

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting on July 13TH, 2021

The Comprehensive Plan Review Committee held a meeting on July 13, 2021 at 7:00 pm at the Stanford Town Hall.

Committee members present: Karen Mosher, Tom Angell, Richard Bell, Gary Lovett, Conrad Levenson, Jeff Spiers and James Sansum (via teleconference).

Others Present:

Rosemarie Miner, Committee secretary (via teleconference)

Wendy Burton, Town Board liaison

Nina Peek, AKRF, Inc. consultant (via teleconference)

Madeleine Helmer, AKRF, Inc. consultant (via teleconference)

Other attendees: Charles Shaw, Bangall (via teleconference)

The only business on the agenda was to review the oral comments on the Draft Comprehensive Plan ("Draft Plan") from the public hearing on June 28, and written comments received since May 11.

Oral comments from public hearing

Michael Shafer, 21 Decker Road – Congratulated the Town Board and the Comprehensive Plan Committee for their wonderful, caring work. This plan has taken way too long and looks like there is nothing to be afraid of.

Emily Hay, 391 Shuman Road – She and her husband were the founders of a non-profit group of farm owners trying to save their century farms, who will be holding a charity jazz and blues festival event on Aug. 21st, 250 people or less, with appropriate security and parking. She wanted to put any concerns to rest as it will in no way impact the public, If anyone had questions, they should reach out to her.

Johanna Shafer, 21 Decker Road – Thanked the committee for their openness in hearing from the public. Many people have worked on this over the years and has heard from people that many are in favor of it, building up businesses to make our community better, and it needs to be passed as it's taken countless hours of work to get to here.

Henry Boehringer, 38 Thompson Lane – 1. A Master Plan will give guidance to future Planning Boards therefore needs to be specific in goals. 2. Stated that the Plan contains a reference to a Hudsonia overlay. He thinks this is not necessary, because the DEC does enough; said that Gary Lovett and Tom Angell have advocated a Hudsonia overlay in the past. 3. Stated that there must be transparency-- owners of properties with prime agricultural soils can't be surprised with what they can or can't do. Challenges have been brought to courts and courts have not upheld all towns' rules; certain legislation to be takings, and the Town Board needs to think about this. 4. Regarding the business section of Town, it should expand to the north on 82. Other Planning Board members have referred to the business

center as a donut hole, and it is not; groundwater requirements could restrict that here with no water/sewer district; we don't want to become a donut hole. Restricting business to the center of Town without expanding the RC zone makes no sense. And no Hudsonia overlay.

Committee response: We agree with the points about specificity of goals and transparency, and we believe that the Draft Plan is both very clear in its goals and that it recommends that the Town be transparent in its land use decisions. There is no mention of a "Hudsonia Overlay" in the Draft Plan. The Planning Board does use the Hudsonia Critical Habitat study in its review of applications. Use of habitat studies, if they are available, is required by SEQRA for review of proposed developments, and this requirement has been confirmed by Appellate Court cases.

The comment about extending the RC zone precipitated an extended discussion within the Committee, reviewing both the positive aspects (more room for business development) and negative aspects (potential sprawl, diffuses central business area). Several other commenters at the public hearing called for expanding the RC zone, and one called for not expanding it. Karen Mosher moved to recommend expanding the RC zone north along Route 82 to include the triangle of land between Route 82 and Millis Lane. Jeff Spiers seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of 4-3. The votes were: Mosher- yes, Spiers-yes, Angell-yes, Sansum-yes, Levenson-no, Lovett-no, Bell-no. We modified the Draft Plan accordingly to recommend expansion of the RC zone.

Duffy Layton, 6 Hunns Lake Road – This should not be called a public hearing, it needs a larger venue. The Zoom meeting was not a public hearing either, just an informational session. Ceded his remaining minutes to Mark Burdick.

Committee response: The public meeting via Zoom was well attended and allowed for a good discussion of issues. For the June 28 public hearing, COVID-19 considerations required that the capacity of the meeting room be limited to 35 people to allow for social distancing. By allowing new people to enter when others left, and by extending the meeting, everyone who wished to speak was given a chance to do so.

Mark Burdick, 19 Burdick Way- Presented a list of 52 individuals who gave him permission to speak on their behalf. Thanked the committee for their time working on this.

1. Pg. 9, section about adoption of zoning amendments and having a committee write appropriate zoning laws: After the Town Board adopts a Master Plan, but prior to the zoning amendments, the Planning Board will interpret the Comprehensive Plan for various applications. Disagrees with this. The Planning Board should not be making decisions based on the new Comprehensive Plan before a new zoning law is finalized. The Town Board is the legislative body and should be making the laws.

Committee response: If and when the Town Board adopts the Comprehensive Plan, it will become an official document of the Town and the Planning Board should consider it in their decisions. However, the current zoning laws will be in effect, and

the Planning Board will be bound by them until the Town Board passes new zoning laws.

