

## TOWN OF NORTH EAST ZONING REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES February 6, 2023

The Town of North East Zoning Review Committee meeting took place on Monday, February 6, 2023, 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, Ed Downey, Dale Culver, Julie Schroeder (via Zoom) and Bill Kish. Also in attendance were Will Agresta, Chris Kennan, Sam Busselle, Kathy Chow, Rich Stalzer, Laurie Kerr, Paul Bengston and Emily Edelman.

Chair Greenwood started the meeting by addressing the parking requirements outlined at the last meeting. The committee had received an analysis done by Laurie Kerr and Kathy Chow questioning the need for so much parking and suggesting we consider reducing the required number of spaces but adding in an overflow area. **The committee agreed too much parking is not desirable.** Agresta explained parking needs are dependent on the uses. He gave the example of greater needs if only a single use versus multiple uses with needs at different times of the day. He is working on pulling together a parking standards chart for various uses.

Agresta addressed the expansion parking concept. Start with reasonable parking standards that do not result in over parking then have provisions for a percent reduction if they can share parking with another property. This approach would require a legal agreement between property owners. He clarified this does not reduce the need for parking, but it will provide access to additional parking to allow expanded coverage through an incentive. Agresta said such arrangements would require a parking demand analysis of both properties.

Sherman raised the question as to how we reserve land if more parking is needed due to a change in use. He suggested requiring alternative parking where grass could be allowed to grow through sections. He also reminded the committee of the need for a snow shelf.

A discussion followed about parking needs for residential units. **Agresta agreed that 1.5 spaces for one-bedroom apartments is sufficient but noted that residential parking needed to be fully dedicated.**

### **BD West south side map discussion**

Kathy Chow had large blowup maps printed and designated approximately 60% coverage on each parcel. She then provided post-it note rectangles sized to various dimension for building footprints and parking requirements. The exercise is to allow the committee to visualize what different standards would represent.

**Maximum building footprint size.** Agresta noted that **certain uses such as a grocery store can be exempted from the standard.** The committee agreed that for the larger parcels, we should encourage smaller buildings near Route 44 with a larger building being allowed towards the rear of the parcel. Previous discussions had suggested the shorter end of a building face the road. The committee felt that businesses need the ability to have display area visible from the road and that the requirement to break up the façade every 30 - 40 ft was desirable and should be required.

The committee **agreed to exempt a grocery store** from a maximum footprint size. There needs to be clear definition of what is required to qualify as a grocery store.

The committee **agreed we want to encourage a line of buildings nearer to Route 44 with a setback of 70 – 75 ft from the center line of the road.**

The committee **agreed that the maximum width of the building facing the road should be 100 ft with required façade changes such as an indentation or building material change every 30 – 40 ft.**

The committee discussed allowing building footprints of up to 15,000 sq ft. To encourage housing above, the committee agreed to limit a one-story building to 8,000 sq ft but allowing up to 12,000 sq ft to 15,000 sq ft if second-floor residential housing was added.

Agresta mentioned that the average retail store is 1,000 to 2,000 sq. ft.

**Minimum building separation.** To reduce the sense of mass and create scale. **It is typical to require separation of 35 ft or the height of the tallest building.** Culver asked if the depth of the building should factor into the degree of separation. Culver suggested coordinating the property line setbacks with the minimum building separation standard, to encourage a more visually appealing development.

**Maximum number of stories.** Kish proposed that we pick an arbitrary point on the surface of Route 44 and allow 35 ft to the peak of the roof if the roof has a pitch of greater than 6 and 12. If the pitch of the roof deck line is less than 6 and 12, the allowable height would be 30 ft. This will allow for the slope that exists south of Route 44 and would penalize flat roofs. Kish asked Agresta to calculate the height needed for ground floor retail and two stories of residential with a peaked roof. **Agresta suggested we just require peaked roofs.**

#### **Public Comment**

**Laurie Kerr:** Given ADA requirements an elevator would be needed so two stories of residential makes more economic sense. She made the case that a little more latitude on height may bring down the cost of building the third floor and recommended allowing 40 ft. Kish suggested the increased height could be an incentive bonus for more affordable housing. Kerr suggested giving 2 ½ stories as of right but if building affordable housing, 3 stories would be allowed.

**Kathy Chow:** With a mixed-use area and our desire for additional housing, Chow recommend we not allow one story buildings. She advocates allowing parking under the back of the building.

**Sam Busselle:** Busselle would like to see an architectural rendering of how an 8,000 sq ft second floor apartments would be laid out. Again, he highlighted the importance of purpose statements in the code.

**Paul Bengston:** Bengston pointed out that the town measures building height to the midpoint of the roof, not the peak.

He did not think the second story should always have to be residential. Office space for the main floor tenant or rentable to others should be an option as well. A bank can build a smaller footprint by putting some of their office space on the second floor. Again, clearly understanding the building code requirements for vertical mixed use (residential or other uses on 2nd floor) would be very helpful for the committee to decide how to proceed.

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

Respectfully Submitted by

Edith Greenwood - ZRC Chair