

Town of Ancram
Zoning Revisions Committee
23 April 2012

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Don MacLean, Jim Miller, Bob Roche

Members Absent: Terry Boyles, Donna Hoyt, Bonnie Hundt, Kyle Loughheed, Bob Mayhew, Jane Shannon, Dennis Sigler

Others Present: Ann Rader

The ZRC convened at 7:08 p.m. Because there was not a quorum, no meeting was conducted.

Members present informally reviewed a density bonus update and a non-conforming uses draft provided by Nan Stolzenburg to identify issues warranting consideration by the full committee.

Those present agreed that Nan's cautions (quoted in the 23 April agenda) should be accepted and also believe that verbiage should be added to A(3)(c) that explicitly states that criteria and procedures for determining qualified Ancram residents should be established by the Town Board.

Those present also agreed with Nan's comment at N4 that provision of affordable lots merits thought. Among their observations:

- Add "provision of affordable lots off site" as A(6)(b)(5)(e) and change (d)[sic] to be (f); this change would implement a ZRC 16 April decision that "developers should have flexibility to offer affordable ...lots either within the development or at another site or sites outside the development."

- Members also requested Nan's confirmation that only affordable housing may be built on an affordable lot, and that all buyers/occupants after the first buyer/occupant must also be qualified for affordable housing. In addition, members requested Nan's confirmation that such constraints must be included in deeds or similar documents and recorded in public files. Members ask Nan to advise whether verbiage should be added to the Density Bonus section to explicitly state that all buyers/occupants must be qualified for affordable housing and that such points must be captured in deeds or other appropriate documents.

- Members also suggest adding verbiage analogous to that at A(5) requiring affordable housing built on off-site affordable lots to be compatible with the finish quality of units built on site and also compatible in appearance with the off-site neighborhood.

Turning to the initial draft of Section VI, Non-Conforming Buildings, Uses and Lots, those present endorsed Nan's recommended additions at A2, A3, and B and endorsed the rationale behind such changes (See Nan's Comment N3).

Those present prefer the current C1 and C2, rather than the "new" C2 on page 2 because they perceive the new C2 is likely to penalize a homeowner whose house has been destroyed by fire

or other disaster. They perceive that this feature is akin to “kicking the home owner while he’s down.”

Those present agreed with inserting the new first sentence in D, and with deleting the original subsection E as recommended in Comment N3. The additions at A2, A3, and B accomplish these ends more effectively than the original E.

Members agreed with the new E, but request that this subsection be rendered into simpler, user friendly English—especially the phrase “or any subsequent amendment thereof applying thereto.”

On page 3, consensus was that E1, E1a and E1e should be retained, but in E1a, delete “whose aggregate area is equal to or greater than the minimum lot width area for that district.” The focus should be upon adjoining lots by the same owner. However, the group wondered whether deletion of 1b, 1c, and 1d then causes a situation in which there are no setbacks that apply. If so, does that mean that building can occur almost up to the property line? What guidelines apply? Members request Nan’s thoughts.

Members affirmed new J and K on page 4 and noted that J appears to be consistent with B3b of Section XIII, Site Plan Review.

Discussion ceased at 8:25 p.m.