

**Community Preservation Fund Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2010**

Members present: Chair Susan Ezrati and members Rich Bienzynski, Pete Hubbell, Brent Kovalchik, Robin Logan, and Phil Seymour.

Also present: Harry Colgan, TB Liaison

Absent: No Members were absent

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. A quorum was determined to be present for the conduct of business. Susan asked if members had any changes or corrections to the March 4, 2010 minutes. Hearing none, Phil made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Brent seconded the motion, and all members present voted in favor.

There were no official minutes from the April meeting since there had been no quorum.

Susan said that she had revised the memorandum and had added two items to the ranking process. First, if a property owner offered to sell an easement but another parcel with a higher ranking came in with an application and was funded instead, the original property would move up one rank. That property would continue to move up one rank each year the property owner offered an easement but was not funded. Brent described a similar concept by which properties that were not funded because of that situation would be put in a separate category for consideration the next year.

Susan said that the second item she had added concerned two contiguous properties, one with a high rank and one with a low rank, that were offered for easement. In that case, she said, the low ranking property would rise in rank to the level of the higher ranking property because the value of the total land area had increased

Susan gave a brief report about Ted's presentation of the CPFAB's progress to the Town Board at its meeting on April 28. She said that Ted had informed the Town Board that the CPFAB was waiting for the villages to map their historical and cultural features.

Susan said that the acceptance of façade easements was one way of preserving historic features. Robin referred the members to the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines. Brent said that the L'Enfant Society in Washington DC had a template for such easements.

The members discussed the possible advantages and disadvantages of easements and/or preservation regulations in Tivoli and other historic communities. They noted that the Village of Red Hook currently has no appointed Village Historian.

Brent noted that the New York State law concerning Community Preservation funds was very specific: only properties on the NYS Registry of Historic Places are eligible for funding. The Board then discussed whether a "notable structure", such as an original Dutch barn or other historic building or feature, located on an agricultural property could raise the ranking of that property.

Brent and Susan said that they would try to have a draft list of buildings and historic features from the villages and hamlets soon.

Brent noted that funding could be available for aquifer and wetland protection and other categories that would be of interest to the villages and hamlets; however, he said that he did not think that a “preservation district” would be eligible.

Susan suggested that the committee could include a prologue to the section on historic and cultural preservation that included a list of “notable” properties that the Town felt were significant but that were not eligible for funding under the law because they were not on the NYS Registry of Historic Places.

Brent suggested a provision to amend the list of eligible properties when and if a “notable” property was put on the state registry. He said that parcel owners could be advised that they had a “notable” property, giving them a chance to apply for inclusion on the registry.

The members also discussed other eligible features such as waterways, access to waterways, etc.

The committee then discussed the process for dividing Community Preservation funds. The members generally agreed that there would be two (2) pools—one for the villages and hamlets and one for farmland projects. Depending on the number and rank of eligible projects in each category, one pool could flow into the other, after which there would be a mechanism for rebalancing the pools. Susan said that Town Attorney Christine Chale was working on some draft language for this process. She said that the committee would recommend the proportions of the pools in their report to the Town Board.

There was some discussion about the parcels, especially the agricultural parcels, located at the gateways to the villages and how they fit into the Centers and Greenspaces plan. Brent explained that the Cookingham parcel would not act as a receiving parcel for the transfer of development rights as some people thought. Rather, he said, all the development potential of that parcel would be clustered in the portion of the parcel located within the Red Hook Village boundaries, leaving the remainder of the farmland to be put under a conservation easement.

Since there was no further business to discuss, Rich made a motion to adjourn. Pete seconded the motion, and all members present voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, June 3 at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Schoonmaker
Substitute secretary