2. Pg. 11, #1,2: Previous Master Plan proposed a “village” behind McCarthy’s with a developer building 600 housing units and a water/sewer district serving from Bangall to Grist Mill. Most people didn’t want this, and it’s not in the Plan. The Town’s Water Supply Protection Plan stated that the groundwater was good at present, and continuing with wells and septics was OK in the Rural Center. This should be mentioned in the Plan. Proposes the following be added to the document: “A majority of the negative comments and the subsequent considerations to eliminate both the central water system and the sewer system, which are needed to have the planned development and the extension of the central water and sewer system to Stanfordville and Bangall hamlets, were based on and reinforced by the fact that a Water Supply Protection Plan prepared for the Town in October 2000 came to the final conclusion that the groundwater quality in the Town of Stanford is relatively good, and that “...evidence at present indicates that continued use of individual wells and septic systems seems viable, even in the rural center, with a complete future build-out.”

Committee response: This is too much detail to the proposed text to include in these bullets. We have included the entire Water Supply Protection Plan in the Appendix of the Draft Plan, and will refer to it in the sections that discuss water supply (see below).

3. Chapter 6, pgs. 118-120: Suggests that executive summary of the Water Protection Study should be put into the Plan on pp 118-120, regarding wellhead protection. The study states that the water quality is good but if density is increased, it may need to be looked at again.

Committee response: We have included the entire Water Supply Protection Plan in the Appendix of the Draft Plan. We added text on p. 119 to indicate that if density is increased, water quality would need to be re-examined.

4. Chapter 6, pgs. 67-69, regarding recommendation to focus new higher density growth in the two hamlets: Again, the water study indicated that if density is increased, we need to take another look at the water situation. He thinks we shouldn’t increase density, because people overwhelmingly did not want central water or sewer. It needs to be clarified that if we increase density, then a water/sewer system may be needed.

Committee response: The Draft Plan does not recommend any change in allowable density (i.e., zoning). It does recommend that new residential and business development be focused in the RC zone, which could result in an increased number of commercial and residential buildings, to the extent that it is consistent with the zoning. The water study was based on a build-out analysis under the current zoning, so in theory its conclusions should hold if the zoning remains the same. Nonetheless, we agree with the basic point that as development of the RC zone continues, the Town should monitor the

groundwater to be aware of any degradation of water quality. We will add text to this section to make that point.

5. Three months ago the committee recommended a commercial zone from Bangall to Grist Mill Lane. Thinks it should be extended from the Bank to Uncle Sonny's as the past draft of the Plan suggested, because of the difficulty for commercial properties in the RC zone to get Health Dept. approvals. At Big Rock Market, with 1½ acres, barely got Health Dept. approval. They require 100' separation between the well and the septic and 100' from the parking lot. Had to do a lot of work, including a \$15,000 water treatment system, and this is one of the largest lots in the RC zone; most are smaller. Extending the commercial zone to Sonny's would give more opportunities. Sonny's, the John Hughes auto shop, and the Carousel have been commercial for a long time. Says the whole strip up to Sonny's should be commercially zoned, but at the very least the 6 existing businesses in that strip should be commercially zoned. Those businesses are currently considered non-conforming pre-existing uses. Some people are concerned with "urban sprawl" but he does not think that is much of a concern.

Committee response: The Committee voted to extend the RC zone, see above.

6. Agricultural lands: Mr. Burdick explained conservation easements, and believes they are a good thing. Spoke of the Pulver family conservation easement behind the Mountain View restaurant in Pine Plains, and that Red Hook has a fund to purchase development rights for farms through transfer taxes. Stanford is 50 sq. miles, 32,000 acres, with 21,000 acres of farmland, 8,000 in conservation easements and another 2,000 acres in State and Town protection. So about 10,000 acres, or 30% of the land, is already protected. We have lots of open space, and no other town if the County has this much. This plan calls for more – how much more do we need? This Plan will require the Planning Board to review non-agricultural development on land with prime agricultural soils. The Board already does that—he cites the example of driveway not being allowed to be put through prime ag soils. He thinks the Town needs to purchase development rights, rather than regulate. We shouldn't tell Clarence Knapp to sell his farm only to someone who wants to farm.

Committee response: The identification of prime agricultural soils does not carry with it any regulation of development on those lands or specification in relation to whom the lands can be sold. The Town recognizes that agricultural soils are a crucial, non-renewable resource for an agricultural community, so the Planning Board works with applicants to allow their development plans to go forward while minimizing the loss of prime agricultural soils. Because this already occurs, we have deleted the bullet on pages 133 and 128 that calls for Planning Board review of applications for non-agricultural development located within areas designated as having Prime Agricultural Soils and/or Soils of Statewide Significance.

7. Pgs. 14, objective 2.1: Plan recommends focusing new development outside of ecologically

sensitive areas, to prevent the loss of agriculturally significant soils. He thinks this needs to be clarified.

Committee response: The Committee agreed to revise the statement to say "Encourage new development to be located outside of ecologically sensitive areas."

8. Pg. 23, under Industrial, for gravel mining: Plan says there is a single active mine. He reminded the Committee that JSK still has their permit to mine and another permit is attached to that mine. It's not active, but still has permit.

Committee response: We are aware that the JSK mine still has a permit, but here we are referring to the only active mine in town.

9. Natural Resources and Environment section: Plan recommends more environmental control. We already have DEC wetland laws, stream buffer laws, SEQRA, grading permits and erosion – we don't need additional layers of control. The Draft Plan proposes a CEA along the Wappingers Creek from the north to the south end of Town. Plan calls for new CEAs, scenic view areas, and ridgeline protection. Burdick's land is the whole ridge across from the Town Hall and that ridge would be the best place to build. If this is so important to the Town, they should purchase development rights. Should compensate people along the Wappingers Creek.

