

DRAFT until reviewed/approved by EHH Cmte

**ECONOMIC HEALTH AND HERITAGE MEETING
JUNE 25, 2013**

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Kurt Wheeler, William Hall, Ted Bartlett, Bill Zupan, and Don Ferlow

Members Absent: Phil Byrnes, Karen Eldridge, and Dave Connor

Also Present: Pringle Symonds, Bob Lucas, Dan Kuper, Tom Long, Sandra Thomas, Jen Shirley and Hume Laidman

.....
MINUTES

K. Wheeler: The first order of business is approval of March, April and May's minutes of the Economic Health and Heritage Committee.

B. Zupan: I make a motion to accept the minutes as submitted.

T. Bartlett: I second it.

K. Wheeler: All in favor?

Minutes passed 5-0
.....

K. Wheeler: The first item on the agenda for tonight is review of the suggested edits to the Comprehensive Plan (see attached-item A). Ted Bartlett has had already submitted some changes to the plan that he would like to see (see attached-item B).

The committee reviewed the suggested edits to the comprehensive plan and the changes that Ted Bartlett had suggested. T. Bartlett read his suggestions for possible edits to paragraph one.

K. Wheeler: Ted, can you please explain what do you mean by the physical entrance to the Village?

T. Bartlett: It is the actual, physical significant gateway.

B. Hall: I think the physical part could be simplified to this is a significant visual gateway. The physical part could be removed. (Discussion ensued.)

K. Wheeler: Then we will remove the “physical” part and keep it the “visual gateway.” We will get public comment and the other board members comments. The concepts are what we want to make sure we have solid.

K. Wheeler: Let’s discuss the second paragraph of the suggested edits. We have discussed the need for a variety of needs for housing including lower cost houses, down size houses and senior housing. Are there any comments or suggestions on the second paragraph?

B. Zupan: Does commercial include retail? Do we need to clarify it? We made it very specific the first time it was written there was no retail. If we are going to propose adding retail, should it be included in the comprehensive plan language? We talked about bigger stores that would not hurt the business district downtown. If we are having a public hearing, the people will know specifically what we are talking about. We can always delete it, if it gets a lot of negative feedback.

K. Wheeler: Retail businesses in VES would need to be those incompatible with the downtown businesses shopping district. This area is not for small retail shops. There could be a zoning regulation that could, for example, stipulate that the business has to be over 2,000 square feet or some other size that rules out the downtown options.

T. Bartlett: I would like to leave the commercial retail language out of the comprehensive plan.

D. Ferlow: It is the comprehensive plan but the zoning determines the usage.

K. Wheeler: The goal is that we don’t want strip mall construction. We don’t want to take business out of the downtown.

B. Zupan: If the committee passes this and then we are having public hearing on the zoning regulations and retail is proposed, they may say it is not in the comprehensive plan. We can take it out, but I think that it should include that we will let retail under certain guidelines.

B. Hall: When we initially have the public hearing, in addition to the recommended revisions of the comprehensive plan, we will also be discussing the zoning. If we discuss both – people will get the whole picture. (Continued discussion as to how to best phrase paragraph two.)

K. Wheeler: That was the idea to have a sub-committee to begin to work ahead on both. The public will understand which direction we are moving in. It sounds like we have consensus to keep paragraph two as it is.

K. Wheeler: Now moving on to the third paragraph. In the 2008 comprehensive plan, it made it sound like the properties were already annexed in to the Village. It did not mention that these properties were in the town. This paragraph clarifies it. I tried to capture the spirit of everything we talked about including conservation analysis, the most important resources, referencing the aquifer protection plan and referencing the design standards.

B. Hall: What we are doing to Village Edge South applies to anything annexed east of the Village Edge South. The zoning says any land annexed in will be zoned the same as the adjacent properties.

General discussion about paragraph three language. Consensus that it fits the goals set by the committee.

K. Wheeler: The last item we discussed is Appendix A, Table III.2.1, which includes all the details. This is already reflected in the zoning and does not need to be in the comprehensive plan.

