

**COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 1**

Supervisor Louis opened the continuation of the public hearing of proposed Local Law 4 of 2008 at 7:30 pm, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Also attending: Councilwoman McKeon, Councilmen Kuenster, Norris, and Byas, Attorney for the Town Wukitsch, Town Clerk Brooks, Tax Collector Stuart, and 64 members of the public. Absent: Highway Superintendent Jordan.

Supervisor stated that this was a continuation of the public hearing held on Monday, November 3, 2008: proposed Local Law 4 of 2008 provided for revisions to the Town's Zoning Ordinance. He added that there were sign-up sheets in the back, and preference would be given to those who did not speak on Monday, followed by those who did speak on Monday.

Ron Hofaker—I am a property owner in New Baltimore for 22 years, I feel compelled to apologize to my neighbors; I must confess to being among the purported 30% who responded to the cleverly executed survey. At the time I thought it to be a genuine request for neighbourly input. I hadn't the slightest inkling that it was carefully structured questionnaire designed to be manipulated to an end. The wiser 70%, content with the status quo, did not supply the Board with responses like mine that were twisted and convoluted to make it appear the responders endorsed zoning changes. It is my opinion that the majority of those who are here tonight are as I am attempting to stop the totalitarian implementation of any zoning changes.

John Degnen- Thank-you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. I've lived in the Town 40+ years, built a home here, raised my family and my children consequently have also built homes and are raising their families here. I am also part owner of commercial piece of property on 9W. I have participated for 20+ years in elected office and various Town programs. I really want to talk about the commercial property on 9W. The Thruway exit 21B went in we expected explosion of growth to occur at that time; it did not happen. We developed a Comprehensive Plan then, and instituted zoning as we know it today to control the growth and expansion that did not happen to the expected levels. In 1967, the Town missed an opportunity have water on Route 9W. Coxsackie was building a new reservoir in District 3 and conversation took place about a pipeline from Scheller Park up the 9W Corridor. Imagine cost. Present zoning maintains control and to this day we still have no great development in 9W. I support the Greene IDA proposals for the 9W Commercial Corridor. However, I feel that commercial property near IDA proposal there is a certain amount of control required by the IDA to bring in the destination retailer. That control being who can develop outside is not direct competition. I urge the Board to rescind the new zoning for the 9W and leave zoning straight commercial as is.

Greg Ziccardi - Thank you for letting me speak. I own 281 acres, bought for recreational purposes and retirement. I find it very awkward that I stand in this room, beside the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, the First President, on the day after we elected a new president, and the Town Board would tell me what I can and cannot do with my own property. That you want me to pay my taxes on time, which are exorbitant by the way, and then you want to tell me that I have to set a certain amount of property aside that I cannot do anything at all with it, that its just got to be there for beauty, is anyone on the Board own acreage? And you are for this? You want someone to tell you what you and your grandchildren can do with your land? I don't understand; as far as mailings, I'm an out-of-town landlord. I don't get any mailings sent to me, I don't get my tax bill sent to the proper address. You try to turn around and tell me that I cannot do what I want with my own land. Vote no to Local Law 4 and 5 and I hope that everyone else in here does.

Tom Sterritt -Thank you, guys, for giving us the opportunity to speak and be heard. I'm primarily here to speak on behalf of the business community. I would briefly like to address the issues of concern of the landowners and conservation subdivision. I can't put it any simpler than just wrong. The ownership is the basis of liberty. We have the Constitution right here that puts forth that idea. For any government body to pass laws that infringe on that liberty goes against the basic foundations of our country. I also believe that when a small group of people, in this case the Town of New Baltimore, is

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 2

actively seeking to acquire the property of others by the passage of laws without providing the proper compensation is morally wrong, not to mention reprehensible. Let me briefly touch on property taxes. I think everybody here has gotten mailings from the various political people running for office. Almost every piece of political advertising I received within it was a paragraph on property taxes using crushing/burdensome/driving people from their homes. I believe we need to reduce property taxes in general. We certainly don't need to be reducing taxable properties. As far as the Zoning, how it relates to businesses, my name is Tom Sterritt. I own and operate Tri-County Truck and Trailer Repair and have been doing business in New Baltimore since 1990. I feel I can speak with some authority on the issues having been before Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning Board in the last 8 years regarding two separate commercial projects. First project was a 3,200 square foot building, today owned by Dale Hitchcock of Albany Tank Services, which employs 15 people and has an annual payroll of \$700,000. The second project was a 4800 square foot building that houses my business, 2 full-time and 3 part-time employees, and an annual payroll of \$200,000. I also collect sales tax for the State in the neighbourhood of \$10-12,000/year, not to mention the property taxes you collect. Several jobs resulted available to local people and more tax revenue. From what I understand neither project would have been viable under the proposed zoning; neither project would have been completed, no jobs and no tax revenue. I had a conversation with David [Louis] after a recent meeting; the Board needs to be very careful asking the question, "How does a potential proposal benefit the Town?" Not sure how much this has to do with it, but I just want to say it. Very few proposals will benefit the Town directly, outside the realm of jobs and tax base. The Town does not directly benefit from a truck repair shop. Nor a trucking company that my family owns here in the Town. But I'm sure most of the citizens of this Town have visited Albany Medical Center or St. Peters Hospitals. Parking garage structures at both facilities were built using KIT Transportation as the trucker, Tri-County Truck and Trailer Repair built all the apparatus used to safely ship the various pieces to the job sites. Again, these companies do not directly benefit the Town but indirectly they do to a great extent. I'd also like to reiterate the concerns of others when questioning the fairness and legitimacy of this process. I believe the protocol was not properly adhered to. I don't think an adequate enough cross section of the people was included in the drafting of the proposal. I also believe when you have two people voting on something that they themselves wrote to me that screams of a conflict of interest and if it doesn't there is no such thing. Who would not love to have the boss hand them the checkbook and say here you decide what I should pay. You wouldn't be in business very long, especially with the guys I have working for me. I would end my statement with this, as stated before, the Town Board has the final say in the proposal. I would like to challenge each Board member to poll the community and cast your vote based on the will of the citizens of the Town of New Baltimore, not on the desires of a few powerful individuals.

Karen Bulich Moreau- Attachment #1b

Peter Zacek Up to now all I heard is I. Singular, I. "I brought land over here for recreational purposes. I don't get my mailings." Well, I got land here, two generations worth. I think of all of us. I had another land buyer buy 500 acres right next to me, that man right there, David Louis, was helpful stopping him from putting in a landfill which this whole Town ought to thank this man, your land would have been garbage.

