

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose: Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) Meeting #16
Date and Time: June 23, 2014
Location: City Recreation Center Community Room, 15 Vanderbilt Avenue
Attendees: See attached Sign-In

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
<p>Item #1 Public Comment on Agenda</p>	<p>Comment #1: Concern about added commercial language by Committee Chair. Thanked City and Chair for taking time in the past few weeks to discuss more. Spoke out against Commercial nodes in residential areas (CN's). There isn't a definition for 'node', public doesn't know what it means. Did contact Secretary of State, none of this is necessary to protect City against Law Suit</p> <p>Comment #2: [Submitted letters from neighbors who couldn't make the meeting] Looking to keep residential neighborhoods residential, please do not allow density or nodes beyond what exists. Residential neighborhoods are saturated, already walkable, and already have nice corner stores.</p> <p>Comment #3: Keep everything residential. Does not want commercial nodes in residential areas.</p> <p>Comment #3: Thanked City and Chair for meeting with her. Concern with the lack of press; hardly any notices go out. People's private lives will be affected by this and they need to know. Against home office, too broad, don't know what occupation will be. Just another way of saying commercial. Don't agree with activity nodes, things get grandfathered in as is. Nodes are going to be commercial expansion into residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Keep in mind when discussing and revising land use</p>

	<p>Comment #4: Against expansion, think there's still so much room elsewhere for commercial. Moved from NYC and there is something special about Saratoga. There is much confusion in process (nodes, definitions). Please keep the City the way it is.</p> <p>Comment #5: CPC draft and vote on language for RN's and CN's that keeps these areas residential. Alright with existing businesses but does not want expansion throughout. Responsibility of CPC to respect and stand for residents' opinions and desires.</p> <p>Comment #6: Lived here 22 years and have seen a lot of changes. Keep residential areas (RN and CN) residential. Saratoga is expanding, exponentially and people are perturbed. Even New homes going in don't have yards any more. Would like to see residential areas keep green space.</p> <p>Comment #7: Concerned about residential areas becoming being inundated with cars and ugly structures. Likes Saratoga the way it is now, even with changes. City should address dilapidated houses and eyesores.</p> <p>Comment #8: Please don't support the Chair's proposal; please support Mr. Denny's language but also take nodes out.</p> <p>Comment #9: Showed what existing zoning allowed for on the Saratoga National property. Ideally would like to condense development in the interior property and leave the remaining as open space. Creates economic sustainable feature for this area. CPC is prohibiting path to complete project. Would like to have open discussion. Had discussion last time but had no consensus.</p> <p>Comment #10: On proposed future land use map the Yaddo property east of Northway was reclassified from CDD to Institutional. Why? Suggest give real consideration to why it is needed? Saratoga National views themselves as custodians of greenbelt. Built 25 acres of wetlands and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>\$15,000 on Lake Lonely for water flow.</p> <p>Comment #11: Requesting density cap change for plateau area back to MDR-1 to be consistent with rest of plateau, adjacent area, and other neighborhoods there. Was changed last comp plan without any notification.</p> <p>Comment #12: Sometimes you need to develop property to preserve. Proposal is to maintain park-like setting similar to Spa State Park. Would be same density, just concentrated, not sprawling. Looking for path to do this project.</p> <p>Comment #13: Comp Plan isn't about land owners, or specific projects.</p> <p>Comment #14: Comments made at the last CPC meeting were wrong; people are misleading CPC members. Need to deal with facts, not opinions when making decisions on land use. Trying to do really good job and want to preserve land.</p>	
<p>Item #2 Update from City</p>	<p>The Deputy Mayor addressed the public and CPC. This is the 16th meeting. Thanked everyone for all the hard work. Knows everyone is busy folks and sit on many boards in the City. Tonight will be last CPC meeting for now. City has asked MJ to compile all documents to date and put together draft Plan to be distributed by Friday July 18th. The CPC will meet again on September 8th.</p>	<p>MJ to prepare Draft Plan</p>
<p>Item #3 Future Land Use – General Discussion</p>	<p>A member looked at 2001 Comp Plan where there are currently no definitions, other than SDA's. Definitions are really a function of zoning, may be beyond CPC's responsibilities. The member suggested the Consultants come up with general language for the definitions and it can be reviewed in September.</p> <p>Tasked with updating the 2001 Plan, but we are WAY out of scope now. Heard a lot of very valuable input from neighbors. Suggests keeping it simple like the 2001 Plan.</p> <p>The Chair pointed out the current SDA definitions are very detailed. Firm believer some kind of description, level of intensity, and use should be included. This serves as guidance for zoning which has to be in compliance with Comp Plan.</p> <p>City – From a planning perspective, some definition is</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>very important to create framework.</p> <p>Doesn't know how we go further without gathering consensus.</p> <p>Two issues: land use areas on map and the definitions. Definitions are fine, pending Committee agreement, but how does that translate to the map. If area conforms with Vision, don't change it. Why are we changing some things (i.e. adding Equine)? Actions and Visions should determine change.</p> <p>2001 Plan was inconsistent, seemed bizarre to have definitions for some land uses but not others.</p> <p>CPC is closer to finalizing map than definitions. Didn't know meetings were happening with residents. Would like to know what's been discussed. Start with consensus on map.</p>	
<p>Item #4 Future Land Use – Map</p>	<p>East/West side Parks don't need to be dedicated, they ARE recreational in use.</p> <p>Tom Denny motioned to change East/West parks to Parks and Recreation. Charles Wait seconded. CPC unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Leave Newman Center as is (HDR, will now be CRN-1)</p> <p>Change the area east of the Northway back to CDD (got changed to Institutional per last meeting)</p> <p>Crescent/Jefferson area – Motion to change, after CPC discussion decided no change to be made.</p> <p>Property near Saratoga Lake proposed as SG- would CMU be a better, more flexible option? Both SG and CMU allow for residential or commercial. Area has a history of being commercial. Leave as SG designation.</p> <p>Owe it to folks who own the arrowhead property to discuss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we have record of why it was changed during 2001 Comp Plan? Why are adjacent areas different? City – they are PUDs. What was intent of 2001 Committee? • It's vacant land; should allow development but with conservation in mind. When was it decided PUD's are not allowed in the CDD? 1990. • Trying to come to consensus and will have difference in opinions. What is best for the City and taxbase? • Agrees, doesn't think it will destroy rural character. • Promote, give bonus to those who want to donate? Zoning does provide provision for bonus with open 	<p>Consultant to make revisions to Future Land Use Map</p>