Committee response: The CEAs proposed do not create any land use regulation; rather, they identify critical habitats for plants and animals in the Town. The scenic viewshed protection recommended in the Draft Plan is voluntary and based on incentives offered by the Town. The Draft Plan recommends that the Town consider further the complex issues involved in ridgeline protection before deciding on a policy.

10. Businesses: Need to ease site planning for contractor needs. Many tradesmen in town need to be allowed to have their "contractor yards" – site planning and fencing are gray areas in the current zoning, but these people need to have a place to operate from their homes, not just in the center of Town. Contractors are an important business in Town.

Committee response: There is currently no prohibition against contractor yards in the zoning code, and we have not proposed to add any such prohibition.

11. Toby Riccardelli asked him to mention speed limits in town. Route 82 from Cold Spring Road should be 40mph, at the bank then 30mph, then back to 40 after Grist Mill.

Committee response: The speed limit on Route 82 is not under the control of the Town. Speed limits on State highways are set by the NYS DOT. The streetscape improvements,

e.g. crosswalks, suggested in the plan may help to convince the NYS DOT to lower the speed limit.

12. More wedding venues: Good in some circumstances, but site plans are required for noise, etc.

Committee response: We agree, and the Draft Plan recommends that the Town establish criteria for these venues and require a special permit.

13. If you make changes in this Draft Plan, please red line them so they are easy to see.

Committee response: Redlining is difficult in the publication system being used, but we will produce a list of changes.

14. In favor of loosening the accessory apartment requirements, and not just for family members.

Committee response: Agreed.

15. The Plan talks about agri-tourism, but also think about general tourism. For instance, he is thinking about having tenting on his property.

Committee response: Agreed. The Draft Plan recommends promoting many types of tourism in Stanford, including agriculture, nature, history, etc.

16. He is in favor of Historical Resources recommendations. Big Rock is on the National Historic Register. But Bob Palumbo had to spend a lot of money to prove that his project would not affect the Big Rock building. Thinks this was wrong, and we need to be careful of excessive regulations.

Committee response: Agreed. The Draft Plan does not recommend any specific regulations with regard to historical resources.

17. He is in favor of better parking in the RC zone.

Committee response: Agreed.

18. Solar energy and wind turbines: Not a lot of wind energy in town but with new technology, it could happen in the future. Should be allowed so we can get away from fossil fuels.

Committee response: Agreed.

Hans Tabor, 2 Trestle Lane – He has been here for 8 years and is running for the Town Council. He had read the proposal and had several question and comments:

1. What will the population be in 10 years? Do we need new housing? How much more?

Committee response: The Cornell Program on Applied Diagnostics estimates that the population of the Town will decline slightly to 3657 residents by the year 2030, with an age distribution similar to 2018 (see page 30 of the Draft Plan). This suggests that we may not need more housing beyond the needs that already exist. The Draft Plan recommends a study of housing needs for the Town.

2. How many new businesses do we want over the next 10 years? Do we want 30 more, 50 more along the new stretch? We'll look like Rt. 44. Doesn't want to see much more change. Bicycle paths, sewers, traffic lights, police? Will this increase traffic and accidents?

Committee response: We do not know how many more businesses will be in Town in 2030, and would not want to specify an arbitrary number. Most Town residents think that some increased commercial activity, of appropriate types, would benefit the Town and should be located primarily in Stanfordville.

3. On pg. 8, working on large capital improvements. What are they? Will they increase taxes? Changes in resources brings increased taxes. On Pg. 9, the Plan says we like the town the way it is, but if it doesn't change, the town won't survive. He thinks it will survive.

Committee response: The sentence on page 8 refers to finding grant funding for capital-intensive projects. Some capital –intensive projects discussed later in the Draft Plan include improving the Recreation Park and making streetscape improvements in Stanfordville and Bangall.

4. Zoning and subdivisions, pgs.5-6: The Plan recommends goals of a broad array of housing options: for young people, for old, for low income. He thinks changes lead to more taxes.

Committee response: We do not think improving the diversity of housing options leads to higher taxes. The mechanisms that the Draft Plan recommends to increase housing options are all based on individual landowners' use of their private property.

Charlie Shaw, 10 Millis Lane – Has been a resident since 1975. Handed out sheets with comments from the Burdick Park Planning Committee and the Stanford Historical Society to the committee. This is his 3rd review of this document in the last 10-12 years.

1. Burdick Park: Hudsonia has been commissioned to do a study of the Burdick Park for rare and endangered species. A similar study was done years ago when the County wanted to site their landfill here in 1987-1988 on three farms, 2 of which were the Staats Farm and the Cagney Farm. Hudsonia's study results showed Blanding's turtles, and the County backed

off, and there were a lot of these turtles. He had two pair of Blanding's turtles and placed two in the Burdick Park area and two on the Lisman property. Now he wants to know if they're still there. p. 76, line 8: Change name from Dot Burdick Park to Burdick Park. Asks that the Bangall Memorial Park be listed on several pages (His specific comments are listed in his written comments.) Also consider the development of a walking trail from the Rec. Park and ultimately leading through Burdick Park to the Bangall Memorial Park. The Town should consider participating in the Certified Local Government program, which could give possible funding for the Burdick Park as well as to restore the Whitlock Preserve and the aforementioned walking trail, as well as the one at the Rec. He also thanked Mark Burdick for all his parents had done for the town.

