

TOWN OF MARBLETOWN PZC SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: June 7, 2018
 Rondout Municipal Center, 1915-1925 Lucas Avenue
 Meeting Room M-1
 Cottekill, New York 12419

Dan Proctor (Chairman)	Present
Will Husta (Vice-Chairman)	Present
Daisy Foote	Present
Daniel Giessinger	Present
David Hodes	Present
Gary Johnson	Present
Harry Hansen	Present
Michael Wilcock	Present
Nancy Gagliardi	Present
Sally Dolan	Present
Staci Sindt	Absent
Tracey Dewart	Present
John Cirone	Present

Also present was Marbletown Attorney Tracy Kellogg.

Chairman Dan Proctor called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 6:02 p.m. The Chairman proceeded with a more in-depth explanation of what the items contained in the Agenda would involve. Annexed hereto and made a part hereof is the Power Point Presentation provided for the June 7, 2018 meeting. The Chairman again wished to stress the slide which reflected the Marbletown Strategic Guidance (Relevant to Draft Local Law) on Slide “6.”

The question being posed to the Sub-Committee was “does the idea of a special event venue law fall within the guidance of the Town’s strategic plans?” Daisy Foote and Tracey Dewart took issue with the allowance of special events venues in residential areas and it was noted that the first task at hand was to determine if the Town’s Strategic Plan Supported the inclusion of the proposed law being discussed, with Chairman Proctor noting that details could be worked out later if this one question could be affirmatively answered. Nancy Gagliardi also raised issue of whether there was an actual need. The question was raised as to the need and how many requests had been made for special events for private venues and whether they would serve public needs.

Chairman Proctor polled the Board as to whether the Strategic Plan supported the inclusion of the legislation currently being proposed. John Cirone responded affirmatively indicating that

events already exist and have existed in the community. Michael Wilcock stated that it was an interpretive question as to whether allowing special events reflect rural character desired by community and wasn't sure if it was responsible business development and whether the population could be surveyed to determine their opinion. Sally Dolan responded affirmatively stating that it helped to preserve farmlands and provided possible alternative to development. Nancy Gagliardi did not feel that it aligned with the Strategic Plan currently and desired more data first prior to forming an opinion. Gary Johnson felt that as it currently stood, undefined, unenforced and unplaced, it didn't fit within the Plan. Daniel Giessinger felt that it did. Harry Hansen felt that it felt within the scope of the Plan but growth wasn't previously anticipated when Plan was developed. Will Husta stated that the community was surveyed when Plan was developed and recommendation were made to Town Board and felt that it did have a role. Daisy Foote indicated she had been involved in the Plan and event spaces had not been discussed during the development of the Plan and she responded in the negative. Tracey Dewart also responded in the negative for private events but there were opportunities to promote tourism with public events in the community were supported by the Plan. David Hodes responded, stating as a full-time resident, it did fit the Strategic Plan and that the character of the Town has perpetually changed. Chairman Proctor then returned to the content of the slides.

Vice-Chairman Will Husta was called upon to explain the alternative uses of farmlands which included the possibility of subdivisions and development. Reference to the Osterhoudt property on Cooper street in the R-3 Zoning District was used as an example and the possibility that a conservation subdivision was an allowed use in that district and could support up to 70+ single family residences. Discussion ensued between particular members on Sub-Committee with regard to what venues existed currently and what had been requested. Chairman Proctor indicated that a comprehensive list would be compiled.

Copies of five (5) different local laws relative to special events venues had been provided for reference and all members were asked to familiarize themselves with same in helping to determine "best practice" if it was to be adopted and what may be taken from existing laws in other Towns.

The question was again raised as to how many requests for commercial special events had been requested to which Vice-Chairman Husta responded five this year that he could recall.

Public and members of Board were requested to provide comment as to the benefits of allowing events venues:

Ryan Holspiegeler spoke to the expense of restoring and maintaining barns (which many could be considered historical) and how the use as an event venue contributed to the upkeep.

Nancy Gagliardi commented that a choice was made to dissemble her barn due to its location and the cost to restore it versus the ability to have a business in a residential community. Until given data otherwise, she wished to know best places for venues to exist.

David Hodes inquired as to whether a positive impact on the tax base could be quantified by allowing venues and possible costs of permit if venues were to be allowed, could be instituted to generate money back to the Town.

Tracy Dewart provided a list of pros and cons (annexed hereto).

Chairman Proctor again asked if there were additional benefits not listed currently. Hearing none, attention was asked to be turned to the concerns had regarding events venues.

Nancy Gagliardi indicated that housing values could be negatively affected. Supervisor Parete asked if data supporting the impact special events venues could have on property values could be provided to substantiate her statement.

Chris Silva indicated that the sound couldn't be mitigated.

Attorney Tracy Kellogg provided input that planning is a proactive approach, not to be reactive and that the meeting has been stimulated partially due to a reactive action. Attorney Kellogg attempted to provide direction to the Sub-Committee stating that it wasn't about endorsing the law but whether they wished to address the issue and if so, would they want to address it from a regulatory standpoint. If choice was not made to regulate, from a legal and planning standpoint, exposure to greater negative activities could be incurred and from her background, this was a positive, not the support of weddings and large activities, more making a statement that they were allowing in a controlled environment and this allowed opportunity to set that structure.

