

APPENDIX A
Planning Workshop 1 Report

Town of Carmel
Croton Plan
Comprehensive Plan & Zoning Ordinance
Update

Planning Workshop 1
Report
Thursday
May 6, 1999

Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The Carmel Town Board held the first community workshops in May to begin to identify the goals and objectives for the Town's Year 2000 Comprehensive Plan. Approximately 100 people attended the workshop which was held in the Town Hall.

The workshop began with an introduction and welcoming remarks by Frank DelCampo, Town Supervisor. Following this introduction was a slide show presentation given by Frank Fish and Evie Strauss of Buckhurst Fish and Jacquemart, Inc. Planners, and Gerry Schwalbe of Divney Tung Shwalbe, engineers. The presentation consisted of an overview of the planning process and time schedule, a description of the scope of work. These are summarized on the attached timetable. This was followed by a brief review of the history of planning in Carmel, a general analysis of demographics and land use, and an introduction to the environmental and engineering issues facing Carmel. The presentation included a series of photographic images of Carmel.

After a short coffee break, a 'Town Meeting' was conducted and participants were invited to ask questions and make comments on any aspect of the future plan or planning process. Specifically, the consultants requested input regarding goals and objectives for the study, and input regarding issues faced by the town including strengths and weaknesses. For almost two hours, participants elaborated on their ideas and concerns regarding the Croton Plan, the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

The workshop generated a wide array of ideas from the public about Carmel's future, as well as highlighted issues and concerns currently being faced by the City. Workshop participants also offered a variety of recommendations as to how all these ideas might be addressed by the Town and its residents. This report summarizes the collective output of the workshop and provides a framework within which the Town can begin the Comprehensive Plan update.

The workshop closed with an announcement of the next workshop to be held in September when school sessions resume.

QUESTIONS & COMMENTS:

1. Suggestion that the Plan be a regional, not just county-wide or Town-wide perspective. Since there is a need and goal for NYC to have a greenbelt surrounding the city, Putnam County should be considered part of this greenbelt.
2. A.) The plan should include as part of the process, an overlay that includes new subdivision activity.
B.) Traffic information should include the hamlets of Carmel and Mahopac and around the Lakes during the Summer.
C.) Zoning text needs to include a category for Home Offices.
3. Request for specific recommendations, not just an analysis
4. Concern that most data is from 1990 and 1991 and the year 2000 data from the US Census will not be available until the year 2,002. Suggestion to add in the data at a future date and to try to get more current data from other sources such as utility companies.
5. Question regarding the affects of illegal uses on the town and a concern that too many zoning changes are made.
6. Request to investigate alternatives to waste disposal besides septic, including on-site waste disposal system, on-site recycling system, community recycling system, improved on-site septic systems.
7. Concern regarding loss of water quantity and quality as development continues. Wells are being removed and becoming dry. Should analyze water supply and project levels based on density, rainfall and removal of water sources, etc.
8. Question regarding school involvement with the process. Answer explained the use of existing study by Carmel and planned study by Mahopac School District to be integrated and discussions already underway with each district. Plan will look at projections for the Town and relate back to the school needs.
9. Concern if the Croton Plan has any benefit to Carmel. 90% of the study is funded by NY City, but the client is the Carmel Town Board, so the Plan will directly address the needs and goals of the Town. In answer to the question if the plan is mandated, it was explained that although it is not mandated, Putnam County decided that each individual town would produce their own Croton Plan which was agreed upon.

