand outwards
 - Maybrook: Houses were described as “too close together.” 4-8 unit multi-family development, if well designed, was thought to be appropriate there.
 - The area around the Village of Montgomery (Industrial and Orange County Airport): Another potential growth area
- The group identified places for more than 10,500 units of future growth:
 - City of Newburgh 4,500 units
 - Airport strip 2,000 units
 - City vicinity 1,500 units
 - Around Salisbury Mills 1,000 units
 - Around Maybrook and Montgomery 1,000 units
 - Walden 500 units

Table 2
(Facilitators Graham Trelstad and Kyle Snyder)
Main Concerns and Ideas

- Provide a Variety of Transportation Choices
 - People are spread out, variety will be tough
 - City residents can not get to transit or transit does not exist (irregular hours, etc.)
 - Getting people to jobs is important
- Align Development with Road Capacity
 - Local roads can not handle traffic as it is; charts showing existing roads are adequate do not match to what residents have experienced
 - Local roads often act as cut-throughs for residents to avoid high-volume roads
 - Lack of sidewalks
 - Growth of area needs to be regulated and guided to certain areas – one idea is to widen Route 17K to four lanes
- Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place
 - Need to be careful to make sure all levels of density fit in with the area, and low density housing meets design standards (no McMansions – see Meadow Winds south of Route 52 west of I-87)
- Mix Land Uses
 - More mixed use on Broadway; is it possible to put a trolley on Broadway instead of buses? Trolleys usually require a higher land density than 12 units/acre, but there are ways to make buses look/act like trolleys to avoid the “bus stigma”
- Comments on Density Guide Chart
 - How does high-density housing work in hilly terrain? There are challenges, but also ways in which it has been done.
 - Density is okay, but keeping the housing of a high-quality is important at each level of density.
 - What makes high quality? Access to open spaces, aesthetically pleasing
- The group identified places for more than 6,500 units of future growth:
 - North of Route 17K west of 747/Drury Lane – 600 units of medium/high density
 - City of Newburgh east of Broadway terminus (along waterfront) – 1100 units of medium/high density – Leyland Development
 - City of Newburgh around Broadway – 600 units medium/high density
 - South of Route 17K east of Rt. 300 near Auto Park Place – 500 units high density
 - Salisbury Mills – 700 units medium density
 - Stewart Terrace – already some medium density – continue this trend
 - Route 207 south of Stewart State Forest – 300 units medium density
 - Southwest of I-87 and Route 207 – 100 units medium density
 - Vails Gate – 1000 units high density

- Mountainville – 200 units medium density
- South of Stewart Airport – 1500 units medium density

Table 3

(Facilitators David Kooris and Marty Taub)

Main Concerns and Ideas

- Provide a Variety of Transportation Choices
 - It is currently dangerous to walk, as cars speed through intersections which lack crosswalks.
 - Bicycle commuting may be viable downtown, or as connectors to trails.
- Align Development with Road Capacity
 - There is a need for route options to get in, and out of, development nodes. All accesses to a development node can not be along Route 17K, for example, or that one access will have serious congestion.