

# **Appendices:**

**Appendix A:     Town Board Resolution Establishing the Open  
Space Committee**

**Appendix B:     Open Space Questionnaire Results**

**Appendix C:     Open Space Scoring System**

**Appendix D:     Cost Comparisons for Servicing Development vs.  
Open Space**

**Appendix E:     Public Information Meeting Minutes**

## **Appendix A: Town Board Resolution Establishing the Open Space Committee**

---

Sponsored by: Edward F. Rosenberg, Town Councilman  
Submitted by: Kevin Corcoran, Town Planner

### **RESOLUTION NO. 69-2006**

**Moved by:** Councilman Rosenberg  
**Seconded by:** Councilman Quinn

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Glenville is concerned that open space, including agricultural resources, is being lost as a result of new development, particularly residential development; and

**WHEREAS**, the Glenville Town Board believes that the subject of open space should be studied to determine if action is warranted to address the preservation of open space; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town Board has determined that an Open Space Committee should be appointed to study this topic;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Town Board hereby establishes a seven-member open space committee, with appointment of individual members to follow after consideration of the qualifications, interests, and addresses of the 26 Glenville residents who have expressed an interest in serving on an Open Space Committee; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the charge of the Open Space Committee is as follows:

- To determine if strategies for the protection of open space in Glenville are warranted, based on numerous land use, census, and mapping resources, and based on guidance from various agencies such as the New York Planning Federation, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Capital District Regional Planning Commission, Schenectady County Planning Department, Town of Glenville Planning Department, and municipalities that have already examined open space matters and/or have adopted open space plans, etc.
- If it is determined that the Town should address the loss of open space, the Committee shall articulate the range of options that are available regarding preservation, strengths and liabilities of the various options, relative costs of the these options, and anticipated level of staff commitment.

- To produce a written report to the Town Board, within nine months of appointment of the Committee, with said report outlining the merits of an open space planning effort, and with recommendations as to framework, scope, costs, staff/consulting needs, etc.

and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that the Town of Glenville Planning Department will serve as staff to the Committee, with Councilwoman DiGiandomenico to serve as the Town Board liaison to the Committee.

**Ayes:** Councilmen Rosenberg, Quinn, Bailey, Councilwoman DiGiandomenico and Supervisor Quinn

**Noes:** None

**Absent:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Motion Carried**

Town Board decision on February 1, 2006

## Appendix B: Open Space Questionnaire Results

---

### TOWN OF GLENVILLE OPEN SPACE COMMITTEE

### Open Space Questionnaire Results

The Town of Glenville Open Space Committee is currently preparing an Open Space Plan. The following is a questionnaire to determine your opinions about open space protection. The information you provide below will assist the Town in creating the plan.

**Question #1. Should Glenville have a plan for preserving some amount of its open space (farms, forests, recreational space, scenic vistas)?**

459 Yes

10 No

**Question #2. Does Glenville need more open space for public use (hiking, biking, organized sports, picnicking, enjoying the outdoors)?**

322 Yes

117 No

**Question #3. How important is it to you to protect, expand, or improve:**

	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Most Important</u>
a. our aquifer	8	98	355
b. stream corridors	17	185	252
c. wetlands	46	179	228
d. wildlife and associated ecological resources	24	183	246
e. places of historical value	43	225	192
f. scenic views	49	224	201
g. community entranceways	99	239	101
h. open spaces for active recreation (i.e., ball fields)	89	258	109
i. open spaces for passive recreation (i.e., hiking)	40	220	208
j. farmlands	44	170	245
k. forests and woodlands	17	140	303

**Question #4. How satisfied are you with the Town's current park facilities in relationship to the following:**

	<u>Not Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Most Satisfied</u>
Organized sports/activities (i.e., soccer, baseball, playgrounds)	<b>43</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>93</b>
Passive recreation (i.e., biking, walking, fishing, hunting, etc.)	<b>150</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>49</b>

**Question #5. What are the types and locations for future open space that you believe are the most important for the Town to consider?**

