

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

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Terry Boyles, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Don MacLean, Bob Roche, Jane Shannon, Dennis Sigler

Members Absent: Bonnie Hundt, Kyle Lougheed, Bob Mayhew, Jim Miller

Others Present: Donna Hoyt

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and determined no recusals were necessary.

The committee approved minutes of the 30 January meeting.

Viewing Use Table Worksheet (Updated 3 Feb 2012) (transmitted as Use Table FEB 3 12), members identified and resolved possible problems related to uses in the RhoR1 District:
pp. 1-2: General comment to be applied throughout Use Table—To preclude reader confusion, do not split rows between pages (e.g. current text for “Two-family dwelling” and pp. 5-6, “Adult entertainment facility/service, escort service” and pp. 10-11, “Gift shop,” and pp. 13-14, “Photography,” and pp. 14-15, “Professional Office”).

p. 6 and elsewhere: RhoR1 entries appear to lack the second half of the text (e.g. “Antique restoration” shows “P for low impact Home Occupation only” but not the “second part” of the designation. Compare to AH-R2 entries.)

p. 7: Bakery—“No retail only” confuses some. Appears best to delete “only.”

p. 11: Home Occupation, High Impact—Change SUP to X.

p. 14: Professional Office—Change X to P for low impact home occupation, X for all others.

Members briefly noted three points about the I-1 District:

pp. 2-3: Under the heading of “Residential Accessory Uses,” the I-1 column shows SUP for NC Wind Power, SPR for Private bridge, and P and SUP for Solar Energy. Mr. Sigler requested that Nan Stolzenburg verify that it is ok to show uses categorized as residential accessory in the I-1.

p. 4: The row above the Commercial Ag Uses heading appears to have an extra X in I-1.

p. 17: The first row under Industrial Uses has an extraneous X.

p. 3: Upon further reflection, members determined that “Private helipad” in the Ag District should be changed from SUP to X. Also, the definition and/or individual standards for “Private airfield” should make clear that such airfields are intended solely for small, single engine, propeller driven, fixed wing aircraft—not for jets and helicopters.

Scanning through the list of uses, members suggested that the following be defined: ECHO, Group home, Manufactured home, Dwelling, Accessory Use, Accessory apartment, Guesthouse, Playhouse, Pool house/cabana, primary/secondary structure if those terms appear, Self-storage pod, stable, Agri-tourism, Adult entertainment, escort service, Baseball hitting facility, Camp, Campground, Clinic, Day spa, Electronic entertainment, Shopping center, Food processing,

Scrap/salvage yard. Note: the committee did not pause to determine whether these terms already have been defined in draft definitions or elsewhere.

The committee then examined the latest FBD draft (FBD v5 Feb 3) with the following results:
p. 2, para E1, 2d sentence: Request Nan Stolzenburg clarify whether each additional parcel must also be a minimum of 5 acres. Members sense that requiring 5-acre minimum for each additional parcel may take more land away from underlying Ag District than is necessary.
p. 6, para G6b: Request Nan explain what are “United States Post Office Certificates of Mailing.” Members are not familiar with this term and wonder whether simply stating “proof of mailing” will suffice.

Mr. Sigler voiced concern about the two-step process whereby (as the first step) the TB gets the FBD application, turns to the PB for review and advice, then renders decision about whether to create the requested FBD; after which comes the second step in which the PB conducts SPR, subdivision, or perhaps SUP review of the project to be placed on the approved FBD. He opined that the applicant and the PB are, to a great extent, going through the same information and process twice, thereby expending undue time, energy, and money. During ensuing discussion, the “chicken and egg” aspects of the situation became clear. To be conscientious when deciding about the proposed FBD, the TB and PB must have more information than merely the applicant’s concept for the FBD. Much of that info is the same as that which the PB would normally use as part of the site plan, subdivision, and/or special use review. However, the application info doesn’t necessarily constitute all info that the PB would ultimately seek, including specific details about parking, screening, etc. It is likely that the PB, having reviewed much of the info prior to providing their recommendation about establishing the FBD, would be able to move more quickly than normal through the SPR and/or other reviews. Mr. MacLean and others also noted that, unless the TB approves an FBD, there’s no “place” for the proposed use to go, hence no need for the detailed SPR, subdivision, and/or special use review by the PB.

The Chair will inform Nan Stolzenburg about the issue and seek her response and advice to the committee, including whether a solution may include a statement within the text that the PB may use info provided in the applicant’s petition to the TB when conducting its reviews, and may request the applicant provide additional details as necessary for PB deliberations and decisions.

Looking ahead, the Chair noted that the 13 February meeting will begin at 7:30 p.m. Also, members prefer to forge ahead and will meet on 20 February. During the latter part of February, the ZRC will review the Telecommunications Law to determine whether any adjustments are needed and, if so, what those adjustments should be.

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

