

received
3-19-15

1

March 19, 2015

To: Kingston Planning Office, City Hall, 420 Broadway, Kingston, NY 12401

From: Daniel Mackay, Director of Public Policy, Preservation League of NYS

Re: Comments on "Kingston 2025," draft of January 2015.

Introduction (p1):

It is clearly long-past time for a revised planning vision and comprehensive planning document. What will Kingston do going forward to assure that there is not another 53-year gap in comprehensive planning?

This section should reference establishment of the HPC via local legislation in 2006, and subsequent local landmark designations of the LPC. While the LPC is strictly concerned with aesthetics, not use, the commission's designated responsibilities make it capable of significantly influencing Kingston's built environment. This section should also reference establishment of the HAC in 1982/86 and reference the legislative intent incorporated in its Management Plan: [http://kingston-ny.gov/filestorage/8463/8511/8682/12437/Kingston Urban Cultural Park.pdf](http://kingston-ny.gov/filestorage/8463/8511/8682/12437/Kingston%20Urban%20Cultural%20Park.pdf)

Additionally, this section should acknowledge National Register Districts established in Kingston, all of which post-date the 1961 plan. In addition to numerous individual NR listings (1971-2013), the following districts should be noted:

- Stockade District (1970/1975)
- Roundout/West Strand Historic District (1979)
- Chestnut Street Historic District (1985)
- Albany Avenue MPS (2002)

A list of NR-listed and NR-eligible properties is appended at the end of this document.

Additionally, recent historic resource surveys undertaken by the City of Kingston or local partners should be referenced, even if they have not yet informed a NR nomination.

- Portion of Broadway corridor (2012-2014 as funded by the CLG program)

National Heritage Area status (1995) and Hudson River Valley Greenway status (1991) should also be referenced in the introductory narrative regarding programmatic recognition conveyed to the city and region at the state and federal levels.

Process (p3):

Current draft makes no note of the planning consultants identifying or utilizing any of the above-referenced designations or surveys.

Recognition of the Bluestone Survey is appreciated, but underscores the lack of reference to above local and state/national historic designations. This section also fails to note the significant losses to bluestone sidewalks suffered in recent years.

It would also be useful for the Kingston 2015 document to include a list of eligible census tracts in the city qualified for the NYS Rehabilitation Tax Credit programs:

Census Tract 9517, Ulster County, New York	\$42,424	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9518, Ulster County, New York	\$55,083	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9519, Ulster County, New York	\$63,313	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9520, Ulster County, New York	\$64,643	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9521, Ulster County, New York	\$35,132	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9522, Ulster County, New York	\$86,285	Not Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9523, Ulster County, New York	\$69,000	Qualified	City of Kingston
Census Tract 9524, Ulster County, New York	\$73,924	Not Qualified	City of Kingston

http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc10map/tract/st36_ny/c36111_ulster/DC10CT_C36111_002.pdf

Local and Regional Setting

Existing Neighborhoods (p8):

Notes Stockade District is NR-designated. Text does not note that a portion of Rondout is so designated. All four existing National Register historic districts should be placed in context with the “Existing Neighborhoods” narrative, as well as the pending Broadway survey funded by the Certified Local Government (CLG) program in 2012.

Vision

Vision Statement (p12):

Vision statement appropriately acknowledges “traditional architecture and historic identity” and notes employment opportunities from “historic tourism.”

Guiding Principles acknowledge, “Historic and cultural resources of the City must be strongly protected and leveraged to the maximum extent to attract residents, businesses, and tourism, thereby creating and promoting economic development.”

These are clear, prominent statements (the latter, in particular), but the draft plan does not do enough to implement them or understand the current administrative and programmatic infrastructure supporting historic preservation in Kingston.

The role/authority/mission of both the LPC and HAC need to be described in detail.

Plan: Overview (p15):

“It should be the overwhelming preference of the City to prioritize reuse of existing buildings, redevelopment of brownfields, redevelopment of brownfields and obsolete buildings, intensification, or “building upwards” of existing core areas, over any new greenfield development.”

