

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

October 8, 2014 - DRAFT

**Comprehensive Plan Committee Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Email address</b>
Jim Schoenig	VOB Mayor	jschoenig@brewstervillage-ny.gov
Christine Piccini	VOB Deputy Mayor	dpiccini@aol.com
Tom Boissonnault	VOB Trustee	TJBVOB@gmail.com
Mary Bryde	VOB Trustee	MBryde314@gmail.com
Terri Stockburger	VOB Trustee	tp.stockburger@verizon.net
Peter Hansen	VOB Clerk/Treasurer	phansen@brewstervillage-ny.gov
Bob Cullen	Town of Southeast Councilman	rcullen@southeast-ny.gov
Jack Gress	VOB Zoning Board, Coalition for a Better Brewster	jackgress@verizon.net
Richard Ruchala	VOB Zoning Board	rrr845@gmail.com
Rick Stockburger	VOB Planning Board	rstockburger@verizon.net
George J. Gaspar	VOB Planning Board, Resident (architect by profession)	gjgaia48@gmail.com
John Folchetti	VOB Engineer, Consultant to Committee	John.Folchetti@jrfa.com
Anthony Mole	VOB Attorney	am@herodesmole.com
Bob Dumont	Business	Bob@thebowlcompany.com
Joe Czajka	Patterns for Progress	Jczajka@pfprogress.com
Barbara Barosa	Putnam County Planner	Barbara.Barosa@putnamcountyny.gov
Meghan Taylor	EDC President	meghan.taylor@putnamcountyny.gov
Harold Lepler	Covington	haroldlepler@gmail.com
Larry Nadel	Covington	nadels@comcast.net
Don Rossi	Covington, Legal Council	dmrossi@hoganandrossi.com

Members present Oct 8, 2014	Members absent Oct. 8, 2014
Jim Schoenig	George Gaspar
Jack Gress	Meghan Taylor
Mary Bryde	John Saccardi
Tom Boissonnault	Larry Nadel
Bob Cullen	Don Rossi
Joe Czajka	Terri Stockburger
Barbara Barosa	Richard Ruchala
Anthony Mole	John Folchetti
Bob Dumont	Christine Piccini
Harold Lepler	Peter Hansen
	Rick Stockburger

Mayor Jim Schoenig led the Committee in the pledge of allegiance and made a motion to open the meeting. This was seconded by Mr. Bossoinneault and passed unanimously.

#### Agenda Item I

Mr. Schoenig made a motion to accept the amended minutes from the September 10, 2014 meeting to include a correction on page 12, fifth paragraph to change the statement made by Mr. Gress from “Mr. Gress further stated that Mr. Czajka told the Village that only 20 units could be accommodated” to “Mr. Gress remembered that someone said only 20 units could be accommodated”. This was seconded by Ms. Bryde and passed unanimously.

#### Agenda Item II

##### Review of August 15, 2014 memos from VHB to approve the findings

##### A. Historical and Cultural Resources memo

- . Discussion revolved around VHB’s recommendation of establishing an historic district vs. an historic overlay. The consensus was that an historic district designation would hinder development. And that while a benefit might be tax credits or grants, there are always strings attached when accepting either one.

- . Mr. Gress asked what the difference was between an historic district designation vs. an historic overlay, and the response was that an historic overlay is more stringent. Mr. Gress remembers that they would hinder development.

- . Mr. Czajka mentioned that there are other mechanisms to maintain the historic character of a town and didn't recommend either an overlay or district, particularly since neither provides for a windfall of dollars.
- . Ms. Barosa reiterated that neither would benefit the Village at this point.
- . Ms. Barosa said it could be phrased in the Comprehensive Plan as a *possible* change in the future, that the Village could adopt an historic district in the future.
- . Mr. Schoenig summarized that they would drop either the historic overlay or historic district designation recommendation and this was agreed to by the Committee.

B. Housing issues and Potential Solutions memo of Aug. 15, 2014 – includes six suggestions.

There was a discussion about establishing a district for town houses only.

- . Mr. Mole asked about setting up a new district only for town houses and Ms. Barosa said, Yes, this is possible.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that R20 zone already allows for town houses.
- . Mr. Boissonneault talked about town houses that were built on Tuckahoe Road in Eastchester and talked about promoting ownership.
- . Mr. Boissonneault thought that town houses would work well near the Bordon bridge.
- . Mr. Lepler recommended not mentioning ownership as it could lead to legal issues and fair-housing issues.
- . Mr. Mole added that they may have to start as rentals that eventually lead to ownership.
- . Mr. Czajka asked about combining zoning so there weren't so many zones in the Village.
- . Mr. Gress stated that he didn't recollect that town houses were allowed in the R1 zone, and wanted to make sure that town houses were allowed in the R20 zone, which would mean that there are only three parcels that could allow town houses.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that the Committee could make the recommendation to change zoning to allow for the opportunity for town houses. Doesn't mean it's going to happen.

