

**Danby Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting
March 22, 2012**

Present:

Joel Gagnon
Anne Klingensmith
Frank Kruppa
Robert Roe
Steve Selin
Naomi Strichartz

Absent:

Ted Melchen

Others Present:

Secretary	Pamela Goddard
Code Officer	Sue Beeners
Energy Intern	Zachary Patton
Town Board	Leslie Connors, Kathy Halton
Public	Ted Crane

Chairperson Robert Roe opened the Planning Board meeting at 7:03pm

Town Board Report

Connors opened a discussion regarding required annual training for Planning Board members. She presented information about an upcoming presentation on gas drilling (to be held in Spencer) as an example of the type of event that might, in the opinion of the Town Board, qualify.

Connors gave a short report of recent actions of the Town Board. The report included information that the TB is reviewing the proposed resolution regarding the National Defense Authorization Act. This will be acted on at the next TB meeting. The TB is also reviewing options regarding enacting a Veteran's property tax exemption.

Connors posed the idea of holding another joint TB/PB meeting to review activities and needs for the coming year. It was suggested that this be held during a Planning Board meeting and might include a presentation that could include something that would qualify as training for the board members. Beeners suggested someone from Sustainable Tompkins and other related organizations.

Presentation Report: NYS Taxation Issues Related to Gas Drilling

Halton, Kruppa, and Crane gave a short report of information presented by the Tompkins County Council of Governments Task Force on Gas Drilling earlier that evening. Connors made copies of a two page hand-out for members of the PB. A major issue will be the lag time of several years between the cost to local communities (e.g. road repairs, emergency services, health impacts, water testing, criminal justice costs, etc.) and any revenue realized through various taxes. Current systems for taxing gas production are not sufficient. NYS currently taxes gas extraction through an ad valorem property tax that is collected after the gas is sold. New, accurate, and verifiable methods of measuring gas are required for fair taxation (Gas production is currently self-reported by companies with no independent verification of meter accuracy or other product information). These problems make it difficult for government agencies to budget around drilling issues. TCCOG presented a series of recommendations which may be considered by the Town and Planning Boards.

Approve Minutes

RESOLUTION NO. 9 OF 2012 - APPROVE MINUTES

Resolved, that the Planning Board of the Town of Danby approves the minutes of February 23, 2012.

Moved by Strichartz, Second by Klingensmith.

In Favor: Gagnon, Klingensmith, Kruppa, Strichartz, Roe

Abstain: Selin

Chair Roe closed the Meeting and opened a Work Session at 7:28 pm

Comprehensive Plan Work Session

The PB discussed a work plan for reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and Hamlet Plan. Beeners suggested that the PB consider what the current critical issues are for the Danby community. The discussion started with an overall view of how the PB will approach Comp. Plan review. This started with a brief history of how the Danby Comprehensive Plan was developed and structured.

The PB is leaning toward using the existing Comp. Plan as a base structure for the planned revision. Copies of the most recent Danby Comprehensive Plan (including the 2011 amendment on high impact industrial activity) were distributed to the PB. A prime question is whether "Sustainable Community/Energy Use" might be a new section, incorporated in each section (as appropriate), or some combination of both. Beeners suggested that the "Planning Use Consideration" part of each section could be a good place for updates to be added. The Planning Use Consideration sections could then be used as an executive summary of the updated Comp. Plan.

There was a discussion regarding when the public gets involved in the process. Previously, the community was asked for input through a survey at the beginning of the process. There was a suggestion that upcoming meetings could include a public comment session on critical issues for each section of the Plan. There was interest in following up on both plans.

Each member of the Planning Board expressed his/her preference for a section for their focus. *Agriculture* will be reviewed by Strichartz and Halton. *Natural Resources* will be reviewed by Klingensmith, in conjunction with her work on CEA designations. *Utilities and Communications* will be reviewed by Selin. *Housing and Transportation* will be reviewed by Gagnon. *Cultural and Historic Resources* will be reviewed by Melchen (if he is willing). *Community Services* will be reviewed by Kruppa. *Economy* will be reviewed by Roe, with assistance from Strichartz. *Land Use* may be considered as part of other sections or may be dropped. PB members may consult with each other on various subjects.

Gagnon suggested that each board member review their section and come back to the Board with a set of proposed Planning Considerations. There was a related discussion in getting experts related to each section to come and speak to the PB. Different topics will require different approaches. A first step will be preliminary review and short reports on the main issues for each section.

Hamlet Action Plan

Joel gave an update on the research/study he has done in the current zoning ordinance in terms of what gets in the way of cluster or multi-use development. He suggests that some things could be fixed with zoning changes, but that there are other overriding issues. Most of the new development, even in the hamlet, has been of sprawl nature. There needs to be a method to locate homes and businesses in such a way that they relate to other development. Gagnon also noted that there's currently not much of an incentive to direct development into clustered areas. He suggests that an effort needs to be made to think about what could be done and where.

There was a discussion about how to frame this consideration. Klingensmith asked whether there was still interest in trying to figure this out? Is there a reason to support increased density in an area of Danby? Strichartz expressed skepticism regarding people wanting to live in dense areas. Others raised the examples of EcoVillage and Fieldstone Circle where people seem to be happy to live in

closer proximity. Patton raised the possibility that housing pressure may come with gas drilling in neighboring areas. This raised the question of zoning to prevent 1-2 acre housing developments.

The idea of a hamlet oriented “floating zone” for mixed use was discussed at some length. This extended into further discussion about engineered water and sewer systems. Kruppa spoke to the difficulties of doing so while saying that the County Health Department was willing to be open minded.

There seemed to be consensus to exploring mixed-use zoning for a specific area, zoning to make it more difficult to create sprawling housing developments, and septic requirements for quarter acre density development such as the “cottage cluster” development proposal which met with some support from the community. Kruppa will do more review before the next PB meeting.

Climate/Energy Action Plan

Beeners and Patton gave a brief presentation about an outline Climate/Energy Action Plan drafted by Patton. Beeners encouraged the PB to review this as a possible unifying framework for reviewing the existing Comp. Plan in regards these issues.

Intern Proposal

Beeners raised the option of the PB making use of a Summer intern for 10-20 hours a week over ten weeks. The intern could come with GIS, project management, public engagement, and writing skills. After a discussion and some questions and answers, the PB declined engaging an intern at this time. Members of the Board thought that it was too early in the process of Comp. Plan review to effectively use an intern.

Adjournment

The Work Session/Meeting was adjourned at 9:12pm.

Pamela S Goddard, Planning Board Secretary