David Louis Peter, would you just address the Board?

Peter Zacek I apologize, I'm a little caught up in this. So I thank the Board for being what they are. Not everyone is going to agree with everything, but what I hear I don't think they got all the information; I don't know if it's your fault, I don't know if you spelled it out in their terms. Everybody thinks you're going to rape and pillage, I don't think that's the case, I just think it's misinformation. These are all good people; they are all here because they are worried- the economy. This is their legacy, what they are banking on. And all of a sudden it might not be, they lost on taxes, they lost on savings, they lost their jobs and now their final threshold their property this is what they've been holding for- I don't think you guys are in the business of hold people up and stealing their land. I just think you should spell it out in layman's terms.

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 3

Donna Carlson- Attachment #2

Jeff Carlson- Attachment #3

Rich Guthrie- Attachment #4

Charlotte Carter- Attachment #5

Ted Hilscher Board members, I'd like to face out to the audience...

David Louis Ted, I'm gonna ask you to address us; I'd like to be consistent with the rules.

Ted Hilscher I see some taxpayers out here.

David Louis But this is a hearing, you're expressing your comments to the Board

Ted Hilscher I do see some taxpayers here, and I want to talk about taxes. I am in favour of the conservation language in the proposed zoning law and I'll tell you why I am and why it's beneficial maybe not to everybody in this room but to almost everybody in this room. I know that taxes never go down. I know our taxes are very very high. But what I want to talk about and what I want you to consider

David Louis We pay taxes up here, too.

Ted Hilscher But there's more of us out here. Tax control, I am in favour of the commercial development of US Route 9W. I think that's where we need to go to build our tax base. But one of the things I like about this Conservation language, it will limit the number of houses that will spring up in District 3 and District 4 in the countryside, it will not prohibit houses being built in the future, but it will, if adopted, prohibit some of the houses that would have been built but for the adoption of this language. Why is that good? Well, when houses get built, the people who live there send kids to school, that costs money, drive on the roads, which create the need for maintenance, the people in those new houses if we have unrestricted development they require police service, fire services, that cost money. The amount of taxes that houses pay doesn't cover the cost of services that the people require who live in those houses. That's been proven. So when you have houses go in, your taxes go up. That's why I'd like to see residential development not go totally unrestricted. We'll never prevent new houses going in. And people who own large chunks of property, I've been here 19 years, I own 80 acres, I'm worried about my taxes. Will the taxes go down, no. But they will they go up a larger extent than they need to go up if we have unrestricted development. When you have unrestricted development all of us in this room are going to suffer from higher taxes. That's why this is beneficial to most of the people in this Town and most of the people in this room. Thank-you.

Eileen Vosburgh I live in the hamlet and own a small piece of property just 36 acres in District 2. I know many of the people who were on this committee for the proposal. These are community-minded people, who openly ask for input throughout the process through open meetings, surveys and mailings at home. I believe this has been a bi-partisan process which has repeatedly modified these plans based on public feedback. Forty years ago when I was a kid I remember people talking about zoning, it was a hot issue then. It's a hot issue now. And on those 36 acres in District 2 that we own I also wouldn't want anyone to tell me what to do there. But when my husband and I pass on and somebody else purchases that property, I would want to know that the new people coming in that bought that property wouldn't hurt it and further wouldn't put something in there that would hurt my neighbors. Development is coming, as Mr. Turan said, and we have an opportunity now here to either have a voice in it or have some big developer who doesn't care about our community in New Baltimore to make those decisions. Nobody likes to be told what to do but we have to be smart about this, we have to have a plan.

Steve Bush I own commercial property in Town 25 years now, pay good taxes on it. And it's an investment in my future, hate to be selfish, but thinking about my future. I don't presently run a business there but in the future I would like to. You have me restricted by Center Commercial, which takes my little piece and limits me to do absolutely nothing, to raise livestock, agriculture. I've been in automotive business 25 years; I'd like to retire in it. My future is in your hands. Like everyone said, our real estate values up and down, our 401K's are in the toilet. Think about us.

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 4

Nicole Anatriello I have a vested interest in this community. I am a property owner and I own Access Safety Products on 9W. I'd like to comment on the proposed zoning changes. I purchased a piece of commercial property on 9W in Hannacroix and so far the property has proved itself and I am very pleased with decision to move business here. I'm having a tough time understanding why business owners, the small handful we have here, are being subject to this harassment. In economic crisis, why wouldn't our town support businesses? I've been told time and again it is not the homeowners who bring in the tax dollars yet the businesses that generate the positive result. As one individual expressed Monday night we business owners need to have the flexibility to change with the times to keep our businesses going for the next generation. We need the flexibility so if we have to sell we look attractive to prospective buyers. I feel these changes will affect the business community in a negative way. If we start losing businesses, who will pick up tax burden? The homeowners? I really don't think the homeowners could handle it. I've been to a few of these meetings now and not once have I had the feeling of assurance or confidence nor was I handed any graph, statistics, or documentation to strongly support these proposed changes. More important I was not approached as a business owner or a woman in business. Did you have to come to me? No, you did not but the Township should be for the people, with the people, about the people. I was told by one individual here at one of the previous meetings that we can only guess and implement this and see what the ending results will be, the future cannot be predicted. As I have expressed before, this is our livelihood, we do not depend on Albany or another community to put food on our tables. Maybe one of the Board members would like to visit my home and explain to my three children what will happen if things don't play out according to their plan. I think we fail to remember that small businesses are just that. We can't handle these large restrictions and the ending results may prove to be negative and permanent. It's bad enough going through Hannacroix with the poor, suppressed feeling I get when I drive down that long stretch of Commercial District. 9W is a Commercial District. Just stand out there some day and see the large number of trucks that travel that road. You may be amazed. We should be thinking positively about economic development helping the small business owners. They're the ones giving back to the community by helping with the taxes. I don't see where attracting more businesses to the area on 9W, our Commercial District, will hurt the landscape and integrity of the land. This is what the property was intended for: Commercial. Furthermore, why are the very Board members that designed and created this idea allowing themselves to vote on their very own creation? Why wouldn't they vote in favour of something they created? This seems like a social responsibility to the community to step down from this voting process. How could you move forward on this proposed plan when there are so many who are dissatisfied with it? In conclusion, nothing lasts forever. Including those very seats we the people have put you in. When you have gone and left those seats for whatever reason, the people will still be here to deal with what you have done. You need now to listen to the people. I also want to say that I came from a community where the taxes were 40% less than what I am paying here and they seem to afford a plan of televising the meetings so the whole community know exactly what is going on especially the business owners who work long days and do not make these meetings. They seem to lay everything out in black and white and there is no hidden agenda. Lastly, I incorporated my business last year and own 90% of the business. I did not realize I should have divided up amongst the Board member the other 10% they feel they need to tell me exactly what I can and cannot do with my business. We business owners put everything we have into our businesses and we expect 100% results out of it. I am not for this proposed zoning change and I urge you to consider this and the negative impact it will have on our business district.

