

General Strategy

Proposal would establish "overlay zones"

- Similar in application to the "open space design"
- Town Board control over location and design features
- More restrictions and design features than the current "Special Exception Use Permit" regulation.
- Two separate overlay districts are proposed: Traditional Neighborhood and Commercial/Restricted Business zones.
- Multi-Family development is not allowed in the Major Arterial zone.
- Multi-family uses within residential zones are adequately addressed in those regulations and are not included.
- There is no specific Senior Housing distinction – Senior Housing must be considered the same as normal multi-family since shifting demographics could require a change in use in the future.

Principal Features

- Multi-family use will only be allowed on lots within sewer districts. An exception mechanism is available which could allow restricted multi-family development on unsewered lots in the Commercial zone.
- Screening requirements are enhanced, including from public roadways.
- Underlying zoning regulations (buffers, setbacks, etc.) apply in all cases.
- Interconnectivity to adjacent commercial and residential development is required to the maximum extent possible.
- Two (2) parking spaces are required per unit. At the discretion and recommendation of the Planning Board, additional open space in lieu of parking can be approved; this option should be considered when the project is designated as "Senior Housing" with lower parking needs.

Traditional Neighborhood Zone

1. Small scale, low density (4 units per acre, 16 units maximum).
2. Two (2) acre minimum lot size for the consideration of a Multi-Family Overlay Design.
3. Scale and design standards compatible with Hamlet features.

Commercial and Restricted Business Zones

1. Unit Density to be determined based on entire parcel acreage.
 - Density varies according to size of units:
 - ✓ 1 bedroom – 12 units per acre
 - ✓ 2 bedrooms – 10 units per acre
 - ✓ 3 bedrooms or greater – 8 units per acre
2. Minimum Lot size for consideration of a Multi-Family Overlay Design to be 5 acres.
3. Multi-family developments in commercial zones will require a "commercial component" (minimally 25% of the entire parcel acreage), establishing these as essentially "mixed use"; interconnectivity with other residential and commercial uses is required.
 - a. Part or all of this percentage can be saved as "green space" for later commercial development; this reserved commercial green space is in addition to the required overall project site open space as per lot coverage calculations.
 - b. Upon recommendation of the Planning Board, the Town Board will designate which part of the property is to be "green space" and which part will be "commercial development" at the time of Concept Plan Approval.
4. Multi-family developments in these zones will require 30% (20% with required interconnections as per the underlying zoning regulations) of the land be devoted to "green space".

5. In special cases, the Town Board, upon recommendation of the Planning Board, may allow multi-family uses on unsewered lots within the Commercial zone. These circumstances include:
- Maximum 70% lot coverage.
 - Minimum 50% commercial use of developable land (35% of the total lot).
 - Maximum on-site waste treatment of 7500 gpd, including residential and projected commercial waste (this requirement, combined with the minimum commercial use, would typically yield a maximum of 16 housing units, regardless of site acreage).
 - Super majority vote of the Town Board

Note: Multi-family housing is not allowed on unsewered lots within the Restricted Business zone.

The crux of the debates will be:

1. Density in C and RB zones. BK wants 6 per acre regardless of size; proposal varies with size, similar to Amherst and Orchard Park. These are only numbers, and they can be negotiated/changed.
2. Commercial Component in C and RB. Proposal allows a “staged” development, but builders will not like it.
3. Building on unsewered lots. There are three choices:
 - a) Allow unrestrained. (PB will probably not recommend this)
 - b) Allow with restrictions (as in this proposal). (Metzger/Steven will object to the restrictions as proposed.
 - c) Do not allow at all. This might be ultimate PB and/or TB position.
4. Special Senior Housing Code. Proposal allows for “softening” parking requirements, but does not recognize Senior Housing as a separate category. Belief is that Senior Housing eventually becomes “Affordable Housing” and should be treated as such.
5. Development “cap”. BK and PC have talked about this; this is a separate issue.