	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Most Important</u>
Small areas throughout the Town	<b>132</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>94</b>
Medium-sized areas in a few locations	<b>77</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>89</b>
Large-sized open space areas in a very few locations	<b>112</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>143</b>
A mix of open space (small to large)	<b>54</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>195</b>
Areas adjacent to existing parks and preserves	<b>83</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>121</b>
Areas currently without open space	<b>115</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>116</b>
Trail linkages between existing open space areas	<b>102</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>142</b>
Trail linkages between neighborhoods	<b>161</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>105</b>
Open space with public access along the Mohawk River	<b>38</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>230</b>

**Question #6. In order to preserve open space, do you think Glenville should:**

Acquire land and easements through donations	<b>383</b> Yes	<b>42</b> No
Partner with State/land trusts to purchase land/easements	<b>350</b> Yes	<b>70</b> No
Establish a program to purchase development rights	<b>262</b> Yes	<b>127</b> No
Encourage landowners to preserve their land through tax incentives, voluntary conservation easements, etc.	<b>391</b> Yes	<b>44</b> No
Establish a policy for acquiring land	<b>358</b> Yes	<b>69</b> No
Increase taxes to purchase land and easements	<b>95</b> Yes	<b>328</b> No
Increase the use of planning and land use regulations	<b>327</b> Yes	<b>83</b> No

**Name and address (optional):** **267**

(TALLY DATE:10/20/06)

## Appendix C: Open Space Scoring System

---

### Open Space Scoring System

	<u>Points</u>
<b>Aquifer Recharge Areas</b>	
- Wellhead protection zone	5
- Primary recharge zone	4
<b>New York State Freshwater Wetlands</b>	
- Wetland	3
- 100' buffer	1
<b>100-Year Flood Plains</b>	3
<b>Slopes in Excess of 15%</b>	2
<b>Rivers and Streams</b>	
- Property adjacent to Mohawk River	4
- Class AA or A stream flows through the property	3
- Trout stream flows through the property	3
- Class AA or A stream borders the property	1.5
- Class B or C stream flows through the property	2
- Class B or C stream borders property	1
- All other year-round streams (flow through or adjacent to the property)	0.5
<b>Significant Plant or Animal Habitat</b>	3
<b>Unique Geological Resource</b>	3
<b>Historic Significance</b>	
- Structure on National or State registry	4
- Historic marker identifying structure	3
- Historic site	3
- Historic marker citing property	2
- Adjacent to historic structure (regardless of whether on registry or not)	1.5
<b>Working Landscapes and Farms</b>	
- Forestry property tax exemption	3
- Active Farm	3
- Class I and II ("prime") soils	3
- Adjacent to an active farm	1

	<b><u>Points</u></b>
<b>Adjacent to Public Park or Preserve</b>	5
<b>Recreational</b>	
- Downhill ski areas	4
- Hiking, biking, skiing trails	4
- Hunting, fishing, game clubs	3
- Sledding hills	3
- Proposed parks, playgrounds, trails, and other recreational features	3
- Boating access	3
<b>Viewsheds</b>	
- Property is part of a significant viewshed	3
- Mohawk River view	3
- Ridgelines & hillsides comprising a vista from public properties or roads	1
- Roadside vista adjacent to property	1
<b>Airport Runway Protection Zones</b>	5
<b>Adjacency to Linear Features</b>	
- Adjacent to Wolf Hollow	4
- Adjacent to Hoffman's Fault	3
- Adjacent to Mohawk-Hudson Bike-Hike Trail	3
- Adjacent to old trolley line	2
- Adjacent to any proposed bike paths	2
- Adjacent to any proposed greenways, waterways, or linkages	2

