

Date	July 29, 2024 (6 to 8pm)
Project	Canandaigua Downtown Revitalization Initiative
Location	Hurley Building Conference Room, 205 Saltonstall Street, Canandaigua, NY
Attendees	Local Planning Committee, Urban Strategies Inc., Department of State, and ~10 Members of the Public (including project sponsors)
Purpose	Local Planning Committee Meeting #3

Overview

As the steering body of the Downtown Revitalization Initiative (DRI) process, the role of the LPC is to brainstorm ideas, provide direction to the consultant team, review planning products, discuss, evaluate, and recommend projects, and act as ambassadors to the program.

At LPC Meeting #3, the consultant team provided an update on work undertaken since the June meeting before providing a high-level overview of the 27 projects that were received through the Open Call for Projects. The LPC also confirmed the evaluation criteria they would like to use in their initial project evaluation.

Meeting Agenda

- Code of Conduct
- Engagement / Work Update
- Preliminary Review of Projects
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps
- Public Comment Period

Meeting Summary

The following is a high-level summary of the information that was presented at LPC Meeting #3. The presentation slides that were used at this meeting are available on the project website: CanandaiguaDRI.com. Key questions / points of discussion by the LPC are also

summarized. A list of decisions is included at the end of this summary.

Code of Conduct

- The Code of Conduct was read by the LPC Co-Chairs. The following conflicts of interest were noted:
 - Tracey Dello Stritto – Chamber of Commerce’s project
 - Kari Buch – Chamber of Commerce’s project
 - Andy Griffith – Chamber of Commerce’s project
 - Jim McGinn – Chamber of Commerce’s project
- Following the meeting, the DOS representative confirmed that the following do not represent conflicts of interest
 - Denise Chaapel – Phoenix Street and Coach Street public improvement projects
 - Bob Palumbo – Bemis Block

Engagement / Work Update

- Urban Strategies provided an overview of work undertaken since LPC Meeting #2, which included:
 - Finalization of the DRI Vision and Goals
 - Hosting the Open Call for Projects (from May 29 to July 11 – 6 weeks)
 - Initial meetings with project sponsors, including phone calls and site visits
 - Ongoing work on the Downtown Profile and Assessment
 - LPC survey to get feedback on the Draft Revitalization Strategies
 - Initial review of 27 project applications

Preliminary Review of Projects

- The majority of the meeting was dedicated to introducing the 27 projects received through the Open Call. This began with an overall summary:
 - 18 Projects total
 - 20 renovation / rehabilitation projects
 - 1 new development project
 - 4 public improvement projects
 - 1 Small grant fund
 - 1 wayfinding strategy
 - Total Project Costs of **\$28.4M**
 - Total DRI Funding Request of **\$24.0M**
 - Generally clustered at the north end of Main Street, between the railroad tracks and Saltonstall Street.

- A high-level overview of each project was provided next, including:
 - A description of the project and its location
 - The project sponsor and property owner
 - The project cost and DRI funding request
 - Whether the match requirement and match goal are met
 - The expected outcomes of the project in relation to the DRI goals
 - Initial considerations (e.g., missing information, project readiness, etc.)
- Full details on the 27 projects can be found at the LPC Meeting #3 Presentation Slides, available at **CanandaiguaDRI.com**.

LPC Questions and Discussion

Over the course of the meeting, the LPC was invited to ask questions or comment on the material presented. Comments and questions from the LPC were documented by Urban Strategies for the purposes of ongoing outreach and project development with project sponsors. General questions and comments from the LPC are summarized below, followed by project-specific questions and comments (where applicable).

General Comments / Questions

- A member of the LPC asked whether job creation was something that the State considers when reviewing projects. The DOS representative said yes, it is.
- A member of the LPC asked whether any affordable housing had been proposed. Urban Strategies noted that the residential projects were primarily market-rate housing; however, an information session would be set up for project sponsors who might be interested in using the County's Vacant Rental Housing program, which provided funding for new housing units in vacant buildings provided that they meet certain levels of affordability. Urban Strategies noted that they would also circulate a summary table with more detail on the types of housing units proposed in terms of size, affordability, number of units, etc.
- A member of the LPC asked whether it would be possible to see visualizations of these projects as it's difficult to understand what is being proposed. More information will be made available through the project applications, which will be shared with the LPC for their evaluation.
- A member of the LPC asked how project costing would factor into the evaluation. Urban Strategies noted that project costing factors less into the LPC's work and is more part of the consultant team's role to ensure that project's are appropriately budgeted for.
- A member of the LPC asked what happens when a project is awarded DRI funding but experiences overruns. In such cases, the project sponsor is responsible for

project overruns, which is why it is important to get a solid understanding of project scope and budget through the process.

