

**Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
24 May 2010**

**Members Present:** Hugh Clark, Terry Boyles, Barbara Gaba, Kyle Lougheed, Don MacLean, Bob Mayhew, Jim Miller

**Members Absent:** Barry Chase, Bonnie Hundt, Bob Roche, Jane Shannon, Dennis Sigler

**Others Present:** Donna Hoyt, Leah Wilcox

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Members approved minutes of the May 17th meeting.

All present reviewed draft Section VIII, Zoning Board of Appeals, paying special attention to Nan Stolzenburg's comments in her email of May 19, 2:05 p.m., subject: Re: Section VIII, ZBA, Edits. Verbiage suggested in Nan's comments NS3, NS5, and NS6 will be incorporated into the next draft and other suggestions will be included, except the phrase "either the ZBA or" will be deleted from NS6 dealing with restraining orders. Concerning Nan's comment at NS14, members agreed that the next draft will incorporate language drawn from NYS law about default denials of appeal.

The ZRC also reviewed the draft Planning Board Section and affirmed that previously agreed upon language about alternate member appointments and training, a PB Secretary, majority plus one override of county PB, failure to act, and other points will be included in the next draft.

After reviewing draft Section VII, Administration and Enforcement, and affirming previously agreed upon edits, the committee determined that, after Nan updates these three sections with the latest language, these sections will be passed to the Building Inspector, his deputy, and their assistant; and to the chairpersons and secretary/clerk of the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals for their review. Those officials will be invited to confer with the ZRC on or about June 21<sup>st</sup> about their reactions to these draft sections.

Discussion then turned to four questions about the organization of the Site Plan Review section posed by Nan. Deliberation focused exclusively on where to put various elements within the new zoning law. A tentative conclusion was that residential site plan review probably should not be a section in the new law, but that features of the current ordinance requiring site plan review of multifamily dwellings should be retained. Another tentative conclusion was that uses requiring site plan approval should be incorporated into the updated use table rather than in the narrative text of the law. Another suggestion was that the use table should have a column for special uses and perhaps also for commercial design standards. Comprehensive deliberation and decision will occur at an upcoming meeting.

The ZRC then determined priorities for research by the CAC.

The next meeting will be a discussion with Nan on June 7<sup>th</sup>.