Committee response: We thank Mr. Shaw for submitting these as written comments also. See our specific comments under the written comments section below. We will make the suggested editorial changes, and will refer to the "Dot and Irv Burdick Park", as the Burdick family prefers.

2. From the Historical Society, he and Town Historian Kathie Spiers thanked the Committee for their prior revisions in Chapters 2 and 4 regarding historical hamlets and resources and added changes in the lists given out this evening. He requested that his written comments from the Feb 16 and 17th meeting be also included in this record. For example, the Historical Society has actually identified 15 historical hamlets in the Town. Tables 4-1 and 2-7—historical properties: Plan lists 12 properties, but the Historical Society uses a different database; they would like to add 18 more properties that are either listed or eligible for listing on historic register. They have submitted written comments. They proposed a Historical Preservation Commission, working as an independent commission to identify historic properties and define the borders of the historic hamlets. The Commission could have members from the Historical Society, the Town Historian, and other individuals. Should not include voting members from the CAC, the Planning Board or other Town organizations. This Committee would not be regulatory, only giving voluntary guidelines that could institute programs for the restoration and preservation of these historical properties, and in the demolition of any structures.

Committee response: We thank Mr. Shaw for also submitting these as written comments. See our specific responses under the written comments below.

Michael Rena, 461 Bangall Amenia Road – Emphasis on the historical side of the Town is extremely attractive, and economic viability comes from the charm of its buildings, farmlands, woodlands. There should not be excessive regulations, and some that are mentioned in the Plan are absurd. Things can be done to develop tourism and have even more charm, like what Big Rock has done.

Committee response: We agree with the comment about the charm of the Town. We do not think there are any absurd regulations proposed in the Draft Plan, and Mr. Rena did not mention any specifics.

Peter Kraus, 312 Bangall Amenia Road – Appreciates the comments of Michael and Mark, as the Town does resonate charm with its bucolic nature. Some in town want to augment income by the use of their land, but this must consider public health and safety. Event venues can be challenging economically for required infrastructure, e.g., fire, police, electricity. An idea to consider would be to permit events in a certain location. He proposes a piece of Town-owned land where events could be held, attracting people, and a focal point to lease or rent the space. It could be funded through taxes, and the Town could regulate the activity there and have oversight. Activity would be concentrated in one area and not encouraged everywhere. Don't allow event venues to be laissez faire. He complimented Mark Burdick on fine research, including the speed limit issue; thinks speed limits in Town should be lowered.

Committee response: We do not recommend that the Town own and run an event venue, particularly if it is a money-losing venture as Mr. Kraus suggests. There are no Town staff to run it, so it would require hiring new employees and would be a burden on taxpayers. In addition, this approach would prohibit landowners from using their land for an event if they chose to do so and had the necessary permits.

Steve Horowitz, 6187 Rt. 82 – He is also friends with Mark Burdick but didn't agree with him on everything. 1. He is not in favor of extending the RC zone north to Uncle Sonny's, because it would encourage sprawl. It is sensible to have reasonable growth and have it more concentrated; walking from one place to another keeps the present charm. 2. Existing non-conforming uses should be extended longer, for example 2 to 3 years. For instance, the Carousel, which has been vacant now for a couple of years. But this should not be an excuse for changing the zoning for that entire section of Town. 3. Regarding purchasing of development rights, he feels that this is an expensive and ill-advised way to achieve conservation. Paying for it will raise property taxes.

Committee response: After considerable discussion, the Committee voted to extend the RC zone north to the junction of Route 82 and Millis Lane to allow more space for commercial activities in Town. See discussion above.

Emily Hay, 391 Shuman Road – She is living on a multi-generational farm. One central location for commercial activities is impractical. People should be able to use the land the way they want, following current laws, and not have to pay a fee to hold an event.

Committee response: The Draft Plan recommends that the Town set criteria and guidelines for events and require the organizers to obtain a special permit.

John Kemmerer – An organization founded by Emily Hay will celebrate the 100th anniversary of their farm, and any comments can be addressed to her or to him.

Written comments received May 11- July 8, 2021

Michelle Gluck, 70 Fancor Rd.

Thank you to the CPRC for all your hard work in creating and curating a community vision for the Town of Stanford as it moves forward. I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments about the current draft of the plan. Here are some things that stuck out to me and my husband, Gregory Williams, to comment on. Apologies for the “free flow” of text, but this was the best way for me to get comments down on paper with time allotted.

-Was any public surveying done during the plan update this year? Page 13 references a “vision and goal setting workshop” in 2012. Was any sort of surveying or visioning completed in the past 8yrs since then for the comp. plan update? If not, why not? From the public comment opportunity provided by the CPRC, it seemed that there was a lot of resident interest in the plan that differentiated from sentiments expressed in 2012, which leaves one to wonder what sentiments might have been captured through more recent surveying opportunities, had current residents been provided a means. Just a thought.

Committee response: Our task was not to develop a new Comprehensive Plan, but to consider how to revise the 2012 Draft Plan based on community comments about it. Polling was done before and during the development of the 2012 Draft Plan.

