

**Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
13 February 2012**

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Bonnie Hundt, Jim Miller, Bob Roche, Jane Shannon, Dennis Sigler

Members Absent: Terry Boyles, Kyle Lougheed, Don MacLean, Bob Mayhew

Others Present: Donna Hoyt

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and determined no recusals were necessary. The committee approved minutes of the 6 February meeting.

The Chair reviewed Nan Stolzenburg's responses to issues raised at the 6 February meeting.

The committee reviewed the updated draft of the Floating Business District (FBD v6 Feb 11 (2)), approved edits incorporated into that draft, and requests Nan make the following final adjustments:

p. 6, subsection 5b, 7<sup>th</sup> line—change “one hundred (100) feet” to “five hundred (500) feet” to coincide with previous edit in 2d line.

p. 6, subsection 5b—Change text to make Town, rather than applicant, responsible for providing notice of public hearing by mail to all property owners within 500 feet. Intent is to make this notice similar to that on page 14 of Section XIII (Site Plan Review), Sub-Section C8b, and similar to that on page 5 of Section VII (ZBA), Sub-Section I 7a. With this change, there is no need for the applicant to provide a list of nearby property owners or proof of mailing. Costs or reasonable fee should be part of the text.

p. 6, Sub-section 6—Insert a Sub-section 6b that requires (“shall,” not “may”) the Town Board to refer the application to the Conservation Advisory Council for an advisory opinion, similar to text on page 6 of Sub-Section V (I), Open Space Conservation Subdivisions, Sub-section 6p, and similar to that on page 6 of Section XIII (SPR), Sub-section B9d.

Given text on p. 3, G1 re: the informal meeting with the TB “to determine if the Town Board is willing to commence the FBD review and decision process,” and given that the TB “in its sole discretion, may reject any request for a FBD at any time during the petition review process” (p. 6, G7a), and given that the committee finds no text requiring the TB to state its reasons for rejecting/denying a FBD proposal or application, members request Nan answer:

1. Must the TB state its reasons if it is not willing to commence FBD review/decision process, and must the TB state its reasons for rejecting/denying an FBD application?
2. Does an applicant have any right to appeal a rejection/denial? If so, to whom? Via what process?

The committee then resumed its review of draft Section J (10) Individual Standards 11/11 [12 1]. Starting at page 25, results were:

p. 25, Outdoor Wood Furnace, c2—delete “upon which the outdoor wood boiler is located.”

p. 25, Outdoor Wood Furnace, c3—Change two references to Claverack.

p. 26, Personal Services—when defining day spa, consider the likelihood of extensive traffic, comings and goings within one day.

p. 26, Private Airfield, Aircraft Hangar, Helipad—based on February 6 decisions, delete helipad. At paragraph c, delete “landing pad.” At paragraph d, delete “or helicopters.” Delete paragraph f. At paragraph h, delete “or helipad.” Discussion occurred about limiting hangar size, the number of aircraft permitted, and whether the owner must be a licensed pilot. Similarities to an individual who collects automobiles was noted. Consensus was that owner need not be a licensed pilot, that paragraph d gives PB authority over maximum number of planes, and that judgment should carry over to maximum hangar size. Members reiterated decision made on February 6 about limiting to small, single engine, non-jet, fixed wing aircraft.

p. 28, Recreational Facility, Outdoor—Members cautioned that reference to LL #4 of 2008 should be checked to ensure it is Ancram’s noise ordinance. Also, reference to “Site Plan Section VI (F)” appears to be incorrect. Probably Section XIII.

pp. 28-29, Recycling Facility—re: paragraph b, members initially questioned rationale for “opaque block wall,” but subsequently speculated that it is appropriate to shield surrounding area from noise and unsightliness, and that the wall itself is landscaped. Paragraph g is confusing—60 dBA versus 70 dBA. Use one, probably 60 dBA. Members reiterated that only a small recycling facility is authorized, not a large, intrusive one.

pp. 29-30, Retail and Professional Office—re: paragraph c, while understanding the general value of prohibiting parking in the front yard, questions arose about some existing buildings in Ancram and Ancramdale and that there is no room to park on sides or back, e.g. Ancram Post Office. Given that PB may grant waivers, no change was called for, but request Nan review this provision.

pp. 30-31, Retreat Center—re: paragraph a, delete first “Allowed” in line 1, making it “Uses that may be allowed....” Questions for Nan re: paragraph b, is 40% total building coverage or is it total impervious surface? Re: paragraph l, what is “PRD approval?” Re: paragraph l 2, members opined that requiring both “landscaped islands” and “shade tree planters” may be excessive, and suggested that the planters may be superfluous.

pp. 31-32, Sawmill—re: c, it may be necessary to clarify that logs, lumber, sawdust etc are “sawmill by-products.” Also, delete paragraph f because it repeats paragraph c.

p. 33, Self-storage Pod—re: e, members noted that commercial s-s pods often are made of a galvanized metal that shines or have the provider’s own color and logo, and that users may be precluded from painting those to a neutral or subdued color. Nan: advice?

Upon the Chair noting that the 20 February meeting will review the Telecommunications Law, the meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.