Worth noting that brownfield sites often have historic resources associated with them. A basic, site-by-site assessment should include a determination of whether clean-up possible without requiring building demolition. This is an issue to anticipate as the city advances a clean-up program. Typically state or federal clean-up funding should trigger (State) Section 14.09 or (Federal) Section 106 review to determine if historic resources are present. It should not be a foregone conclusion that building demolition is desirable or necessary on brownfield sites.

Similarly, the phrase “obsolete” building raises concerns. How is this wording defined? This appears to be the only use of this term in the document.

“Building upwards” may threaten or diminish the context of existing historic buildings and architectural patterns.

Generally, however, reinvestment in existing historic cores is an appropriate strategy to protect greenfields (open space and working farmland) from future development. Directing investments back to historic community cores also reinforces past tax revenue investments in existing infrastructure.

Goal 1: Promote a Sustainable Citywide Land Use Policy**Strategy 1.1.4 (p17):**

“Consider adapting form-based codes and aesthetic requirements for homogenous areas of the City.”

The Kingston 2025 plan should explicitly identify these potential areas up-front. What are the areas of homogenous character? I would not consider any pre-WWII neighborhood appropriate for such form-based treatment, certainly not in lieu of the Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission’s oversight.

Kingston’s Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) provides such aesthetic guidelines and expertise for locally-designated landmarks in the City. The plan only notes that certain (historic) areas of the city should “remain subject to special design guidelines.” This phrasing does not appear to recognize or endorse the existence or role of the LPC.

Strategy 1.1.6 (p18):

GEIS discussion notes “Form-based codes and aesthetic requirements should promote maintaining neighborhood and area character while minimizing delay and unnecessary regulation.”

What is the trigger for such language? Any intersection between form-based code and the jurisdiction of the LPC will require careful consideration to evaluate unintended consequences.

Plan: Housing

Objective 2.2: Encourage improvement of existing residences (p22):

This section should reference availability of NYS Rehabilitation Tax Credit Programs for owner-occupied historic homes. Available for State/NR-listed properties located in qualified census tracts: <http://nysparks.com/shpo/tax-credit-programs/>. At least one property in the Stockade District has made use of the historic homeowner program (as of 9/2014 data). Two properties have utilized the federal rehabilitation tax credit incentive (Kirkland Hotel, James & Mary Forsyth House); one property has utilized both the federal and state rehabilitation credits (Lace Mill).

Further information on the NYS and federal rehabilitation tax credit program, and case studies from this program, are available at the League's website: <http://www.preservenys.org/tax-credits.html>

This section should reference the availability of tax abatements provided by Kingston as authorized by section 444-a of NYS's Real Property Tax Law:

<http://ecode360.com/6726094?highlight=historically,historic#6726094>

Article VI: Exemptions for Historic Properties [Adopted 12-7-2004 by L.L. No. 5-2004, approved 12-29-2004]:

A. "This real property tax exemption for historic properties is being enacted in order to achieve the following goals: to increase incentives for property owners in historic districts to invest in the upkeep and rehabilitation of properties; to provide an incentive for the restoration and rehabilitation of commercial structures which qualify as landmarks in order to provide financial advantages, not available elsewhere in the City at this time, which may help to attract and retain businesses in the City of Kingston; to assist homeowners who are interested in restoring their own properties, but may not be able to afford to do so when faced with potential increases in taxation as the result of alterations which would qualify for this exemption; to provide financial incentives for investment in low-income residential neighborhoods which may contain landmarked buildings or districts designated within the area; and to provide a concrete benefit to offset the possible financial disadvantage of owning historically or architecturally significant properties which are subject to the regulation of the City's Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission.

B. The City of Kingston real property tax exemption for historic properties is intended to apply to alterations or rehabilitations of historic property as authorized pursuant to §§ 96-a and 119-aa through 119-dd of the General Municipal Law and § 444-a of the Real Property Tax Law and all other powers granted to the City of Kingston to provide such exemptions.

