

**Town of Ancram
Zoning Revisions Committee**

**Erin Robertson, MINUTES
February 24, 7:00 pm
Norman Anton Presiding
Erin Robertson Zoom Host**

Present: Erin Robertson, Bonnie Hundt, Norman Anton, Robert Greenberg, Dennis Sigler

Absent: Carol Falcetti, Steve Olyha, Kim Tripp, Susan Wohleking

Minutes of February 10, 2025. Approved

1. Definitions that were approved at the Feb. 10 meeting were reviewed and approved again.

Dwelling Unit. A single unit providing complete independent living facilities for one or more persons,

including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

Dwelling Group. A group of two or more dwellings occupying a lot in single ownership.

Multiple Dwelling is three or more dwelling units which are individually owned, rented, leased or let or hired out and occupied as residence or home.

2. Discussed and approved the definition for **DWELLING:** a building that contains one or two dwelling units used, intended or designed, used, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied for living purposes.

3. **Art V.16. Multi-Family Dwellings**

- Discussion about the title included dropping the word FAMILY. It was pointed out that Multi-Family is used extensively throughout the zoning and would be a big deal to make all those changes. Multi Dwelling does not work with the approved Multiple Dwelling. The team became exhausted with definitions and didn't feel that it was productive at this time and decided to return to definitions after reviewing more of V.16.
- **Art V.16.a.** Currently states that there shall be a minimum dimension of 800 square feet per unit. It was decided that 800 SF was too big for a minimum. It was decided that there should be a minimum SF but we did not know what minimum size is adequate. It was decided to ask Nan for her expert opinion.
- **Art V.16.b.** Currently states; *All structures containing multiple family units shall have a minimum roof pitch of 6 over 12.*

The discussion included a diagram to understand roof pitches and if different roof pitches make a difference for affordable housing. The group did not think that different pitches made a difference except for aesthetics and that the current requirement of a 6/12 pitch would be limiting. It was pointed out that **Art V. A. 22. Supplemental Commercial Design Standards g. Roof Types and Materials 1. All roofs shall be pitched with a min of 5” rise for each 12” run...** The group decided not to impose a stricter standard for Multi-Family Dwellings and that 16.b. should be removed after consultation with Nan.

- **Art V.16.c.** *All front yards attached to multiple family structures shall have a clearly defined front yard using landscaping, fencing, hedging, or brick or stone wall. Front yards of attached townhouses may be unified into one common yard treated as a single front yard for the entire building.*

The group searched for a reason to have a clearly defined front yard with specific landscaping and determined that it was about open space and aesthetics. It was discussed that setbacks would keep structures back from the road which would create a front yard and it would be expensive and possibly limiting for affordable housing to insist on specific types of landscape details. It was decided to remove 16.c.

- **Art V.16.d.** *All multiple family units shall have the following dimensions:
1. The maximum impervious surface area coverage, excluding paved areas for recreational facilities, such as a basketball or tennis court or a pool, shall be fifty percent (50%).*

Lots of discussion about % of lot coverage, and **ART. IV. Density and Dimensions specifically Table 22. Lot Dimension Schedule** which has a Maximum Lot Coverage for each district. The group did not understand the reason for excluding paved areas for recreational facilities and if it makes an impact for drainage with the increased % of impervious surfaces on the lot. The group thought that the Maximum Lot Coverage % on Table 22 was more **What is maxd lot coverage on Table 22** generous than the 50% maximum in 16.d. It was decided to get consultation from Nan about the implications of removing the 50% maximum lot coverage and if the Lot Dimension Schedule would adequately support affordable housing.

Meeting ended at 8:29.