

CAIRO ZONING COMMISSION, Cairo Town Hall, March 9, 2009

ATTENDANCE: Sue Oldakowski, John Gallagher, Doug Ostrander, Rich Booth, Mary Kames..... Full minutes are available on audio tape.

Absent: Moira Scirico, Jeff Shapiro, Bill Hummel

Meeting called to order by Doug.

OPEN WITH THE PLEDGE

At the March 9, 2009 meeting the members discussed the following issues;

1. **Creation of a new Density Calculation Option** – It was decided that the Section IV, A 1 Density Calculation - should be a combination of Option #2 and #3 and needs be written. In this Option #4 Net density would be in areas that are to be protected or some particular reason. These areas are to be selected and overlays used to indicate where these locations are located. The gross density measurement is to be used in all other areas outside of the restricted areas covered by the overlays. The wording for this Option is what is needed.
2. **Selection of protected areas for overlay** - the members need assistance in selecting the restricted areas that would enforce the net density calculation. The selection would represent the design of the major overlay.
3. **Term "build-able"** - in reading and discussing the density calculation options - the term "build-able" be inserted in the section that discusses Rural Residential District & Mountain District - the members felt that that term would assist the reader to understand the use of minimum lot size notation. It was felt that it was confusing to say "One dwelling unit per 3 acres with a minimum *"build-able"* lot size of .5 acres. (Page 10)
4. **Monitoring Lot Splits** - in our discussion of section IV part 2 *Monitoring Lot Splits* (page 11) the members were confused as to what the difference is between the "subdivision law" and this section.
 - Is this just a section that directs the Planning Board on how to monitor the subdivisions that are being contemplated?
 - Is monitoring subdivisions really part of zoning?
 - How does the Planning Board keep up-to-date maps? Digitally using the County GIS website?
5. **Regulation of Lot Dimensions** - Section IV, part B – what is need is an in-depth discussion of the Table Lot Dimensions on page 12. There are sections on the table that generated a great deal of discussion. The origin of the setbacks was a question to be answered. Some of the titles of the column headings are unclear. A discussion of this table would assist the members in understanding its contents.

6. **50% requirement in conservation subdivision**- Section V, part B1 - page 13 there is mention of a 50 % requirement – there is a questions as to its origin.
7. **Senior Citizen housing** - Section V, Part B2 Page 14 - members felt they would like to increase senior citizen percentage to perhaps 30% - Is there anything that would preclude this change?
8. **Contiguous districts** - Section V, C4 page 14 - members were not sure of the interpretation of this paragraph - it generated a great deal of discussion. Members understood the incentive development when it came to residential development. Supposed it was a light industrial development - could the incentive be used to allow more industrial development in an area?
9. **Fee simple** - Section V, part C6 (b) page 14 - members do not understand the terms "fee simple"
10. **Submission of application** - Section V, part D1 page 15. – This subject was discussed and it was determined that an example of the application would be helpful to review - perhaps from another township.
11. **Time frame missing?** - Section V, Part D6 page 16 - in the first paragraph the members felt that time frame for completion of the advisory report should be completed. It was felt that if a time frame was set it would move the process along. Do we want to place a time frame on the Planning Board? This time frame should be reasonable because the Board is only a part-time agency.
12. **Section V, Part D8** page 16- entire paragraph was not clear to any of the members - an explanation and discussion of the paragraph is needed. This could be a discussion item at the next meeting.
13. **Power of the Town Board** - Section V, Part D9 page 16. - This paragraph ensures that the Town Board has the last "word" n the use of the incentive. Is that what the paragraph is meant o convey?
14. **After decision is made by Town Board** - Section V, Part D10 page 16-17 - Does the Town Board have the right to rescind an incentive if it should later discover some additional information that would have influenced their original decision if known before it?
15. **Proportionate share** - Section V, Part D12 page 17 - the term "proportionate share" is mentioned. It was felt that it is unclear as to the quantity or percentage of the share. Can this be spelled out more clearly? It seems rather vague and leaves a great deal open to interpretation.

These are the questions that were raised during this meeting. The questions were to be sent to Nan Stolzenburg via e-mail by Doug for clarification and to be discussed at the next meeting march 23, 2009.

A motion to close the meeting was made by Richard Booth and seconded by John Gallagher.

Next meeting 3/23/2009, 7:00 pm at the Cairo Town Hall.