

20/20 VISION
VILLAGE OF WILLIAMSVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN
COMMUNITY PLAN COMMITTEE

APPROVED MEETING NOTES – NOVEMBER 6, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 PM.

Community Plan Committee Attendees: Charles Akers, David Brody, Mary Carr, Paul Iskalo, Walter Pacer (Chair), Victor Paquet, Charles Rizzone, Carolyn Schlifke, Wesley Stone, Dave Vitka, Kate Waterman-Kulpa

Absent: Steve Appler, Thomas Claxton, Kim Gianelli-Calos, Pastor Madsen, Ed Zabel

Consultant/Town/Village Staff Present: Lawrence Bice, Joelle Guy, Dan Howard, Lynda Juul

Village Board Members: Mayor Lowther, Trustee Kingsley

Residents/Other Attendees: None

ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES

On motion by Charles Akers, seconded by Carolyn Schlifke, the meeting notes of October 16, 2007 were accepted.

Kate Kulpa and Wes Stone abstained from the vote.

Motion carried.

REVIEW OF DRAFT PLAN MODIFICATION

The committee overall seemed to be happy with the modifications that Lawrence made to the draft, and liked the language that was used.

Individual Comments:

Paul Iskalo questioned the new map. He asked if a change was made to it at all. Lawrence stated that the general location of the park and connection to Lehigh Trail was pulled out. Also, there was a small change at Milton before it hits the green area; the houses on the south side were erroneously put in the high density area and this was changed. Lawrence also commented that there was a slight change on the eastern end

from Village Mixed Use and Village Main Street. The boundary was moved further to the west. Paul thought the compromise was to leave the north side of Main Street as VMS and the south side would be changed to VMU from the east, all the way to Garrison Road. Lawrence's recollection was that it wouldn't be changed north-south, but to meet more in the middle. David Brody's recollection was the same as Paul's. Wally felt we didn't make a determination. Paul disclosed that he does have a vested interest in that area, but thought the committee had agreed to the change. Dan Howard read an excerpt from the October 2nd meeting notes that indicated the committee had agreed on what Paul was saying. David Vitka asked what the proposed development is for that area. He hopes something really wonderful will be done there. Chuck Akers commented that he felt a lot of people are very happy with his (Paul's) development to date, and that he shouldn't be forced to disclose this information. Dave Vitka is concerned about the fabric of the neighborhood pertaining to Park Drive. Vic Paquet commented that we shouldn't be looking at specific streets or parcels of land. You could go through the map and talk about all the little boundaries. Lawrence indicated that the lines have to line up somewhere, but that this is still conceptual and that guidance for zoning code changes would come later. If a member of the committee wants to propose that the line be altered, he doesn't have an issue with that. Dan commented that as he reads the discussion, the north side would stay as is, and the south side would change to VMU from Garrison to the east. Kate stated she has a vested interest in S. Long Park and asked if she could or should request a change in zoning because of that. Paul feels he would be making the same argument whether he owned the corner of Main & Garrison or not. He feels this is a more logical place to have a change in zoning than at Main & Park, which is insignificant. Dave Vitka agreed that an area with four (4) corners, such as Main & Garrison, is a logical place for a change. David Brody asked for clarification. He feels VMU is less intense than VMS. Lawrence indicated not necessarily, it's more about acknowledging the change in land use in the eastern part of the Village. The center of the Village is more of a traditional village scale. There is allowance for higher buildings in the pink area to the east, although this issue may not be closed. It is supposed to be conceptual. David Brody stated that the conceptual "thing" only goes so far when the zoning code is changed, and felt these boundaries will be pretty influential. David Brody stated he is in agreement to changing the south side of Main Street. Lawrence asked that the committee take a vote on this if required. Wally felt the minutes indicated that this would be discussed at the next meeting, but it was not. Lawrence changed the line to be mid-block between Park and Garrison. Chuck Akers wondered what the difference is if mixed use is allowable in both areas; Lawrence commented that the main difference is the number of stories allowed. It's also more of the traditional Main Street core is seen in VMS. As you get to the east, the configuration is different. It's a little less traditional. Paul challenged the idea of the four corners. Many times that indicates the beginning and entrance to something different. If there are character fighting elements and you're picking an area to change to the Village Core, he thinks this is defined at Garrison Road. Wally didn't think Main & Union is a fair comparison to Main & Garrison. David Brody felt it wasn't meant to be a comparison. Kate stated that she agreed with Paul. If you put a taller building somewhere mid-block, you have a Hampton situation. If you put something like that on a corner, it wouldn't infringe so much on the neighbors. She is concerned with how the pink zone affects the residential neighborhood. Six (6) stories at

that corner seems a little scary to her, and she wondered what the residents would think of this. David Brody stated that the recommendations of up to 4 or 6 stories is more of an indication to the Village Board of where you want to go, but the Village Board could enact a zoning ordinance stating that it could be lower from Garrison to Park. Paul stated that in any community you have areas of increased density and areas of decreased density. If everyone wants the Village to be single-family detached homes, you don't have a Village any more. The compromise has to be that you have areas of lower density off-set by areas of higher density. That's the whole essence of being a village. That's the difference in choices and diversity and all the things the Community Plan talks about. You have to have areas of increased density that are offset by areas of decreased density. Wally felt that the plan has this, and it doesn't need to be addressed in this one area. Lawrence commented that when the zoning code is done, you can have set-back height ratios. Things like this can be done to offset height from the residential neighborhoods. Paul proposed this be put to a vote, and that he won't be offended either way.

Motion made by David Brody, seconded by Wes Stone, to move VMU to Garrison on the south side.