Rob VanEtten I've lived in the Town all my life, and my wife and I love the countryside and hope that the character will remain for many generations. After Central Hudson cut a swath through our land for the power lines it about brought tears to our eyes to see what had happened. We were told that our existing zoning couldn't help us. I don't see where the proposed document would be any improvement. Despite loving the countryside, I don't [want] any changes. I don't think we should look across the fence line to tell our neighbours how to live. Our current zoning, as it should, insures that our

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 5

neighbors won't do something to create health or safety issues. This, along with good stewardship of the land, has made the Town as special as it is. So, if it is not broke, don't fix it.

Kevin Kemnah I've been a resident for 24 years. For the most part I sit back, you people do your jobs, do good job for the most part. I realize we do need some kind of rules to be governed by, which we already have. Now, I was away for four months because I just retired, and I just returned. I had read in the Newsletter, until a couple of days ago I stopped at the Town Clerk and got the full copies of Local Laws 4 and 5; reading through them sounds more like you want a gated community than a Town. It tells you here there is a prohibition on travel trailers that you can't park between your house and the road. Well, I have blacktop driveway between my house and the road; that's the only place I can park it. Where else would you like me to park it? Then, let's say I sell my house, but keep the rest of my property, go to Florida with my travel trailer/RV for 6 months and come back to New Baltimore for 6 months in the good weather, I have to come to you for a permit to park my camper for 45 days on my property that I pay tax on? I don't think so. You asked for specifics. The Planning Board may require when it deems necessary, the attorney and other people spoke about this new conservation and all the rules on made subdivisions; big changes. But now, just on minor subdivisions, they may deem it necessary for you to follow all requirements of major subdivision. So now, if you're doing a minor subdivision, how are you going to put 50% of that away and why would you want to give 50% of your property to anybody if you worked and paid for it? I think you should just vote NO. We already have zoning; it's good enough. If you want to make some changes, fine, but some of these are crazy; you want a gated community not a Town.

Meave Tooher I did participate in this process for writing these local laws. Although I am going to address the Board, I do feel compelled to address a couple of the issues that have been repeatedly raised, one of which has been someone impugning the integrity of David and Arlene for participating in this process and then being members of the Board that will vote on it. If you would please think of all of our legislators, who write all of our laws, they then vote as members of the legislature on those same laws. That is the process in this country and in this Town. There is no conflict, inherent or otherwise, in doing that. They are two votes that they get to vote of the number of members on the Board; there is nothing in any way conflicted by them participating in the process. For all of us who participated in the process and for the members of the Town that participated in this process you have been and continue to be given a voice, that's the point of these public hearings. It's not about impugning people's integrities or questioning the motives with which people act, it is the process by which we as a Town act. I was asked to participate in this process because I am a member of Zoning Board of Appeals, and now the Chair of the ZBA. I will tell you, that some of our zoning laws do not work. A number of you business members have come before us on the ZBA asking for permission to engage in certain activities and we have been constrained by poor definitions, poor guidance in the law, we have had to consult with our Town Attorney on occasion for clarification. The zoning is in place but it does need modification. The issues that you bring to the Board now, that we all bring to the Board, concern the ownership of property. I do own property in the Town; it is somewhat under 50 acres but I take very seriously that property and my use of it. The conservation subdivision is a concept that this Town is exploring to help preserve the property; it has not been carved in stone. In fact, that is the reason for these meetings and for your comments, to give the people who are working on it an opportunity to know what the Town wants. But some of the misconceptions that are being perpetrated are unfair to you.

David Louis Excuse me, if there are private conversations going on, could you please take them outside and please respect the speakers and their ability to address the Board?

Meave Tooher As far as the conservation subdivision goes it can and may improve the quality and value of your property. I think as Town Board members you all have to consider that and all of the information that you get here today. I think what we attempted to do as a group was to bring to you a version that we felt was the best thing for the Town and for the people in this Town. It was not a hidden agenda, it was not written in hidden

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 6

meaning. It was not in any way hidden from anyone in this Town. And I do take some umbrage with being accused of having some sort of hidden agenda in doing this. Because I know I participated, took time from my family, took time from my job to try and do what I thought was best for this community. But you all get an opportunity to participate in this process and to speak to this Board and we all have been speaking to this Board. As business owners I think the Board should hear what you have to say and if this needs to be tweaked then certainly, Board, please be responsive and listen to what your business members of your community have to say. However, there is a lot of misinformation out there. I was approached by members of the business community saying they were having meetings separate from the meetings the Town was conducting to discuss these issues. My suggestion was bring it to the meetings that are available to you, for the people working on these laws, so they can be incorporated. That was not done. I think divisiveness and separatism is not the way to resolve the issues that are before us, or the needs of the Town. If the Commercial District needs to be modified because there are needs both of the people and the business owners, bring those concerns to the people who are looking to write the laws to address it. I know many of those changes were incorporated into what is now Local Laws 4 and 5. They were not dismissed, they were not tossed aside, they were taken very seriously and incorporated into all the language that are now in the laws that are before you. So I would say, if people feel strongly, whether it's Board members or community members, we should be discussing this and resolving the disputes that are between us. We are one community and one people. And the point of this is the betterment of the whole Town. Everybody is not going to be happy. I wasn't happy with some of the decisions that were made; I voiced my opinion. Some of them were incorporated; some were not. You have all voiced your opinion. I know they were incorporated because I helped rewrite the language that incorporated them. Please don't think that anyone has predetermined anything about these laws or these regulations. But I think if we all work together we all end up with a better Town with better zoning and a better community. Thank-you.

