

APPROVED
8/9/2021

July 8, 2021
Town of Taghkanic
Town Board Meeting

Note all documents in these minutes may be clicked on and enlarged for easier reading

6 pm: The Taghkanic Town Board and Zoning Commission held a Special meeting on the above date with a combination of *Supervisor Ryan Skoda* and all other Board Members, Town Clerk and Zoning Commission at town hall and 2 residents attending via Zoom. *Supervisor Ryan Skoda* opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Town Board

Present:	Ryan Skoda	Supervisor
	Elizabeth Craig	Board Member
	Kara Gilmore	Board Member
	Linda Swartz	Board Member
	Joyce Thompson	Board Member
	Cheryl Rogers	Clerk

Zoning Commission

Present:	Al Huehnel	Kathy Bainer	Elizabeth O'Donnell
	Moisha Blechman (former ZC member)		

Via Zoom	Don Critchell	Ted Fink ZC Consultant
-----------------	---------------	------------------------

Absent: John Roberts (excused)

CAC

Present: Tony LaSalvia

Public Audience: Erin Edwards Barbara Hermance Nadja Palenzuela

The purpose of this Workshop is to provide the Town Board with an opportunity to comment on the Draft Zoning Code which was presented by the Zoning Commission following the May 10 Town Board Meeting, and to determine if the Town Board accepts the code as presented and, if so, to set a date for Public Hearing.

Supervisor Ryan Skoda turned the meeting over to *Board Member Joyce Thompson Chair of the Zoning Commission:*

Zoning Commission Chair Joyce Thompson began by saying that the ZC worked hard to try to write the code in a “positive voice” – what can be done rather than what is not allowed - and to clear up ambiguities and conflicting language in the existing code, while not making the code so detailed that common sense cannot be applied. Accessory dwellings and home-based businesses have been defined and expanded in a way that allows the property owner to

utilize their property to their best advantage while minimizing neighborhood impacts. The town's commercial area, currently mapped as B-1, will be changed to Mixed Use (MU) to provide for more housing possibilities.

Regulations for Short-Term Rentals are currently being developed by the STR Subcommittee, and with the State putting pressure on towns to allow for heavy solar production (industrial solar farms), it is recommended that these uses be done as amendments to the code.

Zoning Commission Chair Joyce Thompson asked for the Board's concern, changes, and recommendations. *Zoning Commission Co-Chair Linda Swartz, Secretary* made all duly noted changes concerns and recommendations in the following Sections 10, 20, 30, 40, 50B and 60 in her attached minutes.

The Town Board set a date for the next Workshop: **July 13, 2021 beginning at 6 p.m.**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at **9:15 pm**, carried unanimously by all members present. The next Regular meeting will be **July 12, 2021** at the Taghkanic Town Hall.

Town of Taghkanic
Joint Town Board/Zoning Commission Workshop
Review of Draft Zoning Code
July 8, 2021

Present: Town of Taghkanic Supervisor Ryan Skoda, Town Clerk Cheryl Rogers, Town Board Members Kara Gilmore and Elizabeth Craig, Town Board Members and Zoning Co-Chairs Joyce Thompson and Linda Swartz, Zoning Commission Members Al Huehnel, Kathy Bainer, Donn Critchell, Elizabeth O'Donnell and ZC Consultant Ted Fink. Former ZC Member Moisha Blechman was also present.

Excused: ZC Member John Roberts

Public Audience: CAC Chair Tony LaSalvia, Erin Edwards, Barbara Hermance

The purpose of this Workshop is to provide the Town Board with an opportunity to comment on the Draft Zoning Code which was presented by the Zoning Commission following the May 10 Town Board Meeting, and to determine if the Town Board accepts the code as presented and, if so, to set a date for Public Hearing.

Joyce Thompson began by saying that the ZC worked hard to try to write the code in a "positive voice" – what can be done rather than what is not allowed - and to clear up ambiguities and conflicting language in the existing code, while not making the code so detailed that common sense cannot be applied. Accessory dwellings and home-based businesses have been defined and expanded in a way that allows the property owner to utilize their property to their best advantage while minimizing neighborhood impacts. The town's commercial area, currently mapped as B-1, will be changed to Mixed Use (MU) to provide for more housing possibilities.

Regulations for Short-Term Rentals are currently being developed by the STR Subcommittee, and with the State putting pressure on towns to allow for heavy solar production (industrial solar farms), it is recommended that these uses be done as amendments to the code.

Section 10, Zoning Scope and Purposes:

- 10-C.14. Change "*and are built to human scale (walkable) rather than auto-scale (drivable).*" to "*appropriately scaled to the Zoning District.*"

Section 20, Definitions:

- Town Board Member Kara Gilmore feels that the section of defined terms is very good, but suggested that defined terms, as they occur throughout the entire document, should have their first letter(s) capitalized. (Note: terms are not hyperlinked.)
- Business, Professional or Administrative Office: Change beginning of sentence as follows: "*Any building or part of a building in which the principal use is as a commercial office where one or more persons are employed . . .*"
- Insert "LARGE SCALE EXCAVATION" and "SMALL SCALE EXCAVATION" in the appropriate alphabetical places in the Definitions and cross reference them to "EXCAVATION".