10. Need expressed to protect the Putnam County environment, especially wildlife and recreation land. Concern that there be a balance between fiscal needs and environmental development.
11. In response to the comment regarding the use of Professor Zimmerman's infrastructure study, it was explained that it is only a revision from the old plan and focuses only on a few particular segments. Much of the data may be outdated.
12. Suggestion to focus on stormwater issues and to investigate contamination sources (i.e. filling stations). In answer to this concern, it was mentioned that the State and County have data which will be mapped and analyzed for the Town. Land uses in the watershed and critical problem areas will be analyzed.
13. Concern that since a variety of proposals will be suggested, how will these be paid for? Fiscal issues and sources will be investigated as part of the plan. The EIS requires such an analysis.
14. Question regarding impacts to Emergency Service due to land use and population changes. Answer confirmed analysis for a land use perspective, but not regarding the internal affect on these functions.
15. Question regarding how extensive and expensive the updates would be.
16. Suggestion that the following information be included: Diversion and affects of diversion, building permits, traffic flow.
17. Concern that the following be included: Historic features, wetlands and steep slopes, and wildlife.
18. Question regarding how this study will integrate the Diversion Study recommendations since no decision by the county regarding the study recommendations. Consultants commented that this study will deal with that which is completed during our planning process, otherwise the plan could wait on particular areas or make recommendations to the county.
19. Concern that we should delay the Plan until there is better data. In answer to this concern it was suggested that If the Town has a plan then it can make recommendation to the County, State and NYCity. In addition, many aspects are not directly related to the Croton Plan and water-related issues.
20. Concern that there are already mandates on properties and with this study more restriction will result.
21. Comment that tourism industry should be endorsed.

- 22.** Comment that Towns are trying to stabilize their tax base, along with inevitable residential growth and the resultant need for increased septic, etc. and the limited commercial growth projected by the Chazan report - Can we evaluate the new WWTP based on these factors?
- 23.** Question regarding how will the population growth will affect the Zoning recommendations?

APPENDIX B
Planning Workshop 2 Report

Town of Carmel



Planning Workshop II

September 30, 1999



Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart Inc.



INTRODUCTION

The Town of Carmel is participating in the Croton Plan, a New York City Department of Environmental Protection initiative to help protect the Croton Watershed and guide balanced growth pressures with water quality protection. In the Memorandum of Agreement with all municipalities in the watershed, volunteer participation in the program is allowed. The Town is also updating its Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance in conjunction with this process.

The Carmel Town Board and Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart Inc. (BFJ) held the second community workshop on September 30, 1999. The first, held on May 6, 1998, took place at the Town Hall. It helped to identify goals and objectives for updating the Comprehensive Plan. This second workshop provided the findings of the Community Character assessment and an overview of water quality in the Croton Watershed. Approximately 50 people were in attendance at workshop II.

The workshop began with a greeting and introduction by the Town Supervisor, Frank Del Campo. A slide show presentation followed given by Frank Fish of BFJ and Jerry Schwalbe of Divney Tung Schwalbe, Engineers. The presentation provided an overview of the planning process and a series of photographic images of Carmel. For discussion purposes, a concept land use map was outlined to the audience. It recognized many existing land uses, and a number of changes to the existing comprehensive plan designations.

After a short coffee break, the gathering was broken up into small working groups. Participants were invited to sit at any one of five tables, each devoted to a major component of the Plan: Environment (wetlands, steep slopes, open space, recreation) Economic Development (retail business, employment, industry) Infrastructure (water, sewer, storm drainage) Traffic General Land Use and Zoning.

To help focus the discussions, the working groups were each provided with a handout containing several questions about the Plan component(s) being considered by that table (see Appendix A). For approximately one hour, participants discussed the questions, writing down their responses and suggestions. Afterwards, one person from each table presented that table's output to the entire gathering.

Workshop participants also offered a variety of recommendations as to how all these ideas might be addressed by the City and its residents. This report summarizes the collective output of the workshops and provides a framework within which the Planning Commission can begin to establish goals, policies and objectives of the 1999 Plan.

A. Economic Development

- Low impact industry/business would help to reduce tax burden on residential property.
- Transportation to major highways is required. Carmel Hamlet area best suited to attract industry.
- Retail business expansion does not benefit tax base.
- Encourage high technology industry to locate in Town and Putnam County.
- More business within Carmel may not necessarily benefit the residential taxpayer – more taxes may be required to address other problems created
- The natural environment is Carmel's most valuable asset which may attract tourism as a means of economic development.
- An institute of higher learning would not only benefit taxes, but retain the youth within the region.
- Mixed uses in hamlet areas would help to build neighborhoods.
- Assisted living complexes for the aged would not benefit residential tax burdens.

