

# Office Zoning Stalled Again

**GUILDERLAND**—A zoning amendment that would allow doctors, dentists, and surgeons to practice in residential areas stalled again Tuesday night after a stormy public hearing before the town board.

As the hour-and-a-half session came to a close, Town Supervisor Carl Walters told the 70 residents attending that a decision on the proposed zoning change would be the subject of further "deliberation."

"**MAYBE WE CAN** build around it as a skeleton, or improve it," Walters said in reference to the present amendment during a recess after the hearing. "I don't know. It's going to take a lot of work."

Asked if he could estimate when a decision would be made, Walters replied, "No sir. This thing has already been going on for almost a year."

The bulk of testimony Tuesday was in opposition to the amendment, which would eliminate the current requirement that practitioners in residential zones live on the site of their practice. There was, however, considerable comment in favor of the proposed change. Testimony on both sides was frequently followed by applause.

**CRITICISM OF** the proposal ranged from general concern with its wording to specific complaints regarding possible parking and traffic problems.

"I think it's discriminatory in nature and vague in content," declared Richard J. Kalish of 7 Norwood St., summing up the comments of many at the hearing.

Kalish and others argued the amendment was discriminatory because it did not provide for residential practice by other professions such as lawyers and psychologists.

Town board members attempted to counter charges of vagueness by pointing out that where the amendment was not specific, the rest of the local zoning law would apply.

**MELVYN BEHN**, president of the McKownville Improvement Association, delivered an opposition petition focused on possible lowering of property valuations, traffic and parking problems, and deterioration of residential property because of absentee ownership.

Supervisor Walters said the final version of the amendment would be an attempt "to please as many people as possible."