-Sidewalks and walkability was an amenity that multiple stakeholders expressed an interest in for the center of the Stanfordville hamlet at the 5/6 public comment opportunity. A “ctrl+f” word search revealed that the word “sidewalks” is not included in the draft plan, which is interesting because Objective 3.3 mentions “pedestrian friendly community”, which sidewalks contribute to. I strongly encourage the CPRC to add language that includes/recommends sidewalks for Stanfordville so residents and visitors can safely patronize the town businesses and municipal services. Additionally, sidewalks and other features such as street trees and sidewalk plantings, benches, and streetlights help provide a visual indicator to cars to slow down, and indicate for those “passing through” that they are entering a walkable town center. It makes a place more inviting and welcoming. Lastly, there are grants to help support local municipalities fund sidewalk projects. <https://hcr.ny.gov/community-development-block-grant> . Consider adding “sidewalks” under the Community Character and Place Making section as “Streetscape improvements”.

Committee response: There does not appear to be a consensus in Stanford on the value or desirability of sidewalks. Therefore we have left this section general, with more specifics to be worked out when the improvements are being planned.

-amenities in the form of natural resources and recreation is highlighted as a strength in the existing conditions and in what Stanford prides itself on. The Recreation section, as it identifies a lack of youth recreation activities as a concern, could use more than one bulleted recommendation, and more specific recommendations. Especially with the recent formation of an “events” committee for the town. Examples of recommendations could be expanding on youth 4-h programs, or partnerships with the local grange, local library, regional organizations or other community organizations, increase public programming in the rec park, consider doing a community mural in the park, make an “explore stanford’s trails” webpage on the town website, or a “family activities”/community bulletin section, etc. Consider teasing out the “paved walking path” idea or others of the Town of Stanford Rec Commission out and elaborate on them as a bullet for the Comp

Plan recommendation section. With all the parks/preserves in the Town, maybe a youth trail crew could be formed to help maintain trails, build bridges/pathways, create signage, etc..

Committee response: These are good ideas and they should be considered by the Rec Commission as it develops a strategic plan. Because recreation was not a subject that drew any comments from the community during the review of the 2012 Draft Plan, it did not fall under our charge from the Town Board, and we essentially left it unchanged.

-was Dot Burdick park mentioned in the “open space/rec/green space” section?

Committee response: We will mention it under Existing Conditions on page 26.

The following questions are asked in reference to the information in Section 6: Utilities & Infrastructure about the Town’s groundwater supply and report from 2000. Consider adding “educating the public about proper septic system and well maintenance” as a Comp. Plan recommendation on pg. 119. I noticed that the public water and sewer system recommendation was removed from this draft plan. Are current septic systems strained/aging in the Stanfordville hamlet? How will economic development be successful, and businesses be able to operate without planning ahead for necessary infrastructure, if needed? What might cause a water system to be needed in the future that isn’t a current need now? Do the current economic development goals/vision and current trends for population growth and indicate a future need for water system infrastructure? I imagine this is difficult to assess with current fluctuations due to the pandemic and a lack of accurate/updated population data. Does current water quality data of drinking water and of the Wappinger Creek indicate a need for public water and sewer? If not public sewer, then is there another approach to ensure private sewers are upkept and updated to ensure safe drinking water and water quality of local tributaries and the Wappinger Creek?

Committee response: The Town’s Groundwater Resources Study from 2000 indicated that the groundwater quality was good throughout the Town (except for a few individual wells) and should remain so under buildout conditions. The Draft Comprehensive Plan recommends that the Town undertake regular well monitoring, act on the recommendations of the Water Supply Protection Plan (which include educating landowners about how to protect the groundwater), and identify and consider protecting a potential wellhead area in case a public water supply is needed in the future.

-consider more specific information/focus on trees/tree preservation and their benefits and trees through lens of town zoning, natural resources management/habitat protection. Consider conducting a community tree inventory/community forestry plan or ways to educate and encourage homeowners to plant trees, restore riparian buffers etc. Possibly something to engage the Town CAC on/involve them with. Much of our forested lands have limited undergrowth due to deer browsing. Educating homeowners about this could lead to healthier habitats and more active land stewardship. Funding for community forestry plans is available. It is also a NYS CSC action that provides the Town with points towards CSC Certification <https://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5285.html> <https://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/4957.html>

Committee response: The Draft Plan recommends protecting the remaining large forest blocks, but does not discuss a community tree inventory. That was not among the public comments received on the 2012 Draft Plan, and thus was not in our purview to consider. Nonetheless, these seem like good ideas that could be considered and implemented by the CAC.

-add a Comp. Plan recommendation for the Town to create a Natural Resources Inventory, as a way to update the 2004 Hudsonia inventory. There is funding for this through the NYSDEC Hudson River Estuary Program Local Stewardship Planning Grants <https://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5091.html> , and an NRI provides the Town with 10 pts. towards NYS CSC Certification, and a priority action.

Committee response: This was not among the public comments received on the 2012 Draft Plan, and thus was not in our purview to consider. A Natural Resources Inventory for the Town could be done by the CAC, and much of the information needed is available in this Draft Plan and the documents it draws upon.

