

TOWN OF CAIRO
Zoning Commission

Minutes of October 22, 2007 Meeting

In Attendance: Jeff Shapiro, Rich Booth, Mary Pesez Kames, Nan Stolzenberg, Sue Oldakowski, Bill Hummel, Peter Maassmann, Doug Ostrander, John Gallagher, M.A. Tarpinian, Alice Tunison (Liaison)

Meeting called to order with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Jeff opened the meeting welcoming the public and asking that any personal conflicts within the board be dealt with privately and outside the confines of the meetings.

Regarding the minutes of the October 9th meeting, Alice asked that her name be removed from the absentee list and be put back on the attendance list since she had signed in and was there for the Pledge of Allegiance. Several members disagreed since she left immediately after the Pledge and was absent for the remainder of the meeting. Her name was put back on by direction of the chairman and the minutes were approved and seconded. Alice also felt that too much time is spent in discussion with audience members and therefore the tape runs out and some points are left out of the minutes. She asked that it be noted that Mr. Aprea commented that the existing commission might not remain the same after the election, depending on the discretion of the newly elected board of the Town of Cairo. Everyone was reminded that it was addressed in the July 2nd meeting

Doug highlighted a draft from the meeting of October 9 and e-mailed a copy to all the board members. Of the highlighted items, Section B.1 paragraph a. should be changed to begin "Except those specifically exempted in Section 2 below" and then continue with "all new land use activities....."

Section C.2 – Sketch Plan - the last sentence in the first paragraph should read "The Planning Board shall schedule a site visit by at least a minimum of two board members to familiarize itself with the parcel and project." There is a waiver included on page 9, #7. Nan felt there should be a fee schedule set by the Town Board. In the second paragraph change five copies to read eight copies.

Section C.4 – Application for Preliminary Site Plan Approval – change five copies to read eight copies. The Preliminary Site Plan Approval has been recommended by Nan to be set up as a two-stage process. She said oftentimes the State won't even look at the application unless there is at least conditional approval by the town (which is about 90% approval). This could actually be more beneficial than a one-stage process since more details would be covered before the Board would grant conditional approval. Therefore, the second stage, or final approval, would be more administrative and the final hearing could be waived. The Board has the ability to establish a one-step process for a minor job that requires a less intensive review (Section C.7).

Section C.6 – Additional Requirements – the first paragraph should read "If, in the opinion of the Planning Board, the project could have traffic, visual or stormwater impacts....."

Section C.7 – Less Intensive Review and Waiver Requirements – Move the last sentence in the paragraph to become the second sentence of the paragraph. The new third sentence “Minor projects.....” should be defined to read “....under 5,000 square feet **OR** that create no new parking....”

Section C.8.a – change “may” to read “shall”. C.8.b - remove “as appropriate and within reason” from the first sentence. C.8.c – change “may” to read “shall”.

Section C.11 – first paragraph the “may” was changed to read “shall”.

Richard Booth questioned the legality of Section C.12 – Failure to Take Action on Application.

Section C.15 – Reservation of Park Land – change to read “In accordance with the provisions of Section 274-a(6) of the Town Law, the Planning Board may require.....”

Section D.3 – Nan will review the wording as far as parking restrictions in the Site Plan versus zoning. In the last sentence, change “may” to read “shall”.

Suzanne questioned Section D.4.a regarding the cost of a traffic study. Costs were covered on page 10, Section C.8.c. Nan will change the language of Section C.8.c to clarify that **all** costs pertaining to a study are to be borne by the applicant.

There was discussion on Section D.4.c whether to change the second sentence to read “shall” rather than “may” but it was decided to leave it as “may” since Section A.2.b spells it out clearly. After further discussion on the definition of nuisance noise Nan suggested that they have a stand alone noise ordinance and have the Site Plan Review refer to it.

Section D.6 – change second sentence to read “These plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Engineer retained by the Planning Board prior to approval.” Use the statement “Engineer retained by the Planning Board” wherever “Town Engineer” is used.

Section D.7.e – Nan will define outdoor storage.

Add Section D.7.f - “Planning Board may consult with CAC where appropriate.”

Peter asked at what point he should give copies of the Site Plan Review to the Planning Board. Jeff hoped to finish up Sections E, F, G and H at the next meeting (11/12) and have the whole package ready for Nan at her next meeting (11/26).

Section D.11 and D.13 were felt to be vague and should be incorporated into D.14. Nan had handed out other documents that she felt the members might want to look at first and then revisit Sections D.11 and 13.

Section D.14.f – add “to include trees.”

Section D.14.h – to be cross-referenced.

Section D.14.j – to be rewritten to further define.

Section D.14.l – after much discussion it was decided to change the paragraph to read “On hills or ridge tops, building heights shall remain below the ridgeline to prevent visual disruption of that ridgeline.” In this instance a site visit could be extremely important.

Nan handed out copies of the buildout analysis and census data from 2000. Jeff told the audience they can view the information by going to www.planningbetterplaces.com, going to the client page and typing in Cairo.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, November 12, 2007. The agenda will be Sections E, F, G and H (Definitions). Nan will be back on November 26th.

Motion was made to adjourn and seconded.

Submitted by: Carol Hummel