



**Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee  
Zoom Hybrid Meeting  
Meeting Minutes  
January 28, 2026  
Approved: February 25, 2026**

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Ann DiPetta, Elizabeth Weatherby, Alison Weaver, Roxanne Marino, Karl Klankowski, Mo Klein, Tai Basilius, Karen Meador, Kim Moore (on zoom), Diane Cohen (on zoom), Katelin Olson (arrived at 6:16)

**Committee Members Absent:** None

**Quorum Present**

**Comp Plan Consultant Present:** Matt Horn, Jessica Geary, AJ Fawver

**Town Staff Present:** Lori Asperschlager, Niels Tygesen

**Members of the Public Present:** Shirley Brown, Rich Goldman, Bob Howarth, Marina Howarth, Lou Licari, Kristy Licari, Patrica Scharp, Sarah Adams, V. Romanoff, Sue Poelvoorde, Jes Seaver, Susan Ritter, David Blanton, Sigrid Pauen

**Members of the Public Present on Zoom:** Debbie Biltonen, Rudy Nunez, Krys Cail

**Proceedings**

Chair Ann DiPetta called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm at the Town Hall.

**Approval of Agenda**

**Motion:** Klein motioned to approve the agenda; Klankowski seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**PUBLIC HEARING (Continued Hearing of the Draft 2025-2045 Comp Plan**

Before beginning the public hearing Weatherby talked to the committee and public that the new draft future land use map was set up in the room.

**Motion:** Weatherby motioned to open the public hearing; Klankowski seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

Rich Goldman resident in Waterburg and had questions about where the idea came from for 30 units on 1 acre lots when the zoning is for 2 acre with 400' frontage. As a resident there, he and others are not interested in that happening.

Bob Howarth reiterated a point he made two weeks ago, strongly opposed medium density use in the state Ag District 2. Concerned that it is encouraging growth in that area without an available water district and sewer system.

Susan Ritter spoke about the concerns that there was no discussion by the committee on the rationale for the medium density residential area on the future land use plan map. Concerned that new housing in the Town would increase and there is not the infrastructure available (such as in Dryden or Lansing). Would like to see the future land use map be built off the 2009 comprehensive plan to create a new 20 year plan.

Rudy Nunez business owner of Howl Studios at 1607A Trumansburg Road. Asked if his property would stay as industrial zoning. The committee will note that question and address it later in the meeting.

Sue Poelvoorde would support the committee to go back to the 2009 going back highly recommend the

going back to the 2009 future land use plan and categories rather than have a future land use map that has 4 housing categories and is not right sized for the town. Does not support the future land map indicating individual parcels, but would rather see a shape-based map like was used in the 2009 plan.

Jes Seaver owner of town property and a retired real estate agent with concerns that the housing market has been difficult and there aren't housing options for every stage of life. Supportive of the draft plan and the start of the work.

Sarah Adams struggles to understand the medium density character area on the map. Does understand the need for housing options. There is no cohesive planning for housing and would like to see housing concentrated closer to services (ex. Jacksonville), cluster housing, municipal water.

Lou Licari Waterburg resident and does not support Waterburg having medium density housing character area.

Shirley Brown Waterburg resident concerned that the medium density character area hasn't been thought through for what the town will look like in 15 years time when the plan is reviewed again. Uncertain if the future land use map is putting the town in the right direction.

Goldman spoke again and would like to read about the committees thinking about the change to the Waterburg area.

Kristy Licari is a runner and wondered if a study has been done for Waterburg Rd as it merges into South St. She sees Land Trust signage on field parcels, and this land would not be available for development but on the future land use map it is designated as medium density character area.

Sigrid Pauen spoke about the term medium density housing, developed mainly for urban purposes to curb sprawl and have housing near infrastructure that already exists. The 2009 plan was interested in creating these nodes to help mitigate the need for extensive new infrastructure. She believes in the concept of the 2009 plan.

Nancy Zahler is a part of the Jacksonville Community Association but spoke on behalf of herself and not the association. She was glad to see a commitment to developing a plan for Jacksonville. Stated that years ago she had approached Ithaca Housing Development about a housing development in Jacksonville, but the farmland isn't for sale. The housing options described in the current draft of the plan are valuable. The current plan has a provision for drive-thru restaurants and suggests putting in language that the town supports drive-thru restaurants for local businesses and not big boxes and franchises. Posed a question regarding Cayuga Compost/P&S Excavating – if their designation changes will there be language in the plan that grandfathered in businesses or current uses?

Mariana Howarth expressed concern for medium density housing in the town.

Poelvoorde spoke again and read from the plan about medium density and the trait about having walkability, but many of the areas on the map are not walkable to business and services.

Brown spoke again and asked the committee to identify what properties are under trust with Finger Lakes Land Trust and note that on the map.

