

**TOWN OF DAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
COMMITTEE MEETING
JULY 21, 2009**

Members Present: Ted Mirczak
Mary Ann Johnson, Supervisor
Dave Davidson
Ken Metzler
Larry DeRubbo
Judy Traeger
David Cox
June Dixon
Richard Lamb, Consultant

Members Absent: None

Others: Suzanne Denn, Town Board Member

Minutes Review:

Committee Member Cox stated on Page 4, first sentence “not be classified Forest Preserve” may have been a misstatement. He believed APA intends to classify the land surrounding the lake “Forest Preserve” and not classify it “Wilderness”. The Secretary will review the tapes, ascertain the correct information and place an annotation in the minutes. Committee Member Cox stated DEC has not announced it would not be “Forest Preserve”. (Review of the taping of the March 17, 2009 does not specify what the classification will be but Mr. Grisi does state it will not be classified “Wilderness”.)

Motion by Supervisor Johnson, seconded by Committee Member Dixon to approve the minutes with the above referenced annotation. Ayes: Mirczak, Johnson, Davidson, Metzler, DeRubbo, Traeger, Cox, Dixon. Carried: 8-0.

Discussion ensued on tape retention schedule and the Secretary will determine how long they are required to be retained. She planned to retain the taped meetings with all the other materials in the vault. The informational meeting was not taped because there is no requirement for it.

Debrief Information Meetings:

Chairman Mirczak stated while the attendance was low at the Informational Meeting, those who did attend were very engaged in the meeting. It was difficult to determine the leanings of the attendees but they did have many good questions. Professor Lamb stated these types of meetings are generally low attended.

Chairman Mirczak will appear at the August 15th Property Owners Meeting without any specific agenda. Discussion ensued on attendance projections and the necessity of a response to the EMS letter prior to the workshops. The Johnston email

(copy attached) and Committee Member Davidson's response will be made part of the formal minutes. Professor Lamb stated the final plan will include an analysis of the issues which will include public comments (brief background of the EMS services with decisions made by the Committee and any other issues which are brought up by the community) to be written by a Committee Member. Chairman Mirczak stated this would be included in the Goals and Recommendations with rationale of each statement prior to the goal.

Workshops:

Fifteen to twenty individuals signed up to attend the first workshop to be held on August 8th from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. Email addresses were provided and will be utilized for communications from the Committee.

Discussion ensued on Revision 3 of a document prepared by Professor Lamb to facilitate workshop activities and review of list of workshop volunteers indicating their area of interest. Additional advertising will be done to try to garner more workshop volunteers. Discussion ensued on the makeup of the workshop groups; anticipation of attendance; land use as the topic which generated the most interest; decision that topics discussed at the first workshop will be determined by the citizen volunteers who attend; and, format each workshop session to cover all topics to provide an opportunity for all community members to be heard.

Professor Lamb stated the first hour devoted to Recreation would involve an extensive presentation and the second hour would cover all other topics including land use and community development and services which would include any EMS discussions. Committee Members should be present at each workshop session with the Committee Member working within each workshop group keeping notes to report back to the entire Committee. Committee Members Dixon and Davidson will chair the EMS group.

Within the different subject groups, the role of the Committee Member will be to facilitate discussion, keep notes, and to guide the discussion to stay within the specific subject matter with Professor Lamb interacting within all groups. Handouts will be provided by Professor Lamb (via email) and he will also provide a revised Workshop Discussion Group list which will include new grouping of categories. Under the Recreation category, there will be a specific format with the General Category topics to be determined by the public concerns. The projector may not be needed at these meetings.

It was determined that the Workshop Discussion Groups would be: 1) Resource Preservation Goals and Land Use and Zoning Goals, 2) Community Development and Public Services Goals and 3) Recreation Goal. Committee Members will determine by interest generated at the time of the meeting what their role will consist of.

The second Workshop will be held on Tuesday, August 25th from 7 to 9 p.m. with the next regular Committee Meeting to be held on Tuesday, August 18th at 9:30 a.m.

Status of Website:

The website is in excellent shape thanks to Norm Hotz. A large volume of information has been forwarded to Norm and he has been more than helpful in disseminating it and locating it in the proper location.

A PowerPoint of the July 11th meeting was included on the website with the whole plan broken into sections. As more information is developed, it can be included with the next submission to be the survey analysis. Committee Member Davidson has rewritten the latest analysis to be circulated among the Committee Members for comment. He has not changed the Analysis of the Verbatim Questions from the draft version which was emailed to all Committee Members. He did not believe it would be possible to combine the resident categories as he did not impose the categories but they were arrived at from his analysis of the data. Committee Member Davidson will email these two items for ultimate inclusion in the plan and will be included on the website as soon as all Committee Members are comfortable with the drafts.

