



CITY OF KINGSTON PLANNING BOARD, HISTORIC LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
COMMISSION, AND HERITAGE AREA COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA - KINGSTONIAN
September 26, 2019
Common Council Chambers – 6:00 PM

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT: Wayne D. Platte, Jr.,
Chairman, Robert Jacobsen, MaryJo Wiltshire, Matt Gillis.

HISTORIC LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Mark
Grunblatt, Chairman, Andrea Puetz, Peter Demuth, Hayes Clement.

HERITAGE AREA COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Hayes Clement, Chairman, Bonnie
Rutski, Vice-Chair, Bernard Matthews, Abigail Robin.

OTHERS: Suzanne Cahill; Planning Director, Kyla DeDea; Assistant Planner, Donna Brady,
Senior Clerk, Julie Edelson-Safford; Historic Preservation Administrator Ald. Reynolds Scott-
Childress, Common Council Liaison, Daniel Gartenstein; Assistant Corporation Counsel.

APPLICANTS & REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Joseph Bonura, Brad Jordan and Patrick
Page, applicants; Michael Moriello, attorney; Stephen Mackenzie, architect; Dennis Larios,
engineer and Frank Campagna.

GENERAL NOTES:

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Introduction of all Board Members and Staff Present
3. Identify exits, bathrooms, no elevator in case of emergency
4. Silence cell phones, conversations should be taken out of room
5. Respect speakers

REGULAR BUSINESS:

Item #1: Open Public Speaking (15 Minutes Allotted- all limited to 2 minutes)

Sarah Wenk – 150 Main Street – submitted a document with notes and images on behalf of
Marissa Marvelli who was unable to attend the meeting.

Geddy Sveikauskas – Uptown neighbor to the project – Stated that he spoke about the
Kingstonian project before and that he has similar comments. No group gets everything that
they want but what you hope for in a project like this is that you get something that will work
for everyone. He agrees with the SHPO comments but feels that we should not follow
everything they want but also should not defy them for no reason. We can make the project

more consistent with the neighborhood. We have a developer that is very keen not to lose money and a community that is very interested in what is happening here and what will happen in the future. He has not commented to make the project smaller but is more interested in making it better. He thanked the Planning Board for including and listening to his previous comments. He also stated that he is not commenting on traffic or other specialized issues because he is not an expert but what he does want to speak about are the visuals and community character. The project should be more consistent with its surroundings. He does not want to suggest that the project should be smaller because it could result in it not happening but he does think that it could look better. It is possible to make changes that will make the project fit better without resulting in it being more expensive. He is even open to a few more units if it would result in changes to aesthetics. He is not sure that he likes the front side using more honest materials and the backend just being what it is. What needs to happen is that we need to listen to each other. What is upsetting is the tenor of the conversation from both sides. We shouldn't be looking for new ways to oppose the project and we also shouldn't be saying that due to financials, there is no way to give an inch. We need to listen to each other and work together on this. More information sharing is needed. He can live with the project or without it but can't live with a bad project.

Tanya Garment – 102 Wurts Street – Wanted to remind the Planning Board that the Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission sent a comment letter which should be considered during the review. These original comments should be considered part of the official record. The local boundaries of the Stockade District go all the way to the back side of the property. The HLPC oversees this historic district.

OLD BUSINESS:

Item #2: #9-17 & 21 North Front Street and 51 Schwenk Drive and a portion of Fair Street Extension LOT LINE DELETION of the Lands of Herzog's Supply Company and the City of Kingston. SBL 48.80-1-25, 26 & 24.120. SEQR Determination. Zone C-2, Mixed Use Overlay District. Kingstonian Development LLC/applicant; Herzog's Supply Co. Inc. & City of Kingston/owner.

Item #3: #9-17 & 21 North Front Street and 51 Schwenk Drive and a portion of Fair Street Extension SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT to construct a Mixed Use building with a 420 car garage, 129 apartments, 32 hotel rooms, and 800sf of retail space. SBL 48.80-1-25, 26 & 24.120. SEQR Determination. Zone C-2, Mixed Use Overlay District. Kingstonian Development LLC/applicant; Herzog's Supply Co. Inc. & City of Kingston/owner.

J. Bonura introduced the project team. He explained that they took the comments that they have heard and made some significant changes to the design. He invited S. Mackenzie to describe the project details and the changes that have been made to the design noting that these are not final drawings but that the goal is to show everyone the direction that the project is going based on feedback.

S. Mackenzie gave some of the background on the design process. He discussed the historic boundary noting that the historic district extends to the rear property line. He stated that he reviewed the SHPO letter and that he believes that the Fair Street section is a gray area but that

it makes sense to consider the project as a whole. M. Grunblatt mentioned that the historic district map should be reviewed for accuracy with the most recent version

S. Mackenzie stated that this is a multifaceted site with constraints. North Front Street needs certain considerations, Fair Street connects North Front to Schwenk Drive, Schwenk Drive borders a strip mall across the street. Historically buildings were constructed with detail facing the street and the other 3 sides were essentially boxes with little detail. He stated that they took the approach that North Front Street is the priority and deserves more resources than the other sides.