**Motion:** Klein tabled the public hearing until next meeting; Klankowski seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**DRAFT LAND USE ELEMENT & FUTURE LAND USE MAP PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Matt Horn from MRB lead the discussion related to the committee member comments.

Klankowski talked about the research he did regarding new builds or tear down and rebuilds that happened from 2001-2025 (approximately 200). Would like to see in-fill housing, such as duplex townhomes, single story houses built in a cluster for senior citizens, not large apartment buildings. Need to allow the town to modify the zoning to allow for small groups of homes on 5-10 acres that meet the water and sewer needs.

Weatherby asked that Klankowski mark up the current future land use map with the current water district map. Olson stated that several town residents are connected to the village water line. There are a lot of water lines underground and the best bet is to tap into existing water lines.

Marino asked for discussion on the justification of medium density residential in the plan. There are competing needs of the town regarding housing and agricultural lands. There have been no studies conducted on demographics and once a study has been done then the comprehensive plan map can be amended. Would like the committee to reduce the medium density on the map, and focus on where there is reasonable access to public transportation and it does not threaten agriculture land.

Olson spoke about going door-to-door during the campaign and heard numerous times that a diversity of housing options was important to residents. She also heard from residents about water issues from their wells and how to get access to public water. The public has asked the committee and town to both protect agriculture land and have more housing by creating in-fill housing.

Marino is not opposed to diverse types of housing built in the town. However, a lot of the medium density residential on the draft future land use map is not feasible. Would like to see the boundary for where medium density residential area ends south of Curry Road to Indian Fort Road.

Olson said Water District 1 is owned by the village and users on that water are town outside of village properties (permissive service area). If an engineering assessment is done, there is money to replace old infrastructure. It becomes challenging to build new lines and infrastructure. The justification of the medium density residential area by Indian Fort Rd is because of the water line. Marino disagrees on the justification for the medium density residential and is concerned about the intention of the map as is.

Klankowski asked Olson if the area south of Curry Rd to Indian Fort Rd could change to Low density residential could help support the replacement of the water. There isn't one specific housing type that would assist with that. The investment the state has put into CARS will likely drive the replacement of the water district 1 line.

Basilius understands the need for housing, but has concerns about land being developed.

Meador shared her thoughts about current zoning laws and potential issues.

Weaver does not support medium density residential in many of the areas. Would like to find the balance for low density and medium density areas. Horn shared that low density would be a duplex on a larger lot and medium density would be a townhouse or a 5-unit apartment. Weaver stated if areas are

left as agriculture then it completely closes out the possibility of duplex or townhouse housing options, but changing to low or medium density would allow for zoning law to take over.

The committee appreciates the participation and heard the concerns about the medium density residential area and some discussion on where to scale back on the medium density residential area, but no decision was made.

For the record the question asked earlier regarding 1607a Trumansburg Road the property does not have any proposed changes and is still in the commercial mixed used area.

#### **LATEST COMP PLAN DRAFT**

The next draft of the plan will be released to the public on February 2.

#### **REMAINING MEETING CALENDAR**

February 11 is the next meeting with following work session meetings on February 25 and March 11. On March 12 the plan will go to Highland Planning with all comments and changes to produce the next draft. On March 18 the next draft will be released to the committee and the public. March 25 is the scheduled meeting to discuss referral to the Town Board.

MRB would like each committee member to come back in 2 weeks with either an ok for now the map currently is or a proposal with how the map should be changed. By February 6, have any changes to MRB so the committee can review amendments ahead of the 2/11 meeting.

#### **APPROVAL OF PAST MINUTES (December 10, 2025 and January 14, 2026)**

**Motion:** Klein made a motion to table the approval of past minutes to next meeting; Weatherby seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**Motion:** DiPetta motioned to adjourn; Klein seconded. **Passed unanimously.**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM.**

Respectfully submitted by Lori Asperschlager, Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Secretary  
February 25, 2026

To: Members of the Town of Ulysses Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

From: Helen M. McLallen and Craig W. Williams

Re: Land Use & Rural Character Element, draft Comprehensive Plan

Date: January 28, 2026

We are asking you to consider changing the property at 8120 Route 227 to a more accurate Future Land Use Character Area for the following reasons. In the current draft it is classified as Low-Density Residential (LDR), the definition of which we don't believe fits this property.

LDR is defined in the October 31, 2025, draft (the most recent draft available to the public online at [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6720335bb4b4b8751b1d7278/t/690cd9c64c4cc07e3412f4cf/1762449862516/Ulysses+Comprehensive+Plan+2025+10.31+Draft\\_reduced.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6720335bb4b4b8751b1d7278/t/690cd9c64c4cc07e3412f4cf/1762449862516/Ulysses+Comprehensive+Plan+2025+10.31+Draft_reduced.pdf)) as "primarily to provide for housing and complementary uses at a low-density residential scale in areas generally outside of Tompkins County Agricultural District 2" It is further stated that LDR is characterized as "smaller lots subdivided piecemeal from larger parcels for single detached residential uses" and that "Lots are generally smaller than the Rural Residential area".

