

**Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
13 December 2010**

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

**Members Absent:** Don MacLean

**Others Present:** Donna Hoyt

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members approved minutes of the December 6 meeting.

The committee discussed several features of Version 5 of the Site Plan Review section with the following results:

Re: page 20, paragraph F1b, Cmt NS5—

Members decided to delete “used for housing of livestock” so all agricultural structures could be included and decided that “5,000 square feet” should be decreased to “3,000 square feet.”

Members also want to ensure that a 100 foot buffer is in place between agricultural structures and waterways.

Mr. Mayhew asked whether slaughter houses are included within the definition of “agricultural structures;” the committee seeks an answer from Nan Stolzenburg.

Noting that the definition of “agri-tourism operations” includes “activities” such as pumpkin patches and corn mazes, Mr. Lougheed and others voiced concern that subjecting such activities to site plan review, including abbreviated review, would unduly stifle such enterprise when the true intent is to encourage agricultural activities. Assuming that parking and similar safety issues are the principal concern, the committee opined that such activities should be governed by the zoning permit process rather than by the site plan review process.

Ms. Hoyt and others questioned why para F1a6 contains “within 500 feet of a farm operation” and seek an answer from Nan, especially as paragraph E6 of the draft Open Space Conservation Subdivision Law calls for setbacks of 100 feet and 300 feet. Mr. Mayhew also questioned why a 500’ criterion would apply if there is another landowner’s property situated between the farm operation and the proposed residential site.

Re: page 20, paragraph F2, Cmt NS6—

After discussing potential ways to inject objective criteria for determining whether PB review is “deemed necessary,” the committee endorsed Mr. Sigler’s suggestion that if a parcel is 7 acres or more, the PB may require site plan review. The committee seeks Nan’s thoughts about the viability of this approach. The committee also deleted “major” from the phrase “may require major site plan review.” In addition, change “of a residential review” to “of a residential project” or similar wording.

Re: page 23, paragraph F5, Cmt NS7—

The committee did not perceive significant difficulty in having the ZEO know and apply the goals, policies, and standards set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, and did not identify criteria for all residences to meet, which would then be incorporated into general zoning.

Re: page 25, paragraph F6a, Cmt NS9—

For simplicity and coordination, the committee determined that the applicant should submit directly to the Planning Board, with a copy furnished to the Building Inspector.

Re: page 25, Cmt NS10—

The committee prefers that farm worker housing be included within this section, perhaps as its own sub-section labeled “site plan review for farm worker housing” or some similar heading.

The ZRC then turned its attention to draft Local Law, Open Space Conservation Subdivisions, and determined the following:

Re: page 2, paragraph E, Cmt NS3—

Paragraph E1 is acceptable.

Paragraph E2—Most members do not understand the basis for 25 feet street frontage, which appears to be too small, and therefore are uncomfortable with this provision. The committee tentatively resolved that the minimum should be “50 feet, to be reduced under certain circumstances” at the discretion of the Planning Board. However, the committee would like to hear an explanation of the 25 foot rationale from Nan at the January 3 meeting before making a final decision.

Paragraph E3—The committee again reviewed Detailed Strategy 1.4 of the Comp Plan. Members of the ZRC who had served also on the Comp Plan Committee all recalled that Comp Plan deliberations leading to the ½ acre minimum presumed individual water and septic systems. Because paragraph E3 opens a new category of lots within major subdivisions that would be served by some sort of communal water/septic system, the ZRC decided to approve E3 as written.

Paragraph E4—While noting that some lots may be so small that installation of house, driveway, swimming pool, or other impervious surfaces would cover more than 30% of the lot, the committee opted to go with this provision as written.

Paragraphs E5 and E6 are acceptable as written.

During discussion of this section, members determined that verbiage should be added where appropriate to convey that when this local law is adopted the “clock on subdivision should be set to zero” as discussed on several previous occasions.

Re: page 3, paragraph F2a-h, Cmt NS4—

Members could not identify additional items to add to this list and request that Nan add whatever she thinks appropriate. The committee would review and strike out if necessary.

Re: page 6, paragraph G7, Cmt NS7—

Members discussed possible additions (e.g. sidewalks, block length, grid pattern), but ultimately decided that this paragraph as written introduces the concept sufficiently.

Members noted the list of definitions Nan provided to accompany this draft local law.

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.