

**Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
16 August 2010**

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

**Members Absent:** Kyle Loughheed, Don MacLean

**Others Present:** Donna Hoyt

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Members approved minutes of the Aug 9th meeting.

Members reviewed the Site Plan Review section and had the following questions and determinations:

- re: paragraph A1a.3: ask Nan Stolzenburg why demolition should be included;
- re: paragraph A1a.4: ask Nan why relocation should be included;
- re: paragraph 6.8 of the Comp Plan: should the hole in the ground be addressed as part of site plan review, elsewhere in town law, or should the BI enforce as he issues the demolition permit?
- re: paragraph A1a.5: does change of the exterior façade include a change in landscaping?
- re: paragraph A1a.6: does “contraction” mean removing a section of a building?
- re: paragraph A2a: appears to treat residential within section on commercial: not clear what’s intended in this paragraph—e.g. what are “related land use activities?”
- re: paragraph A2j: is this redundant of first sentence in paragraph 3?
- re: paragraphs A2d and 2i (when “temporary” is inserted): “temporary” needs to be defined in each instance, and probably will be defined differently in each instance—e.g. a “temporary” farm-stand may need to be defined in seasonal terms, whereas a “temporary” lawn sale may be defined by setting a maximum number of days per year, e.g. 12-15. How do other towns ensure that temporary truly does mean short duration?
- re: paragraphs A2f and 2h: why does this paragraph contain these provisions—para j specifies no substantial change and h pertains to residential?
- re: paragraphs A2f and 2f: there are two paragraphs labeled “f.” The second 2f appears to need only a BI look, not site plan review.
- re: paragraph 3: revise from legalese to user-friendly, comprehensible English.
- re: paragraph B, Procedures: for consistency with other sections and ease of use to readers, revise organization and sequence of this entire section to mirror Section 6 of the wind power law final draft, i.e. first a list of application materials followed by the step-by-step application and review process.
- re: paragraph B3: Given that the zoning law should coincide with the Comp Plan, is it necessary to include here “level of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan?” If the application complies with the zoning law, but not with the Comp Plan, may it be denied?
- re: paragraph B4: Check with Don MacLean whether “ten days prior” is correct?
- re: paragraph B5 h: Does NYS provide a “blank form/fill in the blanks” for an Ag Data Statement? Spell out “Ag.”
- re: paragraph B5 cc: Is this redundant of paragraph B5 h?
- re: paragraph B5 m: Jane favors “entrances and exits” as simpler language.
- re: paragraph B5 t: Some members contend that “satellite dish antennas” are no longer big enough and obtrusive enough to warrant listing here; others agree that satellite dish antennas may be relatively small now, but that a cluster of them on a commercial building or residence becomes obtrusive and unsightly and should be subject to site plan review.
- re: paragraph B5 dd: will there be design standards for “elevation and façade treatments?”
- re: paragraph B5 ee: what is a “frequent outcrop?” Better wording may be “many outcrops.”
- re: paragraph B6: All appears satisfactory with paragraphs B6 a, b, and c.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.