- 1) Our property (24.66acres) is substantially larger than even the Rural Residential area ("lots less than seven acres in area and not in active agricultural use"), let alone the smaller LDR lot sizes.
- 2) 70% of the property is in the agricultural district, with most of that actively farmed. It has been in continuous agricultural production for well over 150 years and we intend to continue that use. Its agricultural use is documented on the Ulysses Land Use and Land Cover map (2015) in the current draft and that use has not changed since then.
- 3) The only residence is the one which has existed as the farmstead since it was built in 1852; the property has never been subdivided for creating building lots.

Our property is different from all the other parcels on the southeast side of Route 227 which the Future Land Use map includes in the Low-Density Residential designation. None of them have active agricultural use; they are only residential. There is some agricultural property on the other side of Route 227, nearly opposite our property.

For similar reasons, our property doesn't fit the definition of the Rural Residential land use designation.

- 1) Parcel size is more than three times larger than in the Rural Residential definition.
- 2) Our property is in active agricultural use

Therefore we believe that the only classification that fits our property is the Agricultural and Natural Resource land use designation.

- 1) It is actively farmed, and we intend to continue that use (it is leased to a commercial farmer).
- 2) It has a single detached dwelling, the original, historical farmstead
- 3) It is a larger parcel than either the Rural Residential or the Low-Density Residential areas call for.
- 4) More than 95% of the parcel area is undeveloped by buildings.

Thank you.

**From:** [Carissa Parlato](#)  
**To:** [Katelin Olson](#); [Elizabeth Weatherby](#); [Lori Asperschlager](#); [Ann DiPetta](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Comp Plan Review - support  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 28, 2026 3:19:13 PM

---

**From:** JES SEAVER [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2026 3:17 PM  
**To:** Carissa Parlato <clerk@townofulyssesny.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Comp Plan Review - support

**January 28, 2026**

Town of Ulysses Town Board 10 Elm Street Trumansburg, NY 14886

Dear Members of the Town Board,

I am writing to express my support for the comprehensive plan draft currently under review. We have a unique municipality that is special, from the lake and our State Park to our thriving village to our ag lands and interior borders there is a lot to work with here and a lot to take into account.

I care deeply about protecting our agricultural and conservation lands and promoting recreation, and I believe this plan does that responsibly. As a retired realtor with over a decade of experience in this community, I witnessed firsthand our critical need for balanced growth in housing and industry alongside agriculture, conservation, and recreation.

Right now, we're failing multiple generations. Our older residents lack options to downsize. Our young people struggle to find both meaningful work and affordable housing. And families with children—in the most expensive phase of life—cannot find suitable homes at reasonable costs.

The evidence is all around us: declining school enrollment paired with rising property taxes, and home prices in the Trumansburg School District climbing exponentially. We're losing population because we're not retaining industry—including cottage industries and small businesses that round out our employment options. We lack the variety of homes needed to move people through the housing cycle, from starter homes to family homes to downsizing options. I think the plan thus far is a good start in addressing some of that.

Best practice responsible land use management requires incremental growth and land use laws that promote it. We need a mix of housing styles so people can find homes appropriate for every phase and stage of life, across all price brackets. If we don't grow, we stagnate.

Supporting local businesses—our shops, dining, and tourism—is a huge component of creating the vital ecosystem for a thriving municipality. These businesses benefit everyone, they create the tax base, the jobs, and the quality of life that makes our community desirable. It's even possible that if we can get some of our young people to stick around we may be able to foster their interest in taking on our ag lands as our current farmers seek retirement or create value-added ag products that enhance the bottom line and promote a thriving local economy while preserving our mix of land use.

I applaud the Town Board for taking the initiative to create a comprehensive plan. It's the best path forward for responsible growth. This plan represents countless hours of volunteer and staff work, and it shows. You've created a responsible framework that applies best practices with genuine foresight for our town's future. I understand it's part of the process that not everyone will be pleased with every portion of the plan, but I particularly appreciate the nuance you've achieved.

I urge you to move forward with this comprehensive plan and thank you for your dedicated service to our community.

Sincerely,  
Jes Seaver  
16 Elm Heritage Hotel  
[sixteenelm.com](http://sixteenelm.com)

--  
Jes Seaver

Associate Real Estate Broker



**Warren Real Estate of Ithaca**

830 Hanshaw Road

Ithaca, NY 14850

[www.warrenhomes.com](http://www.warrenhomes.com)