C. This article is intended to create a real property tax exemption that preserves or increases the historic character of real property located within the City of Kingston.

The abatement is restricted to locally-designated landmarks. Are there any records detailing extent of use in Kingston? This program/benefit needs greater promotion by the LPC, HAC and by city government departments.

The City of Kingston should request that the Kingston City School district support (via school board resolution) adoption of the 444-a tax abatement program. The City and District do not lose tax revenue under this program, but delay receipt of increased assessed value in order to incentivize greater property investment in the city in the near term.

Objective 2.4: Maintain and promote traditional architectural form consistent with the existing neighborhoods, including provision of front porches, short setbacks, and traditional building scales (p24):

This section advises form-based code to dictate infill development on vacant lots. Where there is local landmarking, established State/NR districts, or likely NR-eligible neighborhoods/commercial districts, the use of form-based code has to be very carefully considered/monitored. LPC has jurisdiction over new construction in designated local districts, and should have review authority and final approval for form-based code application as it applies in their landmark districts.

A City-wide comprehensive historic resource survey would get out in front of identifying potential conflicts with form-based infill development. Such survey work would determine which additional neighborhoods of the city are eligible for local, state, or federal landmark status.

Plan: Economic Development

Strategy 3.3.4 (p28):

The plan references the need for an open-space inventory. A city-wide historic resource survey is the preservation equivalent. What areas of the city have never been surveyed? Which of those areas are qualified for the NYS rehabilitation tax credits (via qualified census tracts?). Three of the four NR districts nominations predate the turn of this century. They should be considered for updates and/or boundary expansions. While a city-wide survey might appear daunting, a strategic approach, such as focusing survey work in areas of the city qualified for state incentives, might have particular support from owners of both commercial and residential historic property.

Retaining Certified Local Government (CLG) status would allow Kingston to access public funding for survey work, in addition to private sources for survey funding, such as through the Preservation League via our Preserve NY Grants program: <http://www.preservenys.org/preserve-new-york.html>

Goal 4: Enhance employment opportunities and promote economic vitality in the city

Objective 4.1: Establish Kingston as a liveable city where residents want to live and businesses want to locate:

The city of Kingston should initiate a "Rehab-Ready" program that identifies vacant or underutilized historic properties and markets them for reinvestment. An effort by the city to determine NR-listed/NR-eligible (for federal credit use) and census tract qualified (state credit use) properties to promote available incentives. The city could also undertake building code and adaptive reuse assessments for key properties or locations would assist owners in marketing or re-developing such properties. The pilots for these programs have already been developed by other communities (Catskill/Greene County) and organizations (Preservation League) in the Hudson River Valley. State funding, from several sources, is available to underwrite such activities. Such programs also address **Objective 4.2 and Strategy 4.2.4, and complement 4.3.2** (note reference to "Shovel-ready" business).



See this overview of the Preservation League’s Industrial Heritage Reuse Program for an overview of efforts to identify and promote reuse and reinvestment in vacant and underutilized industrial buildings in the Capital Region: <http://www.preservenys.org/industrial-heritage-2014.html>

Objective 4.2: Reduce the cost of doing business

Promote the availability of state and federal rehabilitation incentives to attract new or renewed investment to historic commercial and owner-occupied properties. These are specific incentives tied to Kingston’s unique historic resources.

Promote the availability of real property tax abatements tied to local landmark designation. Encourage the school district(s) covering Kingston to also adopt this program. Encourage Ulster County to adopt this program. In each case, the increase on assessed value from improvements to historic real property would be abated for 10 years. Taxing authorities do not lose revenue, but defer revenue increases in exchange for accelerated reinvestment in the built environment. Adoption by multiple taxing authorities is key to building value for this incentive. **See also Strategy 4.2.1.**

Objective 4.4: Increase population density in main street areas and neighborhood centers through zoning for mixed use.