## Appendix D: Cost comparisons for servicing development vs. Open space

---

Sample Cost of Community Services Studies in Northeastern U.S. Revenue-to-Expenditure Ratios in Dollars			
	Residential including Farm Houses	Combined Commercial & Industrial	Farm/Forest Open Land
<b>Connecticut</b>			
Bolton (1)	1: 1.05	1: 0.23	1: 0.50
Durham (2)	1: 1.07	1: 0.27	1: 0.23
Farmington (2)	1: 1.33	1: 0.32	1: 0.31
Hebron (3)	1: 1.06	1: 0.47	1: 0.43
Litchfield (2)	1: 1.11	1: 0.34	1: 0.34
Pomfret (2)	1: 1.06	1: 0.27	1: 0.86
<b>Massachusetts</b>			
Agawam (4)	1: 1.05	1: 0.44	1: 0.31
Becket (2)	1: 1.02	1: 0.83	1: 0.72
Deerfield (4)	1: 1.16	1: 0.38	1: 0.29
Franklin (2)	1: 1.02	1: 0.58	1: 0.40
Gill (4)	1: 1.15	1: 0.43	1: 0.38
Leverett (2)	1: 1.15	1: 0.29	1: 0.25
Southborough (5)	1: 1.03	1: 0.26	1: 0.45
Westford (2)	1: 1.15	1: 0.53	1: 0.39
Williamstown (6)	1: 1.11	1: 0.34	1: 0.40
<b>New Jersey</b>			
Freehold Township (7)	1: 1.51	1: 0.17	1: 0.33
Holmdel Township (7)	1: 1.38	1: 0.21	1: 0.66
Middletown Township (7)	1: 1.14	1: 0.34	1: 0.36
Upper Freehold Twp. (7)	1: 1.18	1: 0.20	1: 0.35
Wall Township (7)	1: 1.28	1: 0.30	1: 0.54
<b>New York</b>			
Amenia (8)	1: 1.23	1: 0.25	1: 0.17
Beekman (9)	1: 1.12	1: 0.18	1: 0.48
Dix (10)	1: 1.51	1: 0.27	1: 0.31
Farmington (11)	1: 1.22	1: 0.27	1: 0.72
Fishkill (8)	1: 1.23	1: 0.31	1: 0.74
Greenwich (15)	1: 1.40	1: 0.12	1: 0.16
Hector (10)	1: 1.30	1: 0.15	1: 0.28
Ithaca (town) (14)	1: 1.09	1: 0.27	1: 0.27
Kinderhook (12)	1: 1.05	1: 0.21	1: 0.17
Montour (13)	1: 1.50	1: 0.28	1: 0.29
Northeast (9)	1: 1.36	1: 0.29	1: 0.21
Reading (13)	1: 1.88	1: 0.26	1: 0.32
Red Hook (8)	1: 1.11	1: 0.20	1: 0.22
<b>Summary Data</b>			
58 communities (median)	1: 1.15	1: 0.29	1: 0.37
New York towns	1: 1.27	NA	1: 0.29

Source: Adapted from American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Technical Assistance Division, with additions by Camoin Associates, Inc.