General discussion about desire to remove the table as part of the revision process

K. Wheeler: All of our suggested edits will be given to Attorney Jim Stokes for his review. After that we will need to have a public hearing in July. I make a motion to schedule the next meeting and a public hearing for July 23rd at 6:30 p.m.

T. Bartlett: I second it.

K. Wheeler: All in favor?

Motion passed 5-0.

.....

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Laidman, members of CRIS, would like to see more senior living facilities. They believe that Cazenovia is losing a lot of their seniors to Chittenango and Hamilton.

K. Wheeler: This would be a prime area to do this.

B. Hall: That is part of the reason we took out the language of single family housing, so it could include senior housing.

.....

D. Ferlow presented possible concepts for Village Edge South. (see image) The one concept would include numerous residential lots that could be as small as 5,000-6,000 square feet in the southern half of the zone. Conceptual areas are also blocked out in the

northern (commercial) part of the zone for a potential motel and other uses. There would one curb cut from Route 20 on the eastern end with access to the parcels from an access road. Parking would be behind the buildings.

T. Long: Are there zoning regulations for the elevations of the buildings?

K.Wheeler: Right now the zoning allows two story buildings. We are proposing language that would allow greater than that combined with strategy to minimize the visual impact of a taller building.

D. Ferlow: One thing we did notice when we studied this. Right now we could build a 2 story building on a small lot (20,000 sq. feet), 20 feet from the right way line of Route 20 in accordance with the zoning. In that regard, you set back 100 feet a 3 story building the roof line is below the visual line of the two story building at the allowed setback.

J. Shirley: Would the buildings be historic looking?

T. Bartlett: You don't want to make this plan to copy the Village architectural. It can be compatible so it is not in conflict with the Village.

K. Wheeler: The State DOT will have a lot to say about the curb cuts and the plan D. Ferlow has presented there will be only 2 major curb cuts.

K. Wheeler reminded everyone that this is conceptual plan at this point. Don Ferlow is trying to illustrate the variety of sizes that you could incorporate in to this and still be attractive.

.....
K. Wheeler: We have a summary of some concepts for zoning conservation analysis. (See attached)

D. Ferlow: I looked at two options. You look at the water crossings, steepest slopes, vegetation, forests, soils, trails, scenic view sheds, water supply areas, stonewalls, and utilities that would be important.

Option 1 is the planning board meets with the developer and they decide that these were the important areas and than the plan would move forward.

Option 2 would follow the town's conservation plan, which is the same thing, except there is a density calculation involved. It would subtract from the developable areas certain elements (army corp. and state wetlands, steep slopes greater than a certain amount) and that would give you a developable area.

The conservation analysis portion would include sitting down and doing a site visit and getting published maps and blocking out the important areas and developing a conceptual

plan for a green space development. That would be taken to the board and from that they would make a decision on the conservation portion of the property.

K. Wheeler: This would be part of the initial application.

D. Ferlow: On this site, we looked at 2 simple areas- the central valley, which is steep and the little piece next to the conservation area that Gregg development has set aside. The rest of the site is essentially open ground. The south is more harmonious to residential and the upper portion is more conforming to commercial.

B. Zupan: I would caution about using everything that the Town put in. The Town was looking at keeping their density low. The greatest density was to be in the Village and the town was to have less density.

K. Wheeler: One thing that is incorporated here is a minimum commercial building footprint. This steers your smaller boutique type retail downtown.

.....
K. Wheeler: Is there anything else to bring before this committee?

Nothing else was brought before the committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Dady
Deputy Clerk
Village of Cazenovia
July 5, 2013

Attachment A – Suggested Edits for Plan for Review at 25 June 2013 Meeting

Suggested edits to Comp Plan re: VES from 28 May for review at 25 June 2013 EHH Meeting

PART II – INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES:

p51-52- Natural and Scenic Resources:

9. View from Route 20 East looking to [into] the area southwest of Cazenovia: This is a significant gateway to the community. It is the point where the major road traversing the rural (and some suburban) development narrows and enters the “Village”. This point is elevated above the Village center and offers a broad pastoral view to the southwest across

the rural rolling hills south of the Village. (The Knapp/CPF properties can be seen in the distance.) This pastoral view is in dramatic contrast to the strip shopping center on the north side of the road.

