



Carol Mackin <townclerk@clintondcny.gov>

Re: Hospitality Venues

1 message

Eliot Werner <deputysupervisor@clintondcny.gov>

Thu, May 7, 2026 at 3:59 PM

To: Shane Egan <se@cappillino.com>

Cc: Carol Mackin <townclerk@townofclinton.com>

Shane,

I met with Rich this afternoon and right off the bat he made a good suggestion that other folks have made as well, which is that we include language that a procedure will be established to handle applications for changes in the overlay district.

Digging deeper into the law, he suggested that this draft may be conflating policy and zoning. In other words, we should retain the general information in Section 250-15.1 but move the specific zoning requirements (setbacks, number of rooms, etc.) to a separate statement within the Zoning Law. Otherwise the Town Board may find itself duplicating the Planning Board when it reviews applications for new properties.

I'm not sure that I'm conveying Rich's thoughts clearly but I'm sure you understand what I'm trying to say. Let me know what you think.

Eliot

On May 5, 2026, at 7:29 PM, Elliot Werner <deputysupervisor@clintondcny.gov> wrote:

Shane,

It occurred to me (somewhat belatedly) that you might be interested in these comments from our new Planning Board member. I'm meeting Rich for coffee on Thursday afternoon and would be happy to have your comments.

Also, on several occasions Paul has referred to the regulations governing traditional B&Bs. Maybe we can look at these prior to the public hearing.

Eliot

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Richard Levin <richardblevin@gmail.com>
Date: May 5, 2026 at 9:30:44 AM EDT
To: Elliot Werner <deputysupervisor@clintondcny.gov>
Subject: Hospitality Venues

Eliot:

First, apologies. I have a problem with Thursday 11:00 AM. Can we move to any time in the afternoon on Thursday or any time on Friday except 10:30 to noon?

On to the substance. I'm not yet entirely familiar with how an overlay works. As I read it, it's restrictions on a particular use that are in addition to the limitations that would be imposed by the zoning of a parcel. As I understand it, hospitality uses are permitted only in the commercial hamlets and under the bed-and-breakfast local law in other areas.

If I have that right, then it seems as though the draft LL, though apparently attempting to follow option #3, is in effect option #2. I suppose it's possible that it would apply to the three existing/pending hospitality uses (Omega, Six Sense, "new" Milea/Hollow Rd) if they (or a future owner) ever wanted to change their use. But it would effectively prohibit hospitality uses (other than B&B) everywhere else.

In addition, even if it were deemed to permit hospitality uses elsewhere, of if the Town Board were to amend the overlay map to permit other areas, the restrictions are so tight that they are not commercially viable. And for the size hospitality venues they would permit, a person wanting to start a hospitality venue ("to support tourism and economic development", as the LL states), the person would use the B&B law.

The above suggests a hidden agenda to implement option #2. Which goes back to the Town Board preference for Option #3. I'm not sufficiently informed about the pros and cons of Option #2 vs. Option #3, so I can't yet address that. But if the Board want #3, I don't think this draft accomplishes it.

Rich

From: Elliot Werner <deputysupervisor@clintondcnj.gov>

Sent: Sunday, May 3, 2026 4:33 PM

To: Richard Levin <richardblevin@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Hospitality Venues

Rich:

The current conference center law was passed by a different Town Board in 2021. In July 2025 I sponsored a moratorium that prohibits the development of new conference centers. The moratorium expires in July 2026 and the new law (if passed) will take over.

When the board passed the moratorium, we had a spirited discussion about how to handle the three applications that are already in progress. The sense of the board members was that these three properties should be "exempt" from the moratorium.

When I began working on the new law several months ago, I proposed three possible approaches—two of which follow the above consensus.

- 1) Allow the current (2021) conference center law to continue in force.
- 2) Prohibit new hospitality venues throughout the town and allow the three exempted properties to exist as preexisting, nonconforming uses.
- 3) Establish an overlay district that would allow the three exempted properties (as well as any new hospitality venues that the town might find suitable) to exist as permitted uses, but under very strict parameters.

I favored option #2 but the board chose option #3 and the draft reflects this choice.

Not as short a statement as I anticipated but I hope it clarifies the situation.

Eliot