

Copake Hamlet Revitalization Task Force
January 27, 2016 - 7:00 p.m.
Copake Town Hall

Present: Leonard Barham, Andrew Fisher, Chris Quinby, Jennifer Redman (by phone), Roberta Roll

Absent: Rus Davis, John Pollok

Town Liaison: Jeanne Mettler, present

1. Interview of Peter Kelly We interviewed Mr. Kelly. After the interview was concluded Roberta invited him to stay for the meeting and he did.

2. Meeting with Bob Haight

Bob attended our meeting and reviewed our concerns about zoning, as follows:

Parking – page 93- 232-13- C (2)— Right now – and in the new zoning, a business can avoid the Town’s required parking if they are within 400 feet of Municipal Parking. ***We suggest that the Town extend the 400 feet to 500 feet or more- measured as a radius. Our concerns are that the municipal lot be available to alleviate the requirement of onsite parking for individual businesses. We want to determine what a reasonable distance would be.***

We need to find out how many parking spaces are provided for in the Hamlet Plan. We also discuss the need for a flow study to establish the real needs of the Hamlet.

Acreage-Bob says that LURC relied upon the water study done in Copake some years ago. That study required large acreage based on the water quality in the Town- for instance five or six acres in the rural areas of the Town. The new zoning would require two acres minimum in the hamlet unless there is an alternative septic system in which case it is one acre.

Bob pointed out that the lots in the Hamlet are already established- so in fact he questions what difference it makes if the lot sizes are two acres.

Page 41- Hamlet Business From our December 9, 2015 Minutes: *“Why doesn’t the code say what the minimum lot will be if there is a public sewer?”* Bob’s response is that any business would need at least an acre to accommodate both water and sewer and parking etc.

Height, setback and other dimensions

From our December 9, 2015 Minutes: *“We question the Maximum Height in Hamlet (p41). Does this allow for business and residential mix?”*

Also a question from our December 9, 2015 Minutes: *“The minimum rear yard in the Hamlet- the business is double residential (40 for residential and 60 for business). The Side yard footage is similar. Is this requirement too high? A business does not want to have large lawns or excess yard space”.*

Bob responds that the reason is that they did this is that they wanted to limit the size of buildings. They did not want to encourage 40,000 square foot buildings. But he understands our question and he will speak to Nan about this.

Max Lot Coverage Including Impervious Surfaces

From our December 9 Minutes: *“We assume that LURC means that Impervious Surface includes both asphalt paved surfaces (being “used” as parking, and also the buildings themselves.) We think that the heading on the chart is ambiguous.*

Page 20- Clarify the definition of “use”- or clarify whether Max Lot coverage refers to separate “uses”. Should say “including impervious surfaces including the building and paved lots”

Bob says that in this context, impervious surface always includes the building- first and foremost.

“Another issue is the Max Lot coverage- requires business to leave 50% of the lot free. Again, won’t this discourage growth of business?”

Bob says that LURC wanted to maintain a “bucolic” setting.

Auto repair shop – 110

“Is there another section of the Code which further describes and regulates Auto Repair? So far we cannot find it”.

Bob says that in State Law there are numerous designations: auto repair, auto body, etc. So LURC went by State definitions and regulations. The new zoning law cannot change requirements for existing businesses. But the Planning Board has authority to require vegetation, buffering.

Design Standards- Bob says that they did adopt the Design Standards recommended by the Task Force. In fact he says that the Task Force should insist on the inclusion of standards. It would give the Planning Board guidance in making decisions.

Watershed Areas- Bob advises us that LURC tried to follow the Comprehensive Plan. They tried to distinguish between the watershed areas since they are not all the same. For instance, Rhoda Pond is not the same as Copake Lake.

Hamlet Area- LURC extended the Hamlet area north on Farm Road through Camp Waubeeka and south on County Rte 7A to KOA. They wanted to allow for some development in these areas. This will provide for development if these campgrounds- including, for instance, if either of the Campgrounds closes and the land is to be used for a new use.

We thanked Bob for his dedication to this project and his assistance this evening. Bob left the meeting.

3. **Welcome of new members-** Roberta welcomed Andy and Lenny to the Task Force.

4. **Agenda for Next Meeting** Roberta advises us that she has met with Gerry Fultz who is working on establishing a Revitalization Committee in Ancram. At our next meeting we will meet with Gerry Fultz.

5. **Approval of the Minutes of January 13 , 2015-** tabled because Jeanne did not send the Minutes to Roberta. She will.

6. **Rapid Care Center** Rus gave Roberta a check from Copake Community Service, Inc. in the amount of \$12,500. Roberta contacted Columbia Memorial to check on the status of the contribution from Friends of Copake. Betsy Gramkow called Roberta back to say that Friends of Copake has sent a letter committing to \$6500 to the hospital. The balance of the money in the Friends account will go directly to the Rescue Squad.

7. **Balance of the Agenda-** In view of the hour, we agreed to table the rest of the Agenda. Peter Kelly was excused.

8. **Recommendation of New Member:** The Task Force agreed to recommend that the Town Board appoint Peter Kelly as a member. Roberta will convey our recommendation to the Tow Board.

9. Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne E. Mettler