

MEETING SUMMARY – OCTOBER 9, 2013 MEETING

TOWN OF LANSING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE

Members Present: Jase Baese; Maureen Cowen; Ruth Hopkins, Town Board; Lynn Leopold, Village of Lansing Trustee; Kathy Miller, Supervisor; Susan Miller; Philip Snyder; Susan Tabrizi; .

Others Present: Jonathan Kanter, AICP, Planning Consultant; Monika Roth, Cornell Cooperative Extension Tompkins County; Larry Moore; Kay Moore; Skip Hardie; George Frantz, Consultant.

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

Member Comments/Concerns/Announcements: None.

Presentation and Discussion of Draft Town of Lansing Agriculture & Farmland Protection Plan:

Monika Roth from Cornell Cooperative Extension Tompkins County, presented an overview of the Draft Town of Lansing Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan that she has been working on with a committee of farmers representing the Town of Lansing. Monika introduced Skip Hardie, Chair of the Ag Plan Committee, and Larry Moore and Kate Moore, members of the Committee. George Frantz, Planning Consultant, assisted with the zoning aspects of the Ag Plan and was also in attendance. Monika provided a powerpoint overview of the Plan, followed by questions and discussion regarding the Plan. [Monika prepared the attached “Notes from meeting with Lansing Comp Plan Committee – Oct. 9, 2013”.]

Draft Meeting Summary – September 11, 2013: The Committee had no corrections or revisions regarding the September 11, 2013 Meeting Summary.

Survey: Susan Tabrizi indicated that the survey results are available and that the Survey sub-committee has not had time to get together to analyze the survey results. Susan mentioned that some results already stand out, such as strong support for a Town Center including small-scale stores, support for walkways and trails, opposition to hydrofracking, etc. Jonathan indicated that approximately 60 on-line surveys had also been submitted, and these will need to be analyzed as well. Several comments were made about the open-ended questions and how these would be analyzed. Susan felt that open-ended responses are difficult to analyze and that it would not make sense to spend much time on these – they can simply be included in an appendix. It was agreed that the Survey sub-committee should meet to discuss the survey results. It was also suggested that any presentation of survey results in a public meeting and in the draft Plan report should be simple, short and easy to understand. Susan also suggested that the Committee should not try to over-analyze the survey results (e.g., come up with reasons why people responded in a certain way). Maureen Cowen indicated that the survey results should provide helpful support or rationale for pursuing a number of recommended actions in the Plan, such as trail implementation, agricultural protection, etc. The sub-committee will schedule a time to meet to discuss the survey results.

Review of Goals and Objectives: Because of the lack of time remaining, the Committee agreed to postpone the discussion of the Parks, Recreation & Pathways goals and objectives section until the November meeting.

Public Information Meeting: The Committee agreed that the public information meeting should not be scheduled until at least January 2014. Jonathan will coordinate possible dates with the Committee.

Other Business: None.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 13, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the Lansing Library.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Prepared by Jonathan Kanter, AICP

Notes from meeting with Lansing Comp Plan Committee – Oct. 9, 2013 (Prepared by Monika Roth)

Present – committee – Maureen Cowen, Lynn Leopold, Susan Miller, Susan Tabrizi, Jase Boese, Phil Snyder, Ruth Hopkins, Kathy Miller, Jon Kanter

Ag Committee Members – Skip Hardie, Kay Moore, Larry Moore, George Frantz, Monika Roth

M. Roth shared powerpoint overview of plan. Key points:

Ag is alive & well in Lansing.

Recommending change from RA to AG zone in most of N. Lansing.

Zoning review (Frantz) – objectives: make zoning ag friendly; ensure consistency with Ag & Markets Ag District Law; AG zone would send a message that **Agriculture is the prime use in the zone**, may reduce land completion and issues arising from non-farm rural neighbors; strengthening agriculture will strengthen ag development opportunities; also recommending some definition modifications in current zoning law.

Questions/Discussion

Susan Miller pointed out strategy that seems to be contradictory...Farm Friendly Zoning – 1-e – avoid zoning that is too restrictive for farmers; need to clarify this statement. **Are farmers supportive of or concerned about the new zone?** Skip stated that the sentiment from the farm community seems to be in support of the new zone. Frantz suggested the new zone may reduce density in the ag areas putting less pressure on farming operations and reducing competition for land.

Add a list of permitted uses to text in addition to the uses that are suggested for removal from the zone.

How does the new zone prevent rural sprawl, stop development from encroaching? -- may just slow it down...less sprawl means farmers operate more efficiently, therefore, they are more viable which is what keeps land in ag

Are there more parcels that should be identified for protection thru State program?

Suggestion made to add this as a strategy to the plan. In particular, parcels that serve as buffers in the southern part of the town would be useful to protect ag in the northern part. Need criteria for targeting parcels...as high priority for PDR/protection by permanent easement.

What about climate change implications? Skip indicated that he has noticed changes during the past 50 years...more hay cuttings, longer season varieties. Farmers are pretty adaptable to

weather changes. Larry mentioned that having high OM in the soil is one way to reduce the impacts of drought.

Encourage conditions that allow for a diversity of farming enterprises, including small enterprises that raise food for the community.

There are many non-farmers in the RA zone, how will they be impacted by the change?? Will they support this change??? Need to spell out what it means for them...What rights do they lose, what are the benefits?

Some concern expressed at end pertaining to large farms and water quality impacts. Also, another person mentioned large farm neighbors and manure odors.