

**Town of Ancram  
Zoning Revisions Committee  
27 September 2010**

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

**Members Absent:** Kyle Lougheed, Jane Shannon

**Others Present:** Donna Hoyt

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Members approved minutes of the September 20 meeting.

The Chair noted that Nan Stolzenburg had provided to the Farmland Protection Committee the third version of the Ag Plan, which includes all notes/comments from committee members plus those from the Columbia Land Conservancy. Nan also provided to that committee an edited version of the current zoning ordinance that contains additions and deletions based on the Comp Plan and on Ag Committee recommendations. After review, the Ag Committee will pass along final recommendations to the ZRC. The Chair also reported that ZRC decisions had been incorporated into the wind power law, which was subsequently forwarded for final legal review. The Chair also will pass to members a biodiversity paper recently received from the CAC.

Focusing on Paragraphs C (Criteria for Review) and D (Guarantee of Site Improvements), the committee completed initial review of the draft Site Plan Review Section and concluded that some specific provisions in C2 should go elsewhere in the zoning law, some adjustments to commercial off-street parking provisions may be appropriate, some language may be simplified for clarity, and further information and discussion about maintaining Ancram's architectural character would be helpful. Members also wanted to clarify that the check cited at D2b would be deposited in escrow, that the Town Board rather than Planning Board approves the bond at D3b, and wanted the rationale for withholding 10% of the applicant's money for a period at D5 and for withholding 5% after construction phase completion at D7. To keep like subjects together, members also prefer to move D7 forward to become either D2c or D3.

To become familiar with the draft for Minor Site Plan Review, the committee briefly reviewed draft updates to Paragraphs A1 and A2 (pages 1-3) and concluded that Paragraph A should be expanded to explain up front that there are two forms of review. Based on Nan's comment NS3, members seek more info about the pros, cons, and considerations of "all versus some" regarding size, district, footprint, etc. and also more info about the rationale behind exempting customary residential accessory uses of 600 square feet or less. Scanning draft Section G, the committee sensed that if a project needs escrow, it probably should undergo regular site review (para G3). Paragraph I1 prompted speculation about the value of site plan review for road building, tree cutting, etc when development plans are not yet known. It was suggested that "developed" is a more accurate term than "maintained" at I3, and members wonder whether small commercial development should receive minor site plan review.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.