- A member of the LPC asked how considerations like parking, garbage, and construction are considered through the process. Urban Strategies will review parking considerations are a high level. More detailed considerations like garage collection are not part of Urban Strategies review as more detailed site planning matters. While projects are expected to be able to break ground within two years, it is not expected that construction for each project would take place within the same time frame.
- A member of the LPC asked how planning / zoning considerations are factored in the process? What happens if the Planning Commission says no? Urban Strategies undertakes a higher-level review of projects from these perspectives with the purpose of identifying red flags or showstoppers. While the City's Planning Director does not make such decisions, they are able to provide insight into what the Commission would and would not support. At some point in the process, a meeting with the Commission could be set up to ensure there are no major concerns from their perspective.
- A member of the LPC asked what would happen if a project were to go south after being funded. The DOS representative noted that claw back clauses are built into the contracts that project sponsors will need to enter into.
- A member of the LPC asked about property maintenance issues and whether that would factor into sponsor capacity. The City noted that they would share information about maintenance issues with property owners to consider as part of project profiles.

Project Specific Discussion

1. *Preserve Canandaigua's Historic City Hall as a Civic Landmark*
 - a. A member of the LPC asked whether there were other funding sources for this type of project.
 - b. John Goodwin (City Manager, project sponsor, and LPC member) noted that historic preservation grants are highly competitive and typically not sufficient to cover the scope of work. He also noted that there are no funds set aside for this work in the City's capital budget.
 - c. A member of the LPC asked whether the architectural assessment report could be circulated. It will be made available when application materials are made accessible to the LPC for their evaluation.
 - d. The LPC noted that there would be merit in extending the DRI boundary to include this project to allow it to continue being considered.

2. *Renovate Patty's Place to Enhance its Role as a Local Institution*
3. *Expand Skip's Showroom Space and Improve the Appearance and Accessibility of the Building*
4. *Reactive the Upper Floors of the Historic Bemis Block*
 - a. Urban Strategies provided some background re: meetings with the State Historic Preservation Office around the rehabilitate of the third-floor ballroom. As SHPO will not allow the subdivision of this historic space, the project sponsor is working with their architect on a new direction that involves a community space / event venue.
 - b. A member of the LPC asked whether an elevator would be need. It was noted that, given the change of use to a more public use (event center), an elevator would likely be needed and that the sponsor is aware of this
5. *Rehabilitate the Upper Floors of 88-92 South Main Street for Residential Units*
6. *Restore the Façade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Memorial Post 7414 Building and Renovate the Kitchen*
 - a. A member of the LPC asked whether the Post planned to restore the building. Yes, they do. Also, all projects would be subject to SHPO review, which considers compatibility with the historic district. Projects would also be subject to architectural review by the City.
7. *Establish 97 South Main Street as a Hub for Creativity and Community*
8. *Renovate 100 South Main Street to Create New Apartments and Improve its Façade*
9. *Renovate and Expand the Chamber of Commerce Building for New Retail Units, Offices, and Meeting Space*
10. *Improve the Façade of 120 South Main Street and Upgrade the Existing Apartments*
11. *Reactivate the Second Floor of 143 South Main Street and Enhance its Façade*
12. *Restore the Façade of 166 South Main Street and Add Residential Units to the Second Floor*
13. *Build Four New Apartments at 209 South Main Street*

