**Town of Stanford**

**Meeting Minutes from Comprehensive Plan Review Committee**

**February 23, 2021**

**Committee Members Present via Video/Conference Call**

Gary Lovett, Committee Chair

Rosemarie Miner, Secretary

Tom Angell

Conrad Levenson

Karen Mosher

Jeff Spiers

Richard Bell

**Others Present**

Wendy Burton, Town of Stanford Supervisor, Town Board Liaison

Nina Peek, VP AKRF, Inc. Committee Consultant

Madeleine Helmer, Deputy Project Manager, Planning, AKRF, Inc

**Public Comment**

Two members of the public were present, Charlie Shaw and Danielle Salisbury.

The meeting opened at 7:35 pm via Zoom Webinar.

Gary invited members of the public to put comments or questions in the chat. Gary reviewed the proposed agenda:

1) Review and approve minutes of February 9, 2021 meeting (minutes sent out before the meeting).

2) Review text of Chapter 4 ("Community Character and Economic Development.") This was sent to us by Madeleine on February 17, 2021 and is also available on the Google Drive.

3) Review final, formatted version of Chapter 6 ("Utilities and Infrastructure").

Committee members reviewed the minutes from February 9, 2021 prior to the start of the meeting. The following amendments were proposed by Tom Angell:

* Page 1, amended is misspelled
* Page 2, the first paragraph: add hopefully before “align”
* Remove apostrophe from Old Bulls Head in the minutes and the plan

The following amendments to the minutes were proposed by Nina:

- change the number of recommended Historic Hamlets to 6 new ones with the addition of Anson’s Crossings

- page 2, #3: change to “currently SEQR review is only required if a property is listed, eligible for listing, and/or substantially contiguous with a site”

A motion to approve was supported unanimously. Gary will make corrections and then Wendy will post on the Town website.

***CHAPTER 6***

Conrad suggested that under General Recommendations (in the table on the first page), change the wording to “protect the quality of Stanford’s groundwater” and change the phrase “food production” to “agriculture.”

Motion to approve this chapter was made by Tom Angell and unanimously approved by the CPRC.

Questions that came up:

* Wendy asked if food production needed to be stated specifically because some agriculture practices yield non-consumable products. Conrad mentioned the practice of hydroponics and aquaculture which, from his understanding, are included under the word agriculture.

***CHAPTER 4***

Gary shared his screen to review Chapter 4. Changes to be made to the table of “General Recommendations”:

1. Gary suggests removing the poll included under “General Recommendations” due to being out of date and out of context. Jeff seconded this amendment and Richard agreed.
2. Clarify “collaborations” in the third recommendation. Nina clarified that the concept would be to work with other towns.
3. The report needs clarification around the differences between home-based businesses and working from home. Gary points out that these are very different concepts.
4. Agricultural businesses and small businesses are mixed up in this goal. It has been decided that the CPRC wants to encourage agricultural businesses, but we need to clear up the wording here so the two aren’t intertwined.
5. The CPRC would like to see this “Design streetscapes” eliminated and replaced with “Explore opportunities for pedestrian connections and bike paths.” The box on the right side of the table should talk about how this would benefit local businesses. Richard suggests including a citation from a study that shows streetscape improvements have a positive effect on the local economy.

*Recreation*

The Haunted Fortress is planned by the Recreation Commission and will be happening in 2021. There are five members of that commission.

Gary asked where the outdoor fitness equipment would be placed in the park. Perhaps the “cross training” reference could be replaced with different language.

Gary asked the committee if the Rally Farm land still in negotiation with Winnakee Land Trust should be omitted from the Comprehensive Plan. Richard suggested waiting until the Plan is nearly finished to follow up on the addition of this parcel. Dot Burdick Park will be added to this list of recreational spaces.

Danielle offered language that would align this section of the plan with the Climate Smart Communities framework. Add the following recommendation:

* “to maintain and enhance current recreation activities and facilities to promote social vitality and health for a healthy and safe community.”

Nina asked the committee if the recommendation for a community center from the 2012 Draft Plan should be included in this Plan. Richard said the Recreation Commission is not planning to include a separate community center in its upcoming capital campaign, and he indicated this doesn’t align with the work the Recreation Commission is doing in conjunction with the library.

*Historic Hamlets*

Hull’s Mills and Anson’s Crossing Have apostrophes but Hunns Lake does not. This will need to be addressed throughout the report.

Discussion of recommendations made by Charlie Shaw and Kathy Spiers:

* The current recommendation was to establish a Historic Advisory Commission that would report back with further recommendations. The recommendation regarding historic overlays and zoning amendments should be eliminated.
* Richard offered sample language that would clarify the distinction between the Historical Advisory Commission and the Stanford Historical Society and the role of both moving forward.

