

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2013
 7:11 p.m. - TOWN HALL - 1529 NYS RTE 12
 BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK 13901

PRESENT: Cynthia Paddick - Chairwoman
 Judy Snyder
 Messer: Donnelly and Bernard

ALSO, PRESENT: Alex Urda P.E. - Town Engineer
 Russell Hemedinger - Town Board Member

ABSENT: Thomas Geisenhof- Assessor & Building/Code Inspector
 Gene Hulbert, Jr. - Town Board Member
 Raymond Warren- Planning Board Member
 John Barrett- Appointed Resident Member

The meeting convened at 7:11 p.m., at which time Mrs. Paddick called the meeting to order and welcomed the audience. First order of business is the approval of the minutes from the August 25, 2013, Comprehensive Plan meeting.

No one was prepared for this meeting to take any actions. September minutes to be approved on October 28, 2013, the regular Planning Board Comprehensive Plan meeting.

Mr. Hemedinger stated this is an informational meeting only to discuss the new zoning district classification, setbacks and area requirements along with the combination of the Commercial Development (CD) and Planned Development Commercial District. (Pdd-c) and with their setbacks and area requirements.

The next meeting on October 28, 2013, hopefully we will have a guest speaker to discuss the size of drill pads, well heads, etc. still waiting on confirmation from someone.

Summary of last month's recommendations were

- Eliminate the Planned Development District Community Service (Pdd-CS)
- Eliminate the Planned Development District Recreational (Pdd-R)
- Combine Commercial Development (CD) and Planned Development Commercial District (Pdd-c)
- Create a new mixed commercial business district

The Board reviewed the permitted uses for the new Zoning Classification from Rte 12A to Prentice/Port Road list as follows:

Permitted Uses

Principal

1. Enclosed warehousing and wholesale establishments
2. Office building, community center, private recreation
3. Medical professional building
 Veterinary office
4. Building contractors office, indoor material storage/equipment & sales
5. Wood fabrication shops
 No Outdoor displays and sales

- 6. Printing establishments
- 7. Indoor Machinery & equipment sales & service (removed from PDD-C)
- 8. Warehouse & storage in association with business office use
- 9. Home occupations
 - Beautician
 - Accountant
 - Crafts
 - Counseling
 - Consultant
- Uses permitted with special permit (Article IV §73-12)
- Amusement Center
- Public Utilities

Private club was removed and changed to private recreation.

Aleta Kinne resident of Port Road asked if a Casino would be considered private recreation.

Mrs. Paddick said they would require a special use permit.

Mr. Hemedinger wasn't sure if this would fall under private recreation, they will have to discuss that at a later date.

New Zoning Classification for the area from Rte 12A to Prentice/Port Rd.

Lot Size	Width	Principal Use			Accessory Use		
		Front	Side	Rear	Front behind	Side	Rear
1 acre	175'	50'	20'	25'	principal use	20'	20'

**Maximum Lot Coverage 60 percent
With 10 foot landscape buffer**

Mr. Urda stated they consider a side buffers to prohibit paving to the property line.

Mrs. Snyder suggested having parking and deliveries in the rear of the commercial business only to have it more harmonious for the resident's in the area.

Mr. Bernard felt the fifty foot front setback was huge and could possibly impact the parking in the rear. They may want to reconsider front yard setback.

Mrs. Paddick said they should be aware of the right-of-way on both sides which varies, with one side being larger; this will impact the front yard setback. They could consider having a few parking spaces in the front of the business for quick drops off and such.

Mr. Hemedinger stated they will also have to tackle the building height and signage for the new district at a later date.

The Board agreed with the new setback dimensions and the landscape buffer of 10 ft and to include parking and deliveries behind the principal structure.

Combining Commercial District (CD) and Planned Development Commercial (Pdd-c)

Currently	Lot Size		Principal Use			Accessory Use		
	Area	Width	Front	Side	Rear	Front	Side	Rear
CD	12,000	100'	35'	15'	15'	behind principal use	5'	5'
Pdd-C	6 acres	350'	30'	20'	25'	same	10'	25'
Combined	½ acre	35'	15'	15'	15'	same	10'	25'

Maximum lot coverage for all districts is 60 percent.

Mrs. Snyder suggested making the rear yard setback for the accessory use to match the principal use of fifteen feet or change it to twenty-five feet for both, but make it consistent either way.

The Board agreed for the combination district the rear yard setback should be fifteen feet for both the principal structure and accessory structure.

Everything else was fine for the combination of the Commercial District and Planned Development Commercial District.

Eric Jonson, resident of 1006 Castle Creek Road, stated he was unable to attend Septembers Comprehensive Plan meeting. However, I did attend the August meeting and while reading the August minutes noticed my comments regarding option number for energy development were not included. I would like to read my comments along with some my additional comments, so they can be added the minutes.

Attached is Mr. Johnson letter regarding his comments and concerns.

There being no further discussion a motion was made by Mrs. Snyder, seconded by Mr. Donnelly to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Aurelio
Ordinance Secretary

RECEIVED

Eric Johnson
1006 Castle Creek Rd
Binghamton, NY 13901

OCT 15 2013

October 15, 2013

TOWN OF CHENANGO
ORDINANCE/ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

I was unable to attend the September meeting for the comprehensive plan, but did read the minutes of the August meeting which I attended. I did notice that the comments that I made at the end of the meeting, because we were not allowed to participate in the board discussion, were not included in the minutes.

I would like to restate those comments regarding Option 4 for "Energy Development" zoning.

A 1 mile radius around an Energy Development is much too large. This 1 mile radius would encompass over 2,100 acres or over 10 % of the Town for a single energy development. There are only 21,000 acres the Town. You couldn't see the proposed location for Energy Development a mile away in many areas of the Town because of topography. Considering that a natural gas well pad is only about 5 acres, you are expanding the area to be addressed in this option over 400 times. This large an area seems to be exceedingly over stated and excessive.

The voting process seems to be very cumbersome, unwieldy and unmanageable. Especially since the Town will make no effort to ensure substantial participation in the voting. Voting based on assessed value will favor those high value, small acreage parcels. Expensive homes on less than 5 acres will receive more representation than larger areas of rural, agricultural or forested land that have a much lower per acre value.

Voting based on voter registration seems equally unfair when you consider that someone with more acreage, say a farmer that has been paying Town taxes for 50 to 60 years will have the same vote as someone that has just moved into an apartment from outside the Town and has never paid a cent in taxes. How can you tell someone who has been a responsible landowner over an extended period of time, paid their taxes, contributed to the community, that they no longer have the ability to decide how they will use their land?

I thought the purpose of zoning was to provide a structure and framework to allow development to occur without the direct influence of politics. Having the Town Board make the final decision turns the entire process into a purely political one. I thought the rules and regulations were supposed to be fairly applied, not just grounds for political games and power grabbing.

The existing zoning process has applied to every homeowner, rural landowner, commercial business or industry currently in the Town or looking to move in for a long time. These same rules should apply to any energy development businesses that want to be in the Town.

I firmly believe that this is not a viable, reasonable or fair option from many viewpoints.