TOWN OF NORTH EAST ZONING REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES December 5, 2022

The Town of North East Zoning Review Committee meeting took place on Monday, December 5, 2022, at the North East Town Hall, located at 19 North Maple Avenue, Millerton, New York at 4:30 PM. Board members present were Chair Edie Greenwood, Dave Sherman, Julie Schroeder, Dale Culver, Ed Downey and Bill Kish. Also in attendance were Will Agresta, Chris Kennan, Lana Morrison, Sam Busselle, Meg Winkler, Rich Stalzer, Laurie Kerr, and Rob Cooper.

Housing Presentation - Meg Winkler and Sam Busselle

Winkler gave a presentation on the Housing Expo the Millerton Tri-Town group will mount at the Library Annex in early 2023. It will be a visual exhibit of various different types of housing options. Materials prepared by Hudson River Housing and AARP clearly articulated the problems and various solutions. These publications will be available at the Housing Expo.

Incentive Zoning

At the last meeting Kish suggests we develop two lists – one of what we hope to gain from an applicant and a second list of what we are willing to give to an applicant. All present agreed.

It was decided the two priority benefits for the commercial districts are:

- Establishment of common access driveway connections to reduce road cuts
- Development of affordable housing for persons of low or moderate income

Specific incentives or bonuses to provide flexibility from zoning standards could include:

- Increased lot coverage
- Reduction of parking requirements
- Pocket parks and additional landscaping in parking areas
- Reduction of height restrictions

More broadly put, Kish suggested that any exception made to any bulk standard can be used as a potential incentive.

Sherman pointed out that we have many small parcels in the Boulevard Districts. He questioned if rather than allowing them to be further divided, would it be better to encourage they be assembled to allow for more flexibility in furthering our goals. Agresta said he could see this as an incentive as there is an intrinsic value of eliminating interior setbacks, so it helps with coverage.

Kish asked Agresta how incentives would be shown in our code. Agresta said he would create language that used an "up to" approach. An example would be coverage of 20% could be increased up to 30% if such and such is done. Agresta suggested we focus on the benefits we want in the commercial districts and then approach what concessions should be allowed.

Agresta is working on examples of different coverages for our next meeting. In his preliminary work he notes he is working on both building and site coverages and feels the constraint will be site coverage due to parking requirements. The solution may come from reducing setbacks.

Sherman questioned giving an incentive for creating a pocket park of additional landscaping in parking areas. He felt we might want to require such improvements in a mixed-use building.

Kish asked if we could require recreational space when more than 2 or 4 units were going to be built.

Culver was concerned about maintenance and quality and felt these aspects need to be clearly defined.

Kish summarized where we would allow bonuses in the following areas:

- Parking requirements
- Lot coverage
- Building height
- Building square footage
- Lot frontage requirements

Sherman questioned why we needed to deal with maximum lot depth. Agresta felt we might not have an issue in the commercial districts and that this standard relates more to the residential districts.

Kish suggested we might want to encourage interior development so as not to have buildings set further back on a lot and to encourage interior connectivity. The committee agreed that we do want interior connectivity where possible. Agresta said this issue can be handled by setting maximum building size in the standards. Sherman felt we need to increase the minimum lot width on the boulevard to prevent existing lots from being divided up and creating long narrow lots.

Agresta pointed out that a frontage requirement only matters if a purchaser was looking to divide a property. Non-conforming lots would be viewed as preexisting. Incentives that will make the most difference will related to setbacks and coverage. Given the constraints presented in the boulevard, Agresta points out that we may want to set our coverage numbers low so we will be able to offer meaningful incentives.

Sherman feels the committee needs to focus on what we are trying to achieve on the boulevard. How much retail and services space does our community expect? What would the results be if someone develops the parcel to its maximum? Are we backing ourselves into an urban setting in our rural community? Sherman does not want to create incentives that create something we do not want.

Greenwood asked if incentives were given for installing solar panels. Agresta questioned how solar panels produced a benefit to the community. Schroeder said covered parking lots with solar panels are permitted in our code. Kish said possibly they should be required.

Public Comment

Meg Winkler: Winkler asked if interconnectivity include courtyards/greenspace for residents or is it just for cars. Agresta and the committee agreed that pedestrian flow would be included in how interconnectivity would be defined. The committee talked about it being a requirement not resulting from an incentive.

Laurie Kerr: Kerr suggested an additional half or partial floor be used as an incentive and could allow for a creative design element such as a tower to mimic the Village. She suggested additional landscaping and pathways along Kelsey Brook could be used as an incentive.

Sam Busselle: Busselle asked how the Village and Town are communicating about zoning. He is following up on the suggestion in the Comprehensive Plan. Nothing formal has happened to date but the Pace report being done for the Village will be shared when completed.

Chair Greenwood adjourned the meeting at 6:00 PM. The next meeting will be held on January 16, 2023.

Respectfully Submitted by

Edith Greenwood - ZRC Chair