

Planning Board Special Meeting

April 29th, 2020

Via webex.

Members present

Scott McCarthy, Chair
Sal Cuciti
Larry Hammond
Carl Dilorenzo
Franco Zani
Charly Long
Gerry Marion
Lambros Violaris

Meeting opened at 6:05pm

Scott opened with remarks concerning recent possible inadequacies concerning minutes, procedures, etc. Asked for patience as the Town muddles through the present crisis and the newness of the meeting medium.

Scott suggested that a temporary minute taker be assigned to assist with record keeping. Sal named Lambros for this evening.

Scott reminded the Board that two projects submitted letters. Reminded Board of the townwide impact of the zoning amendments being considered.

Public comments would be allowed at the end of the meeting should any be offered, limiting time to 3 minutes .

Scott asked Rob to lead the Board through the amendments, reminding the Board that there are alternatives to be considered.

Rob Stout suggested an orderly process, referring to Scott's email from April 24th, 2020 as the basis of an approach to consider the amendments.

Rob discussed the process of the legislative action which would follow the referral back to the Town Board and the Town Board will craft a local law which draws on multiple sources for guidance and advice, including the Planning Board's comments tonight.

Rob explained the new PRRD as a floating zone, created via a rezoning application to the Town Board.

Step one of that is an applicant appearing before a committee of review which would prepare a proposal to the Town Board either recommending or suggesting rejection of the rezoning applications, possibly with conditions or recommendations for consideration by the Town Board. Ultimately, the Town Board has legislative control.

Board discussion of process.

Scott-process would streamline the new PRRD process, the referral committee would send their recommendations to the Town Board.

Rob-pre application committee works through design and gives feedback to the Town Board.

Town Board does rezoning for potential development and would list restrictions and requirements within the local law if adopted.

Paul VanCott—reminds Board that the Town Board has the ultimate authority in where and what can be developed within a PRRD.

Franco Zani asked about locations for PRRD. Asked if PRRD was only available in areas with existing water and sewer, concerned that water and sewer extension possibilities could be limited if not allowed to connect. The language does allow for a PRRD where water and sewer are available, so future development would be able to connect.

Larry Hammond asked about the Town Board having total control, concerned based on previous development (Highland Square) where the Town Board crafted a zoning which tied the hands of the Planning Board. The answer was yes and no. There would be specific zoning schemes designed for the rezoning of the PRRD based on a conceptual plan, but there would still be site plan review authority in the Planning Board's review.

Vote on accepting the preliminary process and the PRRD as a floating zone (Franco moved, Charly seconded) all ayes. Carries.

Rob: second element of tonight's discussion is the Standards for the PRRD. He asked the Board to be able to justify their recommendations.

Scott-reminded the Board that the Comprehensive Review Committee took a logical approach to the considerations contained in the recommendations from that committee. He feels that perhaps the Town Board suggestions are too stringent although also believes that the committee agreed that density reductions were important and that the Town needs smart development and desires and improvement to the quality of life while understanding that the Town should not create zoning which keeps development out.

Sal stated that the comp plan committee zoning is the same as currently exists. He spoke about the Town Board comments and feels that they are reasonable.

Rob proposed going step by step through the standards

Density proposed by committee was 4/12. Town Board suggests making density 4/8.

(4 units per acre independent housing and 12 beds per acre institutional) (4 units per acre independent housing and 8 beds per acre institutional)

Scott asked Board about their thoughts. General discussion followed.

Carl asked why the Town Board suggested 8 per acre. He stated that he thought it might be difficult to develop based on those lower numbers. Other areas (of the country) have higher density and they seem to work well. Cost is also an issue for seniors.

Larry prefers comp plan committee numbers and that the Town Board should revisit the numbers in 2 years to see if they still work.

Scott reminded the Board that the Comp Plan calls for a yearly review and assessment of the Town's performance in working on items in the Comp Plan.

Charly prefers Committee numbers.

Carl prefers Committee numbers.

Larry prefers Committee numbers.

Franco prefers Committee numbers.

Gerry prefers Town Board numbers.

Sal prefers Town Board numbers.

Vote on Town Board recommended 4/8 density suggestions (Gerry moved, Carl seconded)

Sal: Aye

Gerry: Aye

Rest of Board: Nay

Area and Bulk standards:

Comp Plan Committee recommended minimum 20 acres for PRRD. Town Board suggests 25.

Little discussion

Vote on 25 acres for minimum in PRRD (Scott moved, Charly seconded)

Unanimous Aye.

Discussion on G.2: no minimum lot size applicable to dwelling units or other principal buildings in PRRD

Gerry asked for clarification

Vote to remain as written: (Franco moved, Charly seconded)

Unanimous Aye

Minimum Setbacks (G.3)

Scott thought they might be too stringent, by increasing setbacks, buildings get pushed to the center of the property.

