

II. MILO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE

The Milo Comprehensive Plan Committee (Comprehensive Plan Committee) consisted of a group of Town Citizens interested in charting the future growth and development of the Town. They were appointed by resolution of the Milo Town Board in the spring of 2006. Over the three years the plan was developed, membership varied slightly. A complete list of participants may be found in Appendix A.

For the first several meetings of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, monthly programs were organized to inform participants on various planning topics, approaches, town assets, town issues, and the resources available to the Comprehensive Plan Committee. As the public attended these meetings, the several people volunteered to serve on topical 'SubCommittees. Over the next 2 years these SubCommittees provided valuable information and recommendations on a wide range of topics to the Comprehensive Plan Committee. The Comprehensive Plan Committee itself researched and made recommendations on the remaining issues, using interviews with business operators and the results of a survey of residents and property owners to gauge opinions of the general public and of affected interest groups. The volunteer Subcommittees and the issues they were formed to address are summarized as follows:

I. Agriculture & Rural Character:

A. Existing Conditions

1. Type & location of businesses: review existing land use Map and map of agricultural land uses
2. County Agricultural District review and recommendations
3. Natural resource inventory
 - a. Review soils maps:
 - 1.) erosion vs. agricultural capability.
 - 2.) Presence of prime agricultural soils
4. Trends in Agriculture
 - a. Open Space preservation and rural character
 - b. Municipal utility service availability
 - c. Mennonite impacts
 - 1.) Land values
 - 2.) Secondary businesses in agricultural areas
 - 3.) Other businesses
 - 4.) Auxiliary residences
5. Development threat of agricultural land: Ownership patterns of agricultural land
 - a. Farmer Owned
 - b. Rented from Farmer Friendly owner
 - c. Rented from a developer
 - d. Vacant and at risk land

B. Existing and potential land use conflicts

1. Rural residential development
2. Rural Commercial development
3. Growth of the Village of Penn Yan and loss of farmland
4. Is non-agricultural related rural residential development an impediment to agriculture?

C. Zoning Changes

1. What are the limitations of existing zoning on agricultural operations:

2. Are lot sizes too small/ too big?
3. Are too many non-AG related residences allowed in agricultural areas? How do these impact each other (noise & odor vs. shade and pools too close to lot lines)?
4. Are additional land uses that could increase farm income limited by existing zoning (such as welding shop, seed sales, etc.)?
5. Zoning changes to favor agriculture.

II. Business (handled by Consultants through interviews, reporting back to the Comprehensive Plan Committee)

A. Survey of existing non-agricultural businesses in Town

1. Commercial sales
2. Tourism related
3. Magnitude of employment and fiscal impact
4. Importance of land use character to businesses
5. Identification of concerns of business owners

B. County Airport

1. Description of Asset
 - a. What type of aircraft can the airport handle?
 - b. Fixed base operator
 - c. Auxiliary businesses
2. Adjacent development
 - a. What types of supplemental/supporting land uses are located in proximity to the airport now?
 - b. Are there existing conflicts with adjacent uses?
 - c. Is there sufficient, properly zoned land to accommodate growth in supplemental/supporting adjacent land uses?
 - d. Is there sufficient utility and transportation infrastructure to support growth in supplemental/supporting adjacent land uses?

C. Wineries

1. Inventory of number and location in Town
2. Identification of special needs
 - a. Restaurant auxiliary uses
 - b. Special events (for example: weddings & receptions)
3. Zoning
 - a. Support of wineries and auxiliary businesses
 - b. Conflict with
 - 1.) Existing adjacent land uses (residential and agricultural)
 - 2.) Adjacent residential development
 - c. Encourage proper design and location.

III. Rural Character (Photo Inventoried by Consultants, issues handled by Comprehensive Plan Committee)

A. Inventory significant views in the Town

1. Windshield/photo inventory of town and significant views
2. Survey residents
3. Produce final significant view map.

- B. What defines the rural character of the Town:
 - 1. Low density of development—how low?
 - 2. Character of Agricultural buildings and land use
 - 3. Size of non-agricultural businesses in agricultural areas.
- C. Wind Towers:
 - 1. Map of wind potential in Town
 - 2. How does the Town of Milo's wind resources compare with other locations?
 - 3. Is the transmission infrastructure (electric grid or local transmission lines) in close proximity?
 - 4. Evaluation of commercial production facility vs. installations for on-site use.
 - 5. For on-site consumption: Lower height, normally smaller size, owned by the property owner
 - 6. Survey of Residents
- D. Regulation of Communication towers
 - 1. Existing tower locations
 - 2. Regulatory framework and extent of federal pre-emption.
 - 3. Develop regulatory framework from options: Can't exclude!!!!