One of the challenges is to include a 420 space parking lot and to make that fit into the historic district. S. Mackenzie presented the new plans. He noting that the SHPO letter refers to keeping Fair Street open but that the applicants disagree with the importance of keeping this open to vehicles. The plan they present includes a separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. If Fair Street remains open, the applicants feel that traffic will be aggravated by people coming and going from the parking garage and will also be a missed opportunity for additional commercial space and public space. Also, the visibility of the bluff is better articulated and the view from Fair Street remains and is better framed.

There are many benefits to the public plaza space and there is opportunity to add a fountain or an interactive fountain.

S. Mackenzie described the layout, floor plan and circulation. There are different color options for the Kingstonian hotel which are not final options and could change based on comment. Other changes include lowering the cornice down a level which will alter the scale and better fit with historic buildings. Now proposing punch openings instead of balconies and simplification of the backside of the building. Several reasons why the building is separate along Schwenk is separate from the rest of the building and one of the reasons is the Building Code, another reason is aesthetics. They are proposing a brick look along Schwenk Drive but the materials need to be researched because the site will need to be able to support the weight. There are possible materials that could accomplish the look.

Members appreciated the change to the pedestrian bridge and the material changes being proposed. W. Platte and M. Grunblatt mentioned the connection to rail history ties in the new trestle look of the pedestrian bridge. The applicants stated that there are tradeoffs between various costs associated with each item, parking garage, green building techniques, façade elements, windows, etc.

H. Clement commended the architect on the design changes but asked about making the windows on the Schwenk Drive façade double windows. The applicants stated that there may be a reason on the interior for the single windows including interior walls, this would need to be researched. H. Clement also asked whether the pedestrian bridge is covered or uncovered. The applicants stated that it is uncovered.

R. Jacobsen asked about making the Schwenk Drive building a 4 story building to change the relationship to scale on the rear building. The applicants stated that there are building code issues of window requirements and the construction materials.

A. Puetz asked about replicating the buildings on both sides of Fair Street facing Schwenk by a material change and stepping the building back. J. Bonura said that the area on the east side of Fair Street does not include units on the lower floors and that stepping the upper floors back would eliminate 16-20 units from the plan. S. Mackenzie said that there is a possibility to move units to create the look but that it would require additional study.

M. Grunblatt asked about the water element. J. Bonura asked about keeping the fountain. Various Board and Commission members stated that they appreciated the inclusion of water in the public space but did not have strong feelings about whether the fountain is interactive or just decorative.

There was discussion on three possible color options for the Kingstonian Hotel. The applicants said that they are open to changes on this building. They are looking to historic Benjamin Moore colors. R. Jacobsen asked about replicating the Kingstonian hotel and the mention of SHPO and HLPC's concerns in the past about creating a false sense of history. J. Bonura said that there is funding to replicate the building from the State and that SHPO has been involved in the design of the building. Drastically changing the design would compromise about a million dollars in funding. The grant requires paying homage to the original in scale and detail. R. Jacobson asked whether there was anything from the original building. J. Bonura said that the original columns were the only thing that they found and that they are trying to reuse them. J. Bonura said that the reason for including the red is because there is red on some of the original columns that were found.

B. Rutski questioned the use of the blue on the Fair Street façade. She liked the new look of the pedestrian walkway and the changes to the Schwenk façade and preferred the red option for the Kingstonian but thought that the Fair Street façade looked like a medical building and needed some more attention.

W. Platte asked about the siding. The applicants said they are proposing a board and baton look to create more of a commercial look.

M. Grunblatt said that this is now a welcome to Kingston building. This is a change from a minor entrance to a major entrance. There is opportunity with the Plaza to create a real entrance to Kingston.

M. Grunblatt asked if J. Diamond was going to be presenting to the Planning Board. J. Bonura said that the report has been submitted and there are a few areas on the site that are noted as being sensitive and that J. Diamond will be on site during excavation of those areas. He will not be doing another presentation.

Staff noted the importance of keep the view of the mountains open on Fair Street. J. Bonura said that they agree and that they have received similar comments during the discussion of the glass atrium that was originally proposed. They want to include trees but will be moving the trees to the sides of the plaza to preserve the view shed. There will be a landscape architect but it is too early to have that design formalized.

J. Bonura asked what more is needed from the applicants before moving forward with SEQR. Staff stated that an outside firm has been contracted to review the traffic study but that the review has not been completed yet. W. Platte said that SHPO is also interested in continued discussion as the plans change. J. Bonura said that they will be sending a formal response to that letter and will also provide the new drawings. M. Moriello asked whether the Planning Board wanted a draft Part 2 of the EAF. The Board agreed to accept a draft. Staff and the Board will review it thoroughly and make any changes they deem appropriate. Also, S. Cahill mentioned that there will be an independent study undertaken to review the Traffic Impact Analysis.

Decision: The Planning Board voted to table the applications. (WP – motion, RJ – 2nd, MJ, MG – yes)

Decision: The HLPC voted to table further discussion on the Kingstonian. (MG – motion, AB – 2nd, HC, PD – yes)

Decision: No decision was made by the Heritage Area Commission due to lack of quorum.

Adjourned.