B. Traffic

Areas of Congestion:

- The intersection of State Route 52, Fair St. (C.R. 60) and Route 301, locally known as Library Corners. A proposed County Court complex would additionally impact upon this area.
- State Route 301 between State Route 52 and the Taconic State Parkway northwest of the Town of Carmel.
- The intersections of Fair Street (C.R. 60) and Vink Drive, Glenna Drive, Everett Road, Hill & Dale Road (C.R. 44), and Simpson Road (C.R. 57) east of Route 52. Several proposed developments could further impact these areas including the Centennial Golf Course Development, River Run Estates in the town of Southeast, and the Kent Development.
- The intersection of State Route 6 and Church Street.
- The intersection of State Route 6 and Willow Road.
- The confluence of Willow Road, Seminary Hill Road, and State Route 52 in the hamlet of Carmel.
- The intersection of Crane Road (C.R. 32) and State Route 6. A proposed rec-plex in this area would create additional traffic.
- The area adjacent to Putnam Plaza Shopping Center on State Route 6.
- The intersection of Croton Falls Road (C.R. 34) and State Route 6. Croton Falls Road is a major route for commuters into the hamlet of Mahopac.
- State Route 6, Stoneleigh Avenue (C.R. 35) and Drewville Road (C. R. 36) near the Hospital. Traffic results from hospital activity and commuters to and from Westchester County.
- The intersection of Drewville Road and Route 6.
- State Route 6 at East Lake Boulevard (C.R. 72) and at State Route 6N.
- Baldwin Place Road near the Baldwin Place Shopping Center

Traffic solutions:

- Eliminate prohibition of right turns from Fair Street (C.R. 60) to State Route 52.
- Eliminate parking on the east side of State Route 52 between Vink and State Route 301 within the hamlet of Carmel.
- Use old railroad right-of-way as an alternate to Route 6.

- Require all new developments to conduct a traffic impact study.
- Synchronize traffic signals on State and County roads.

C. Environment/Open Space

- Town to protect wetlands that are less than 12 acres in size – those wetland not already protected by the Department of Environmental Conservation.
- Promote and enforce the existing tree ordinance that protects trees eight inches in diameter or greater and limits the amount of land clearing.
- Limit area of disturbance for larger residential lots to protect animal habitats.
- Create stream corridor protection for St. Michaels Brook.
- Create nature preserve at Lockwood Pond.
- Purchase development rights (PDR) or transfer development rights (TDR) as regulations within the zoning ordinance to prevent further development.
- Create walking areas and bike paths
- Create public notification for developers and builders similar to Planning Board public hearing notification.

D. Sewer and Water

Sewer Issues:

- Sewer systems could create a loss of water supply – sewer studies should include effects on water supply.
- Septic system design controls need to be more stringent.
- There is a lack of construction checks/inspections during septic installations.
- Soil suitability should factor into minimum lot size for zoning.

Water Supply:

- Create public water supply system and develop long range plans to incorporate area within the town that are having water problems.
- Exclude ground water contamination sites from development.
- Reduce density to preserve water supply.
- New development proposal need greater study areas. Include not only adjacent properties, but watershed review as well.

E. General Land Use and Zoning

- Golf Course Zone
- Putnam Greenway along old Putnam Railway Line
- Purchase Development Rights or purchase for open space
- Mixed use zones within the hamlets allowing residential and commercial
- Create waterfront parks in hamlets
- Northeast section requires convenient shopping
- Half acre lots are not required. Sewers should be in those areas allowing for less than 40,000 square foot lot size.
- Home office uses should be addressed in the reviewing the Plan

APPENDIX C
IL District Study