PART III: COMMUNITY RECOMMENDATIONS:

p113 - Land Use and Zoning:

- Village Edge South: To allow [single family] residential uses, restaurants, hotel/motel, [and] professional offices and other commercial uses while protecting the Village's, scenic, natural, and historic resources identified via conservation analysis of the zone. The location for Village Edge South is illustrated on Figure III.2.2 and Figure III.2.3 Village Edge South should be further delineated into two distinct character zones divided by the wooded watercourse running east-west across the center of the zone. The northern sector along Route 20 is best suited for commercial uses while the southern sector is more appropriate for uses that will be harmonious with the residential zones to the west and south.

p161: The 2008 Comprehensive Plan noted that, "The proposed zoning district boundary for Village Edge South should extend from the western edge of the Lucas property, and then to continue east along the southern side of U.S. Route 20 East to the eastern edge of the Cazenovia Motel property, then south along the property line back west and north to the western edge of the Lucas Property at the beginning point along U.S. Route 20 East." Portions of the area describe are currently in the Town of Cazenovia, but Village zoning for VES should be developed to include them given their identification as candidates for annexation dating back to at least the 1991 Village Comprehensive Plan. [Currently the Village portion of this area is zoned for residential use with one dwelling unit per 20,000sf or ½ acre and one dwelling unit per 30,000sf or approximately ¾ of an acre. The Town portion of this area is zoned A-Residential which allows for one dwelling unit per acre. The existing density is too low for Village character and not low enough to effectively complement the rural character and may simply lead to a suburban sprawl-type character. The preferred character or form for this area is Village residential. This can be accomplished through the use of specific dimensional regulations and design standards. However, this area is included in the zone of contribution and consequently a lower impervious coverage, between 10% and 15% is recommended (see Appendix B, *Wellhead Protection Plan*). The proposed density combined with the maximum impervious coverage and minimum open space requirement will not only encourage clustered development that will be in keeping with the Village character but will also encourage adequate pervious coverage to protect the aquifer recharge opportunities. The proposed land uses for this zone include those uses that are considered acceptable in this sensitive area and in keeping with the goals for the Village and Town (see Appendix A).] Development within the VES zone should be driven by a conservation analysis of the site with emphasis on preserving elements previously identified as community priorities, including viewshed to the southwest, maximizing greenspace while allowing economic development, promoting a "hard edge" that is also a welcoming gateway to the village and allowing recharge for the aquifer consistent with Appendix B (*Wellhead Protection Plan*). Future construction in the zone should be guided by design standards created to promote character consistent with a historic, rural upstate village.

[Delete Table III.2.1 from Addendix A. These details are already reflected in new zoning for VEN/VES]

Attachment B – Suggested Edits from Ted Bartlett (para 1):

Suggested edits to Comp Plan re: VES from 28 May for review at 25 June 2013
EHH Meeting

PART II – INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES:

p51-52- Natural and Scenic Resources:

9. View from Route 20 East looking to [into] the area southwest of Cazenovia across from the plaza: This is a significant gateway to the community both physically and visually. It is the point where the major road traversing the rural (and some suburban) development narrows and enters the “Village”. This point is elevated above the Village center and offers a broad pastoral viewshed to the southwest over the agricultural fields by route 20, across the rural rolling hills south of the Village and culminates at the distant north-south ridge southwest of the lake. (The Knapp/CPF properties can be seen in the distance.) This pastoral view within the village is a distinctive and important feature for Cazenovia and is in dramatic contrast to the strip shopping center on the north side of the road.

DRAFT until reviewed/approved by EHH Cmte