Strategy 4.4.1: Provide incentives for the renovation of vacant upper story space for residential use through NY Main Street and other state and federal grants (p30):

Renovation of upper floors in historic buildings is typically a challenge of building code compliance. It is worth noting that there are significant exemptions and options in the NYS Building Code for existing and historic buildings. These options provide significant alternate pathways for upper floors in existing and historic buildings to meet public safety requirements. To achieve sustained reinvestment in Kingston’s upper floors, city code officials will require a detailed understanding of the code as it applies to existing and historic buildings, and the available remedies for upper floor reuse. Grants and training programs are available to address this issue and fund case-studies to promote such redevelopment in Kingston. The Preservation League has provided such training and workshops elsewhere in New York State: <http://www.preservenys.org/technical-services.html>.

The Preservation League, in conjunction with the Genesee Finger Lakes Planning Council, recently published Upper Floor Reuse: A Guidebook for Revitalizing Downtown Buildings: <http://www.gflrpc.org/Publications/UpperFloors/UpperFloorsGuidebook.pdf>

The Guidebook targets the issue of upper floor vacancy in the higher density “downtown” areas of villages, towns, and cities, with examples and case studies from the Genesee-Finger Lakes Region, but will be of value for communities throughout New York State. While these vacant and underutilized upper floors create a number of challenges for communities, they also present tremendous potential for redevelopment and downtown revitalization.

A wide range of topics associated with upper floor revitalization are presented in the Guidebook, including: opportunities for reuse and associated benefits; barriers to redevelopment; revitalization

methods; community, downtown and waterfront development; planning processes; zoning and historic preservation law; New York State Building Code; design considerations; and funding and tax credit incentives. Case studies were also developed to highlight success stories and examples of revitalization techniques. The intent of the Guidebook is to introduce and simplify a variety of complex issues and concepts related to upper floor revitalization to a wide audience of stakeholders

Objective 4.14: Sustainable development checklist (p36):

Reuse and rehabilitation of Kingston's existing and historic buildings should feature prominently on a Sustainable Development checklist. The value of such should be recognized at the micro as well as macro level. The environmental value of repair, rather than replacement, of historic features (such as windows) should be emphasized.

The Preservation League can provide resources that document the investment/return ration of such in terms of energy efficiency as well as impact on local and regional economies. Kingston could become an incubator for craftspeople with restoration/rehabilitation specialization, such as window repair, carpentry, masonry, etc. **See Objective 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.13.**

Plan: Transportation and Mobility (p41-42):

The proposed transportation infrastructure improvements discussed in this section are laudable, and given Kingston's historic development pattern and street grid, enhancing alternative transportation access (pedestrian and bicycle modality in particular) is important. However, proposed transportation enhancements need to be sensitive to the historic built environment, and state and federal investments to improve transportation alternatives and improvements will trigger state and federal historic preservation review. This comment is meant to flag this issue for early assessment and integration into planning for such transportation improvements.

The multiple references to preservation of Kingston's bluestone sidewalks are appreciated; the sidewalks are a unique resource and a distinctive component of the cityscape well worth preserving.

Plan: Historic Resources (p47):

This section references the extensive community recognition given to historic resources: "it became clear that the overwhelming majority of Kingston residents and stakeholders saw Kingston's historic resources as one of its greatest assets. From providing educational opportunities, to establishing neighborhood character, to drawing tourism, the City's historic resources and their preservation drew the most consistent interest" [during the public outreach phase of the report].

However, this section of the Kingston 2025 report reflects little recognition or understanding of Kingston's current "preservation infrastructure": the establishment of the Kingston Urban Cultural Park designation (now Heritage Area) (1982), the establishment of the Kingston Landmark Preservation Commission (1986), acceptance into the National Park Service Certified Local Government program (1986), establishment of the Hudson River Valley Greenway (1991/2007), and establishment of the

GWAT
*

Hudson Valley National Heritage Area (1996). Additionally, note the establishment of National Register Historic Districts in 1970, 1975, 1979, 1985, and 2002.

