This was the twelfth (12th) meeting of the City of Port Jervis Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Update Committee (PJCPC). Committee members David Rivera and Dominic Cicalese were absent. Pat Courtney Strong of Courtney Strong, Inc. (CSI) was also in attendance.

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

The meeting began at 6:00 in the Port Jervis Recreation and Community Center. Mr. Murphy brought hard copies of the meeting materials. He presented a draft of the Comprehensive Plan and said he hoped to have it finalized by the end of April. He noted that after successfully holding two issues-identification workshops and two workshops for the general public, the City will move to public hearings for the proposed zoning changes and for the Comprehensive Plan.

PJCPC Meeting #11 – January 24, 2019

Mr. Murphy reviewed the meeting minutes and summary notes from PJCPC Meeting #11 held on January 24, 2019 which was distributed to the Committee on February 6, 2019. Mr. Murphy summarized the contents of the summary notes from the PJCPC Meeting and they were approved contingent to changes in the “Proposed Zoning Code Amendments Discussion” section.

Discussion of Section 3 Plan Recommendations

Mr. Siegel strongly supports the recommendation to cease the practice of placing zone district boundaries along the centerline of City streets. There was also a recommendation to alphabetize the glossary of terms at the front of Section 3.

A member of the public, John Beasley, spoke about his perception of the City of Port Jervis. He believes the city restricts the licensing of electricians, HVAC, and other contractors to a small circle of known
contractors. He would like the restrictive licenses to be revisited. Mr. Beasley said the City needs to project an 'open for business' image, too much commerce is lost to Port Jervis being in the Tri-State Area.

Mr. Murphy noted that Goal 1 in the Comprehensive Plan addresses bringing in new businesses and making regulations more seamless. He noted that changes to the zoning code will encourage new businesses. Ms. Maginsky and others noted that the City's small size—2.6 square miles—makes it difficult to attract national brand-name, big box stores. Mr. Siegel stated that the City's demographics do not support big box and brand stores since business taxes are less in neighboring Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Mr. Beasley also commented that there is a traffic pattern problem near the mall, and resolving this could have an effect on attracting business. Mr. Murphy said this is something he and the Committee would look into and perhaps list as a recommendation of the Plan.

Other comments on Section 3 included that the icons were confusing. It was suggested to reduce the number of icons and make general themes and groupings. Ms. Maginsky suggested making icons clickable in order to jump to sections in the document. There was also a suggestion to add a column that color coded priority actions as short-term/ medium-term/ or long-term. Another suggestion was having all actions that required funding to be a dollar ($) symbol.

Discussion of Section 4

Ms. Maginsky requested that examples be provided in Section 4, including images and references. For example, with the recommendation for a pedestrian walkway over the railroad tracks, have an example of this from somewhere else in the U.S. accompanied with a picture and reference.

Discussion on Other Topics

Ms. Maginsky brought up the possibility of looking to New Rochelle as an example for redevelopment planning. New Rochelle has instituted 90-day approval process that many communities are looking to emulate. (See: https://www.nyplanning.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/New-Rochelle)

- Instituted Form Based Codes plus Generic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the downtown area.
- The City used a Request for Proposal to award development rights to a master developer.
- Normally, it would take at least two months to go through each board.
- The City created a live/work space for artists and an Arts District.
- Developers were told that if they wanted a height increase they would have to commit to a percentage of affordable housing.
- There is currently 12 million square feet under development in downtown.

Mr. Bavoso noted that a generic EIS could expose the city to liability. Developing near a waterway takes more time. The question is, how could New Rochelle Model be scaled for small communities like Port Jervis?

Ms. Ridgeway notified the committee that there will be a Federal Opportunity Zones Session on March 15th in Newburgh, New York hosted by HV Patter for Progress, $25 admission. http://www.pattern-for-progress.org/events/opportunity-zones-how-to-invest-in-the-region/
Ms. Courtney-Strong suggested identifying Clean Energy Communities as a NYSERDA program and Climate Smart Communities as a NYSDEC program in Section 2 and the glossary.

Public Comment

No additional comments from the public.

Next Steps

Mr. Murphy will be sending out a digital version of the Comprehensive Plan final draft before the next meeting. He requests feedback on the plan by Monday, March 18th in order to send a red lined version form comment before the next meeting. The next meeting will focus on the existing and proposed zoning code. He will be refining cost estimates and working with CSI to enhance formatting, graphics, and imagery in the Plan.

Next Meeting: Thursday, March 28, 6 pm, Port Jervis Recreation and Community Center, 134 Pike Street
Thursday, April 4, 6 pm, Port Jervis Recreation and Community Center, 134 Pike Street

Wrap-up and Adjournment

The meeting ended at 7:55pm.