	<p>space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems appropriate for City council to decide • Need to provide path for these folks. PUDs go to elected officials for a rigorous review process. It seems appropriate for sensitive areas to go before the City Council. PUDs provide opportunity, not permission. • Todd motioned to change to RN-1, Sonny seconded. Motion was voted down with 5 in favor and 6 against. <p>North side of Union was changed to Equestrian after last meeting. Keep as Equestrian.</p>	
<p>Item #5 Future Land Use – Activity Nodes</p>	<p>Chair clarified that activity nodes were not intended to have definitions, but simply meant to be an overlay. Had seen in the City of Albany’s Plan and thought it was cool.</p> <p>The word “node” creates a lot of confusion at this point, with both CPC and Public.</p> <p>Sonny motioned to remove discussion of nodes.</p> <p>Thought nodes were a circle to illustrate where other uses are desired?</p> <p>City – originally intended as small areas where things occur. Then became where potential activity other than residential could occur. How does it impact the descriptions of land uses?</p> <p>Don’t change anything; lives in an “activity node” with a church, school and deli which were grandfathered in. People are happy with how it functions currently.</p> <p>What if one of the uses that was grandfathered in gets sold? The pre-existing use is still allowed, unless closed for longer than a year.</p> <p>Devin seconded Sonny’s motion. The CPC unanimously agreed.</p>	None
<p>Item #6 Future Land Use – Country Overlay</p>	<p>Devin motioned to keep as is and move on.</p> <p>Suggests Consultants clean up Country Overlay and give back to CPC for review.</p> <p>Motion was accepted unanimously.</p> <p>The race tracks should appear in Country Overlay.</p> <p>There are existing inconsistencies between the map and text in Plan. The text should override.</p>	Consultant to create Country Overlay Map
<p>Item #7 Review of Next</p>	<p>Consultant will draft almost entire Comp Plan with the</p>	

<p>Steps</p>	<p>exception of the Implementation Section.</p> <p>Need consensus on actual land use categories.</p> <p>Committee confirmed they are comfortable with the proposed land use category names. (including “residential” added to Core Residential Neighborhood)</p> <p>Would like to see a table of previous and proposed land use categories, including density</p> <p>Explain what changes have been made.</p> <p>Consultant should use judgment and not be overly restrictive.</p> <p>Consultant will send the Draft Plan to the City who will distribute to CPC. Comments and feedback will be collected and another draft will be issued near the end of August. This draft will be reviewed and discussed at the September 8th meeting.</p> <p>Who makes decisions on which comments get addressed and how? City to work with Consultant.</p> <p>A few members expressed they did not want language from the Chair’s proposal in the document (Item 3.C)</p> <p>City will take a look at what is currently in the Plan and consult legal staff to determine what is absolutely required.</p> <p>Todd motioned to keep meeting quorum at 9 members. (Has been happening, but would like to formalize) Devin seconded it. Committee was unanimously in favor.</p>	
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Comment #1: If CPC will receive draft for their comment, how does Public get draft and comment? <i>City website, calendar or call.</i></p> <p>Comment #2: Thank you for supporting public that has continuously come out to speak. Thank you for no nodes. However feels left hanging, doesn’t have final land use language. Use “residential”, not what Chair has proposed. Does support Mr. Denny’s “retaining current, but considerable protection.”</p> <p>Comment #3: When a land use attorney is presenting proposal, they often refer back to Comp Plan. Home occupation could be anything. Big thank you to everyone.</p>	<p>Keep in mind when preparing draft Comp Plan</p>

	<p>Comment #4: Thanked everyone for serving. Fiscal impacts have not been discussed. Town of Guilderland used fiscal model to compare land use decisions. Changing land uses will impact City's economy.</p> <p>Comment #5: Thanked Committee for taking time to discuss potential rezone of property. Of course, disappointed very close vote. Will take time to talk to 1990 committee, to understand why the land use was changed then.</p>	
--	--	--

This meeting summary conveys our understanding of the items discussed and agreements reached at this meeting. Please forward any additions, corrections and/or questions to my attention.

Submitted by:

Jaclyn Hakes / Sarah Quandt
MJ Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
cc: City Planning Staff, CPC, File

DRAFT



**City of Saratoga Springs
Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Meeting #16
June 23, 2014, 6:00 - 8:30 pm
City Recreation Center Community Room**

Please Sign In

Name	Affiliation	Address	Email
Frank Capone	home owner	119 Grand Ave	fk7230@gmail.com
Ted Orosz		77 Belmont Drive	TedVorosz@gmail.com