Roger Downs I'd like to thank this Board, to thank you for the amount of work, the years of work, that you have put in. As one who finds it easy to come out against things, and have done so frequently in this Town, I'd like to apologize for being more involved in supporting your efforts in this regard. I think these zoning measures are tremendously moderate. I've been a landowner here for 12 years; I've lived in other parts of the Hudson Valley and I've watched southern Dutchess County get consumed by developers for zoning regulations like what we have now in this Town. I feel a lot of fear in this room, and I feel a lot of concern for one's land and I understand it. I think one common thread I hear and feel myself is that we like things the way they are and don't want them to change. I think that's a reflection of how we see the landscape today. But whether we want it or not it is going to change. Development pressure is growing. We can watch the tidal wave of condominiums and strip malls coming up the Hudson Valley. It will be here. The economy will eventually turn around. And this land will be developed. This plan protects us from that. There is a dichotomy between viewing land as the fabric of community or a commodity. I think this Board has done a very good job in protecting the citizens who currently own land here that are concerned about their family legacy; they may want to subdivide a piece off or two for their kids. They want to keep land affordable for their family here. And I think you've made allowances here. But if someone's going to be subdividing more than 5 lots off, they are not looking at land as personal rights, they are looking at profit. We have to protect the Town; profit is fine, but it is true that every house built in this community paying \$1 in taxes takes \$1.15-\$1.35 in services, a drag on the tax base. Vacant land, farm land, is neutral, neutral to tax base and a revenue generator in that it is part of our quality of life, making it enjoyable to live here. I think that conservation subdivision is a brilliant tool, characterized as giving you all this power; I don't see it that way. I think that developers will use it as something very advantageous. They want to approach a hundred acres; in this Town where we are rich with vernal pools, steep slopes, wetlands, forested lands, well, if I can get the right amount of lots, I don't care how I can get those lots, I can make money off of them.

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 7

Because it is consolidated, I save on infrastructure, and a lot of this land we can't develop anyway because it is really steep slopes. It's like trimming the fat. This is a brilliant planning tool and it protects landowners and protects the rest of community. Ultimately, there are property rights, I certainly enjoy the rights I have on my property, but at the same rate we do infringe on community when poor land decisions are made. I see these moves as moderate. I see dozens and dozens of other communities in New York and the Hudson Valley with much more extreme measures. In some ways you don't know how good you have it. As one who sometimes feels uncomfortable favoring things, there are many, many citizens in New Baltimore who agree with this perspective and that we want to keep this land rural, and grow the economy. In the end, this kind of land planning is more profitable. The lawyer who spoke earlier, who was paid to speak here, I think she closed with this notion of the current financial crisis; I find it ironic in the current crisis that we've been under-regulated and let corporations move in, through hedge funds, and take hard-earned investments and run with them. In a sense, with lax zoning laws we could allow developers to come in and do what they want and leave a legacy of poor land use decisions. I think prosperity is in regulation in this Town. I support these actions.

Donna Degnen I have prepared my talk for tonight, but listening to all this I keep repeating this. I'm a lifetime resident, I remember when this road out here was a dirt road, I went to this very school in this building, and I know what has built up in Town. I could tell you, when I was a kid, every neighbour on the block. We have built up. We had a zoning law, the people have come in here, they have been made welcome and I'm thrilled that we have had new people come in. Now we're going to this new thing; we're saying, "No more people coming, you're not going to be welcome, we are going to zone the whole thing down, we don't want you." What kind of community are we, that we are not welcoming people in here anymore? I was on the Town Board, 4 years on Town Board, I served with both you, David, and Arlene. I was not, when we first mentioned the Comprehensive Plan, if you recall, I opposed it. I was not for the Comprehensive Plan. We had one. We didn't need another one. Now we're going for a zoning; we have zoning. This is hurting the Town; these are hurting the people that live here. I love this Town. You have no idea the compassion I feel. I have lived here all my life. I think you've worked with me, David, you know how I feel with this Town. Now, I just can't understand why you feel it is so important to do these things to this Town. I don't understand it at all. Now, in 1988, like my husband said before, we did buy commercial property. There was a small farmhouse on there and there was a small farm. We restored that farmhouse, put it on the market, and it was sold. We subdivided 7 parcels off of that; we had four homes built off of that. We didn't build them; the people who bought them did. The rest of it was commercial property. Of that commercial property we have a business there now, Taylor's Monument, that has been a big asset to the Town of New Baltimore. In fact they have a bench out here in our memorial park to Barbara Weeks, who was our Town Clerk for many years, a big asset to the Town who worked with dedication every day of the week, no sick time. When you had questions she gave you the answers ASAP. The other parcel was sold, a commercial parcel; there was another one sold. There is no business on that now; I don't know where that stands. We own the third parcel still. The zoning on that is now telling us what to put there and what we can't put there. We've held that land for almost 20 years. It's a partnership of 5 couples, 4 other couples that are doing this, and now the Town tells us that we have no control over what we own. I am against this so totally.

Steve Pilatich A few weeks ago I started to receive a paper called the Lancaster Farmer. As I was going through it I came across some information about a new 2008 Farm Bill. The bill includes an expanded tax deduction for donated conservation pieces. There was another program some of you may have heard me mention at previous information meetings that we've had here. You can sell your development rights- which is conservation easement; you need to be sponsored by a town, a county, or a non-profit organization where they put up part of the money and the rest comes from New York State. One year, it was 33 million [dollars] the State put up. Your property is appraised at real estate value, then appraised at farm value, subtract the difference, and that is what you receive. An individual on the other side of the river who did this received between

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 8

\$6-7 million for his easement. You still own the land, and continue to farm it or sell it to another farmer or leave it forever wild, it can never be developed and it's assessed as farm land. Thirty-five to forty years ago Greene County had close to 130 dairy farms; now there's roughly a dozen. Now, when they [the farmer] have reached the point where they may want to sell out, conservation easement deed restrictions are being imposed by the Towns in counties along the Hudson River with no compensation. I find it hard to believe that all these areas of land are an immediate threat to major development. [unable to understand] I'd like to know what would happen with some large landowner who passed on in life and their will states in the future their land is to be divided amongst 5 or 6 people. Are you inheriting deed-restricted land? Or half your inheritance has to be in a conservation easement? Some current wills may also be written that way. Anybody want to take bets on [unable to understand]. I am currently the administrator of an estate to be divided between 10 brothers and sisters. Imagine what a tax burden this would be to the residents of this Town, and involve a hundred acres or so and result in lawsuits if the new laws were in place, because 5 acres or more is a major subdivision? In a conservation easement 10% of the land is to be set aside for park or recreation, or you can pay a calculated fee to be held in escrow by the Town if they don't want a park at that particular location. I believe these monies and eminent domain will be used against landowners by the Town to get what they want into where they want to go. When land goes for sale it is for anyone interested, not just a developer. Sounds like there's enough people interested into buying it and keeping it green and keeping a developer out. Again, I oppose Local Laws 4 and 5 of 2008 as they are written.