## Table References

- (1) Geisler, K. (1999). *Cost of Community Services Study: Bolton, Connecticut*. Unpublished paper. Keene, NH: Antioch New England Graduate School.
- (2) Commonwealth Research Group, Inc. (1995). *Cost of Community Services in Southern New England*. Chepachet, RI: Southern New England Forest Consortium, Inc.
- (3) American Farmland Trust (1986). *The Cost of Community Services in Hebron, Connecticut*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- (4) American Farmland Trust (1992). *Does Farmland Protection Pay? The Cost of Community Services in Three Massachusetts Towns*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- (5) Adams, M. and T. Hines (1997). *Assessing Land-Use Costs: A Cost of Community Services Study in Southborough, Massachusetts*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- (6) Hazler, K., J. Kinabrew and W. Sullivan (1992). *The Cost of Community Services in Williamstown, Massachusetts*. Williamstown, MA: Williams College, Department of Environmental Planning.
- (7) American Farmland Trust (1998). *The Cost of Community Services in Monmouth County, New Jersey*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- (8) Bucknall, C. (1989). *The Real Cost of Development*. Poughkeepsie, NY: Scenic Hudson, Inc.
- (9) American Farmland Trust and Cornell Cooperative Extension of Dutchess County (1989). *Cost of Community Services Study: Towns of Beekman and Northeast, Dutchess County, New York*. Milbrook, NY: American Farmland Trust and Cornell Cooperative Extension.
- (10) Schuyler County League of Women Voters (1993). *Fiscal Impact of Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Land Use in the Towns of Hector and Dix*. Schuyler County, NY: League of Women Voters.
- (11) Kinsman, C., L. Garrison and J. Sloan (1991). *Farmington Cost of Community Services Study*. Milbrook, NY: Cornell Cooperative Extension and American Farmland Trust.
- (12) Concerned Citizens of Kinderhook (1996). Cited by American Farmland Trust, Technical Assistance Division, on website, [www.farmlandinfo.org](http://www.farmlandinfo.org), July 2001.
- (13) Schuyler County League of Women Voters (1992). *Fiscal Impact of Residential, Commercial and Agricultural Land Use in the Towns of Montour and Reading*. Schuyler County, NY: League of Women Voters.
- (14) Tompkins County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (1996). *Study of Tompkins County Agriculture, Tompkins County Agriculture & Farmland Protection Plan*.

- (15) Washington County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (1996). *Cost of Community Services Study, Washington County Agriculture & Farmland Protection Plan: Supporting Studies*.

---

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> American Farmland Trust (2000). *Cost of Community Services Studies Fact Sheet*. [www.farmlandinfo.org/fisc/tas/tafs-cocs.html](http://www.farmlandinfo.org/fisc/tas/tafs-cocs.html).
- <sup>2</sup> American Farmland Trust and Cornell Cooperative Extension of Dutchess County (1989). *Cost of Community Services Study: Towns of Beekman and Northeast, Dutchess County, New York*. Milbrook, NY: American Farmland Trust and Cornell Cooperative Extension.
- <sup>3</sup> Cited in Crompton, John L. (2000). *The Impact of Parks and Open Space on Property Values and the Property Tax Base*. Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- <sup>4</sup> American Farmland Trust (1992). *Does Farmland Protection Pay? The Cost of Community Services in Three Massachusetts Towns*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- <sup>5</sup> Washington County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (1996). *Cost of Community Services Study, Washington County Agriculture & Farmland Protection Plan: Supporting Studies*.
- <sup>6</sup> American Farmland Trust (1986). *Density Related Public Costs*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- <sup>7</sup> American Farmland Trust (1999). *Cost of Community Services: Skagit County, Washington*. Northampton, MA: American Farmland Trust.
- <sup>8</sup> Vermont League of Cities and Towns and Vermont Natural Resources Council (1990). *The Tax Base and the Tax Bill: Tax Implications of Development, An Overview*. Montpelier, VT: Vermont League of Cities and Towns and Vermont Natural Resources Council. Cited in American Farmland Trust, *Does Farmland Protection Pay?*, op. cit.

# Cost of Community Services Study

## Chester County, Pennsylvania

### (2003)

#### Goal

In the summer of 2002, the Brandywine Conservancy studied the costs of growth in five townships along the Route 41 corridor in Chester County, Pennsylvania, as part of a larger effort to preserve farmland and open space in the area while providing communities with good planning tools.

#### Environmental Value

Cost of Community Services studies were prepared that calculated the costs of providing municipal and education services to each of the four major land uses within these five townships—residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural—and compared that to the revenues received, e.g., property taxes, from those land uses. The studies used actual 2001 data and followed a nationally accepted methodology that was adapted to Pennsylvania through Penn State University's Cooperative Extension Service and Penn State professor, Dr. Timothy Kelsey. The Conservancy documented that, in each of the five townships, tax revenues and other fees provided by new residential development did not cover the costs of municipal services and educational demands that such development generated. Therefore, taxes can be expected to rise as a result of new residential growth. By contrast, farmland generates a substantial net budget surplus.

