



**TOWN OF DRYDEN PLANNING BOARD
PROPOSED ZONING LAW REVISION #1
PUBLIC MEETING**

**Thursday, July 22, 2010
Town Hall
7:00 – 9:00 PM**

Meeting Notes:

Joseph Lalley, Town of Dryden Planning Board Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Dan Kwasnowski (Town of Dryden Environmental Planner) and Michael Welti, AICP (Behan Planning and Design) summarized the Planning Board's most recent version of the proposed zoning law with an emphasis on the changes that were made since the last public meetings in January and March of this year. Following their presentation, Mr. Kwasnowski and Mr. Welti accepted and responded to questions and comments from the audience. Public questions/comments included the following:

- Varna - there were a number of questions and comments about the zoning proposed for the Hamlet of Varna, such as:
 - Question about allowing ¼ lot size – why? This does not conform to the comprehensive plan recommendation. Even ¼ acre lots would double current density in the hamlet.
 - An alternative zoning plan was recently proposed by the Varna Community Association (VCA) – the VCA would like this added/amended to the proposed town zoning law in full. It was adopted by the VCA. Several people spoke in favor of this.
 - Current zone, as proposed by the Planning Board, is too broad or general. The VCA proposal refines this. Protect neighborhoods
 - Person Interested in developing an eatery on Route 366 in Varna – has found financing to be difficult because of mixed use zoning (bank does not understand). More defined zoning would be helpful
 - Thanks – recognition that new ideas (like the VCA's proposal) are tough late in process - but still worth considering
 - Varna – is not a problem that needs to be fixed. But the road in Varna is a problem. Support for the idea of creating a Master Plan for the hamlet.
- Expect growth to come – we need to take it
- Concern about proposed commercial zone:
 - Too large and too much permitted
 - Stretched out on the highway
 - 20,000 square feet buildings are too large
- Not enough of the good comments/ideas from previous meetings were incorporated in the revised draft

- This is a big change – it will be a big cost to landowners and to the town (administrative)
- New zoning is needed and the process is good – but there are still problems and the proposed zoning is not ready for adoption
- The new zoning will not achieve what is desired – preserve rural character
- Need to allow more density in specific places – specifically around the villages and hamlets
- Concern that conservation subdivision can be required by the Planning Board
- Questions/concerns about the conservation analysis phase for conservation subdivisions:
 - Why was the slope changed from 25% to 15%? Defining 15% as constrained could unfairly take too much land out of the equation.
 - “Scenic Views” as part of analysis – this is too subjective
- Concern about affordable housing – will new zoning allow for the affordable homes? Couldn’t a percentage of new housing be required to be “affordable”?
- Questions about the process going forward from the Planning Board to the Town Board
- Conservation District:
 - Doesn’t like the 2 acre requirement - 2 acres are not necessary for one home. Don’t price out future residents (note: 2 acre lots are not required under the proposed zoning. Density is based on 1 home per two acres, but lot size can be smaller).
 - The proposed Conservation District is too large – even though it has been reduced from the earlier proposal
- Use of special use permits (in the use table) is too frequent
- Concern about the nature of comments at this meeting:
 - Not everyone wants to maximize development
 - Concern about the impact of development
- Concern about loss of freedom
- Distinction between protecting character and protecting environmental resources:
 - There are already strong regulations for environmental protection
 - Protecting “scenic views” – perhaps more dangerous than good
 - Sometimes good projects are prevented (“smart growth” stymied by regulations or opposition)
- Small lot sizes in clustered subdivisions are unrealistic – state health department regulations make this very difficult
- Shared driveways – tough on financing too (banks do not understand these). Private roads might be better.
- Concern about stormwater on Turkey Hill Road - will proposed zoning (density) help this? (note: Dan Kwasnowski explained about the Town’s stormwater regulations)
- Concern about open government – there is still much disagreement about parts of the proposed zoning. Not enough absorption of previous comments. This is difficult material for most to understand. Don’t rush to completion.
- Comfort level is not there yet - concern about people’s rights

- Concern about conservation subdivisions – landowners are compelled to do things – require permission from Town
- Concern about the cost of services – infrastructure costs on people
- Questions and concerns about the use table:
 - A lot of X's on the chart (not permitted)
 - Why not allow more uses by special use permit? Encourage entrepreneurial activities in the Town.
 - Trouble with signage regulations (note: these are existing regulations. They have not been substantially revised)
- Agreement with previous comment about the use table – there are a lot of X's. For example, why can't you have a B&B in the Industrial Zone?
- Concern about the definitions of constrained and unconstrained land in the conservation subdivision section - takes a lot of land out of the equation (look at the slope issue again)
- Perhaps there should be an incentive for conservation subdivisions instead of a requirement
- Lacey's corners – opposite the Community College - some of this should not be zoned Commercial. There is protected farmland adjacent to some of this proposed zone. Also, concern about traffic on North Road that would be generated by the from Commercial Zone
- Conservation District – question about conservation easements (taxes, ownership, maintenance)
- Use Table – confusion about Principal and Accessory Uses – should be made clearer
- Parking section – there is an inconsistency in this section – requirements for paved parking versus expressed desire for permeable surfaces. Clarify definitions.
- There is still some confusion about the proposed zoning. There is no rush to get this done for most of town. Perhaps it would be better to focus on Varna where there does appear to be some problems.
- Look again at Use Table on page 22 - needs to be clarified. Uses should be allowed unless specifically prohibited. Look at "contractor's yard".

Mr. Welti and Mr. Kwasnowski thanked everyone for their thoughtful comments. The meeting was concluded at approximately 9:30 PM.