Larry –if buildings get pushed back too far, developers use the area in front for parking.

Franco asked for clarification on language. Rob supplied.

Sal- suggested that the variable setback might be the way to go. That the setback issue was a wildcard. Maybe create a maximum setback in addition to the minimum setback?

Clarie clarified that the length of building setback was for the front only.

Some discussion on having the setback be 100 feet plus 35 feet per story additional (2 story building would be 170 feet setback on sides and rear).

Larry asked if they could park in the front, answer was yes, based on conceptual plan at Town Board review.

Motion to accept the Town Board suggestions with adjustments (100 foot plus 35 per story) (Franco moved, Sal seconded) Unanimous Aye

Max coverage (G.4)

Carl stated that he thought the Town Board was too restrictive.

Scott agreed and thought it might be a little too restrictive.

Carl suggested 40% coverage

Charly suggested 40% coverage

Gerry suggested 40% coverage

Larry suggested 45% coverage

Franco suggested 40% coverage

Sal suggested 30% coverage

Scott suggested 40% coverage

Vote to recommend 40% gross coverage (Carl motion, Franco seconded)

Carl, Aye; Charly, Aye; Gerry, Aye, Larry, Aye; Franco, Aye; Sal, Nay; Scott, Aye, Motion carries.

No comment on G.5

Building Height (G.6)

Gerry asked, based on the possible 4 story height that the Comp Plan Committee suggested the Town Board could grant, if the Fire Department could fight a fire in a building that tall.

Claire reminded the Board that Applewood is 4 stories and the Fire Department has been on site to test if they could reach that high.

Rob clarified that the Town Board, regardless of what ultimately is in the law, has discretion.

Vote to recommend the Town Board suggestion

Unanimous Aye.

Spacing and design of buildings within PRRD

Scott suggested that without discussion to move forward to next item.

Carl reminded the Board there were design standards for the rest of Town and perhaps they should be referenced here.

Discussion about creating design standards.

Rob suggested adding a statement in the referral back to the Town Board that they should be cognizant of design standards as they craft their law.

There was consensus by the Planning Board on that approach.

No comment on (I)-(L)

From Town Board memo, item #7---1/3 acreage preserved as recreation or other open space

Sal questioned the impact on Recreation fees. General discussion.

No additional comments except for research on impact to rec fees.

Vote to accept item: (Charly moved, Gerry seconded) Unanimous Aye.

From Town Board memo #8

Rob read item.

General consensus

Vote to accept item (Carl moved, Sal seconded) Unanimous Aye

From Town Board memo #2

Sal and Claire discussion on what the 50% applies to. Agreement that it should apply to single family type independent houses.

Sal suggested there were three building types, nursing unit buildings, apartments and cottage/houses. Wants a definition that clarifies the 50% applies to houses only.

Scott asked why 50% was the number decided on. Answer was to reduce density.

Rob suggested a draft modification for further review.

Carl wondered which way created more houses or more nursing units.

General discussion on density.

Paul VanCott, they will work on some draft showing that no more than 50% of the independent housing should be cottages.

Gerry feels like this piece is broken and is with Sal

Motion to have Paul and Rob craft language to revise (Carl moved, Sal seconded).

Carl, Aye; Charly, Aye; Gerry, Abstain, Larry, Aye; Franco, Aye; Sal, Aye; Scott, Nay

Highway Business District discussion

Rob and Paul discussed some textual modifications to the footnotes in the Dimensional Table (footnotes “h” and “i”) would be removed as the setbacks are already adjusted in the bulk table.

Reminded the Board that in the HBD 30% of the square footage of the building would be allowed to have upper floor apartments while 70% must be commercial space.

Motion to approve with textual amendments (Sal moved, Charly seconded)

Carl, Aye; Charly, Aye; Gerry, Nay, Larry, Aye; Franco, Aye; Sal, Aye; Scott, Aye, motion carries

Open to public comment

Taylor Palmer, representing the Views:

Mr. Palmer suggested that the proposed changes were not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed changes would impact the entire district, not just the View project, limiting the possible development of other properties in that zone.

Has submitted letter to Planning Board for their consideration and will do so for the Town Board as well.

Introduced Mike Morgante, PE, representing the Views, who showed a map of vacant properties in the HBD zone.

Showed a new site plan suggesting a 50/50%

John Furst, representing the Villages

Mr. Furst remarked on the inconsistency of the PRRD language.

Remarked on density

Remarked on setbacks.

Will present additional information to the Town Board during their public hearing.

Motion to Close Public Comments, Sal moved, Carl seconded.

Motion to adjourn by Sal, seconded by Gerry. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:33pm.