-I did not identify any substantial information in the “Utilities & Infrastructure section about solid waste/materials management and the Town transfer station. Consider including information about the Town transfer station in existing conditions, and include a section in Utilities & Infrastructure section about any improvements or recommendations that could be made for the town to more sustainably and effectively manage materials/waste. For example, composting at a municipal, home, or community scale and address any needs for the Town transfer station, such as public awareness to use the transfer station, creating a “take it or leave it,” etc – or seeing what other town’s have to gather ideas. The town has at least one large scale composting operation. With new food scraps recycling legislation coming in 2022 <https://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/114499.html> , there is an emerging need for more composting/organics recycling infrastructure in our region. Something to consider addressing in the plan update/ zoning as a type of economic development/ agricultural based business for the town.

Committee response: This was not among the public comments received on the 2012 Draft Plan, and thus was not in our purview to consider. We agree that the Town Board should consider how the Town handles solid waste and look for ways to improve.

Michelle Gluck, 70 Fancor Rd.

The Red Hook Community Preservation Fund is a model for other municipalities to fund conserving lands and implementing centers and free spaces concept. It also fulfills NYS CSC Program action for PE7 Conserve Natural Areas <https://www.redhook.org/161/Community-Preservation-Fund-Advisory-Boa>

Committee response: While this is not in the Draft Plan, we agree that the Town Board should consider this model of obtaining funding for land preservation.

Kathie Spiers, 25 E Hunns Lake Road, Town Historian, and **Charlie Shaw**- 10 Millis Lane, Stanford Historical Society

First, Kathie and I would like to thank the Committee for giving us time in January and February to participate in the revisions of certain sections of Chapter 2, Existing conditions and Chapter 4, Community Character as they relate to the towns Historic Hamlets and vast historic resources. We would like to thank Madeleine Helmer for her professional help in that effort. We respectfully request that our earlier written comments given on 2/16/21 and 2/17/21 be made part of this public record.

Tonight Kathie and I would like to take a few minutes to:

1. Clarify the text of some of our earlier comments.
2. Recommend some additions be included in light of our ongoing research since January.
3. Revise and clarify some of the Comprehensive Plan Recommendations for Historic Resources Protection measures.

Attached please find our latest comments.

Page 77-78

Second Paragraph - Number of properties found in the references Table 4-1 should be changed. The Historical Society and Town Historian uses the information found in CRIS (Cultural Resource Information System) provided to them by a NYS Historic Preservation Program Analyst for NYS Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

Table 4-1 Changes

1197 Bulls Head Road - on Dutchess County Parcel Access is a vacant piece of land. The address for the actual property eligible for S/NR should be used. It is on the CRIS list also as 1197.

Committee response: This property is identified in CRIS under the address 1197 Bulls Head Road – no change necessary.

Wheeler-Collin Farm 20 Church Street Lane - should be 20 Church Lane only - where did the property name come from?

Committee response: Edit will be made.

Spelling on Wethersfield Farm is wrong - drop the "h". It is listed as a "Building District" not a "Historic District" on CRIS. It was placed on both the State and National Registers April 2021.

Committee response: The spelling was corrected in the previous version of the plan. The S/NR property is listed as a historic district – this designation should not change

The name Freight House at 2238 Bulls Head Road should be changed to R.F. Long to match the CRIS list.

Committee response: The CRIS listing does not reference R.F. Long.

Table 4-1 Additions - properties all found on the CRIS list

H.H. Caprpenter Home - 1 Creamery Road

Millbrook School - multiple buildings
 Ketcham's Paper Mill - 2232 Bulls Head
 United Church of Christ - 5928 Route 82
 Leeward Farm - 1175-1182 North Anson Road (former Coleman property)
 Bullis House - 89 Hunns Lake Road (former Renshaw property)
 Carpenter Family Ground - 52 Carpenter Hill Road
 Vosburgh School - 209 Conklin Hill Road (former Picheney property)
 Miller Residence - 2214 Bulls Head Road
 Locust Farm - 8 Depot Lane (Johnsen property)
 Bulls Head-Oswego Society of Friends Meeting House 1323 Bulls Head Road

Additional Properties which should be included in Table 4-1

Bangall Methodist Church 113 Hunns Lake Road
 Isaac Hunting House 225-245 Conklin Hill Road - architect for this house, Nathaniel Lockwood, is architect for Pulver-Bird House which is on the registers.
 The Stanford Station is on the State Register. It is missing from Table 4-1 while its accessory structures are included (2238 Bulls Head Road, 15 Old Depot Way, 5 Old Depot Lane). Dutchess County Parcel Access lists 5 Old Depot Lane as Old Depot Way so this should be corrected.

Committee response: Table 4-1 represents only those properties in the CRIS database that are listed or eligible for listing on the State and National Register. We kept the original 13 listings in the table with the corrections noted above.

Page 78

Paragraph lower left side of page -
 Line 2 - Historic should be Historical
 Line 4 - establishes should be established as the surveys were completed
 Line 7 - markers - what markers are these?
 Lines 11-12 - website does not open for me - try it out Charlie!

Committee response: These changes were made, and the website does appear to be working.

Page 79

Line 11 - If you want to get technical, Hunns Lake should be listed not only as residential but also commercial.

Committee response: The text says "primarily residential" which is correct.

Line 20 - Prior Master Plan provided boundaries for Bangall Hamlet

Committee response: See the discussion below in response to a separate written comment.

Page 82

Column 1

Line 3 - The Stanford Town Historian and Stanford Historical Society assisted the CPRC.