The accompanying Summary Table lists the five townships in the Route 41 corridor and the findings for residential uses using 2001 data.

*Summary Table. Municipal and Educational Service Cost Shortfalls for Residential Uses*

<b>Township</b>	<b>Residential Revenue to Expense Ratio<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Residential Net Difference (actual dollars)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Average Shortfall Per Public School Student<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>London Grove</b>	1:1.19	- \$1,757,639	- \$3,724
<b>Londonderry</b>	1:1.08	- \$281,146	- \$5,604
<b>Highland</b>	1:1.14	- \$407,376	- \$5,746
<b>West Fallowfield</b>	1:1.13	- \$602,938	- \$5,785
<b>West Sadsbury</b>	1:1.33	- \$1,480,733	- \$6,448

<sup>1</sup> For every dollar collected from the residential community, using London Grove Township as an example, \$1.19 was spent on municipal and educational services.

<sup>2</sup> The total residential tax revenue generated per municipality, using Highland Township as an example, fell \$407,376 short of covering the cost of providing municipal and educational services.

<sup>3</sup> The total residential tax revenue generated to educate each student, using West Sadsbury Township as an example, fell \$6,448 short of the actual education costs for each student.

#### Result

Increased farmland and other open space preservation, balanced with modest increases in residential land development, will help reduce increasing municipal service and education costs—as well as temper spiraling tax increases. Clearly, not only does the preservation of farmland and other open space protect a township's cultural heritage and its natural resources by avoiding some of the costs of growth, it also saves money for the residents. Three of the five townships that we studied utilized this information to educate residents on open space referenda for the fall 2003 elections. Two of the townships garnered the necessary voter support.

---

Source: Environmental Management Center, Brandywine Conservancy

## Appendix E: Public Information Meeting Minutes

---

### Town of Glenville Open Space Committee Public Information Meeting June 19, 2006

*Committee members in attendance:* Diane Berning, Dan Grzybowski, Al Haugen, Dorothy Hickok, Dan Hill, Barbara Jefts, Hugh Jenkins, Ray Koch, Stanley Lee, Jack Osterlitz, Michael Pileggi, Mike Sheppeck, Don Snell, Hank Stebbins, Michael Sterthous, Mark Storti, Harry Willis

*Town officials in attendance:* Frank Quinn, Town Supervisor, Kevin Corcoran, Town Planner, Michael Burns, Planner I, Bob Kirkham, Highway Department, Norm Hagen, Highway Department

*Residents/landowners in attendance:*

Megan Allen	Maybrook Drive
Ed Baker	Acorn Drive
Mel Banker	Waters Road
Lisa Burton	Cedar Lane
Robert Clark and family	Van Buren Road
Pat Culhane	Sutherland Drive
Jim Edwards	Kevin Drive
Nancy Edwards	Kevin Drive
David Greenwood	Maybrook Drive
Sally Greenwood	Maybrook Drive
Jan Hagen	Touareuna Road
Paul Hubel	Maybrook Drive
Sarah Hubel	Maybrook Drive
Audrey Hughes	Cedar Lane
Tom Kudlacik	Hetcheltown Road
Kathy Less	Maybrook Drive
Reggie Less	Maybrook Drive
Dorie McArthur	Onderdonk Road
Garry Packer	Jennifer Road
Ron Pucci	Gower Road
Dale Purvis	North Road
Don Reid	Acorn Drive
Kailyn Sheppeck	Alplaus Avenue
Frank Winters	Hetcheltown Road
Donna Wojcik	Indian Kill Road
Marjie Zielaskowski	Sacandaga Road

*Others in attendance:* Mary Martialay, Daily Gazette

Another six to eight people attended but did not sign in.