Section 30, Zoning District and Map:

- Ryan noted that the lot lines on the District Map are not current (they were taken directly from Columbia County GIS).
- Large areas that were changed from R-3 to R-7 removes many smaller lots that could provide opportunities for affordable housing. The ZC explained that a 7-acre parcel could provide an accessory dwelling unit for rent. Ryan recommends that the maps be changed back to the way they were or that, as a minimum, the R-3 District be enlarged.

- Ryan did not have an issue with changing the name of the town’s commercial area from B-1 to MU, but thinks that it might not work out in the way we envision. Elizabeth O’Donnell said that the MU District would support more opportunities for affordable housing because more types of housing are allowed in the MU, like two-family and multi-family housing.
- Kara Gilmore asked why the biggest working farm in town is located in the R-2 District. Linda said that it was laid out that way when Taghkanic was first zoned and she suspected that the farmers wanted it that way so they could easily divide off property if they wanted to or needed to. Audience Member Barbara Hermance said that when the district maps were set in 1988, these farm areas had the best soils. The land is now held in conservancy so it can’t be developed anyway. In 2005 31% of land in Taghkanic (exclusive of wetlands) was under some type of restriction; whether conservancy or deed restrictions or something else.
- Kathy Bainer said that the lines for the R-7 District were drawn to protect the Hudson River Valley tree corridor along which the animals move north and south. That corridor is right in the middle of the R-7 District.
- Elizabeth O’Donnell said that the R-7 area was increased to encourage agriculture-type businesses, and the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts allow for increased density in areas that are already more densely developed. It was suggested that areas like Pumpkin Hollow, which is currently R-7, could be changed to R-2 or R-3.
- Kathy Bainer suggested that further discussion on this issue wait until after we have looked at the regulations for Accessory Dwellings. Ryan said that while he supports accessory dwellings, he doesn’t think that’s the answer.
- Elizabeth O’Donnell asked how many small lots there are in Taghkanic now which are not selling and wondered if it make sense to make more small lots that won’t sell. Ryan answered that in the first six months of this year, we are over budget on mortgage tax.
- Joyce asked if there is there a proposal for a change to the map? Ryan said that he would like to see a change but he doesn’t have a plan right now. He said he would try to put something together and send it to the ZC.

Section 40, Use Table:

The Business Uses listed in the Use Table found in Section 40 pertain to the primary use of the building as a business; they do not pertain to a home-based business enterprise, wherein the primary use of the building would be residential. This may need to be more clearly indicated in the code.

Section 50-B, Area and Bulk Requirements Table:

- In the column titled “Maximum Density”, insert the word “principal” in each of the residential districts
 (“1 principal dwelling unit/___acres”)
 Kara feels that 5% maximum lot coverage seems like very little. Ryan thought that 5% would be okay in R-7, but it would be too little in R-2 and R-3. The ZBA, however, could allow area variance on a case-by-case basis. It was suggested that this might be changed to 6% in the R-3 and 7% in the R2 (keeping the R-7 at 5%) or maybe 10% in each of the R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts. Elizabeth O’Donnell said she would try to make up some sketches so that we could visualize these scenarios a little better at the next meeting.

Section 60, General Provisions & Supplementary Regulations:

- 60-A.2. Linda read aloud the minor changes made in the first sentence by Town Attorney Andy Howard sentence. No one voiced any concern with the changes.
- 60-C.5. First sentence changed as follows: *“Except for single-family dwellings, new parking in the MU District shall be provided at the rear or side of the lot, as practicable. Parking shall link the site to the road front and sidewalk systems, whether existing or planned.”* (The ZC Secretary will search the code for similar instances where the language might need to be changed from “building front” to “road front”.) Near the end of this paragraph, where it says “parking areas of eight or more spaces

- shall be substantially landscaped” remove the word “substantially”. The Planning Board will advise that applicant of ADA requirements for handicap parking spaces.
- 60-D.5.a. Changed as follows: *“For each dwelling unit, one (1) non-illuminated professional sign, sign indicating a permitted home-based business, or a farm stand/produce stand with an area of not more than fifteen (15) square feet per face, set back a minimum of fifteen feet (15’) from the edge of the road, and one 2’ X 3’ nameplate mounted on the building.”*
 - References made to 6 square feet per face in Sections 60-D.5.b., 60-D.5.c. and 60-D.5.d. are also changed to 15 square feet per face.
 - 60-D.6.a. Change “six (6) square feet in surface area” to “thirty-two (32) square feet in surface area”
 - 60-D.6.c. Change “six (6) square feet” to “fifteen 15’ square feet”.
 - 60-D.7. Design Criteria (signs) Kara said that the sign design criteria seems objective. Ted said that the criteria allows enough flexibility for creativity. Ryan recommends that Section 60-D.7.a. be removed in its entirety and Section 60-D.7.b. General Rules by Sign Type, be renumbered accordingly.
 - 60-D.7.b.(7) Signs on Business Vehicles: {Per the previous note, this will now be 60-D.7.a.(7)} Delete the entire paragraph and insert: *“Business vehicles which display signs identifying the business and other information related to the business shall not be parked along the roadside except when necessary in the normal course of business.”*
 - 60-D.9. This regulation is confusing and need to be either removed or cleaned up. It might help to say that signs that will be in place for not more than two (2) weeks do not require a sign permit. This note should also be inserted in Section 60-D.3.
 - Section 60-D.10. Prohibited Signs: Make it clear that these regulations pertain to commercial signs only.

Next Workshop: July 13, 2021 beginning at 6 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Linda Swartz