Bullet 5 - Line 3 - it should read The Town "should implement" as there is no present sign program.

Bullet 6 - Line 2 - add "Town Historian and" the Stanford Historical Society

Committee response: We will make these changes.

Column 2

The Historic Preservation Commission needs to be independent of all Town Boards and Committees. There may come a time that the commission has to present to a board or committee on a project and representatives from those boards and committees should not already have weighed in on the project.

Committee response: The Town Board should make the decision about who sits on this Commission. We do not think having members from the Planning Board or CAC would compromise its independence.

Item 6 under the column - It is not the job of the commission to develop voluntary guidelines. It should provide resources for property owners to utilize on their own.

Committee response: The Town Board will ultimately decide the responsibilities of this Commission. We think that guidelines developed by the Commission are one of the resources that property owners would use.

Last, the town should consider taking action at this time to participate in the CLPG program. It appears that participation can open the door for possible funding for Burdick Park creation and the maintenance of Whitlock Park to restore its trails. There maybe additional locations that could benefit from funding, i.e. the walking trail at the Rec Park.

Committee response: The Draft Plan recommends on p. 82 that the Town consider participating in the CLG program.

Charlie Shaw, 10 Millis Lane, for the Burdick Park Planning Committee

The Burdick Park Planning Committee is a 5 member committee appointed by the Town Board in February of this year. Its task is to develop plans for a 4.9 acre property, between Hunns Lake Road and Rte. 82, just north of The Bank of Millbrook. This property was anonymously donated to the Town as a passive recreation area. Members of the Committee have reviewed the Draft Comprehensive Plan and would like to make the following recommendations:

1. Page 76, 2nd Column, Line 8- The park is listed as "The New Dot Burdick Park"- Change the name to "Burdick Park", since the park is in honor of both Dot and Irv Burdick.
2. Add the New Burdick Park to-
-the text on page 26 Recreation

- the text on Page 48 Recreation
- Figure 2-1 Recreation
- the text on page 76 Recreation

3. We also recommend the Town owned Bangall Memorial Park located in the Historic Hamlet of Bangall be listed on page 26, page 48, Figure 2.1 and page 76, as well.

Committee response: We will make the changes above. The Burdick family prefers that the park be called the "Dot and Irv Burdick Park."

As for Comprehensive Plan Action recommendations, we propose the following be included on page 76, Plan recommendation:

1. The Town consider the development of a walking trail linking the Town owned Recreation Center and the RR Right of Way along the Wappinger Creek with the newly acquired Burdick Park and ultimately up Hunns Lake Rd. (AKA Bangall Lane), to the Town's Bangall Memorial Park in the Historic Hamlet of Bangall.

Committee response: This is an interesting proposal but it has not been thoroughly vetted by the Town or the CPRC. We recommend that the Burdick Park Committee propose it to the Town Board, which could then hold a public hearing.

2. The Town should consider taking action at this time to participate in the CLG (Certified Local Government) program. It appears that participation can open the door for possible funding for Burdick Park creation and the maintenance of Whitlock Park to restore its trails. There may be additional locations that could benefit from funding, i.e., the walking trail at the Rec. Park.

Committee response: The Draft Plan recommends on page 82 that the Town consider this.

Peter Kraus, 312 Bangall Amenia Road

In advance of the town meeting this evening I thought that I would provide you with some background on the issue that many of the residents are concerned about with regard to the town master plan. In the plan as you know there is an explicit permission of Event Spaces. This has given rise to much consternation as to what is the rationale for including this provision. One major question on residents' minds is "Why is the town inserting this provision into its master plan". There can be many reasons for this but one that I have heard most frequently is to allow residents to utilize their land in both farming ventures and commercial ventures to augment their incomes. While all of the residents that I have

spoken to are supportive of town residents improving their income to do so at the expense of public safety would not be appropriate. Commercial ventures that support events which could have under the rules up to 5000 people at them (25% of the capacity of Madison Square Garden) need to comply with various local, state and in some cases Federal regulations. For example either town, state or county highway departments have to approve site lines for the entrance and exit from an event space. The current plan does not require that to get approval the land owner must obtain all the necessary approvals before the town approves the proposal. Changes in traffic flows may also require town and county level approvals. Any development activity on a parcel of land will require SEQRA approval which may also require an EIS study (environmental impact study). Additionally the town has a volunteer fire department, no police department and a volunteer EMS capability. Commercial activity with large amounts of people would require the town to seriously consider establishing a permanent police force to control traffic and adjudicate any issues, plus dealing more effectively with the fire and health issues related to the commercial activities. I doubt the increased incomes of the landowners will translate into big enough tax receipt increases to fund all of this. The town should also consider the rather poor success rate of Food and Beverage commercial activities generally and specifically those suited for outside ventures which have to deal with inclement weather and build appropriate infrastructure to handle the fire, health, traffic, parking and other issues that come along with these ventures. The facts are that very few of these ventures succeed, probably less than 10% which makes these ventures very expensive for the sponsors.

