

From: **Nan Stolzenburg** <nan@planningbetterplaces.com>

Date: Sun, May 12, 2024 at 8:36 PM

Subject: RE: County Planning Board comments on LL1

To: andrew <dboggesstownofolive@gmail.com>

Hi Drew. I have looked over the County comments.

Regarding the yield plan

I am not sure from a bother and cost perspective there is much difference between doing a yield plan and doing a primary and secondary conservation analysis. That requires a substantial investment too so I don't think the issue should be cost for the applicant, but rather how 'strict' and tight do you want this to be. The primary and secondary analysis is apt to get you more environmental information and (I hope) a better design, but to do the yield plan, they would have to do at least the primary analysis in order to know what the yield is. I am having a bit of difficulty seeing why their recommendation is necessarily better.

Regarding use of net usable land calculation

That is certainly something I agree with. This would be in the zoning law, not subdivision, and I often recommend it. But it is a policy that decreases development potential, and while that is advantageous from that perspective, it can be a political issue because you are likely decreasing density. So someone who has a lovely flat open field with no issues will get full density, and someone with a wetland and steep slopes will get less. Again, I wholly support and recommend that because not every lot should have the same building potential due to environmental conditions. But you should also know about how some people might react. If this is a politically acceptable method, we could add that into the zoning for ALL housing developments - minor and major subdivisions.

His last sentence in the first advisory comment is what the conservation subdivision is supposed to do – but the net acreage would add to reducing the environmental impacts.

Regarding interconnections

This is a required modification (the Board can overrule this with a majority vote plus one). I have to quip that Ulster County Planning is the only County that I know of that comes out with required modifications!!! With that said, it seems unless you have the majority plus one vote, this has to be done. With that said, I don't object and also agree having cul-de-sacs is neither rural, nor consistent with traditional development patterns. I have no issue with this one.

Regarding Land Use Referrals

This is also a required modification. Wow. I was not aware that Ulster County had given itself this authority. I would suggest that for this one, you ask Rob the exact specific language needed here and that can get added in so we are sure to be consistent with those requirements.

All in all, if this is all they say, I would react that we are in good shape!
Nan