Chairman Proctor polled the Sub-Committee on the question whether they wished to have the ability to regulate Special Event Venues to which all members present responded in the affirmative.

The meeting ended at 7:55 p.m.

Economic	Pro	Con
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private businesses can benefit if supplies are locally sourced Year-round jobs, wages and salaries are locally generated Potential expenditures Venue Food/Liquor/Catering Photography Event Planning Music/DJ Floral/Arrangement Videographer Cake Transportation Favours Rehearsal Dinner People may be attracted into the area Fees or taxes on venues could offset some town costs Permits elsewhere can be \$2000 Wedding venue investors drawn to area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of adjacent homes depreciate (speedway) Less attractive community to newcomers contributes to realtors view that wedding events are potentially hazardous to real-estate market: drop in new home purchases Loss of asset for retirement hurts long-term financial planning Lawsuits due to zoning changes hurt Town reserves. Includes new owners, and affected neighbors (many such incidents documented in press) Individuals invest in venues that get shut down creating individual loss and threat of lawsuit to town Increase in health problems contributes to health care costs and debility Locals and seasonal residents leave area on weekends to avoid events affecting commerce Growth in poverty and economic disparities e.g. outcome in Napa CA Increased local costs and taxes due to public maintenance: fire hazards, insurance, police presence, increased crime and vandalism, increased emergency incidents Onslaught of investors in wedding venues who may not actually be able to afford taxes without additional income creating more financial risks Local backlash/boycotts if local stores held responsible for unwanted wedding venues Outside vendors might supply wedding events undercutting local businesses, limiting benefits Wedding visitors displace other guests at B&Bs etc. that would otherwise be more actively engaged in local tourist activities and business due to limited capacity of affordable hotels/B&Bs and short term rentals Tax payers must subsidize costs related to new hires for oversight and staff needed to manage potentially 155 wedding venues or 1,860 weddings events each year e.g. review and approve all requests and bookings, and systems for rationing approvals and resolving complaints from all affected by hazards and nuisances generated
Social/political Alter the ways in which people live, work, socialize, and organize to meet their needs as members of society. In general, social impact has an immediate impact on the quality of residents' life The cultural impact can be long-term in nature and includes changes in social relationships, norms and orders (Brunt & Courtney, 1999).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased entertainment opportunities, increased future use of existing recreational and leisure facilities Creates play ground for the elite e.g. Napa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substance abuse, bad crowd behavior and an increase in criminal activity (Getz, 1997:46). E.g. Miami during spring break Community conflict undermines cohesion Loss of amenities due to noise or crowds Resentment of unbalanced distribution of costs and benefits as well as cost inflation of goods and services (Bowdin <i>et al.</i>, 2001:30-31). Social disparities grow Shortages of affordable housing e.g. Napa Residents' perception or actual political betrayal by elected officials affects careers and creates political turnover Skilled outside workers are brought in for the tourism industry, giving local residents a feeling of economic colonialism Permissive laws create an interest in creating wedding venues and this niche market expands beyond oversight capacity and local resources Demands of sector consume and distract local administration from other forms of economic development Alienation may be generated in the host community, leading to social unrest. Lack of access to community facilities and resources e.g. emphasis on private not community events, which can lead to feelings of community alienation and exclusion.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Doxey's index of irritation which describes the changing attitudes of the host community as the number of visitors increases (Saayman, 2000:144 & Yeoman <i>et al.</i>,2004:46). • Crowded footpaths and street leading to traffic congestion, difficulty finding car parking, crowding in local shops and facilities, noise pollution. • Retaliatory actions by neighbors • Friction among stakeholders
Cultural Changes to the norms, values, and beliefs that guide residents' cognition of themselves and the society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential increase in local interest in the region's culture and history, increased awareness of the cultural activities available. • Preservation of historical buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large numbers of vehicles and loud music would ruin the quiet rural nature of the area. • Significant impact on local character of the community, on the cultural identity. (Small <i>et al</i> 2005) • Denigrate local identity and place identity • Noise is related to lower overall quality of life (Daniel Shepherd <i>et al</i> 2011). • Prioritization of private events instead of public events for the larger community that also attracts outsiders e.g. private interests over public interest. • Historical buildings could be preserved in a manner oriented to lower impact businesses or the public.
Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agri-tourism model may protect against subdividing large land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution: short-term rentals with just a few guests have upset neighboring townships specifically concerning noise. Many complaints • Noise directly related to environmental quality of life (Daniel Shepherd <i>et al</i> 2011) • Light Pollution (recall parking lot at Mohonk) • Cars, traffic and accidents • Littering • Land degradation • Parking lots replace forests • Permissive laws create an interest in creating wedding venues, consequently open land and large acreage is purchased specifically to create a wedding venue damaging scenic vistas and creating other environmental nuisances
Health		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress and anxiety • Depression • Accidents/DUIs • Sleep deprivation • High rates of sleeping and other medications associated with night time noise (E A M Franssen, <i>et al.</i> 2003) • Fights (domestic and with neighbors) • Noise is directly related to physical quality of life (Daniel Shepherd <i>et al</i> 2011) • High stress leads to poor mental health and substance abuse

Weddings could be promoted in existing designations (Mohonk/Inn/Parks/preserves) without shouldering the high public and community costs and nuisances.