

## **NORTH EAST ZONING REVIEW COMMITTEE WORKSHOP MINUTES May 24, 2021**

The Town of North East Zoning Review Committee meeting took place on Monday, May 24, 2021 via Zoom at 3:30 PM. Board members present were Chair Edie Greenwood, Ed Downey, Bill Kish, Julie Schroeder, Dave Sherman, George Kaye and Dale Culver.

Guest: Sam Busselle, Chris Kennan, Tom Parrett, Meg Winkler, and Mary Lynn Kalogeras

Chair Greenwood opened the meeting and the Committee continued filling out the attached worksheet for the residential districts of our current code.

Additional comments and questions regarding various districts are as follows:

### **A5A**

Dave Sherman suggested we review the Town's adopted Agricultural Protection plan. Ed brought up the importance of maps, overlays and access to GIS systems. Edie will explore our options.

### **R1A**

Noted that we have examples at Indian Lake Estates and Briarwood. The issue is separation of wells and septic systems and getting Board of Health approval. Higher density development in the Village is made possible by having municipal water. Explore duplexes.

### **R20,000**

Needs to be areas adjacent to the Village. To make building units affordable, multi-unit construction should be less expensive to erect. Dave pointed out that to date, there has been no interest in new multi-unit building of any kind in our community. Bill points out that we need to protect areas adjacent to the Village that have the prospect of being supported with water and sewer. Ed agrees.

### **LC**

Deferred discussion. Gretchen Stevens of Hudsonia will be invited to speak with us at our June 28<sup>th</sup> workshop meeting.

### **Public Comment:**

Meg Winkler asked about solar and wind farms. Julie referred her to the new solar law and mentioned that with a major project, NYS takes control of siting the facility. Meg went on to comment that with smaller lots a great deal of what can be built is dependent on the parcel's topography. She thinks people do want smaller units and urged us to consider alternative building methods such as composting toilets.

Tom Parrett was pleased the ZRC is considering multi-unit options. He feels multi-unit and small houses can be mixed and be zoned accordingly to allow growth to happen organically. Tom is concerned our beautiful area could lead to more Silo Ridge developments.

Sam Busselle explained where he gets his figure of 450 needed affordable units for current residents and told us that does include middle income housing needs, not just affordable. It does not include lower and middle-income households who want to move here. He has sent examples of the Rhinebeck code purpose statements defining a livable community with a spread of income levels in a concentrated area. Lastly, he questions what agriculture has to do with the A5A district. Why limit the uses to particular acreage categories. Purpose statements need to address quality of life, equity and sensitize the reader to the variety of people that need to be able to afford to live here.

Meeting ended at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Edith Greenwood, ZRC Chair

Draft Purpose Statement table - May 24, 2021 ZRC meeting

District	Purpose Stmt (Shorthand)	Relationship to other districts	Incompatibilities	Competition
<b>BD-WEST</b>	Village extension (compatible architecture), walkable, uses provide "everyday goods & services", allow for accessory housing. Attractive streetscape (incl views). Smaller setbacks, parking to rear. Good signage & lighting	Relates primarily to village and to the BD-E		Supermarkets should be HERE!??? (WE NEED TO DISCUSS)
<b>BD-EAST</b>	More auto focused, larger lot sizes & uses, larger setbacks (rural appearance), residential multi-family, hospitality, also good signage & lighting, outdoor display of merchandise,	Like BD-W this is primarily retail & service, but for less walkable, less daily need establishments.		
<b>HB-III</b>	"less pedestrian" commercial uses. But, there's the RAIL TRAIL! (Maybe the R/T doesn't really need to be serviced by HB3). Mix of wholesale, B2B and retail. Auto repair & bodywork. businesses that attract "Occasional" use. Very light industrial. Most uses will occupy very small parcels.	Relates to hamlet (residential), relates to the BD districts because they are both commercial, relates to A5 & R1 to north.	The hamlet (residential). Need to protect the hamlet.	Uses are smaller as compared to those which might appear in BD-E, not really in competition
<b>MA</b>	"No-nuisance" light industrial. Does not take any high-quality potential farmland out. Does not impact important viewsheds. Are warehouses desirable?	Currently sits right in the middle of A5.	Lots of potential incompatibilities with adjacent districts. Probably need strong special permit standards.	

**Draft Purpose Statement table - May 24, 2021 ZRC meeting**

<b>District</b>	<b>Purpose Stmt (Shorthand)</b>	<b>Relationship to other districts</b>	<b>Incompatibilities</b>	<b>Competition</b>
<b>A5A</b>	This is an Agricultural use zoning district which permits residential development so long as this residential development does not take our highest quality ag land out of circulation. There is also a tie in to preserving open space. We need to be able to be somewhat flexible in terms of judging trade-offs. Discuss subjective trade-offs with Will.	Adjacent to R3 (obsolete) and R1 districts.	Potential incompatibility w/ residential neighbours: Farm smells, noise, etc. Right-to-farm law? - Composting? Short term rentals?	Possibly competes with higher density residential zones in the event that a developer creates large parcels in small parcel districts.
<b>R1A</b>	Current mapping of this district is an issue. This is the minimum lot size necessary for a home with private septic & water (verify this?) "Allows for the smallest buildable for homes not on municipal waste/water service"	Depends on where we place this district. Other considerations: Make this a multi-family district? Lots of issues to be discussed.	Need to find out if 1A parcels are desirable from market standpoint. Is this size lot a dinosaur?	If we create a multi-unit district, does this interfere/compete?
<b>R20000</b>	20K is a little under .5 Acre -- Only feasible where sewer and/or water are available. "Allows the smallest feasible single family home where sewer and/or town water are available" - This should be sited adjacent to village.	Q: Should we replace R20k with a multi-unit development zone? Do we want to ask this question? Multi-unit requires BOTH water and sewer.	Without developers willing to build multiple unit developments, land in a dedicated district would sit idle. Need to ensure that we don't create zoning that prevents building in the event that the sewer does not materialize	
<b>LC</b>	DEFER until meeting w/ Gretchen Stevens			