

TOWN OF STANFORD TOWN BOARD SPECIAL MEETING  
DRAFT MASTER PLAN INFORMATION  
MONDAY, MAY 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2013

The Town of Stanford Town Board convened for a Special Meeting on Monday, May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at the Stanford Town Hall.

Roll Call: Virginia Stern – present  
Johanna Shafer – present  
Joseph Norton – present  
Thomas Dewhirst – present  
Mark D’Agostino - present

Supervisor Stern opened the meeting a little after 7 PM. Master Plan Committee Chair Gary Lovett introduced the other Master Plan Committee members present: Thomas Angell, John Royall, Carol Hanlon, Conrad Levenson and Robert Butts.

Mr. Lovett gave a 15-minute presentation on the draft Master Plan: explained what a draft master plan was, its history and its goals.

The following residents asked questions of the Committee:

Erik Kusko, Ridge Road – asked if the draft Master Plan included provisions for wind turbines or solar power.

Kathy Zeyher, ZBA acting chair – right now wind turbines are prohibited in zoning. Also felt that it was an oversight not to have the ZBA contacted.

Conrad Levenson – the Town Board should include that in the zoning amendments and other alternative energies.

Carol Hanlon – not an oversight but those concerns should be addressed with zoning rather than the Master Plan.

Mark Burdick, Rt. 82 – not a law now but what obligation does the Town have to implement the Master Plan.

Gary Lovett – it’s not a legal obligation but it should line up zoning with the Master Plan.

Bob Butts – yes, should be in accord with the Master Plan, and revisions to zoning and the subdivision laws should follow it.

Manny Gonzalez, Hunns Lake Road – how close does this Master Plan follow the old one?

Bob Butts – zoning was adopted after the original Master Plan was done, then revised again four years later. The current draft reaffirms the major principles of the old one.

Anthony Palmeri, Cold Spring Road – his entire property is in an Ag district. What if his heirs didn’t want to continue this? Can they develop it or sell it? Zoning would be an outgrowth of the plan; should have provisions that land use determines its value.

Bob Butts – the map reflects the land use now and AR zoning permits development and residential is permitted now.

Mr. Palmeri – is a variance needed for one family houses?

Bob Butts – there seems to be confusion with the map: this is a picture of land use, not a zoning map. When zoning is revised, then regulations will be determined.

Roseanne Weinstein, Cold Spring Road – her property is now agricultural residential with a minimum zoning of 5 acres. Has been to the Planning Board to subdivide. Will zoning stay 5 acre here? Has no agriculture on her parcel but is neighbor to the Palmeris’.

Tom Angell – as in the zoning law, the current AR and RR are residential now. There is no intention to change that on this side of town, but rather make it looser, more flexible. An existing dwelling could have an apartment over a garage, more opportunity and not make it more difficult. The other side of town, mostly agricultural, could go up to ten acres to balance it out. It won’t grow much bigger and most of the land there is already protected. There could be more lots in the center of town and then zoned that way.

Mr. Palmeri –asked if the plan would include a residential aspect.

Tom Angell – yes.

Michelle Inzeo, Shelley Hill Road – in the RR area, a 1.9 acre lot plus a neighboring lot: would it be grandfathered as a building lot? What if the property was left to someone? Could they build a home?

Tom Angell – zoning defines a “lot of record” on a certain date, and will continue to be addressed. That date would be filed in the D.C. Office, as was the 1980 one, and the Board of Health would still be involved for approvals.

Mr. Burdick – agreed with Mr. Palmeri: the map is confusing.

Duffy Layton, Layton Road – has many questions: sewer & water – did the feasibility study include costs? Went into detail regarding the costs associated with sewer & water. 65% of the land are wetlands, slopes. Has the committee done a complete overlay of the Town, of land already developed? What acreage would be left with scenic views, ridgelines, protected areas, wetlands? What’s still available to be built on?

Tom Angell – Water and sewer will have to happen if you have more than 1 unit per 1 ½ acre lot. No answer until zoning is in place regarding protected areas, ridgelines, slopes. The first Code Committee was told to do the Master Plan and Zoning together; now, been told to be separate. Regarding the surveys, we tried to come up with responses if feelings have changed, if a different direction is wanted. Don’t like that? We’ll change it, let us know and move forward together.

Carol Hanlon – trying to do this with you: Problems, questions? We’re listening, and you do have options.

Mel Eiger, Attlebury Hill Road – thanked the committee for their work. The business association is concerned with the future: young families, necessary services. Need affordable housing for the young people and seniors. If the center of town is developed, the developer pays. Need to grow sensible.

Henry Boehringer, Thompson Lane – asked why behind Town Hall was the optimal place to develop. By “optimal,” the best chance to be successful. Other places as well?

Bob Butts – the location should be the closest to the center of town; envisioning a neighborhood with businesses and residences, pedestrian oriented, providing enough for activities and can also be serviced by a sewer treatment system. Acknowledged that final studies would be needed but density could be greater, such as inquiries about an elderly project.

Gary Lovett – this reflects the historical development of hamlets with higher densities but the other side, closer to the creek, could have environmental issues.

