

Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
11 June 2012

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Terry Boyles, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Bonnie Hundt, Don MacLean, Bob Mayhew, Jim Miller, Bob Roche, Jane Shannon  
Members Absent: Donna Hoyt, Kyle Loughheed, Dennis Sigler

---

The ZRC convened at 7:05 p.m. and approved minutes of the 4 June meeting.

The committee approved Nan's Stolzenburg's edits to Supplementary Regulations Subsection V D, Buffers between Farm and Non-Farm Uses, and also approved retaining 50,000 board feet in V F, Commercial Logging. The ZRC requests Nan incorporate, perhaps in V F 5, that permit requirements may be met by having a consulting forester or DEC forest plan.

The committee approved Subsection K, Flood Prevention, and concurred with the thrust and provisions of Subsection N, Lighting, to preclude illumination and glare beyond property boundaries. To that end, members seek Nan's thoughts: Would it be helpful to also include maximum lumens and, if so, what should be that number? Also, the 22' max height in #6 seems a bit too high; should this be decreased a bit—perhaps to somewhere in the 15-18 foot range?

Members approved adding Manufactured Home Parks to the Use Table as a use within Residential Commercial Uses, and that it will be X in all districts except the Ag District, where it will have the note: "Allowed when approved by Town Board per Section V." The ZRC also approved Subsection O, Manufactured Home Parks, except for the following:

Re: O 2—Refer to, rather than restate here, the review and permitting procedures of FBD G as the procedures to be followed for a MHP district. However, the committee requests Nan determine whether all information requirements at G 2 c are required for an MHP application. Also, it was suggested that cross-referencing be entered into both Subsection O directing a reader to FBD G, and in FBD G to notify a reader that those procedures also apply to MHP O.

Re: O 6a—Put a period after "tampering or opening." Delete "by children or animals;"

Re: O 7—Delete. Members acknowledge Nan's point that MHP "can be intense places and small town roads may not be appropriate for multiple new houses," but note that subdivisions or OSCS may be located off town roads and generate equally intense traffic.

Re: O 8 1c—Change 300' frontage to 50' frontage.

Re: O 12—lines 7-8: Mr. Mayhew objected to the implication that the PB may determine what amenities are not desirable and seeks Nan's rationale and advice about deleting that final phrase—"or that those...desirable." Also, the committee requests Nan delete "equal to one hundred dollars (\$100) per...proposed park" and substitute "in an amount to be determined by the Planning Board".

Re: O 15—The committee found that the passive voice used in the first line leaves vague the responsibility for providing extinguishers and other devices, and requests Nan change to make clear that it is the MHP owner/operator’s responsibility to provide such equipment.

Other queries—The committee seeks Nan’s thoughts about two additional issues:

-Given that an MHP is a “district within a district,” what density and dimensions requirements apply to the MHP and to the “parcels/plots/sites” within the MHP? What is the relationship of the density and dimensions requirements of amended Section IV B to MHP?

-What home occupation uses apply within the MHP district? Is it correct to assume that home occupation uses in the use table for the underlying district apply within the MHP district?

Given Comp Plan direction to establish guidelines to protect designated ridgelines based on their topographical prominence and scenic importance, Mr. Chase, Mr. MacLean, and Mr. Roche explained how the subcommittee conducted its assessment. Their explanation also summarized several measures that were discarded due to the unduly onerous nature of those measures.

After extensive map review and discussion, committee members unanimously endorsed the subcommittee’s recommendation to protect ridgelines designated on Map—Ridgeline Protection Areas (vertical buffer within 500 horizontal feet)—dated 5-12-2011, prepared by Don Meltz affiliated with Community Planning & Environmental Associates. During discussion, Mr. Boyles and others had noted that the subcommittee recommendations do not designate all ridgelines for protection, only those that are most topographically prominent and of scenic importance when viewed from several different vantage points throughout the town.

To improve upon a bit of awkward linguistic construction, members agreed with Mrs. Gaba’s suggestion that the definition of view corridor be edited to: “strategic removal of selected groupings of trees and other vegetation from a forested area to allow for long views from doors and windows of a structure.”

The ZRC unanimously approved Subsection V (R), Ridgeline Protection, and all applauded the time, effort, and balanced judgment that the subcommittee had devoted to this difficult task.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.