IV. Lake Issues (for both Seneca Lake and Keuka Lake)

- A. Lake water quality
 - 1. Storm water & Erosion control
 - 2. Fertilizer, pesticide, herbicide use
 - 3. Steep Slope development issues
- B. Lake level
 - 1. Shoreline erosion
 - 2. Shoreline maintenance
 - 3. Issues in regulation of lake level
- C. Review of new development:
 - 1. Is site plan review needed to ensure
 - a. Impact on views from adjacent residences and properties.
 - b. Stormwater runoff onto adjacent properties and the lake. How much of a parcel can be paved or built upon?
 - 2. Private road access:
 - a. Access to new home businesses: what rights do private landowners have to use a private drive (especially one that is shared) to support a home based business.
 - b. Access to new subdivided parcels off a shared private road or driveway. Note: NY State only regulates access for roads serving 5 or more dwelling units or properties, when they are setting up a new private road. It does not regulate subdivisions accessed by existing private roads.
 - 3. Height, size, character of new or remodeled structures:
 - a. Is there any adjustment to allowed maximum height, foot print (area) of residences based on the size (area) or width of the parcel?
 - b. Is there a minimum size stipulated in the code for year round residences?
 - c. Are single wide mobile homes (commonly referred to as 'trailers') an issue?
 - d. Are seasonal dwellings expressly allowed? Is there a minimum size standard?

- e. Are design standards needed to address architectural styles?
- D. Are Lake front property values displacing local residents?
- E. Open burning
- F. Noise from boats, other watercraft, and other adjacent land uses.
- G. Density of Development concerns
- H. Rental Property maintenance and impact on neighborhood character, noise, traffic.

V. Intermunicipal Cooperation (handled by Comprehensive Plan Committee)

- A. Relationship with Village
 - 1. Commercial districts and scale of commercial uses
 - 2. Residential Neighborhoods
 - 3. Expansion of village into the town
 - 4. Yard Waste collection and composting
- B. Utility infrastructure
 - 1. Water district location/capacity, etc.
 - 2. Sewer district location/capacity, etc.
- C. Service consolidation
- D. Route 14A Corridor Study
- E. KLOC (Keuka Lake Outlet Compact)

VI. Land Use

- A. Property maintenance (Eyesore properties)
 - 1. Assessment of magnitude of problem, scope
 - 2. Grounds
 - 3. Buildings
 - 4. Number of Properties
 - 5. Options for regulating
 - a. Need for Property maintenance Local Law
 - b. Existing NYS Building Code
- B. Land Uses
 - 1. Review existing maps of land uses, supplement as necessary
 - 2. Review appropriateness of mix of development presently existing.
 - 3. Identify public utility districts, water, sewer, etc. Note capacity/pressure zone issues.
 - 4. Identify “neighborhoods.” These are areas of the town with similar characteristics
 - 5. Document the characteristics of each neighborhood
 - a. Hamlet
 - b. Village
 - c. Commercial (strip, local, etc.)
 - d. Agricultural
 - e. Residential (low density, high density, waterfront).
 - f. Others
 - 6. Develop Future Land Use Map to establish goal for next 10 to 20 years.
- C. Zoning Ordinance Review
 - 1. Review existing Zoning Code (ZC) in regard to protecting or enhancing characteristics of neighborhoods defined in B. above.
 - 2. Review ZC in terms of obtaining overall goals and objectives of Comprehensive Plan

3. Review ZC in terms of ease of use, clarity, and fairness.
 4. Identify other issues that need to be addressed:
 - a. Fair housing
 - b. Application procedures/submission requirements
 - c. Expedition of review & approval process for simple issues: combining lots, subdivisions involving moving of lot lines where the result is conforming lots, etc.
 - d. Erosion control
 - e. Building Height/view shed analysis
 - f. Environmental Review
 - g. Modular construction on single lots
- D. Subdivision Regulations
1. Major vs. minor
 2. Access management
 3. Accounting for soil agricultural values
 4. Erosion control
 5. Performance bond requirements
 6. Maintenance bond requirements
- E. Mobile Home Local Law
- F. Property maintenance
- G. Other local laws, existing or needed

Each Subcommittee conducted its own meetings and kept minutes of their work. A record of this activity is on file in the Milo Planning and Zoning Office in the Town Hall, along with the minutes of the Comprehensive Plan Committee meetings.