Bob Knighton I want to respond to a few of the things I have heard that don't quite fit with my understanding of the proposals. Unfortunately the attorney who spoke tonight said so many things that were misleading or untrue that my notetaking got overwhelmed. So I'm just going to try to pick out a few highlights here. For an attorney to suggest that a legislative body should not be involved in writing legislation or that zoning is somehow an unconstitutional taking is either deliberately misleading or incompetent, I'm not sure which it is. Someone tonight said that if you had 100 acres and you wanted to do a 5 acre development you had to set aside 50 acres. I think that the law allows plenty of flexibility to deal that more reasonably. Seems to me like what would happen, is that you would come in for a subdivision and split off 80 acres and 20 acres. And then you'd have a major subdivision of the 20 acres; you develop your five lots and set aside 10 acres. You don't have to set aside 50 acres. I'm sure that's not what the intent of the law is and it's certainly not the way it's written. Someone suggested that developers should factor zoning into price; I think that's perfectly true. Developers like clarity. They like specificity; they like regulations that are relatively up to date. They want to know that once they've invested in the community that their investment is going to be protected by good zoning. It was also suggested that we should reduce the discretion of the Planning Board regarding minor subdivisions. People who are buying lots, whether it's in a major or minor subdivision, have the same expectations. They want to have some degree of assurance that they're going to be able to build on their lot, that their septic system will work, that their water will work, that the property has been properly marked out. If the Planning Board thinks that some things are necessary in a minor subdivision they ought to be allowed to do it. The alternative would be to simply require those things for both a major and minor subdivision so that the buyers would have that level of protection. There has been some argument that the setaside of conservation land loses taxes. Let's take a hypothetical situation. Let's say we have 100 acres currently appraised at \$1 million dollars. You set aside 50, the remaining 50 acres could be developed into 50 lots according to conservation subdivision. Let's say the developer just does 30 lots and let's say they sell the lots for \$15,000 and there's an \$85,000 house on them. Now that's a low price for a lot and a low price for a house. But even so, when all is said and done, a \$1 million assessment has grown to \$3 million assessment. If you have a little more realistic expectation, the lots could go for maybe \$20,000 and have a \$180,000 house on it; so the \$1 million dollar assessment goes to \$6 million. So how you can say that setting aside 50% of the land is going to lose money is beyond me. I could go on, but my notes got so

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 9

jumbled up that I won't. I do think that the Town Board knows how to separate reality from the histrionics. I think when you do that you'll know that the right thing to do is to approve these laws.

John Wallner- Attachment #6

Paul Schiller- I think that we should cut to the chase as to what the citizens of this Town are concerned about. I was involved in CPAG years ago, a great thing. As someone who believes in promoting business, and been involved in land and subdivisions and land use, I certainly have felt that there is a lot of vagueness in the law, which is very difficult and cumbersome and allows the discretion that Boards have to potentially be used against a citizen. I believe the purpose of the discretion of a Board should always fall in favour of applicants. I think the concern of people coming to these meetings especially evidenced with the proposed law as written is that the discretion of the Board would be used against them. I also feel that, when people gave their opinions in the survey five years ago, they didn't understand nor could they have until they saw the proposed law, exactly how those various things could be interpreted. I do believe that the conservation easement law is potentially very damaging economically to individuals, I think it goes against fundamental rights of individuals. I think the people who would be most greatly impacted are senior citizens who've finally gotten to a stage in their life where maybe they're ready to sell their land and the price that's willing to be paid on the value of that land is greatly diminished. And that's a shame, I've seen it in other places. I've heard stories along that line. There is a mechanism for this Town to encourage large lot subdivisions, and conservation easements without forcing it down anyone's throat; it could be done by giving them a choice. And that choice, one of the things that could be done is to reduce the restrictions for major subdivisions. If someone wanted to do a major subdivision and they wanted to include 5 acre lot, not 2, as Cocksackie is currently doing, they reduced the requirements to a minor subdivision. It works. It encourages large lot subdivisions. This Town has so many natural restrictions to development. I think when the original zoning law was written in the early 70's there was concern because of the Thruway of impending growth that was possibly going to change the character of the Town. That truly hasn't happened. The growth in Town has been very, very slow. You go back fifty, sixty, seventy years ago even the population of the Town was not a whole lot different than it is today. Thankfully, there are more businesses in the Town. I think the Planning Board is doing a great job. There should be more clarity, I believe, in our zoning laws because that will make it easier and more certain for a developer to make decisions about what he can actually do. I think a concern in the proposed law is, to me anyway, is not so much the fact that certain uses will be permitted, that's great, it's what actually is defined as being permitted and where it is being permitted. The Comprehensive [plan] called for having a subcommittee of Economic Development and Agriculture and those things didn't happen. There was involvement in the survey. There was certainly plenty of notice for all that public hearings, plenty of notice, and there were public hearings for the Comprehensive Plan, and clearly there was for this, and that's why people are here, and that's why people are upset, because they've read the law. And, indeed, I'm sure there's misinterpretation, yes, there's misinterpretation. I would never be convinced that on general terms, proposed conservation easement or the proposed commercial re-zoning on 9W would be beneficial to the existing property owners. I believe that those circumstances could occur under the right circumstances. New Baltimore is not under.. this isn't Chesapeake Bay. It's a very rural community that has had virtually flat growth many, many years. There isn't impending pressure. We don't have public water, public sewer. Taxes are high already, which is when people look to see what their costs are going to be in a Town, they shy away. We have higher costs. And I believe that if the concern is that voices will be discounted. I believe there are people here today who believe that their voice will not be heard, and a decision will be made by the Board in an expeditious way and not incorporate the concerns of a lot of the citizens. And that's why there's fear, and that's why people are getting excited. I also believe there will be economic damage to certain individuals. And I would request that the Board do some type of economic impact statement to accompany the zoning change. I believe under SEQR, if enough citizens have shown concern about the economic value, or changes in economic value, that that

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 10

should be addressed and certainly that we've heard that voice. And I would hope that the Town would study that in a responsible way and recognize that these fears are legitimate and again please consider a way of gaining the types of futures that we want by lowering barriers rather than increasing them. I really believe it can happen, it can work. People resent being told what they have to do rather than having a choice.

