

**Minutes of the Zoning Commission of the Town of Caroline
Meeting on Tuesday, January 3, 2023**

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Jean McPheeters, chair.

Attendees:

Zoning Commission Members: Ernie Bayles, Michele Brown, Barb Knuth, Bill Podulka, Bruce Murray, Jean McPheeters

Excused: Clm. Tim Murray, liaison to the Zoning Committee

Others: Town Supervisor Mark Witmer and Nan Stolzenburg

Note: Ernie Bayles, Bruce Murray, Jean McPheeters, Barb Knuth, and Supervisor Mark Witmer were inside the Town Hall. Therefore, four members were in attendance at announced places, thereby establishing quorum. Michele Brown and Bill Podulka joined us by Zoom.

Nan Stolzenburg attended by Zoom.

1. Privilege of the Floor:
 - a. Peter Hoyt noted that there is great attention in the draft zoning law to riparian buffers as an attempt to keep water sources unpolluted. However, roadways are all treated with salt and many of the roadways are adjacent to or cross streams thereby putting salt into the waterways. Why is salting allowed on roadways?
 - i. Barb Knuth noted an article published recently in the *Ithaca Journal* about using other substances such as sand on roadways and that many governments are moving in that direction.
2. The minutes of the December 6 meeting were moved (Bayles/Knth) and approved unanimously.
3. Town Council Report: In Tim Murray's absence, Supervisor Witmer noted that the Town Board would be continuing to meet on the first and third Wednesdays of the month at 7 p.m. in 2023
4. Agenda items:
 - a. Jean reviewed a short list of items that we agreed to review including:
 - i. Residential secondary use businesses
 - ii. How we approach density in the Ag/Rural district
 - iii. Exemption from Site Plan Review
 - iv. Reader's Aid Box on conservation subdivision.
 - b. She asked what other items anyone wanted to discuss:
 - i. Bruce Murray noted that there was a Zoom on Thursday regarding solar and agriculture.
 - ii. Jean noted that we needed a definition for Cemeteries to be added to the Definitions.
 - iii. Multi-family dwellings and the residential/commercial issue.
 - iv. Ernie Bayles mentioned density again in mixed use areas.

v. Height of signs (brought up at last info meeting)

5. Bill presented his definition and we discussed Residential Secondary Use Businesses, which are similar to Minor Home Occupations, but are owned/operated by people who rent a property owned by someone else. We made a few minor changes and adopted this language (Podulka/Knuth) Unanimous:

Residential Secondary Business Use – A non-farm-related business activity resulting in a product or service for financial gain, conducted wholly or partly within a dwelling unit or accessory structure as a non-residential use that is secondary and subordinate to an occupied residential dwelling and which does not change the residential character of the dwelling unit or vicinity. In distinction to a Minor Home Occupation, the enterprise is conducted by a business owner/operator who does not reside on the premises or an adjacent property. A Residential Secondary Business Use may employ up to three fulltime equivalent employees in addition to the owner/operator. Exterior evidence of this secondary use, if present at all, is limited to a small sign or lawn plaque. Few customers, clients, or other business associates enter the premises daily. The business does not store business products, equipment or vehicles outside. The enterprise produces only household quantities and types of waste and does not involve delivery truck visits or other traffic beyond that expected of a typical residence. Businesses associated with agritourism, farm brewery/cidery/winery, farm operations, and farm stands are not considered Residential Secondary Business Uses.

6. We had a discussion of how we approach density in the Ag/Rural district. Bill and Ernie suggested that we use the term Development Unit rather than dwelling or lot. Through discussion we adopted a table of uses and how many Development Units each type of project uses. Moved by Podulka/Bayles. Adopted: 5 ayes; 1 abstention (Murray).
7. We discussed the list of possible requirements for small commercial projects to be exempt from all site plan review. After discussion, we agreed that ASPR would be suitable for such projects with this list of 15 qualifications rather than full site plan review or a complete exemption from review. (Podulka/Knuth) Unanimous.
8. Bill presented a first draft of a Reader's Aid Box for conservation subdivisions. He and Nan will continue to work on this and email it to us before the next meeting.
9. We agreed to add Cemetery to the Use Tables and Definitions. Cemeteries will be allowed in all districts. Unanimous.
10. We had already discussed multi-family dwellings, density and the commercial-residential questions during the discussion of item 6 above.
11. We agreed that signage should be at 10 feet since that is the height of road signs, which are made to be legible for traffic.
12. We agreed to meet again on January 17 and that we will all review the final draft on-line and the report. Nan and Jean will work on the report and try to get it to everyone by Wednesday, January 11 so that we can all work on it before the meeting on the 17th.
13. We then discussed potential dates and places for Public Hearings. We are planning on two: one in-person only and one in-person and on Zoom, which will be held at the Town Hall.

14. The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean McPheeters

Approved unanimously, 1/17/23

DRAFT