- . Mr. Czajka talked about financing of town houses and said that a developer would have to state ownership and not rentals.
- . Mr. Lepler recommended to Mr. Czajka that he talk to the banking people he knows and ask them what their requirements are for town houses.
- . Mr. Czajka said he'd find out more information on financing and town houses.

There was a discussion about floating zones.

- . Ms. Barosa mentioned incorporating floating zones which allow flexibility and would allow a developer to do something on a specific site. Floating zones can apply to any zone or can be restricted to specific districts.
- . Mr. Gress said he'd like to see more research on the subject.
- . Mr. Gress asked about where would these floating zones/town house zones be, i.e., around the train station?
- . Mr. Schoenig stated that floating zones could achieve flexibility without going overboard.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that they could restrict floating zones to existing districts and not allow them throughout the entire Village.
- . Mr. Callahan from the audience talked about floating zones in New Rochelle in order to revitalize it. He said that the Village would have to show developers that this is the direction the Village is going in to allow more flexibility and less restrictiveness.
- . Mr. Schoenig stated that the Committee had talked about this re: Garden Street School in order to allow the flexibility to have town houses built on that site.
- . Mr. Gress stated that he wants to get more educated and would like more specifics on floating zones.
- . Mr. Gress warned about changes in elections where new government officials have full authority to do what they want and make changes that are contrary to the vision of the present officials.
- . Ms. Barosa to send out additional information on floating zones.

The question about spot zoning then came up.

- . Mr. Mole said that this would not be considered spot zoning because it doesn't refer to only one single lot. Rather, it would be considered planning since it involves looking at the entire Village. Mr. Mole added that he would advise if he saw that the Committee was leaning towards spot zoning.

The subject of affordable house came up.

- . The memo is recommending ten percent affordable housing.
- . Mr. Mole stated that the Village already has enough affordable housing.
- . Mr. Mole explained that the ten percent affordable housing could be established on any single lot or divided among multiple lots. And the Village has adequate affordable housing.
- . Ms. Barosa brought up the subject of a density bonus included in the zoning regulations.
- . Mr. Boissonneault stated that the Village already has enough affordable housing.
- . Mr. Gress reminded the Committee that once the money from HUD is accepted, the municipality then needs to follow their rules. He asked if the Village was mandated to do the same. Mr. Mole responded, No, and that the Village already had enough and wouldn't need to expand it. And reminded that HUD got involved in Westchester County affordable housing after the law suit.
- . Mr. Czajka reminded the Committee to be careful so that it doesn't look like exclusionary zoning.
- . Mr. Schoenig stated that the Village was fine, and would prefer that that section on affordable housing be removed.

### Agenda Item III

#### Review of Draft Chapters from VHB: Economic Development, and Land Use, Zoning and Community Character

The subject of how to determine the amount of parking required was discussed: Either using the per-bedroom calculation vs. the per-unit calculation.

- . Mr. Czajka handed out the housing report that talked of the study of parking in 56 suburban complexes in five counties.

. The study outlined the number of parking spaces required vs. the number of parking that was actually used. It turned out that 64 percent was used, 36 percent remained vacant at all times. The study showed:

- 1.27 spaces used per the per-unit calculation
- 1.86 spaces used per the per-bedroom calculation

There is no definite recommendation.

. The study explained staggered use of parking which means parking that may be used at some portions of the day for commuters or restaurant attendees, while used by residents at other parts of the day.

The study reflected what the market can bear.

. Mr. Dumont asked how you determine how a space is used and the response was that it was based on registered cars, residential area only.

. Mr. Lepler added that in condominium projects with one to two bedroom units with 2-3 parking spaces/apartment, half the spaces were empty.

. Mr. Gress expressed that he supported parking sharing between business/residential areas and said that this worked out well in North Salem.

. Mr. Czajka recommended going with the lower end of the scale, keeping it flexible and going with staggered use.

. Mr. Schoenig asked what most communities go with and the response was parking/unit calculation.

. Mr. Schoenig reiterated going with the per-unit calculation.

. Mr. Gress stated that one car/unit seemed acceptable by most, with senior housing calculation cut back by 50 percent.

. Mr. Czajka added the need to designate an overflow area initially, with the paving of that area later should it prove to be well used.

. Mr. Czajka also reminded the Committee that “the line of sight parking” often fools people in the amount of parking available.

. Mr. Mole expressed that he preferred the per-bedroom calculation.

. Mr. Gress stated that it seemed that the Committee was in agreement to go with the per-unit calculation with a parking overlay, which would lighten up restrictions.