Tim Walsh My wife, Christina, our children, and I have been residents and landowners for the past 13 years. We own 146 acres on Highmount Road. This property was purchased on the open market. It had been for sale for some time; anyone could have purchased it. And although it is not necessarily a showplace, I assure you my family and I have invested countless hours and dollars into improving the property. Since we were married in 1985 it was a dream of mine and my wife to own a nice piece of property that we could improve, enjoy and pass on. The best stewards of the land, I believe, are the owners of the land. We invested a significant sum to buy the property and even more to improve it and all the while paying our ever-increasing taxes. I think many people can say that; I think that's a sentiment that many people have. I think it's important to note our first speaker this evening, Eric, that brought forth 300 signatures voicing their opposition to the proposal that you have the responsibility to consider. I come before you tonight just as I have every opportunity that has been made possible since I learned about the Town's proposed zoning and subdivision ordinances to voice my extreme opposition to your proposal as well as to the unfairness of the process that created this proposal, both of which I will comment on. We have a beautiful Town, and I believe we do not want nor do we need the overreaching regulations, that in my opinion and in the opinion of many devalue our property, increase the restrictions of our future options and flexibility over property use and inhibit the economic development that many in this Town depend upon directly and most, if not all, indirectly. Frankly, I think this is an organized taking of land and I'll offer some additional comments in that regard. I believe, as I've stated before at every opportunity, that our future should be based on a plan for growth and it should increase flexibility and options available to the Town's residents, not restrict or eliminate them. David, the meetings that I've been at, even through your own admission, the proposal is certainly more restrictive than the current rights we have right now. There was a comment made earlier that we had ignorance by choice. I can assure you that I've never chosen, nor will I, to be ignorant. But when I did come upon the Comprehensive Plan and read it I became a little bit concerned. But I became much more concerned when I read the proposal, when it became real. Because the Comprehensive Plan, that process was rather inclusive, and when I confronted the facts that were put forth that I will go through so I can be specific, as requested- in the Comprehensive Plan there was no way for me to imagine what I am seeing currently in the proposals. First, page 7, Comprehensive Plan, demographics and economic trends, plot the growth of all the Towns in Greene County including Catskill, for the period 1990-2000. During that 10 year period we had a whopping population growth of 1.4%. Now, certainly that does not [connote] runaway population or a tidal wave of pressure. I understand that things can change but we are so far removed from an incredible growth spurt that I think the histrionics or whatever that word was that was used before it is what may be proposing these regulations and I think that's where the control should be set. Again, page 9, there is a chart that is provided by the consultants that the Town hired that shows the Town building permits from 1993 to 2003, where we started in 1993, we ended in 2003 after ups and downs with 15. So 15 was the high point, and we went down to something less than 5 over a 10 year period. I fully believe that things can change. But I think the reaction to the threat and fear is unfounded. I would also like to make the point that the facts, I think getting command of the facts is very important, upon which the Comprehensive Plan was put forth is included here from our consultant, Elan. And I've brought this point up before. I've got to call into question the cookie-cutter approach these firms take sometimes where it states on page 9, "New Baltimore is one of the wealthiest Towns in Rensselaer County." Did they really spend the time and diligence to get us and excavate all the facts? Anyone can make a typo but sometimes maybe they get a little bit caught up. I've had some conversations with people on the Planning Board. What I've been told is that in 7 years we've had 2 major subdivisions in the Town and

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 11

that both were done very successfully. I would suggest to you that the character of this Town that has been created over these past decades that has made us so desirable should be maintained. I don't think anybody disagrees. But I think the point I'm trying to make is that there is a confidence in the process we have right now. You had spoken earlier about the need to make revisions to the zoning. That's always going to happen. I think if we continued with the process that we have, rather than the new 168 pages of regulations that are being put forth, I submit to you that's a better process. It's worked, it's created the character of the Town we find so desirable, why is it we are looking to destroy and upset that? I do not understand. I believe your proposals take away the rights from a large landowner. Kevin mentioned before, when asked, he would like to continue to have the right to do what it is with his land, if he wants to set it aside, that's fine. I do not want that right taken from me. I have that right now. I would like to not have that taken from me. I was here Monday and I heard someone say there's a legal expression that suggests that you can't swing your arm any further than the tip of my nose. And I understand what the man was saying, suggesting you have to be careful, around about your land use. I would suggest that I'm the one that's having their rights taken away. I'm not looking to infringe on anyone else's rights. But I'm looking to protect mine and not have them be denied. I've spent a little bit more time in Comprehensive Plan, not the regulations, and on page 22 it says that some communities also provide a local conservation easement program which reduces the property taxes on the land. I brought this before the Board in direct question several meetings ago. I was told, "We're not going to do that;" again, a suggestion that was made in the Comprehensive Plan that has not made its way into the proposed regulations that we are being faced with right now. There is another suggestion on page 5 of the Comprehensive Plan that states, as part of this flexibility the Planning Board can waive certain dimensional requirements of traditional zoning. In return the developer sets aside a certain amount of the property as undeveloped open space. It doesn't say 50%, it says that you could work on a case by case basis. I want to come back to allowing our process of people from our Town on the Planning Board to work the process as they have successfully done for the past couple of decades. It has served us well and can continue to serve us well should we allow it to continue. To the process, it was suggested that comments that were made were impugning the integrity of the individuals and I can assure that was not the intent at all. I don't know individuals here enough to attest or impugn your integrity. That's not my point. But I will tell you having had a lot of experience in the corporate world that the process where you have somebody author something of this significance and also have the opportunity to vote on it in a group of five is inherently unfair. I go through multiple board meetings, we have all kinds of external auditors, it does not meet the standard of objectivity and I suggest that it should. I am also concerned with the process, not the process that developed the Comprehensive Plan because I believe that was reasonably well done, but the process to develop the proposed regulations. Again, we'll go back to page 29 of the Comprehensive Plan where it suggested the blueprint for action, and it specifically says that the implementation leaders, including the Economic Development Committee, the Zoning Board Committee and the Agricultural Committee should be involved and that the Town Board should form these groups as the first steps toward implementing the plan. That was not done. The reason I find that to be unfair is not to impugn your integrity, but that you are not made up of landowners and business owners and I believe the intent here to widen the participation was to get a balanced and more meaningful perspective. I think that that process has been short-circuited. We went from a Comprehensive Plan and got surprised by the regulations. And that's what's driving a lot of anger and frustration and fear, quite honestly, with what we're seeing here. Lastly, I want to state as Donna Degnen stated, I have not lived in the Town as long as Donna, but I love the Town. When I came here 13 years ago, I grew up on Long Island, maybe I would have been thought of as one of those outlaws from downstate, I don't know. But I'm not, I'm a proud member of the Town of New Baltimore and I choose to be part of this Town and I believe the restrictions although seemingly well-intended will have grave, unintended consequences and they deserve your due diligence and deliberation. I mean no disrespect to all the time that's been put in before but I hope that I can make it clear to you that many of us, certainly