These designations reflect the recognition granted Kingston's historic resources, and variously establish regulatory control over locally-designated historic sites, as well as access to funding and resources intended to assist the municipality in protecting and documenting these resources.

The draft Kingston 2025 plan does not recognize any of these designations or capabilities. Each designation and its benefits/attributes should be described in detail in this section of the report. The responsibilities and capabilities of these entities represent long-established resources for the City of Kingston that protect historic buildings from inappropriate alteration, qualify properties for financial incentives, and attract state, federal and private grants to advance historic resource identification and protection in the city.

The introduction to this section should recognize that significant preservation infrastructure is in place and available to play a productive role in Kingston's intended revitalization. Losing this infrastructure and capabilities would be a significant setback to asserting the foundational role that Kingston's unique historic resources should play in revitalization efforts.

Goal 6: Promote further preservation of City historic and architectural resources and leverage them for further economic development (p47)

Objective 6.1: Continue protection of existing historic assets through recognition (p47):

The mapping referenced in **section 6.1.1** is encouraged for the purpose of generating "interest rather than to fully inform." While mapping for the purpose of generating tourism interest is laudable, it should not be the priority goal of such an effort. Instead, the city's GIS capabilities should be used to associate city tax parcels with historic designation status (local and/or State/National), federal and state rehabilitation tax credit eligibility and availability of a local tax abatement incentive. Property owners and prospective owners and investors should understand the opportunities and responsibilities associated with each property. These are relatively easy components to integrate into a GIS-based tax parcel –based mapping system.

This lead section should emphasize incentives over recognition (**6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, p47-48**). The City of Kingston could play a key role in promoting the incentives that underwrite historic preservation in the community. In addition to federal and state rehabilitation incentives, Kingston could establish a low interest revolving loan fund to fund reinvestment in historic properties, conduct new survey work to qualify properties for federal or state tax credit use, or work with local lending institutions and real estate companies to develop and market tools and properties for reinvestment. Establishment and promotion of such tools across the board could earn recognition for Kingston as a "Rehab-Ready" community, attracting new property owners, business investments, media attention, and public recognition.

The recognition programs referenced in this section (6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, p47-48) are potentially useful, but secondary to the implementation or continuance of meaningful historic resource protections and incentives.

Objective 6.2: Simplify the regulatory program and protections to ease the processing of development approvals involving historic preservation (p48):

No justification or attribution is offered for this objective. This section proposes such sweeping changes to the City's administration of historic preservation that the reason for such would need to be clearly articulated and documented.

Strategy 6.2.1: Develop procedures to combine, coordinate, and/or eliminate review functions by multiple agencies:

"Preservation of valuable historic resources must be ensured while expediting the reviews required by zoning and related laws."

What justification is there to suggest that reviews need to be expedited? How might improvements be made without gutting Kingston's preservation infrastructure? Elimination of the standalone commission or heritage area board would represent a dramatic step backward for historic resource protection in the city. Elimination of the commission would terminate Kingston's participation in the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, eliminating a source of funding and technical assistance for the city in regards to historic preservation. More effective public education and coordination of the review process would have greater benefit than gutting the current preservation infrastructure.

The work of the Kingston Historic Landmark Commission is about aesthetics. The work of such commissions does not stray into defining underlying use of those structures; that is the separate purview of the city's zoning and planning commissions. But neither of those commissions is equipped with the expertise of the historic resource commission regarding historic architecture. Given the span of Kingston's history, the commission is properly tasked with oversight of the city's locally landmarked structures.

Kingston's landmark preservation law was established in 1986. It would be appropriate to consider reviewing Kingston's current law against the new Model Historic Preservation Ordinance, jointly authored by the Preservation League and New York State and published in 2014. A copy of the Model Law is available here: <http://nysparks.com/shpo/certified-local-governments/documents/ModelLawForLocalGovernments.pdf>

The League has published a Supplemental Guide which articulates the essential components of local landmark law and the work of a standalone commission: <http://www.preservenys.org/model-law.html>.