Carol Hanlon – connect with businesses that are already here and not make a strip mall, like walking areas, community centers for the benefit of young and old.

Mr. Boehringer – is that realistically possible in my lifetime?

Bob Butts – we can’t predict that it will but we have to have provisions, opportunities, for it to happen. Mentioned Waterlands – 24 homes with a much larger density.

Conrad Levenson – higher density is the key to affordability; other strategies, you could have an individual action on a current lot.

Mr. Palmeri – must get people here: offices, industry, parks, job creation. Was this included in the Master Plan?

Linda Palmeri, Cold Spring Road – Federal and State grants can allow financial help to a developer.

Mr. Palmeri - Reduce taxes, give incentives to build; can’t expand commercially without incentives.

Bob Butts – constrained by tax laws. With property along the north and south side of Rt. 82, currently AR, must have mixed zoning uses.

Tom Angell – will have areas for individual use too.

Mark Germond, Mountain Road – if there is no idea of the water / sewer feasibility and costs, how can you change the land use arbitrarily? No mention of any commercial use other than in Hamlet Residential 1 & 2. Looks like it follows lot lines and that commercial use will only be allowed in these two areas.

Bob Butts – property for increased density zoning can be “floating” and could be applied for by satisfying the higher density with water and sewer. Existing zoning can also remain in place.

Gary Lovett – that can be included.

Conrad Levenson – mixed use was the intention. Can only speak for the Master Plan, not zoning. The boundary lines do not follow lot lines.

Carol Hanlon – the Town Board is the lead agency; they decide to change it or not, it’s their decision.

Larry McKeough, Woods Drive – Stanfordville Machine may leave and that hits close to home. Encourage commercial growth in the hamlets.

Gary Lovett – the areas surrounding the hamlets have light industrial categories, and then discussed the areas.

Neal Johnsen, Bulls Head Road – the area has not been over-developed; only 1 ½% growth. Feels that this is very restrictive and has undue burdens. The Town Hall is on a ridgeline, the Town Garage is near a wetland – these do not comply. Are you being fair to property owners? “Do as we say, not as we do.” Supports agriculture but they pay 80% in taxes. Studies on how many exempt properties? How is this subsidized? Costs considered?

Gary Lovett – we identified areas that had to be protected.

Tom Angell – we conversed with farmers and the agricultural community and protecting agriculture was the most important thing.

Bob Butts – we have nothing to do with any property owner with an Ag exemption, we don’t propose tax laws, but it’s the choice of the individual farmer, just like we apply interest on a mortgage.

James Sansum – any specifics on the expansion of mining, now and in the future?

Gary Lovett – the property land use for the two existing mines, Darling and Layton. Is light industrial.

Tom Angell – not involved, it’s a separate issue, regulated by the State and by the Town Board.

Mr. Layton – mining is light industrial; already three permitted mines. Of his 102 acres, only 24 is mined and not in the light industrial zone, only Hardrock is.

Mr. Sansum – if the plan is looking toward the future, it should cover the same number of years and should address the affects on agriculture, residential land. Recommends that the three existing mines’ future expansions be addressed.

Mr. Layton – asked about the light industrial area where his property is located; where the Darling mine is the only light industrial area – should be consistent.

Gary Lovett – its stayed agricultural; used the County’s land use maps.

John Bida, Hunns Lake Road – spoke of the four parcels owned by the Catholic Church. Was concerned that a recreation area was proposed in the southern part, but right now it’s a cemetery.

Mr. Boehringer – asked if anything in the Master Plan could have the Town use the Hudsonia overlay. A grandfathered 5-acre lot could be in habitat study area.

Karen Sergio, Homan Road – asked about how CEA’s, ridgelines and scenic views could affect property values. Felt that attorneys might be needed and that it was restrictive.

Tom Angell – properties in a CEA get an increased level of environmental review but doesn’t prevent a project. The Planning Board uses the CAC as a consultant at times for no cost but the area would require a more in depth look. Since being on the Planning Board, there have no disapprovals on any project. Ridgelines would have to be first defined, then work with an applicant to site the house and still have a view. Zoning decides that but would not prevent building on a property. An applicant would know in advance how to present the plan. Scenic overlays are incentives to landowners. Work together with applicants but these are suggestions: may protect some but maybe not all, but its better to know the rules ahead of time.

John VanLeuven - asked about the ramifications of being near a CEA. Could it reduce the size of usable property?

Gary Lovett – that comes from the CAC: larger areas to maintain habitats. Changes only to have more review

Mike Dillinger, Tic Toc Way – asked how many responded to the 2001 survey, and asked why we need this Master Plan – the Town works fine, should keep what we’ve got. If development planned for the center of town, there’s a main power line there – cancer causing if young people and seniors were there.

Tom Angell – there is an option to keep the current one but recommendations give more opportunity for development, loosening the zoning requirements in certain areas in response to more young people and seniors.

Jay Russell, Willowbrook Road – asked if other means of growth were included: mother / daughter, garage apartments? Felt that high density housing was years away; small houses on properties was more realistic.