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 12

myself, believe there's been a significant disconnect to the development of the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed regulations that are confronting us now.

Lee Davis Thank you for extending the public hearing and allowing people to participate. Since I have previously spoken I'll keep my comments brief. My intent is to try and react to some of the comments I heard this evening and hopefully allay some fears and concerns that people have. I will admit because I have eyes that work and drive around the Town that we have not had explosive growth in the Town. The purpose of planning is just for that, planning and if one looks around our surrounding area, particularly from the south but also from the north where Albany is going to be experiencing incredible growth due to the nanotech expansions, the biotech and the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been invested by the state into the local universities and local business the pressures are there. The pressures from downstate are there and they can be seen if you just drive south of here. I think what the Town wisely has chosen to do is take acts so they can plan for growth. When a community gets involved in a situation where the growth has occurred before the planning has occurred you get things that look like Route 9W in the Town of Bethlehem where the new box stores are, and I can't remember exacting which ones they are, but driving through there is a nightmare because the planning for the roads was not done or the expansion just happened piecemeal and didn't allow for the increased traffic. It became so intense in the Town of New Bethlehem that they were forced approximately two years ago to have a moratorium on any development particularly residential development because it was overwhelming their schools and so they felt as though they didn't have enough tools in place and stopped development in its tracks. A similar thing happened in the Town of Clifton Park. While I will acknowledge there hasn't been great expansion, the pressures are there. This was borne out by part of the Exit 21B Project and the study that was done for the 9W Corridor Study by Elan using the statistics of local communities, essentially growth has almost surrounded the Town of New Baltimore and their conclusion was that it will clearly be coming here soon. So that's the purpose of doing this, and I think it's wise. Also, I'm using some numbers that were referenced by the last speaker, the number of building permits, not to say that building is out of control now, but building permits this year up to date have been 108. Where there were 15 in the years referenced in the 1990's, the year 2008 we've exceeded 100. A lot of these are for small projects, I understand, but I'm saying it is growing. As most of you know, I just want to acknowledge people, I've been on the Planning Board since 1991, and so I understand the concerns that people have when it comes to subdividing their property. The vast majority of subdivisions that have occurred in the Town occur by parents who are dividing some land for their children or grandchildren so they can share the benefits of our local community. So, I think I understand the pulse of the Town fairly well from my experience. But I think a lot of the concern, and I don't mean to doubt anyone's concerns, I believe your concerns and fears are real, they are based, I think, on some misinformation or misinterpretation of particularly the conservation subdivision. This 50% setback that's referenced does nothing to diminish the number of lots that can be created. If you have a 100 acre lot, with the current 2 acre minimum zoning, now we understand the lay of the land never permits it, but theoretically you could have 50 lots. With conservation subdivision, at the end of the day on that 100 acre parcel, you'd still be allowed to have 50 lots. It's just that those 50 lots would be put in a smaller area of the 100 acre parcel. And that's done, developers like it because it reduces infrastructure costs if they're going to be building new roads and it also allows the rural and scenic beauty of our Town by locating in the portions of that property where they're best suited so that they blend into the landscape and some of the unique features that may be present. So I just wanted folks to realize that that setback is not restricting the number of lots, you still have the same number of lots, and as for the use of that land, you don't have to be restricted. If you farm on that land currently, it can still be used for farming. If you use it for open space it can still be used for open space. If you use it for logging, it can still be used for logging. All it's saying is, "There won't be houses going there and you can end up with the same number of lots." I hope that's clear and people understand that concept.

**COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 13**

If they don't I encourage them to read it again. Also, it was suggested that perhaps there be some alternatives for minor subdivisions and in fact, unless I'm mistaken, that was written in, in response to public meetings. That is, you don't have to do the conservation subdivision; you can have up to 8 lots, I believe it is, if you agree to have 5 acre minimum zoning, and it will be treated as a minor subdivision assuming there will be no other roads or infrastructure. Similarly if you had a larger parcel, I believe 50 acres is the minimum threshold and you want to use 10 acre minimums, you don't have to undergo the conservation subdivision, the choice is with the developer. For Route 9W I heard from one gentleman this evening who has developed two projects on 9W relating to truck repair and things of the like, saying the current law would not permit either one of those uses. That is absolutely not true. In fact, when that new zone is created, the CZ, can't remember what it stands for, that was to allow all current uses to be permitted in there. So, both of those would currently be allowed to be placed in that zone. Similarly, a gentleman indicated in that same zone that he wouldn't be able to put an auto repair that he's dedicated his life and occupation. That type of business would also be permitted in CZ zone. Then finally back to conservation subdivisions, I think the best way to understand what the conservation subdivision is, it's a way to identify what is the best develop-able part of land on your overall parcel and that's the intent of it and that's the purpose of it. It is not to restrict how much development could otherwise occur on that same parcel. Again, it's a flexible tool and as I indicated at the last meeting the consultants who helped us on this project don't just consult with municipalities; a portion of their business is taken up by developers in rural communities such as ourselves and through that experience they said developers like this type of flexibility, they like this type of tool and it enhances property values, so that means it's going to help you folks. It's going to help folks who want to retire, it's not going to diminish your land, and I can assure you that everybody working on this had nothing but the best interest of the Town's landowners in mind.