Strategy 6.3.1: Allow a zoning incentive for adaptive reuse of landmark buildings, should their current use prove untenable (p49):

The draft text in this section references the “National Register Tax Act” (sic), likely intended as reference to the federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit program. Such error provides this reader with little confidence that the consultants hired to develop this plan have meaningful experience with historic preservation, or the programs and designations already in place in Kingston to advance a historic preservation agenda.

The idea of a zoning density bonus has general merit, but needs further development. What might the impact of increased density be on parking or related impacts outside the building envelope?

Strategy 6.3.2: Task Landmarks Commission with Assistance to local Landmark Owners (p49):

The commission appears to be fulfilling this role already. Certified Local Government status also allows the commission to involve staff from the State Historic Preservation Office in such outreach, and represents a funding source to underwrite such outreach, develop education programs and materials, and conduct survey work in support of the commission’s mandate. Staffing support, perhaps shared with other city departments, would greatly benefit the LPC’s public education and assistance role.

A recent grant awarded by the GLG program to the City of Kingston appears to be directly focused on **Strategy 6.3.2:**

PROJECT NAME:	Midtown Intensive Level Historic Resources and Building Survey Project
CONTRACTOR/SFS PAYEE NAME:	City of Kingston
CONTRACT PERIOD:	From: October 1, 2012 To: September 30, 2014

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The City Of Kingston Historic Resources and Building Survey Project will evaluate past historic resources surveys, undertake new documentation and develop recommendations for designating resources at the local level and nominating properties to the State and National Registers of Historic Places. With support from a consultant, the work will support the City’s comprehensive planning efforts, the development of an interpretive plan, the Historic Landmark Preservation Commission’s (HLPC) Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) reviews, and the HLPC’s active participation in survey efforts. Project goals are to assist property owners in preservation efforts and to contribute information to the development of a citywide interpretive plan in order to create a compelling experience that will lead residents to take great pride in their city and attract new residents, visitors, and investors.

Such are the benefits of a CLG-compliant autonomous landmark commission and retention of the city’s current LPC and HAC commissions.

Plan: Public Facilities

Strategy 7.2.2 (Bluestone Sidewalks and other historic materials)(p52):

Concur with importance of bluestone sidewalk resources and their elevation in planning status.

Core Areas

Strategy 9.7.2 Provide more concrete design standards for development in the Stockade area (p80):

I'm not able to comment at this time regarding referenced conflicts between Article 9 and Chapter 264, but am concerned about draft report language calling for consolidation of various city commissions in support of a single reviewing body. As stated previously, the termination or consolidation of the commission as currently established would undercut historic resource protection, access to grants and other funding sources, technical expertise, and the public's sense of the plan's commitment to historic resources.

The draft plan states a particular concern about the LPC and HAC commissions regarding new construction and infill development. The respective commissions should be given design guidelines that would guide their oversight and streamline their review of such development without diminishing their expertise regarding historic structures or their ability to protect such structures.

Additional Recommendations:

Existing commissions with preservation responsibilities, working in conjunction with local preservation organizations, should be formally tasked with preparing a Preservation Plan for the City of Kingston. This plan would build off recommendations made in this submission, as well as other comments regarding historic preservation opportunities in Kingston in response to the draft Kingston 2025 plan.

The Kingston 2025 report should include a map of National Register districts and individual NR designations, as well as properties currently determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. These datasets and shape files are readily available from the NY State Historic Preservation Office.

The Kingston 2025 report should include a map of Qualified Census Tracts for the NYS RTC programs. See above for a list of qualified census tracts.