RE: Parking structures

- . Mr. Gress then asked about parking structures, particularly around the railroad station.
  - . Ms. Barosa asked about the occupancy of the current parking lots. Mr. Schoenig and Mr. Gress responded that they are at full occupancy, with a waiting list.
  - . Ms. Barosa added that the parking garage would provide multiple uses – to commuters, to businesses, and to residential.
  - . Ms. Barosa also stated that what should be included would be a range in the direction of reducing it.
  - . Mr. Schoenig stated that if parking garages are constructed the Village would get portions of the money generated from those structures to make up for the money lost from the parking lots. However, the Village would no longer have to manage the rental of the lots, etc.
  - . Mr. Gress asked if parking garages would be advantageous and stated that a decision can't be made until a decision is made as to whether there will be a parking garage constructed or not.
  - . Mr. Lepler cited 3.5 to 4 spaces/1000 square feet on retail/commercial/office space. He cited the following statistics:
    - Studios/1 bedroom/senior residences = .6 parking spaces
    - Two bedrooms = 1.2 parking spaces
    - Three bedrooms = 1.5 parking spaces
- And there should be additional spaces per project designated for special projects/visitors, etc. And this could be part of the shared parking figure.
- . Mr. Czajka cited the following statistics:
    - Studio and 1 bedroom = .5 parking spaces
    - Two bedrooms = 1.25 parking spaces
    - Three bedrooms, plus = 1.5 parking spaces
  - . Ms. Barosa reminded the Committee that these spaces could also be shared.
  - . Mr. Lepler cited that at Mt. Kisco Medical = 6 spaces/1000 square feet.
  - . Mr. Czajka also stated that less spaces encourages people to have fewer cars and therefore go more "green".

RE: Bed and breakfasts (B&Bs)

- . Ms. Barosa stated that B&Bs would be additions to residential districts.
- . Mr. Mole expressed concern of a B&B evolving to a boarding house.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that there would have to be specifics stated in the zoning codes.
- . Mr. Gress asked where do they have plans of placing a B&B?
- . Ms. Barosa stated that B&Bs could encourage tourism. She gave Cold Spring as an example.
- . Mr. Callahan commented that B&Bs could be encouraged if bike paths and bike trails are established and promoted. He also mentioned that there are two trails coming together with Dutchess County and/or referenced the walkway over the Hudson and other examples. Cited a study of economic development along trails.
- . Mr. Boissonnault expressed worry having a B&B/hotel in the Village.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that the Comprehensive Plan spans ten years and proposals could be included as things for the future.
- . Mr. Gress stated that what is cited in the zoning is what will matter ultimately.
- . B&B recommendation will be kept in the plan.

RE: Fast food chains/Drive-throughs

- . Fast food chains will be kept in the plan, but discourage drive-throughs.
- . Mr. Dumont stated that he wasn't a fan of chain stores, but volumes of people look for them. Didn't think that they should be totally zoned out.
- . Ms. Barosa reminded the Committee that drive-throughs don't encourage people to stay around. So, it's not the fast food, but rather the drive-throughs that are being discouraged.
- . Mr. Gress stated that there aren't any practical places in the Village for drive-throughs.

RE: "Adult" uses

- . Ms. Barosa stated that the recommendation was to go with special exception use and prohibit them in downtown.
- . Ms. Barosa stated that additional numbers of these types of stores could be prohibited and/or they could be limited to special exception use by permit only.

- . Mr. Barosa said that the cabaret would be grandfathered in, as it can't be zoned out.
- . Mr. Mole stated that the hope would be that it would close.
- . Mr. Mole also stated that any wording would have to be worded carefully, e.g., "no facility within 1000' of a school or 400' of a church; and no more than two in the Village.
- . Mr. Gress stated that can't change the definition. He added that the billiard parlor is not considered an adult-use facility.
- . Ms. Barosa recommended keeping the same restrictions, but move to special exception use permit.

RE: Outdoor dining definitely to be kept in and allow as a special exception use permit.

RE: Limit the extent of the B3 zone on the North side of Main Street, beyond the Walter Brewster house. Thought that it should be zoned residential, not business.

- . Mr. Gress said that this zone used to be B1. And, asked why one would want to make Main Street residential.
- . Mr. Gress stated that he was not in favor of changing the B3 zone to a residential zone as it would put all the businesses in that location out of business; change it to B1, he would be in favor of it.
- . The Committee was confused as to the area that was referenced in this item and decided that clarification was needed in order to discuss further.

RE: The topic of incentive zoning came up. Would allow the Village to include amenities, such as pedestrian plaza and outdoor dining in order to give the developer incentive and this is a method to use.

- . Mr. Gress restated that there are too many things in the Comprehensive Plan that are vague and more things need to be more specific and not give things a general go-ahead.
  - . Ms. Barosa stated that the Committee could start thinking about where they'd like to see incentive zoning.
- And that incentive zoning is something that would be considered more by the developer.

- . Mr. Lepler added that incentive zoning could mean more coverage of the building, with parking regulations, signage, upgrades that are more palatable for aesthetics and beautification, height requirements, etc.
- . The Committee decided they need more information on this.

It was agreed that the next Comp. Plan meetings would be as outlined in the agenda:

- Wednesday, Oct. 22, 2014
- Wednesday, Nov. 12, 2014
- Tuesday, Nov. 25, 2014
- Wednesday, Dec. 10, 2014
- Wednesday, Jan. 14, 2014 (potential date)

Ms. Barosa advised that at the next meeting (Oct. 22) VHB would be attending and topics of discussion would be:

- . Blight study report
- . Zoning issues
- . Clarification of any issues

Mr. Schoenig made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Ms. Bryde and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:45pm.