Bob Turan Thank-you to the Town Board for the work done on this, and thanked all the citizens who came out to this meeting. I've listened throughout the entire process and I have to admit I agree with much of what everyone has said that has come up to this podium and voiced their opinion. I think we have to understand as residents of New Baltimore, we are property owners and residents of New Baltimore, not Sunis and Shiites, We've got a lot more in common and don't have to be adversarial. I think the Comprehensive Plan was a very good document and I think that what we are finding out through this process is that some of the regulations the way they are currently written do not embody what some of us thought were going to be in the Comprehensive Plan, so what I think what's happened is over the meetings about these regulations a couple of months ago, people were worried about a development going in, its going to affect my water table. Well, that caused changes in here that say there has to be hydrologic studies to protect that person. I think there's been so much input that maybe the document has been overworked to try and be so inclusive that it lost sight of the fact that we want the place, as much as possible, to stay the way it is now and protect all of us from unbridled growth. I think the idea in the Comprehensive Plan of a Commercial Zone along 9W was to protect businesses that are there and help them to grow and prosper and ensure that other businesses like them could grow in that area because that's where it's ideal. Maybe the way its currently split up needs to be revised but I support the Town taking a closer look at making those laws more adaptable to the people who are there. If there're changes need to be made I think they are minor and could be worked out. I think while this law may not be passed the way it is right now, that it is a good document to work with based on the input we've had the past couple of nights and that I would suggest the Town Board look at making revisions based on these comments so that we do have something that will protect us and our children going into the future.

Gregory Ziccardi Thanked everyone for allowing a second time to speak. I'm taking a few things out of this meeting, and a lot of it is concern and a lot of it is fear. I think basically the general population is afraid of change. You shouldn't be afraid of change; change can be good. Without change we become stagnant, we don't go forward, we don't go backward, we stay in one spot. It's not good, it's also not good to just go out and rape

COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 14

and pillage the land and change the countryside as most people here want to [unable to understand]. But we cannot go ahead and tell people that you must set aside half of your investment, half of your children's land for the future because we want to keep it green, we want to keep it beautiful. If that's the case, don't sell your land to anybody, keep it all to yourself. Don't let anybody come in here and buy anything, then there'll be no change. There'll be no future. We have a lady here that has a piece of commercial property that she says for 20 years that she can't figure out what to do with cause [unable to understand]. There was a question about building permits, there was 108 building permits given out. Were they for new homes or for someone to put a sink in or a bathroom? Or make an extension on their home? I'm from the Bronx, I lived on Long Island, I watched Long Island get destroyed. I worked in the fishing industry. I watched it go right down the drain. I would not want to see it happen here. Not for any amount of money. And I would not want to contribute to that. But I also don't want to be told that I cannot do what I want to do with anything that I've bought and paid for and continue to pay for. We have regulations put forth here that state you can do this and you can do that. You can get the same amount of lots out of 50 acres or 100 acres, that's if the land allows it to go that way. If the roadways that cut through don't go onto that piece of property that has to be set aside. Also, it depends upon what you ladies and gentlemen of the Board decide. I don't think that's right. I don't think you should be able to turn around and say, "Well, we already approved a subdivision over there, and we did this over here," and I've gone out and spent a ton of money to put in five houses. I gave you a plan that I thought would work, my engineer thought would work, and then maybe you turn around and tell me no. Now I'm out that money that I laid out, you're out that time. There was a gentleman up here said everybody should work together. That should be the goal. I think we should all take that away from this meeting. We should all work together. We're not a communist country, we have the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and we have to live by it. If Kevin wants to keep his 100 acres, and tie it all up and give it away, fine. I don't plan on doing that. I don't think my neighbors want to do that with theirs. Thank you.

Alta Turner I'm sorry that my comments on Monday were kind of cut off because they were better put together. I deal with things on kind of a small scale level, like detail. What I have in front of me is just a description of major subdivisions that have happened in the Town of New Baltimore since 1993. And its partially in response to the comments that have been made to the Planning Board that has done a really good job, and that the few major subdivisions that we've had have gone very well. Part of the reason they've gone so well is because they don't adhere to our current zoning. The developers actively chose to subdivide into larger acreage than the 2 acres per parcel. That's the case with the property on Highmount Road, 6 lots, none less than 5 acres, one as large as 18 acres. On Gedney Hill Road, 6 lots, 2 at 8 acres, one as large as 18 acres. Also, Woodlands of New Baltimore off Alcove Road, 11 lots, 4 at 3 or more acres, remainder at up to 6 acres. Then Highmount Road, 8 lots, none less than 5 acres, largest is 49 acres, which was a subsequent minor subdivision. As Bob Knighton pointed out that could have gone the reverse of what we were proposing. There is another subdivision. It is 8 parcels, at 2 acres each; the existing zoning regulation would allow that over the entire area. In fact, if you are in the situation of a major subdivision with our current regulations there is nothing other than that you can do other than larger parcels. What this regulation is trying to do is to protect against a situation where there is cookie-cuttering of the land, so that we can all live within the vision that we developed with the Comprehensive Plan in the community, and the consistency across the Town with respect to how we want the community to look, is what we were trying to protect for. So, I would just point out that the current zoning, without the modifications that include a lot of laterality in the way large properties can be developed, would put us in the situation of 2 acre per parcels, which is not beneficial to anyone.

Supervisor asked if there were any other sign-ups, hearing none, and with no more from the attending public, Supervisor read.

**COUNTY OF GREENE
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW 4 OF 2008
NOVEMBER 5, 2008-Page 15**

**RESOLUTION
NOVEMBER 5, 2008**

**RESOLUTION CLOSING PUBLIC
HEARING ON LOCAL LAW NO. 4 OF 2008**

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of New Baltimore noticed a public hearing for November 3, 2008, and afforded those in attendance an opportunity to be heard, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board adjourned said public hearing to November 5, 2008 to allow the public additional time to present comments and statements regarding Local Law No. 4 of 2008, at which time further opportunity was afforded to those in attendance to be heard.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that this public hearing regarding Local Law No. 4 of 2008 is hereby closed.

Councilwoman McKeon moved to approve the resolution closing the public hearing, seconded by Councilman Norris.

The adoption of the foregoing Resolution was duly put to a vote, and upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

Roll Call Vote

Kuenster- Aye

McKeon- Aye

Norris- Aye

Byas- Aye

Louis- Aye

Adopted

The Public Hearing was closed at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Janet A. Brooks
Town Clerk

Attachments

1b-Moreau
2-Carlson
3-Carlson
4-Guthrie
5-Carter
6-Wallner