The Secretary will contact Norm Hotz to determine if a compilation of the hits against the website with emphasis on hits to the Comp Plan link can be made.

Skull session on Vision Statement:

Chairman Mirczak stated the vision statements from two towns provided by Professor Lamb would be very helpful in developing this Committee's vision along with 15 additional comprehensive plans and their vision statements which were provided by the County. Chairman Mirczak has requested Committee Member Davidson be responsible for this statement to address the question: What should the Town of Day be?

Committee Members related their perspective was of the Town and what brought them to live here. The general consensus was the Town of Day represents beauty, peacefulness, quiet, lack of stress, a resort without the commotion and easy accessibility to stores, theatres and government offices within a 30-45 minute drive. They would not want to see the ultimate build out come to fruition and believe the steep slope aids in retaining the rural flair while realizing it would not prohibit such development by more affluent property owners. Professor Lamb stated the regulations could be adjusted to discourage development on back lots to keep this type of development to a minimum.

The following items were discussed:

- "Pulling up the ladder" in terms of how restrictive does the Town want to be in their zoning.
- How much growth can the Town undertake without denigrating the character of the Town?
- Can affordable/workforce housing be available or is residence in the Town out of the financial reach of that group?

- Availability of jobs within the Town being scarce, the Town is fast becoming a retirement community or a community of commuters. With the advent of computers, there may be more home offices located within the Town.
- While no Committee Member wanted to see the ultimate build out scenario, agreeing it would be a disaster, is there room for additional population growth off the lake? Committee Member DeRubbo stated there are few buildable lots left on the lakefront and what is occurring in that area at present are teardowns with rebuilding. Committee Member Cox stated in other parts of the country, there is building on mountainsides and at some point it will be worth it here in the Town of Day.
- Committee Member Davidson stated speaking to the point of descendants of local townspeople whose grown children wish to remain in the area, there was an application to the ZBA last year which involved back lots and the constraint the current zoning law puts on the development of those lots. While he is not endorsing this change, when it applies to family wishing to transfer property to family members, it is an issue this Committee may need to take into consideration. It was stated there is a gift lot provision within the law which allows for familial transfer, but it is not a guarantee of the build ability of the lot.
- Chairman Mirczak inquired how important it would be to increase the tax base. Professor Lamb stated residential development has historically shown to increase taxes due to the increase in services outweighing the taxes taken in. Economic development is not an issue because the survey indicated the majority do not want to encourage it. Professor Lamb stated the decision would have to be made to decide if the current regulations should be retained and what the Committee likes about them.
- Committee Member Davidson stated the vision statement may include family values and maintaining a rural community and at the same time may also include regulations on building becoming more restrictive. Chairman Mirczak stated land use regulations will result from what the foundation of the plan is and the vision statement of family value and rural community will move this Committee toward that goal.
- There is a significant amount of density change which could occur within the existing zoning law. The citizenry of the Town of Day may not be aware of this possibility and the consensus of the survey was they do not want more growth. Do we wish to make a change in the existing law? There are no legal constraints to prevent the Town from not changing without additional regulation. We cannot stop building on a buildable lot, but we should not encourage any type of increased housing.
- In the case of substandard lots, currently the setbacks are reduced, do we wish to eliminate that provision in zoning law and would that amount to a taking? Professor Lamb stated one area of control would be at the time of creation of new subdivisions and in scenic areas, require more vegetation and site plan approvals without tampering with existing zoning law. Committee Member Davidson stated if no further subdivisions were

permitted but only construction allowed on buildable lots, the density of the Town would double.

- Dedication of roads to the Town: can the Town be required to accept a road within a subdivision if it is built to the Town standards?
- Conservation subdivisions would be less onerous and should be encouraged in order to maintain the look and feel of the Town as it presently exists.
- Increase lot size requirements as a means of controlling density.
- Cluster development may increase density with lesser standards for road development.
- Tailor subdivisions regulations in vision statement with consideration that road frontage standards were originally set to limit density.

Future Guests:

1. Town Historian Lauren Roberts to be scheduled for an evening session in the fall.
2. David Smail representing the Property Owners Association to speak to the lawsuit regarding hydropower and address the drastic changes in the lakefront property proposal by DEC.
3. Peter Byron representing the Great Sacandaga Lake Association.
4. School Districts (Hadley/Luzerne, Corinth and Edinburg) with discussions to include concern with taxes and growth predictions.
5. Sacandaga Protection Committee.
6. Business owners view of the Town to include campgrounds (Sacandaga), restaurants (Majestic Marina), stores (Skinny's and Day Country Store), real estate firms, Buddy's Tree Service, Rick Carbone, Hayes, etc. at an evening meeting. List to be compiled. Committee to advertise for businesses which provide services to participate and contact those we is familiar with.

Meeting was adjourned at 11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Byrne
Secretary