- Chairman Storti called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Introductions of the Open Space Committee members followed. Mr. Storti also recognized Town Supervisor Quinn and Town Planning staff.
- Mr. Storti offered an observation from his childhood; about how easy it used to be to walk a significant distance to go fishing without being confronted with development. Now it is not so easy, as open space has been steadily lost to development. Mark then discussed the agenda for this evening, noting that feedback from residents and landowners is very important as this will help shape the open space plan.
- Kevin Corcoran then made a *Power Point* presentation showing photographs of existing open spaces in Glenville; both publicly-owned open spaces and privately-held. Mr. Corcoran's presentation also detailed the mission and tasks of the Open Space Committee, as well as a timetable for preparation of the Plan.
- Mark Storti then took a few minutes to go over the open space questionnaire that was handed out this evening. The Town will also be distributing the questionnaire in the next issue of the *Glenville Newsletter*, which will be mailed out within a couple of weeks. For those in attendance this evening, Mark suggested that they return the questionnaire to the Town within two weeks. The Town will place a box for completed questionnaires at the counter of the main office at Town Hall.

There were a couple of questions from the audience about particular wording of certain questions, but it was decided that the questionnaire will remain unchanged, as it has been revised many times to this point.

- Mike Sterthous followed Mark Storti's discussion on the open space questionnaire by detailing the mission of the Mohawk-Hudson Land Conservancy (MHLC), formerly known as the Albany County Land Conservancy.

The MHLC acquires property through purchase for conservation purposes. Currently the MHLC has 1,100 acres in its possession in the Capital District. The Conservancy also acquires conservation easements, either through purchase or donation. The MHLC is currently working with two Glenville property owners, in the Wolf Hollow area, to secure conservation easements on portions of their properties. Mr. Sterthous sees other opportunities in Glenville. The fact that Glenville is putting together an Open Space Plan will assist the MHLC in evaluating acquisition or easement opportunities as they arise in Glenville.

The MHLC acts as the steward of the conservation easements that they secure. The organization monitors properties on a yearly basis to make sure that conditions of the easement are being met.

The New York State Legislature just passed a law that will, for the first time, provide a tax credit to those that opt to place their land in a conservation easement. The tax credit

program amounts to a 25% property tax refund. This incentive should foster voluntary open space preservation efforts statewide on the part of landowners.

Mr. Sterthous acknowledged that the acquisition of land by conservancy organizations results in properties being taken off the tax rolls. But it was also noted that it cost more to service sprawl than would be received in property tax revenue.

- Mr. Storti then highlighted the elements of the “Environmental Features” map. This map identifies properties and areas that possess qualities that make the areas well-suited for preservation. Some of the features include parks, preserves, wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, aquifer recharge areas, and farms.

Mark then asked the audience if there were other features that should be added. The Ski Ventures ski area off of Johnson Road and the sledding hill adjacent to the Glendale Nursing Home on Hetcheltown Road were both mentioned. These will be added to the map, which will be displayed in the lobby of Town Hall, and hopefully on the Town’s website.

- Mr. Storti then opened up the floor to those with suggestions and/or questions. The following is a summary of questions/comments and responses:

An attendee asked how the MHLC decides what properties should be preserved. Mr. Sterthous answered that the Conservancy has developed criteria for evaluating and ranking properties, much like what the Town is doing in crafting their evaluation/ranking system. Some of the criteria include the development threat to the property, adjacency to existing parks/preserves, and viewsheds. Mr. Sterthous also noted that the MHLC doesn’t accept all donations or purchase offers, in part because not all properties score well, and the fact that funding is limited.

A question was posed whether Glenville was looking at its neighbors as it develops its open space plan, with the suggestion that Glenville needs to be in synch with our neighboring towns. Mr. Storti noted that we have looked at our neighbors to a degree. We are aware of Clifton Park’s open space plan. We will also find out what is occurring in Ballston, Charlton, and Amsterdam.

A question was posed about wetlands, given today’s (or yesterday’s?) U.S. Supreme Court decision that has somewhat called into question what constitutes a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (A.C.O.E.) wetland. It was then pointed out that the *Environmental Features* map only shows New York State Freshwater Wetlands, namely because A.C.O.E. wetlands aren’t mapped. Consequently, the Supreme Court decision doesn’t have much bearing on the Open Space Committee’s work. The Committee will have to address how we should deal with A.C.O.E. wetlands.

