

**Town of Ancram
Zoning Revisions Committee
15 November 2010**

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

Members Absent: Barbara Gaba, Kyle Lougheed, Bob Mayhew

Others Present: Donna Hoyt

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

Members approved minutes of the November 8 meeting.

The Chair reviewed highlights of a November 11 memo from Nan Stolzenburg and John Lyons. Entitled "Comprehensive Plan Interpretation for Zoning," the memo answers "yes" to a query about whether it is consistent with the Comp Plan to include in the zoning law standards and procedures for both minor subdivisions and individual homes that are not part of a subdivision, provides an explanation for that straightforward affirmation, and cites case law.

Noting a question on November 8 about agricultural structures and uses undergoing site plan review, the Chair read passages from a November 14 email from Nan Stolzenburg that provided relevant information. The committee then discussed four options identified by Nan and their pros and cons:

1. Exempt all ag structures from site plan review.
2. Exempt all ag structures on a farm already regulated by concentrated animal feed operation (CAFO) and use modified SPR for other farms.
3. Have a modified review for all farm structures but, similar to the abbreviated site plan review, only look at specific siting issues such as setbacks from environmental features.
4. Only require SPR for those ag uses that have the public coming to the site...and use that SPR only to deal with those issues.

Two additional options were mentioned: one using the streamlined model cited in Appendix 10 of the Ag & Farmland Protection Plan, and one requiring PB SPR or Abbreviated SPR for all ag related businesses, but underscoring that the PB may waive review provisions.

After extensive deliberation, members agreed that a combination of #3 and #4 should receive some form of site plan review and requested that Nan draft text for review. Members also suggested that SPR probably should not be required for some common, small structures (such as run-in sheds for horses) and perhaps for some structures that do not have a roof and are below some specified square footage to be suggested by Nan.

During deliberation, members repeatedly identified issues about farm housing. All agreed that zoning revisions should preclude situations in which a farmer puts in modular or stick-built

housing for farm workers, so that those sites de facto become residential lots, but the sites are too close together or have other characteristics that are incompatible with subdivision regulations. Members agreed that any SPR or other requirements should contain a standard or criterion whereby permanent farm residential structures must be able to meet subdivision guidelines if the farm goes away at some future time.

While discussing farm worker housing, members agreed that there may have to be different criteria for mobile homes used as farm worker housing. In that context, members seek information and suggestions from Nan about such questions as:

Is there a space limitation for farm worker housing (or even for other farm buildings)—i.e. is there a limitation on the number of agricultural buildings or farm worker dwellings that may be sited within a certain space?

Are there guidelines about how far apart farm worker housing structures (especially mobile homes) must be to preclude a fire in one from spreading to others?

What are the ground-rules about water and septic systems for farm worker housing, especially for mobile homes? May several mobile homes use a communal water or septic system?

Even though a farm structure does not have to meet the building code, may it be required to meet zoning requirements and be approved for a zoning permit?

The committee then renewed deliberation about paragraph 5g on page 24. All agreed that utility service systems for major subdivisions should be required to be installed underground, and voted to amend paragraph 5g to read: “All new utility service systems shall be installed underground where practical.”

While reviewing paragraph G, Administration/Enforcement/Fines, on page 25, the committee noted that para G3 should be amended at several points. Line 3 should read: “shall result, after notice and hearing *by the Planning Board*, in revocation....” At line 5, “maintained” should be “*developed*.” Also, members sought assurance that references to “Building Inspector” at lines 5 and 7-8 should not be, or also include, ZEO and/or CEO. For clarity and easier comprehension, it was suggested that paragraph G3 be broken into 2-3 subparagraphs, with the second beginning at line 5, and that “less legalese” may aid comprehension.

The committee approved the paragraph on Integration of Procedures.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.