- 14. Transform Lincoln on Main into a Destination for Live Music and Food & Beverage*
- 15. Transform 32 Coach Street into a Brewery, Bistro and Studio Apartment*
- 16. Expand Peacemaker Brewing Company to Increase its Capacity for Patrons and Live Music*
- 17. Expand Casa de Pasta by Creating a Three-Season Dining Room*
- 18. Convert 38 Bristol Street into a Mixed-Use Building*
- 19. Renovate the Apartments at 51 Bristol Street and Enhance the Property's Appearance*
 - a. A member of the LPC asked whether sufficient outreach was done to confirm whether the project sponsor could meet the match requirement. Urban Strategies confirmed that they reach out a week prior requesting more information and hadn't heard back, and that the match requirement was clearly listed on the application form.*
- 20. Improve the Exterior of the Short-Term Rental Lodging at 61 Bristol Street*
 - a. Same as 19.a above.*
- 21. Improve the Exterior of the Short-Term Rental Lodging at 31 Bristol Street*
 - a. Same as 19.a above.*
- 22. Enhance Ontario County Public Square with Historical Interpretation, Accessibility Improvements, and New Park Amenities*
 - a. A member of the LPC noted that the ADA parking stalls illustrated on the concept plan are not viable due to the grading. Urban Strategies noted that Fisher (landscape architect) would review.*
 - b. The LPC noted that there would be merit in extending the DRI boundary to include this project to allow it to continue being considered.*
- 23. Augment Central on Main as a Community Gathering Place*
- 24. Transform Phoenix Street as a Pedestrian-Friendly Destination*

- a. *A member of the LPC asked whether the wires had to be buried. Burying the wires is not critical to the project. Cost estimates are based on general rule of thumb for this type of work, which is difficult to assess as it requires coordination with National Grid.*

25. Enhance Coach Street as an Attractive East-West Connector

26. Establish a Small Project Grant Fund to Support Ongoing Revitalization Efforts

- a. A member of the LPC asked for more detail on how the SPGF works. Part of the funds go towards program administration. A project selection committee would be established to evaluate projects based on evaluation criteria. Another call for projects would be required to solicit applications. There is a minimum match of 25% of eligible costs, which could also be increased to spread the fund out.
- b. A member of the LPC noted that the City has been administering these types of programs for many years.
- c. A member of the LPC asked whether the SPGF was something that most LPC's chose to fund. The DOS representative noted that yes, though it's important to demonstrate demand for the fund through Interest Forms. The State won't fund the SPGF to the maximum of \$600K if there are not at least \$600K worth of projects to fund.
- d. It was noted that there is one property outside the DRI boundary for which an Interest Form was submitted and the LPC discussed the merit of extending the boundary to include it.

27. Implement a Wayfinding Program to Connect Visitors to Downtown's Destinations

- a. *A member of the LPC asked what kind of improvements this would include.*
- b. John Goodwin (City Manager, project sponsor, and LPC member) noted that it would be the full range of wayfinding through the DRI area, including vehicle/pedestrian signage, kiosks, banners, etc.

Evaluation Criteria

- The LPC discussed the evaluation criteria, and which additional criteria should be considered alongside the State criteria (alignment with vision and goals, project readiness, catalytic effect, co-benefits, cost-effectiveness).
- The LPC decided to include the following additional criteria in their evaluation:
 - Market demand / feasibility
 - Job growth
 - Ability to leverage other funds

- Capacity of the project sponsor

Summary of Key Decisions

The purpose of this LPC meeting was primarily to receive information about the Downtown Profile and Assessment and the projects that were received through the Open Call. However, the Committee made the following decisions:

- The LPC voted to extend the north boundary of the DRI area to include the City Hall preservation project and the Public Square improvement project.
- The LPC voted to extend the east boundary of the DRI area to include the east side of Center Street.
- The LPC voted to remove three projects from funding consideration, including:
 - 31 Bristol (for being largely deferred maintenance and for not providing the match requirement).
 - 51 Bristol (for being outside the DRI boundary without rationale for being included and for not providing the match requirement).
 - 61 Bristol (for being outside the DRI boundary without rationale for being included, not providing the match requirement, and being largely deferred maintenance).
- The LPC voted to host project sponsor pitches at a future meeting.
- The LPC added the following criteria to their evaluation criteria: Market demand / feasibility; Job growth; Ability to leverage other funds; Capacity of the project sponsor.

Public Comments

- A member of the public noted that the LPC made a good decision to amend the boundary of the DRI area to include properties on the east side of Center Street.
- A member of the public (a project sponsor) asked what the next steps would be for project sponsors. Urban Strategies noted that STC Design would be reaching out shortly to discuss project scope and budget for the purposes of project updates the next LPC meeting. It was noted that project sponsor pitches would be held at a future meeting and that Urban Strategies would reach out with further information.
- A member of the public asked about next steps for those who had submitted Small Project Grant Fund Interest Forms. At this stage, there is nothing more that needs to be done.