Another individual asked if the Town’s leaders are on the same page as the Open Space Committee. In other words, will there be support for the open space plan once it is released? Mr. Storti indicated that we really don’t know yet. But, the Town Board appointed the

Committee and established its mission. The next step is for the Committee to develop criteria to determine what properties are best-suited for preservation.

One of the attendees pointed out that the MHLC isn't the only entity that can work with landowners to preserve land. Is the Town going to look at other conservancies and additional incentives? Also, the Town needs to make an effort to assist landowners in conserving land. The burden can't be entirely on landowners; there has to be contributions from the Town as well.

Similarly, it was suggested that the Town shouldn't ask people to preserve open space and then hit the landowners with a high property assessment. There has to be recognition on the Town's part that there is value in preserving land. Assessments should reflect the fact that the land can not be developed.

With no more questions, Mr. Storti noted that there will be several more meetings over the next 12 to 18 months where the Town will be soliciting public comments on our open space plan. He then thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Submitted by Kevin Corcoran

## **Town of Glenville Open Space Committee Public Information Meeting December 14, 2006**

Glenville Town Planner, Kevin Corcoran, opened the public information meeting at approximately 7:10 P.M. welcoming attendees, making general housekeeping announcements and introducing Open Space Committee Chairman, Mark Storti.

Mr. Storti introduced members of the Open Space Committee attending, and reviewed the committee's mission statement and tasks assigned by the Town Board. A summary of draft goals, an "open space scoring system," and list of publicly-owned open space in Glenville was shown in addition to other work completed by the committee to date. Background information was supported by numerous maps located around the meeting room (Publicly-Owned Open Spaces, Environmental Features, Natural, Scenic, and Historic Features (i.e. Schaefer Map) and Open Space Areas). Results of the recent "open space survey," distributed in the July/August edition of the Town of Glenville newsletter, were discussed briefly.

An explanation was given for creating three subcommittees (open space planning strategies, environmental resources, and historic resources) and their pertinent areas of research. Each of the three subcommittees presented information relevant to their assigned area, beginning with Hank Stebbins and Harry Willis serving on the open space planning strategies subcommittee. Some of the methods available for preserving open space in New York State include;

- New York State's new 25% conservation easement tax abatement program
- Transfer of Development rights
- Revision to zoning and subdivision codes
- Official maps
- Clustered subdivisions
- Planned unit Developments
- Incentive zoning.

Environmental resources subcommittee members Don Snell and Charlie Beers discussed efforts to identify unique plant and animal habitats. The critical nature of water resources was presented. Specifically, the town's drinking water resources and aquifer were highlighted. Reference was made to the Intermunicipal Watershed Board and its rules and regulations governing land use within aquifer protection zones of the Town.

Historic resources subcommittee member Stanley Lee presented summarized the various historic resources (buildings, cemeteries, sites, etc.) in Glenville, noting that most are not officially recognized by listing on either the State or National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lee discussed the difference between historic district formation and individual historic site nomination. He explained the benefits of inclusion on State or National Register of Historic Places and some of the common misconceptions concerning government regulation of National Register properties. The process for nominating a property was detailed. Finally, Mr. Lee emphasized the need to generate more public interest in Glenville for adding properties to the National Register.

Chairman Storti opened the floor to public comments and a questions and answers period (questions listed below).