Wes Stone & David Brody – Yes
Kate Waterman Kulpa & Paul Iskalo – Abstained
All others – No

The map will stay as already revised by Lawrence, with the change in zoning falling between Garrison Road and Park Drive.

Lawrence addressed the prior question about the economic study and the market for restaurants as being more local. He stated that David Versel had looked at the market size and dollars coming in and out for different uses. There was a question about methodology. He estimated how many dollars were coming from outside the Village as opposed to inside.

Lawrence tried to balance the seam between residential and commercial, but still be realistic. The committee felt this was an improvement over what was in the plan prior to this.

Dan Howard commented that are still some editorial items that he picked up that need to be changed. Lawrence stated that these will be made.

Motion made by David Brody, seconded by Chuck Akers, to accept the changes as presented, subject to final editorial changes.

Unanimously carried.

Mary Carr asked if the Draft Plan will be on the web site – it will be, and also in Village Hall and the Williamsville Library. There will also be a press release and a mailing. The location of the public meeting was discussed. It was decided to hold the public hearing at

Williamsville South High School. At the public hearing, Behan will give a presentation, but most of the time will be dedicated to the public making comments. The Committee would be seated at tables in the front of the room. David Brody stated that he doesn't feel the Committee should have back and forth with the public. Wally asked who would be addressing questions that are asked. David Brody felt Lawrence should respond to specifics, along with Dan Howard. He is more concerned about people who are there with an agenda. Lawrence felt that's where Wally would come in. The committee could also sit in the audience. Dan commented that a way to avoid so many questions is to give a really good presentation. Most people will not look at this before they come to the meeting. At this stage of the game, the Committee is there to find out what the community thinks of the plan. He would argue that we spend more time explaining the plan so people become more familiar with it. Lawrence thought there would be a 15 or 20 minute presentation. Kate Waterman-Kulpa suggested that we have two different time slots, with an informational session preceding the public hearing. David Brody suggested starting at 7:00 PM and having a display up. The hearing could be started at 7:30, and the information session at 6:00 pm. Chuck Akers didn't think there should be a split meeting. Otherwise you may have to go back at 7:30 and give the presentation again. Dave Vitka commented that the Plan is lengthy - it was a 3-hour read for him, and he knew what was going on. He doesn't think anyone could get a clear understanding. Kate felt some of the language may not be understood as presented. It may need some background material. Wally asked if there would be an executive summary on the web site as well. David Brody felt that if we did a good job of advertising the public hearing, people may review the Plan ahead of time. Vic Paquet felt it was rather long for people to review the entire Draft Plan, and that a session from 6:00 to 7:00 PM may be a good idea. The committee discussed having 30 or 40 copies of the plan available for people to read. Chuck Rizzone asked that the four (4) major points to be discussed be put on the post card, possibly with the page number in the plan referenced. David Brody wondered if we should do a full mailing. Kate felt a post card was a better way to go. Lynda stated that we could look into a larger post card and do that if possible. David Brody asked there is an icon right in the middle of the home page of the web site, and the ability to click on that to go to the Plan. He felt it should be the focal point for at least the two weeks prior to the public hearing.

This will be the Community Plan Committee's public hearing. The Committee would then approve that the Plan be sent up to the Village Board. Dan stated we would take the comments at the public hearing and put them into spreadsheet form. At a meeting in December or early next year, the committee could review the comments and determine how it would like to handle them. Based on that review, a version will be drafted for the Village Board's consideration. Dan wasn't sure how the Village Board wants to handle the Plan at this point. There will be written comments following the hearing. The public hearing notice will open up a comment period. This must be held open for 10 days following the public hearing. Lawrence stated it is quite a lengthy process to incorporate the comments. It could take a while. Dan felt that the CPC wouldn't be in a position to do anything with this until after the 1st of the year. David Brody was concerned about the time for the CPC to review the product. He would like a longer time than 4 days to review. Wally agreed with that.

Dan suggested closing the comment period around the 15th or 20th. David Brody said he would like to have at least 2 weeks to review the comments. Carolyn Schlifke will be gone as of the 31st of December. Everything will be mailed to those who will be out of town. Chuck Akers stated that he will be traveling as well.

It was decided that comments will be given to CPC by January 15th, along with a recommended response. The Committee will meet on the last Tuesday of the month, which is January 29th.

The CPC requested that a letter to go to the chair of each Village committee to remind them to invite their committee members to the public hearing. Dan also asked that the CPC members talk about this to their neighbors. John Behan, someone from SRF, and EDR will be present at the public hearing. Dave Versel probably will not be here for this meeting.

Dave Vitka asked if there was a formal education for the Village Board, or if they're "just handed the book". Dan Howard stated that we will be working with the Board. The SEQR process is involved. Many board members have been present at the Committee meetings. They will hopefully all come to the public hearing being held by the CPC and this will give them an opportunity to learn about the plan if they haven't yet. The Village Board may want to meet with the CPC collectively to give their perspective on the plan. Dan will talk to the Board to see how they want to handle it on their end. There has been a lot of discussion and ideas. In other communities the Board many times does not sit in on the meetings, so the Village Board is better versed than other communities have been.

Lawrence stated he would like to have the committee present at the public hearing, and would like them collectively to sit at a table together. The committee should somewhat respond to peoples comments. If it is too much, the comment can be noted and the consultants could intervene.

Motion made by Chuck Rizzone, seconded by Paul Iskalo, to release the plan to the public.

Unanimously Carried.

NEXT MEETING

The Public Hearing will take place on December 4th at 6:00 PM.

The next CPC meeting will be January 29th at 6:00 PM.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one was present at the time to comment.

CLOSE OF MEETING

Motion made by David Brody, seconded by Vic Paquet, to close the meeting at 7:25 PM.

Unanimously carried.