

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

Members Present: Hugh Clark, Barry Chase, Barbara Gaba, Bonnie Hundt, Kyle Lougheed, Don MacLean, Jim Miller, Bob Roche, Dennis Sigler

Members Absent: Terry Boyles, Bob Mayhew, Jane Shannon

Others Present: None

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

Members approved minutes of the December 13 meeting.

The committee unanimously applauded the flow chart provided by Nan Stolzenburg as a exceptionally useful means of envisioning and understanding this new site plan review section.

The committee discussed several features of Version 6 of the Site Plan Review section with the following results:

Re: pages 18-19, paragraph E2, Minor Subdivisions and Cmt NS2—the committee approved Nan Stolzenburg’s recommendation that minor subdivisions use the same criteria previously approved for abbreviated site plan review of single or two-family residences. Those criteria had been located at paragraph F5 on pages 23-24 and will be moved forward to become paragraph E2 on pages 18-19.

Re: pages 19-20, paragraph F, Abbreviated SPR, and Cmts NS4,5,6—the committee decided to delete the last sentence of paragraph 2a. Reasons for that deletion include inability to identify objective criteria that would trigger the Planning Board to require a major site plan review of a residential project and that applications meeting all criteria of paragraph F1a would be approved by the Building Inspector and not be noted by the Planning Board.

Re: pages 23-24, paragraph F5-6, Criteria for Review of ASP and Cmts NS7,8—as noted above, the committee endorsed Nan’s recommendations and, therefore, to now revise wording for paragraph F5 to coincide with E2.

Re: pages 25-26, paragraph F6a(10), Farm Worker Housing, and Cmt NS9—

Considering Mr. Lougheed’s question about how one could determine at the beginning whether density regulations would be met, the committee determined that paragraph (10)(b) or other appropriate paragraph should be modified to require a sketch plan with the same information to be found on a preliminary subdivision sketch. That sketch would serve to validate intended density, and would then not need to be further completed as would be the case for a normal subdivision, but would be filed with the application for future reference.

Members wondered why paragraph (10)(c) includes only single-wide manufactured homes and request Nan explain the rationale.

Members also speculated about the 100/75/150 foot setbacks in paragraph (10)(c), noted that they do not coincide with the current density schedule, and wondered whether they are based on safety considerations. The committee requests Nan provide info: are there New York State or other guidelines about how far apart farm worker housing structures (especially mobile homes) must be to preclude a fire in one from spreading to others?

Members voiced concern about paragraph (10)(d) that four dwelling units per 500 acres may not provide sufficient housing, especially for a farm growing and harvesting produce. After extensive discussion, the committee opted to delete the dwelling per acres provision of paragraph (10)(d) and, instead, to require farmers to demonstrate that their proposal is for farm worker housing and to validate that intent by providing the sketch noted above. That sketch plan would be filed with the Building Inspector and/or Planning Board for future reference, and could be altered in the future if a better way of meeting subdivision guidelines could be shown. If a farmer balked at providing a subdivision sketch for building a permanent structure, mobile homes for farm worker housing could be allowed, but would have to be removed when the farm ceased operation or farm worker housing was no longer used for legitimate farm workers.

The committee looks forward to a final, productive discussion about site plan review with Nan on January 3.

With thanks to Bonnie Hundt for contributing delicious homemade cookies to fuel the evening's discussions, with memories of nine months of deliberation and progress, and with best wishes for a happy holiday and productive new year, the Zoning Revisions Committee adjourned at 8:40 p.m.