National Register-listed Sites, City of Kingston, NY

Number	Name	# of Buildings	Other	NHL	RTC Use
01PR05982	Second Reformed Dutch Church of Kingston	1			
01PR05985	Boice House	1			
01PR05989	Kenyon House	1			
01PR05991	Chichester House	1			
01PR05993	Old Dutch Church Parsonage (Julia Dillon Home)	1			
90PR03310	Cornell Steamboat Company Shops	1			
90PR03460	Clinton Avenue Historic District	17			
90PR03480	Kingston/Rondout 2 Lighthouse	1			
90PR03482	Tremper-Livingston House	1			
90PR03516	Kingston Stockade Historic District	195			
90PR03538	Hoffman House	1			
90PR03541	Ponckhockie Union Chapel	1			
95PR02973	Kingston City Library (Carnegie Library)	1			
90PR05340	Rondout-West Strand Historic District	314			
90PR05354	Community Theatre	1			
90PR05366	Kingston City Hall	1			
90PR05371	Senate House	1			
90PR05381	Kingston-Port Ewen Suspension Bridge		Bridge		
90PR05399	Chestnut Street Historic District	42			
90PR05403	West Strand Historic District	9			
99PR04647	Van Steenburgh, Tobias, House	1			
02PR06288	103 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06289	109 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06292	322 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06293	Ten Broeck Stone House	1			
02PR06294	356 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06295	313 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06296	184 Albany Avenue	1			
02PR06297	Sharpe Burial Ground		Cemetery		
02PR06298	The Kirkland Hotel	1			2008
02PR06329	K. WHITTELEY (Tugboat)		Boat		
03PR06078	Forsyth, James and Mary, House	1			2004
04PR06715	Palen, Frank A., House	1			

National Register-listed Sites, City of Kingston, NY

Number	Name	# of Buildings	Other	NHL	RTC Use
06PR07045	Moses Yeomans House	1			
06PR07046	Cordts Mansion	1			
06PR07071	349 Albany Ave	1		1	
07PR06868	First Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of Kingston	1			
07PR06945	Burger - Matthews House	1			
07PR06974	Cornell Shops Building	1			
12PR05495	National Curtain Lace Factory	1			2014
13PR05819	B&QT Trolley No. 1000		Trolley		
		609	4	1	3

National Register-eligible Structures, Kingston, NY

USN	Type	Name	Status
11140.00063	Building	467-477 Broadway, KINGSTON NY - Former Armory and Municipal Auditorium	Eligible
11140.00073	Building	608 BROADWAY, KINGSTON NY - 3-story 4x12 bay brick commercial bldg w/storefront -	Eligible
11140.00064	Building	3 Dunn St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00071	Building	25 Kiersted Ave, KINGSTON NY 12401 - KINGSTON ARMORY	Eligible
11140.00071	Building	14 HENRY ST, KINGSTON NY - JR. D.U.A.M. BUILDING	Eligible
11140.00113	Building	Ulster & Delaware Railroad (Catskill Mtn. Branch) - KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00114	Building	24 O'NEIL ST, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00076	Building	107 O'NEIL ST, KINGSTON NY - BRIGHAM SCHOOL (demolished 2000)	Lost
11140.00114	Building	47 WALNUT, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00117	Building	93 ST JAMES ST, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00117	Building	52 ST JAMES ST, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00117	Building	23 VAN BUREN ST, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00117	Building	53 CLINTON AVE, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.0012	Building	101 CLINTON AVE, KINGSTON NY - GOTHIC REVIVAL HOUSE/John Pettit House -	Eligible
11140.00077	Building	209 CLINTON AVE, KINGSTON NY - ULSTER COUNTY YWCA -	Eligible
11140.0012	Building	10-16 EAST CHESTER ST, KINGSTON NY - KINGSTON & RONDOUT TROLLEY SHED -	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	429 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	435 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	451 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	453 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	455 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	457 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00123	Building	465 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00183	Building	601 Abeel St, KINGSTON NY - commercial, stone	Eligible
11140.00125	Building	49 Elmendorf, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00118	Building	79 ELMENDORF ST, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00139	Building	31 Linderman Ave, KINGSTON NY	Eligible
11140.00162	Building	76 Garden St, KINGSTON NY - 2-story/front-gabled late 19th c residence w/wrap around porch	Eligible
11140.00167	Building	70 Lindsley Ave, KINGSTON NY - Union Free School (Former)	Eligible
11140.00169	Building	61 Crown St, KINGSTON NY - Cioni Administration Building/Kingston High School	Eligible
11140.0017	Building	35 Bruyn Ave, KINGSTON NY - Hayes Machine Company/Kingston Cooperage Factory	Eligible
11140.00185	Building	159 Washington Ave, Kingston NY 12401 - Residence	Eligible