- How will additional Open Spaces/Greenspace be paid for? Who will bear the burden of the extra cost(s)?
- Is there political will and public backing/support to save (and pay for) open space preservation?
- Can a surcharge be added to new property purchases in support of open space preservation? Can a bond be issued in support of open space preservation?
- What is the anticipated impact upon those who presently own large tracts of undeveloped land? What new regulations, costs, etc., will the landowners assume to preserve open space?
- No additional costs should be borne by present landowners. If people desire open space preservation, these people should purchase the land themselves.
- Concerned with continual increase in property tax burden. The increases make it difficult to retain the land in its undeveloped condition.
- Concerned about public water extensions into undeveloped areas, specifically Washout Road (the impact upon properties with large road frontage), and the resultant additional tax burden.
- Mentioned the efforts underway to compensate agricultural landowners in Delaware County (NYC watershed area) for not developing their properties for residential or seasonal home purposes.
- The added property tax burden and development potential associated with public water main extensions should be carefully considered before an extension receives approval.



- Can property tax incentives/abatement be given for landowners who willingly preserve their land as open space?
- Should “eminent domain” be regarded as an option for preserving open space?
- Has the committee explored “Right to Farm Laws” as another option for preserving rural open spaces?
- What is the significance of numerous “paper streets” through out the town? Can these be linked together and preserved?
- Has the committee reviewed successful open space plans from other municipalities? Are there common landowner concerns? What have other communities successfully implemented to address preservation and landowner reservations?
- What are the true benefits of an “Official Map?”
- What is the value of open space and a high quality of life? Have studies been completed assessing this?
- A “Cost of Development Study” is commonly used to assess the fiscal implications associated with new development. Have any been reviewed by the committee? Will a similar study be prepared for this open space planning effort?

Town Councilman Bailey suggested that the Power Point presentations be added to the Town’s website for public review, as well as the “Real Cost of Development” publication that examined the cost of residential sprawl in three Dutchess County towns. Mr. Bailey also commented on the substantial amount of work completed to date but also acknowledged the need to reach consensus on key open space issues before the Town Board considers the plan.

Being no further comments or questions, Chairman Storti thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:48 P.M.

Submitted by Michael Burns

## **Town of Glenville Open Space Committee** **Public Information Meeting** **April 26, 2007**

Town of Glenville Open Space Committee Chairman, Mark Storti, opened the public information meeting at approximately 7:06 P.M. welcoming attendees, and introducing members of the Town Board, Open Space Committee and town planning department staff in attendance.

Mr. Storti reviewed the Open Space Committee’s mission statement formulated by the Town Board to guide committee efforts. Several maps were located around the meeting room (Publicly-Owned Open Spaces, Environmental Features, Natural, Scenic, and Historic Features (i.e. Schaefer Map) and Open Space Areas) illustrating background information collected and evaluated by the committee. Results of the recent “open space community survey,” were reviewed and discussed briefly.

A summary of draft open space plan goals and objectives was presented using Power Point slides and a handout. These goals and objectives were reviewed by Chairman Storti after

which, Mr. Storti opened the floor to public comments and a questions and answers period (questions listed below).

The following issues and questions were put forth from the approximately 60-65 members of the public attending:

- The word “acquisition” appears four times in the list of draft goals. Is the Town of Glenville actually seeking properties to acquire?
- How will property owners who preserve open spaces be compensated? Will they receive relief from property tax burdens?
- Will recreation impact fees received from housing developments and subdivisions be used to purchase open space?
- Will “eminent domain” be considered as a method for preserving open space? People are worried about this possibility.
- Will the fiscal impact of preserving open space be studied?
- Concerns about increases in property taxes for rural land owners. What can be done to reduce these taxes?
- Why is there emphasis on preserving Town gateways? Who will pay for this?
- Will open space that is preserved be open for public use?
- Public water and sewer extensions into rural areas should be considered carefully and perhaps prohibited altogether.
- General comment concerning the balance of taxes within the Town of Glenville. Specifically, what could be done to encourage additional commercial/business development? Additionally, there should be no corporate “give always” in terms of taxes, which ultimately place a greater tax burden on residents and landowners.
- Fill empty businesses within developed areas of the town such as the vacant K-mart property.
- Stream corridors should feature buffers to provide linkages between open spaces.

Being no further comments or questions, Chairman Storti thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:48 P.M.

Submitted by Michael Burns