

Town of Stanford
Comprehensive Plan Review Committee
Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2020

Committee Members Present via Video/Conference Call

Gary Lovett, Committee Chair
Danielle Hardman, Secretary
Tom Angell
Conrad Levenson
Karen Mosher
Jeff Spiers
Richard Bell
James Sansum

Others Present

Wendy Burton, Town of Stanford Supervisor, Committee Liaison
Nina Peek, VP AKRF, Inc. Committee Consultant
Madeleine Helmer, Deputy Project Manager, Planning AKRF, Inc

Public Comment

No members of the public were present.

The meeting opened at 7:34 pm via Zoom Webinar.

The committee reviewed the minutes from the Sept. 22 and Oct. 13 meetings. Tom moved to accept the minutes of both meetings, with the amendments to the Oct. 13 minutes as proposed by Nina Peek. Conrad seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously.

Gary reviewed some conclusions and questions from the Oct. 13 meeting. The discussion on Oct.13 started out with a call for better information on the availability of low-cost housing options in Stanford and the demand for that housing. Gary's sense of the discussion was that, while doing such a study would be useful and we should encourage the Town or the County to do it, we did not have the capacity to do it now within the CPRC, and that we should focus on the tools we have available to increase the availability of diverse housing options. Conrad said that having a needs assessment would be helpful. Tom had spoken to Anne Saylor, Community Housing Administrator for the County. Tom felt that from Anne Saylor's perspective, the approaches we were proposing, such as relaxing restrictions on accessory apartments, were appropriate, and that we have limited options for increased housing density in Stanford because of our lack of central water and sewer. The County is talking about doing a new study of affordable housing, but the timing of that study is uncertain. Anne felt that one of the biggest impacts the County could have on our situation is in the design standards for septic systems. We agreed that we would not do a "needs assessment" for this Plan, but would encourage the Town to take advantage of any study that the County might do, and if it is not sufficient, the Town

should do its own study. Conrad cautioned that we should frame the issue as housing diversity rather than affordability.

Nina reviewed the memo that she circulated regarding housing diversity. The memo is provided as Appendix 1 at the end of these minutes. The memo discusses general policy goals and proposed plan recommendations. The Committee agreed on the three general policy goals in Nina's memo. One of the recommendations is on focusing residential development in the hamlet area of town, and a discussion ensued on the boundaries of the Stanfordville hamlet. The Committee discussed whether the rural mixed use area should be extended north to Millis Lane and south to Salt Point Turnpike. On the one hand, this provides more space for commercial activities and lots that can be subdivided to more affordable sizes. On the other hand, it begins to look like sprawl. Karen suggested that design guidelines could be used to affect how the businesses in that area would look, to minimize the impression of unplanned sprawl. James suggested an inventory of the properties in the town center to see which could be further developed for commercial purposes. The Committee agreed that we want to focus increased housing density within the hamlets, but we did not resolve exactly where the boundaries of the hamlets are. We decided to take up that discussion when we actually look at a map of proposed land use.

Nina reviewed specific recommendations in her memo for changing the current Stanford code to improve housing diversity. The Committee agreed with all of the proposed changes in Nina's memo, except that we agreed to change #7 to "Consider requiring provision of affordable housing as a part of multi-family residential development in the Town." We discussed whether relaxing restrictions on accessory dwellings should include only conversion of existing structures, or also include construction of new structures. Nina noted that relaxing the regulations on accessory uses, particularly about whether the occupants are limited to family only, could provide more property on the rental market right away.

The Committee discussed the language on clustering of subdivisions, and agreed that the plan should include language that indicates that clustering options are preferable, and if they are submitting plans to the Planning Board for a conventional subdivision, they should also submit alternative plans for a clustered subdivision.

Wendy suggested that the ridgeline protection provisions of the plan could be very contentious. Tom noted that this comes before the Planning Board regularly, and asked that we clarify the policy and not leave it up to the discretion of the Planning Board. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee decided that the best approach was to recommend that the important ridgelines in the Town be mapped, so that both the applicant and the Planning Board are clear as to what land is regulated. Nina reviewed the ridgeline section of the Draft Master Plan, which includes recommendations that the Town specify a definition for ridgelines, identify and map the Town's significant ridgelines, establish ridgeline protection standards and guidelines and incorporate them into the Town's zoning code, establish siting guidelines for structures of ridgelines, and undertake a siting analysis for cell towers, antennae and wind turbines that could affect the ridgelines. The Plan also recommends that the Town "Prohibit certain uses and structures that would

have adverse visual impacts from development on ridgelines,” and the Committee decided that that requirement was too vague to retain. Richard noted that placing a house below the ridgeline still would provide a good view for the owner but would have much less of an impact on the rural character of the Town. Conrad noted that the new regulations would apply only to new structures, and existing structures would be grandfathered. The Town would be making a policy statement that it prefers to avoid development on ridgelines, but there would be exceptions if there was no other place to build. We still expect that there will be objections from people who do not want any restrictions on where they can build.