As I mentioned above, the residents that are concerned about his event idea are of course in favor of helping the town to grow and for residents who want to improve their incomes to be able to do that without incurring a failure rate that is the national average for these types of ventures. As such the Town may want to consider identifying a specific piece of land where all the commercial activity related to a commercial event can take place. In this way the town can help finance the infrastructure that is necessary to meet all the regulations. The town can be assured that in fact the regulations are being met. Users can rent the space at a subsidized rate, not be required to invest the capital assets which they may struggle to afford, and the town can help residents to grow their incomes. The town is better placed to economize on building the necessary capital improvements and can draw on all its residents to finance this. Furthermore the maintenance of the capital infrastructure can be monitored and ensure that regulatory compliance is maintained. The town can also control the traffic and highway issues and once the space is properly structured the traffic issue will be contained to that area when the events are taking place.

In regards to first principles that residents are free to utilize their land in anyway they choose, of course we all support this concept, but when that utilization involves many participants, must be subject to various rules and regulations and requires substantial capital improvements and investment, the town should not be supportive of a poorly organized activity by an individual landowner that puts public safety at risk. I think the town has two options, 1) fund and maintain an inspection infrastructure that determines that all commercial event venues comply with all the appropriate rules and regulations, be responsible for ongoing inspections of these venues, fund a police, fire and health infrastructure that is capable of supporting these activities in a reasonable way, or 2) establish a central place and finance the

construction of all the necessary infrastructure, by virtue of having only one commercial venue this will allow the existing fire, health and enforcement resources to be better utilized, and finally improve the chances that residents can actually improve their incomes rather than risk their savings on a venture that is quite risky.

Committee response: The Draft Plan was revised prior to the June 28 public hearing to recommend that the Town develop criteria for evaluating and permitting event venues. As discussed under Mr. Kraus's oral comments above, we do not recommend that the Town should own and run an event venue.

Miles Price, 1135 Duell Road

I was unable to attend the meeting June 28th related to the proposed draft comprehensive plan but have reviewed the note put forward by Peter Kraus prior to the meeting and your comments.

As a full time resident (1135 Duell Road) of Stanfordville I wish to go on record as endorsing Peter's views. The environmental impact and financial, legal and regulatory consequences of a project that contemplates hosting a continuing series of events attracting a large number of visitors to this municipality which lacks the infrastructure to deal with the potential influx of non-residents must be subjected to a critical and thorough environmental impact study.

Committee response: The Draft Plan was revised prior to the June 28 public hearing to recommend that the Town develop criteria for evaluating and permitting event venues.

Charles Shaw, 10 Millis Lane, and **Kathie Spiers**, 25 E Hunns Lake Road

Please refer to the 6/28/21 written comments about the prior Master Plan, including boundaries for the Historic Hamlet of Bangall. Also, please refer to our recent phone conversations of 6/30/21 and 7/12/21 on this same matter.

While we are not aware of the rationale your committee used to remove this section from the Master Plan, (pages 46-47), we are aware of the rationale and decision making-process to include it in the first place.

The proposed boundaries were formulated in the late 1980's based on sound historic, scientific and planning principles and data. They were originally suggested by the Dutchess Co. Planning Dept. and the Dutchess Co. Historical Society and later confirmed by the Stanford Historical Society, the Stanford Master Plan Committee and its consultants (VHB Engineering – Saccardi & Schiff) along with the Bangall Hamlet Group. (Residents of the Town)

The following documentation is being included to support this request.

- 1) Jan. 25, 2011 – Master Plan Committee meeting minutes – at which you, Tom Angell, Conrad Levinson, (among others), along with consultant Nina Peek strongly supported the Historic Hamlet of Bangall proposed boundary concept. In fact, Ms. Peek and her boss Mr. Hoss, conducted a walking survey and concluded “that the Hamlet boundaries can be used for guidelines based on density and streetscape, and could affect zoning requirements for set back and uses”. (See attached #1 -will be provided 7/13/21)
- 2) Jan. 20, 2011 – Summary of a meeting with the Stanford Historical Society (on Jan 19, 2011), the Master Plan Reps. and Nina Peek (VHB Engineering- Saccardi & Schiff)- after which it was strongly recommended that geographic boundaries for all hamlets be established especially for Bangall and Stanfordville. The 1987 Historic Resources Inventory was used as the basis for boundary identification. (See attached #2- will be provided 7/13/21)
- 3) Dec 31, 1984 – Two maps of the Historic Hamlets of Bangall & Stanfordville identifying every historic building within the hamlets and proposing boundaries for each of the hamlets, were prepared by the Dutchess Co. Planning Dept., in cooperation with the D.C. Historical Society. They have been used as the basis for defining the proposed boundaries of the Hamlets of Bangall and Stanfordville. (See Attached #3- will be provided 7/13/21)

Acknowledgement of proposed boundaries and the proper planning process for defining boundaries is extremely important to be included in any planning documents. We believe Nina Peek can confirm this.

We respectfully request that you **expand and re-include** hamlet boundary considerations in the Comprehensive Plan, as it is one of the basics for proper land use planning.

Committee response: We thank Mr. Shaw, Ms. Spiers, and their colleagues for the impressive research they have done on the historic boundaries of the Bangall hamlet. The Draft Plan recommends the formation of a Historic Advisory Commission, and one task of this Commission would be to establish boundaries for all 15 of the Town’s historic hamlets. Publishing a map of the boundary of one hamlet would invite the obvious questions: What does the boundary line mean? What effect does it have on a property owner to be on one side of the boundary line or the other? Because there are as yet no clear answers to those questions, we think the inclusion of the proposed boundaries in the Comprehensive Plan would be premature.