

Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
23 July 2012

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Donna Hoyt, Bonnie Hundt, Don MacLean, Jim Miller, Dennis Sigler

Members Absent: Terry Boyles, Kyle Lougheed, Bob Mayhew, Bob Roche, Jane Shannon

---

The ZRC convened at 7:02 p.m. and approved minutes of the 9 July meeting.

The Chair noted that there will be a public hearing for Package #3 at 7:00 p.m., 13 August.

After considering Nan Stolzenburg's commentary and recommendation, and following member discussion, which included comments by Mr. MacLean and others that past Planning Boards had operated on a premise that only one principal residence was permitted on a lot, the committee decided to not allow more than one principal dwelling per lot. The committee requests Nan revise Section II D (4), Section IV F (1), and any other passages to eliminate any guidance that conflicts with this decision.

Members identified no additional uses that require individually tailored standards in Section V (J) 10. However, members did identify several edits for Nan to make:

- p. 12, Gas Station, paragraph a, 2d line—change “at least one (1) acres of area” to “at least one (1) acre....”

- p. 29, Sawmill, paragraph a—change hours of operation from 8-7 to 7-7 so they coincide with gravel mine and recycling, thereby making these three industrial uses consistent in their maximum operating hours.

- p. 24, Wood Furnaces, paragraph 2—delete the redundant parts of this sentence and edit for clarity. It appears that the line is supposed to end after “in the rear yard,” or if it is supposed to end after “portion of the lot,” clarify whether “portion of the lot” means “rear yard or rear portion of the lot.”

The Chair noted that, while reviewing the Comp Plan to ensure that the ZRC had addressed all land use features, Nan detected two features in the detailed strategies that had not been overtly addressed:

1. Re: 2.5 Determining Building Lots—The Comp Plan says to establish both a formula-based mechanism and a yield management mechanism to calculate the density a parcel is eligible for. Both are net acreage methods. Current revisions use total acreage, rather than net, as the base for calculations.

Citing history with Long Lake and other developments, most members agreed with net acreage as the basis of calculating how many units could be put in. Discussion focused on details, including making it explicit that land which is unbuildable due to wetlands, steep

slopes etc could be counted within the 60% that is open space. Members agreed to ponder the matter and reconsider again next week.

2. Re: 9.24 Development Rights—The Comp Plan says that if development rights were not allocated at the time of subdivision, zoning laws should assume those rights have been allocated in proportion to the acreage of each lot in the subdivision. Nan had provided corresponding text that could be included in Section IV.

Member discussion disclosed that terminology needed to be clarified, including the definition of “development rights.” Members also identified several questions that text needs to address, such as: who has the open space rights and obligations—the original owner of the overall parcel, or those who get some of the lots, or both?

To help Nan as she crafts definitions, members affirmed their concept of what is a gravel mine versus what is a quarry: Quarries are envisioned as pits caused by systematically drilling and blasting out chunks of bed-rock, whereas gravel mining is scooping out the unconsolidated mixture of accumulated rock fragments, pebbles, and dirt that lies in deposits that are pretty much at, or relatively close to, the surface of the ground.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.