*Economic Development*

The Stanford Business Association maintains a list of its members, and the Town website maintains a list of all businesses in Stanford. Gary proposed highlighting the list on the Town website because it is more inclusive. Rosemarie asked about the recommendation for short-term rental (e.g., AirBnB) registration and whether or not limiting the number of AirBnBs would reduce potential economic gain and create community pushback. Nina clarified that the registry would not place a cap on the number of units available for short-term rental, and its purpose would be to ensure fire and building safety. The registry could also be used to assess the conversion of long-term rentals into short-term rentals, in case that should become an issue for Stanford in the future. Wendy pointed out that Rhinebeck does have a cap and Jeff brought attention to the potential pressure from Rhinebeck’s hotel industry.

Conrad thinks that the “guided tours” wording should be changed to “farm tours.”

Richard also noted that economic development may be spurred by historic preservation and this linkage should be made in the report. Similarly, ecological and agricultural conservation also provide opportunities for economic growth.

Wendy brought up the past discussion around a Chamber of Commerce that could operate in conjunction with the Stanford Business Association. Would this be a volunteer initiative? Wendy isn’t sure how this would fit into a strategy to meet our larger goals. Karen reiterated that the SBA is most interested in the prospect of an auxiliary group that worked with and alongside the SBA. Rosemarie looked up the notes on the discussion of this subject at the November meeting, and read them to the group. Nina will review the November minutes and incorporate the takeaways from the conversation in the recommendations, including the formation of a specific committee. “Chamber of Commerce” probably isn’t the right name for this committee but the CPRC is in support of forming an appropriate committee that would take on responsibilities of a booster organization for local businesses.

*Home-based Businesses*

Gary pointed out more conflated language in the plan around “work from home” and “home-based businesses” and the need for specificity here.

Which types of businesses are acceptable home-based businesses and appropriate for a residential community? Businesses currently allowed as home-based businesses are listed in the Zoning Code. Tom noted that the types of businesses allowed as home-based businesses is an issue that comes before the Planning Board regularly. Currently, there are several categories of home-based business that are allowed by right in the Zoning Code, while others require a special permit from the Planning Board. In the past, the “Codes Committee” recommended a list of businesses that should have the right to establish themselves as home-based businesses without approval from the Planning Board. More work needs to be done on this in the upcoming revision of the Zoning Code.

Richard suggested noting the conclusion the CPRC reached (above), should be stated in the report.

*Design and Placemaking*

Replace “design” with “community character”.

Replace the word “lacks” with “doesn’t have”. Nina suggested a rewording of the beginning of the paragraph to remove any judgement.

“Complete Streets” wording will be replaced by a specific list of improvements (for example, pedestrian connections and bike lanes) and will be consistent with the changes suggested in the beginning of Chapter 4, on page 1.

“Design interventions” will be replaced with “streetscape improvements.” Wendy suggested replacing “interventions” elsewhere due to the aggressiveness of the word.

*Outreach and Incentives*

Stanford should be a “Right to Farm” community but be promoted as an agricultural community (7th bullet).

*Regulatory*

“Create flexible off-street parking requirements in Stanfordville and Bangall hamlets” should be reworded or include an example of what they may look like. Richard suggested steering clear of the word “requirements.” Conrad suggested the specific language of “easing the current requirements” to gain community trust.

Nina proposed new language for this section based on committee feedback that centers the maintenance of community character and limits discussion of design concepts.

*Climate Smart Communities Input*

Danielle confirmed that the proposed changes to the “Complete Streets” wording would still earn the town points in the Climate Smart Communities framework. There is an action based around Complete Streets, but all actions are optional. It would require the Town’s adoption of a policy that uses “Complete Streets” specifically. The consensus of the CPRC was to remove the “Complete Streets” language and replace it with the proposed edits.

Next Steps:

AKRF will make the proposed edits and these chapters will be formatted.

Before the next meeting, formatted versions of Chapter 4 and 5 will be emailed to CPRC members for review. Send any editorial comments directly to Nina after reviewing. The draft of the Future Land Use chapter will be sent to the CPRC members before the next meeting, which will center on discussion of this chapter.

The March 23rd meeting would be a review of the complete plan. The virtual public meeting for the plan would be held in early April. The CPRC would upload the plan on the Town website and circulate it through town before the meeting. It is still not decided how the CPRC will receive feedback (written or oral comments from community members or both).

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

**Next Committee meeting will be held on:**

March 9, 2021

**The public is invited to listen to these meetings by signing on through the following**

**Zoom link:** <https://zoom.us/j/99284835503>

Meeting minutes submitted by:

Rosemarie Miner

CPRC Secretary