

**MEETING SUMMARY – DECEMBER 11, 2013 MEETING**

**TOWN OF LANSING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE**

**Members Present:** Jase Baese; Tom Butler; Maureen Cowen; Jeremy Dietrich; Ruth Hopkins, Town Board; Kathy Miller, Supervisor; Susan Miller; Philip Snyder; Susan Tabrizi; Sarah Thomson.

**Others Present:** Jonathan Kanter, AICP, Planning Consultant.

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m.

**Member Comments/Concerns/Announcements:** None.

**Survey Presentation and Discussion:** Susan Tabrizi gave a presentation of the preliminary survey results and analysis that she and the survey sub-committee have been working on. The following are highlights of the presentation.

The purpose of the survey is to reflect what the community wants and where the Town should go in the future. Susan spent some time discussing the phone survey methodology and that it was based on a statistically valid random sample of Town residents.

**Survey topics:**

- 1) Why people live in Lansing and their overall satisfaction – The most often cited reasons for living in the Town included the quality of the public schools (26.9%) and the rural nature of the Town (18%). The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they are satisfied or very satisfied with living in Lansing (93.7%). Most people indicated that they are very likely to live in Lansing for at least 5 or more years.
- 2) Town Center preferences – When asked what type of development people would like to see in a Town Center, 77.6% supported locally owned shops, 74.4% supported local services, and 65.7% supported various types of residential development. Only 34.2% supported national retail stores.
- 3) Public investment/use of tax dollars: Several Committee members suggested using the term “use of tax dollars” as was stated in the survey questions. In regard to road safety, 58% of respondents supported the use of tax dollars for sidewalks, and 58% supported use of tax dollars for traffic calming. Relating to biking, walking and hiking, 69.7% supported use of tax dollars for bike paths/lanes on roads, 63.9% supported development of biking, hiking or walking trails, and 73.6% supported a requirement that parks and pathways be included in new residential developments. 89.5% of respondents supported use of tax dollars for transportation for the elderly or disabled. 56.8% of respondents thought that use of tax dollars or other governmental support for lakeside commercial development is either important or very important, while 43.2% felt that this is not so important or not at all important.

- 4) Residential Options – There was strong support for providing options for senior housing (86.3%). 76.4% supported housing for moderate income households, and 53.7% supported multi-family housing options.
- 5) Economic development – 86.4% of respondents supported tourism as a form of economic development in the Town, 72.5% supported light industrial development, and only 37.9% supported additional heavy industrial development in the Town. Susan indicated that the topic of natural gas drilling was addressed in the survey by asking the question in two different ways to make sure that there was no bias in the way the question was asked. Some people were asked about hydrofracking - 75.7% of those respondents discouraged this type of use in the Town. Others were asked about shale oil or gas drilling – 70.7% of those respondents discouraged this type of use. The two questions together clearly indicate opposition to hydrofracking in the Town.
- 6) Protecting land use – Respondents consistently supported the protection of agricultural land (91.2%), scenic/natural areas (90.6%), and historical sites (87.8%).
- 7) Environmental sustainability – 88.6% of respondents thought that controlling stormwater runoff and erosion is important, 82.4% felt that energy efficient buildings are important, and 74.1% responded that development of renewable energy sources is important.
- 8) Local government performance – When asked how local government responds to resident concerns, 5% indicated excellent, 38.9% said good, 38.3% said fair, and 17.8% said poor. When asked how the local government does with communicating information to residents, 4.2% said excellent, 37.3% said good, 37.3% said fair, and 21.2% said poor. And when asked how residents would like to get information from local government, 31.2% said through postal mail, 27.3% said by email, and 21.0% said by newsletter. Only 13.7% said they would like to communicate through a website, 3.9% through social media, and 2.8% by attending meetings.

Jonathan reminded the Committee that the survey presentation would be the focus of the joint Town Board/Planning Board meeting scheduled for December 18<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. Several Committee members suggested describing the presentation as a “preview” of the survey results, which could be fine-tuned for a public information meeting in early 2014. Jonathan suggested that a handout of the survey presentation could be available at the joint meeting. The Committee suggested inviting Board of Zoning Appeals members to the December 18<sup>th</sup> presentation, as well as sending a reminder to the Comp Plan Committee. The Committee thanked Susan and the sub-committee for the good work on the survey analysis and presentation.

**Draft Meeting Summary – November 13, 2013:** The Committee had no corrections or revisions regarding the November 13, 2013 Meeting Summary.

**2014 Meeting Schedule:** The Committee approved the draft 2014 Meeting Schedule, keeping meetings on the second Wednesday of each month at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVED – 1/8/14

**Other Business:** Jonathan asked Committee members to let him know which sub-committees would be ready to present and discuss their goal and recommendation sections with the Committee in upcoming meetings.

**Next Meeting:** The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Prepared by Jonathan Kanter, AICP