Karen noted that it is not just the placement of the house, but also how much land is cleared. Wendy noted that one house is not so much of a problem for the view, but a multiple house development would be a larger problem. Nina discussed how Amenia protects ridgelines with a “scenic protection overlay.”

The consensus of the Committee is that some ridgeline protection should be in the plan, and that the Town should define and map the significant ridgelines to make clear where restrictions apply.

Tom noted that in previous public comments there was a lot of confusion about what a Comprehensive Plan is, and the difference between a plan and a zoning code. The Committee agreed that the Plan should include introductory language to make the differences clear.

Nina showed the current land use map, which uses data from the County property database. Nina asked the Committee to review the map (available on the Google Drive) and note any parcels that did not appear to be categorized correctly. The Committee discussed several specific parcels. Wendy noted that a large parcel of Bontecou land, including Bontecou Lake, will be donated to the Winnakee Land Trust as a preserve with public access.

At the next meeting we will talk about the map, the format of the Plan document, and will begin the discussion on encouraging business in Stanford.

Next Meetings Committee meetings will be held on the following Tuesdays:

November 10 and 24, 2020

December 8 and 22, 2020

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:35.

Respectfully submitted by
Gary Lovett
CPRC Chair

Memorandum

To: Stanford Comprehensive Plan Committee
From: AKRF, Inc.
Date: October 22, 2020
Re: Summary of 10/13 Housing Discussion and Recommendations
cc: Project File: 200318

This memorandum summarizes the housing related discussion at the Committee's 10/13 Meeting, and proposes, for Committee review, recommendations to be included in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

General Housing Related Comprehensive Plan Goals

The Town of Stanford encourages development of a range of housing types to accommodate the needs of our residents. To that end, the Comprehensive Plan sets the following housing related goals:

- Create opportunities to convert existing structures for use as accessory dwelling units;
- Focus new higher density residential growth within the Stanfordville hamlet and where appropriate within the Bangall hamlet; and
- Provide regulatory tools for sensitive siting, cluster subdivision and conservation subdivision techniques.

Proposed Plan Recommendations:

1. Consider reducing lot sizes to allow for increased residential density in certain areas of the Town, such as within the Stanfordville or Bangall hamlets. Lot sizes and design would need to comply with Dutchess County Department of Health (DCDOH) and NYSDOH requirements for individual on-site wastewater treatment systems and wellhead locations.
2. Allow additional flexibility for converting existing on-site structures (barns, out- buildings) for use as accessory apartments (eg apartment over a garage). (See 164-22.K)
3. Eliminate requirements for "family" occupancy for residence in accessory dwellings.
 - a. Requires amending the definition for "dwelling"; "dwelling unit"; "conversion"; "family"; "density";

- b. Requires amending the following code sections: “home professional office (164-59)”¹; Regulations for temporary residences not in trailer parks (151-12); “Additional standards for certain uses (164-22)”
4. Consider revisions to restrictions for “rental” units
 - a. Bed and Breakfasts (164-59) – “A private owner-occupied dwelling in which at least one and not more than four rooms are offered for rent for transient occupancy, in which overnight lodging and breakfast are offered to such occupant and in which no public restaurant is maintained.” See also 164-2.2D.
 - b. Board, Lodging or Rooming House (164-59) – “A private dwelling in which at least three but not more than six rooms are offered for rent, whether or not table board is furnished to lodgers, and in which no transients are accommodated and no public restaurant is maintained.”
5. Consider creating a zoning overlay to allow increased residential density (trailers/trailer parks/ manufactured housing², multi-family conversions³ and new multifamily construction) in certain areas. Such development could be accomplished via Special Permit, requiring specific conditions to be met.
6. Partner with Dutchess County or other local housing organization to conduct a Town wide housing needs assessment.
7. Incentivize provision of affordable housing by allowing increased density (additional units, provided certain conditions are met, i.e available parking, sufficient septic capacity, etc.);
8. Prepare an inventory of current stock of rental units.

Draft 2012 Master Plan- Housing Recommendations

Please confirm these will carry forward:

- Allow average density subdivisions;
- Amend the Town’s Zoning and Subdivision regulations to require major subdivision applications to include conservation and/or cluster subdivision alternatives;

*

¹ Will be important for discussion of economic development.

² Chapter 151 – Trailers and Trailer Parks: Defined but does not appear to be included in the Use Table (164-8) Definitions (151-2); “Trailer Park: Any lot, piece or parcel of ground defined by deed, which has been designed and constructed to provide facilities and space for rent to accommodate at least eight house trailers on a continuous basis.”; “Camping Trailer Park: Any lot, piece or parcel of ground defined by deed, which has been designed and constructed to provide facilities and space for rent to accommodate at least eight camping trailers or camping tents between April 1 and December 1 inclusive during the calendar year.”

³ Multiple dwellings (>3 DU’s) are only Special Permit use in Rural Center (RC) zoning district, and prohibited in all other zones. Duplexes (2 DU’s) are permitted in agricultural residential (AR), rural residential (RR,) and RC zoning districts. Minimum lot size for RC is 1.5 acres; all other zoning districts are 5 acres minimum.