Tom Angell – yes, alternative housing.

Bob Butts – yes, included and would be worked into zoning laws.

Dustin Bowers, Rt. 82 – as a business owner, wants responsible growth but what if a high-density area was bought and used as something else? Increased building sites? Could be out of balance and future zoning could make it harder to build. Population growth, additional housing opportunities, let landowners do what they want; too restrictive means little possibility for growth. Allow smaller zoning areas through out the Town.

Gary Lovett – this is a vision for the town only.

Tom Angell – there are two aspects to the town center: a planned development behind the Town Hall and smaller lots within the center with other opportunities for development.

Bob Butts – the Master Plan evolves: if any area becomes high-density, then another use could be a “floating zone” elsewhere. Limit size and concentrate development more efficiently, with more flexibility

Tom Angell – a “build out” generally makes the town twice the size it is now. If you want to look at something different but we heard keep the town with the same growth patterns. Some areas reduced, some the same, more incentives.

Gary Lovett – more room for growth.

Tom Dewhirst, Jameson Hill Road – been here since the ‘50s; doesn’t understand why we need change. Keep businesses here but we couldn’t support 2,000 more people. Need to help struggling businesses, keep the largest employer here, keep families here. Roseland Ranch is gone, nothing here for businesses. Can’t see how all of this will come to fruition. When worked for the Highway Dept. drove on every road: houses for sale, people moving. What’s the plan for business, infrastructure? Why do we need 4,000 – 5,000 more people? How does the fire company and the law enforcement keep up? When you loose a business, you loose people. Now people shop in Poughkeepsie, Kingston. Must keep the people here.

Bob Butts – the committee has been in favor of strengthening the business community and improving the Master Plan improves ideas.

Michelle Inzeo, Shelley Hill Road – also spoke of shopping / groceries and the school that is closing. Not against growth, don’t want a ghost town. Need more regular people.

Supervisor Virginia Stern – unlike in a “Field of Dreams” they will not just come but possibilities will be made. The details will be in the zoning laws. The increased possibilities will be for young families and seniors, for businesses. It may need tweaking, editing but zoning will be the hard work.

Mrs. Carmella Morano, Hunns Lake Road – spoke of the elderly in nursing homes. The town needs to have a working class with extended family support – all generations living together and taking care of each other as it used to be.

Tom Angell – agrees with that and would be permitted.

Conrad Levenson – a beautiful vision.

Mr. Burdick – asked why John Hughes junk yard/ repair shop was left out of the plan but included the gas station at the other end of town. Should keep the zoning the same. Also spoke of natural resources – wetlands, ridgelines - and that 8,000 acres of the 36,000 total was already protected; most towns would be jealous. We have enough protection with existing laws; don’t need anymore.

Gary Lovett – didn’t exclude any businesses but will take a look at that.

John Royall and Conrad Levensen – existing uses can continue.

Tom Angell – yes, could still be but should look at the proximity to the Wappinger Creek. Ridgelines could be protected through incentives.

John Royall – 1/3 of the town is already protected or under stringent control; 2/3 could be developed with the current regulations.

Tom Angell – Bentley Farm could still have the potential for 23 homes

Jeff Spiers, Hunns Lake Road – spoke of buffers around Hunns Lake. Should protect what we already, i.e. septics close by. There were many children here years ago, now they’re all gone. Economy driven.

Debra Dillinger, Hunns Lake Road – not enough to keep young people here and they can’t afford to live here. How do you draw people in? The area might be able to support some central growth – would we need a big grocery store – but still stay rural?

Gary Lovett – not an oversight; agrees. Different land use on private parcels and overhead would be reasonable, such as home occupations.

Tom Angell – zoning could expand the use definitions.

Scott Wuenst, Hunns lake Road – too difficult to build here now. Kids will leave as they can't afford to live here. Leave things the way they are. Only 5 houses built in the last 5 years. You say that the Town Board has the final say – it should be the people have the final say. The plan is vague and intimidating; you have too much power.

Carol Hanlon – has nothing to do with the Master Plan; don't confuse it with zoning which sets the vision of what people have told us.

Gary Lovett – heard the point = more economic opportunities, but we have no power; that's the Town Board.

Jeff Spiers – asked if the Town Board agrees with this, accepts it.

Virginia Stern, Supervisor – the Town Board has been given the draft document. Hearing more comments it can be amended, changed, reworded. Then it can be adopted with the help of a planner. Then a committee will look at the zoning regulations to support an aspect of it.

Mr. Spiers – we're losing families, homes. Can't even have a farmers' market in rural area.

Mr. Layton – zoning will affect changes.

Mike Shafer, Decker Road – the purpose is to protect the Town with a vision; better to talk with the people if you want to build something.

Ms. Dillinger – best to make areas of light industry in the center of town, and have different types of agriculture.

Gary Lovett – thanked all who came out. The next step is up to the Town Board

Supervisor Stern – thanked all who were still there and for the wonderful comments. If another meeting is needed, there will be one. Any further comments can go to the Town Board or the Master Plan Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Ritamary Bell  
Town Clerk