Technical Preservation Services

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



[Home](#) > [Tax Incentives](#) > Check Project Status

Search Results

Information in the project status database is advisory only. Official notification regarding project decisions is made in writing to the property owner by the National Park Service.

Fees are charged for the review of Historic Preservation Certification Applications, based on **Fee Schedule 1** or **Fee Schedule 2**.

Fee Schedule 1 - For projects for which a Part 2 application was received by a SHPO on or after December 31, 2012.

Fee Schedule 2 - For projects for which a Part 2 application was received by a SHPO prior to December 31, 2012.

Your search produced 9 record(s).

Project Number 4,805
Project WILLIAMS APARTMENTS
86 ABEEL STREET
KINGSTON, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 09/03/99
Status: 09/21/99 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received: 09/03/99
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 10/08/99
Status: 10/13/99 (Approve)

Part 3:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Project Number 11,243
Project FORSYTH, JAMES AND MARY, HOUSE
31 ALBANY AVENUE
KINGSTON, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 03/31/03
Status: 04/01/03 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received: 10/01/03
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 10/07/03
Status: 10/16/03 (Approve)

Part 3:

Received: 02/02/04
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 02/11/04
Status: 02/11/04 (Approve)

Project Number 17,607
Project THE KIRKLAND HOTEL
 2 MAIN STREET
 KINGSTON, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 12/16/05
Status: 12/21/05 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received: 12/16/05
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 12/29/05
Status: 02/10/06 (Approve)

Part 3:

Received: 05/20/08
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 05/28/08
Status: 05/29/08 (Approve)

Project Number 27,724
Project The United States Lace Curtain Mill
 165 Cornell Street
 Kingston, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 08/07/12
Status: 10/19/12 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received: 02/01/13
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received: 02/01/13
Status: 03/05/13 (Conditional Approval)

Part 3:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Amendments

Number: 1
Issue: Part 2: Rear boiler house & Type E windows
Received: 07/11/13
Status: 08/15/13 (Conditional Approval)

Amendments

Number: 2
Issue: Part 2: Change in Ownership & design changes
Received: 02/21/14
Status: 03/25/14 (Approve)

Amendments

Number: 3
Issue: Part 2: Boiler House interior features and finishes
Received: 07/30/14
Status: 08/13/14 (Approve)

Project Number 27,879
Project 77 Main Street
 Kingston, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 09/14/12
Status: 10/09/12 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Part 3:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Project Number 28,061
Project Kingston Cooperage Compnay Building
 35 Bruyn Avenue
 Kingston, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 10/31/12
Status: 12/13/12 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Part 3:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Project Number 31,633
Project 9 Hone Street
 Kingston, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 01/06/15
Status: 02/03/15 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Part 3:

Received:
Fee(1) Received:
Fee(2) Received:
Status:

Project Number 31,667
Project The Bridgewater
 111 Abel Street
 Kingston, NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 01/14/15
Status: 02/05/15 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received:

Fee(1) Received:

Fee(2) Received:

Status:

Part 3:

Received:

Fee(1) Received:

Fee(2) Received:

Status:

Project Number 31,668
Project West Strand Apartments
50 Abeel Street
Kingston , NY 12401

Part 1:

Received: 01/14/15

Status: 02/05/15 (Approve)

Part 2:

Received:

Fee(1) Received:

Fee(2) Received:

Status:

Part 3:

Received:

Fee(1) Received:

Fee(2) Received:

Status:
