

Town of Stanford
Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

August 28, 2025

Present: Thomas Angell, Wendy Burton, Steve Horowitz, Chris Flynn, Nina Peek and Taylor Daigle (SLR Consulting)

Absent: Don Smith, Doreen Brown

Meeting begins at 7:18 PM

Ms. Daigle presented the Existing Name from CURRENT Use Table with proposed names, the districts, parking requirements, and additional standards. Items listed in red are in the definitions of parking or other parts of the code and then are added to the use table. Ms. Peek said some of the proposed names do not have definitions yet.

“For Discussion” Document

Ms. Daigle said that most of the language is the same, but reorganized and highlighted questions for discussion.

Ms. Daigle posed an alternative to using 164-1 and going up, where each section has a number and then you can add numbers within those sections so you do not have numbers getting squeezed in when you add new material. Mr. Angell suggested each article will be alphabetical and then each section of the article would be a number. The Commission agreed to that format.

Mr. Angell questioned the need for a distinction between the CR, AR, and RR if the district schedule of use for each zone is not very different and the lot minimum is the size.

Ms. Daigle explained the current code appears to be preventing shared parking, but the Commission agreed that a modification to allow shared parking could be allowed. Ms. Peek explained that the Planning Board could have a provision to get permission from the other tenants to share parking.

Ms. Peek pointed out the Chapter 151 contradicts the bit on manufactured homes in the zoning code. The Commission would like to create a definition for manufactured homes or have the manufactured homes line removed from the zoning code.

Ms. Daigle explained the legend outlining permitted, permitted by right as an accessory use, permitted with site plan approval, permitted with special use permit approval, logging permit required. Ms. Peek pointed out that municipal parks are the only permitted with site plan approval items, yet there is no definition for municipal park.

Ms. Daigle questioned if all accessory structures have the same setback requirements, but

Mr. Flynn pointed out that agricultural structures do not.

Ms. Peek asked to discuss porches as exemptions, the Commission agreed that porches should meet setbacks.

Ms. Daigle discussed that the language for multiple dwellings is contradictory to the new ADU regulations. Mr. Angell suggested that this section of multiple dwellings does not apply to ADUs. Mr. Angell clarified that only 2 dwellings are permitted on each parcel. Ms. Daigle and Ms. Peek will review this section to tighten it up.

For existing lots of record Ms. Peek suggested removing the need for dates in a newly edited edition. Mr. Angell said there is a time where the County started requiring filing so that date would be a better reference point. Mr. Angell said Mr. Butts should have more information on this topic to review. Mr. Horowitz suggested more clarifying language to understand the purpose of existing lots of record. Ms. Peek said the “negative” language makes things more complicated.

Ms. Daigle said they cleaned up the contradictions on nonconforming lots. Mr. Angell suggested a 3-year discontinued use for Non conformation for all uses instead of just commercial uses.

Ms. Daigle mentioned that the termination of certain uses/structures section could be eliminated and incorporated into sign regulations and the automobile wreck yard or junkyard portion be removed.

Ms. Daigle discussed the change of use and if parking should be approved by the Planning Board. Mr. Angell questioned the change of use and what triggers a change of use. Ms. Peek pointed out that the district schedule of use needs special use permit review to decide what items should need special use permits. It will be a discussion point in the future. Ms. Daigle added parking requirements to the schedule use table. Ms. Daigle pointed out that there are items in the existing parking table, but not regulated anywhere else in the code. Mr. Angell asked how shared parking would be incorporated and Ms. Peek said there are multiple use language, but will need more attention.

Ms. Daigle pointed out that the code has medical/dental clinics have “5 per professional” which is up for interpretation, and Mr. Angell asked how other municipalities regulate parking and are there standards for creating parking regulations. Ms. Peek will pull ITE numbers for parking standards. Mr. Horowitz pointed out that Home Professional Offices should be noted as separate.

Ms. Daigle asked about off-street parking and if it should changed to say commercial, business, light industries, cannot have backing out into public roads, but Mr. Angell pointed out that a couple of businesses only have back-out parking. Ms. Peek suggested that the Planning Board can have the discretion to waive the off-street design for non-conforming lots.

Ms. Peek asked about the non-residential uses in the RC District and the reason behind the

square footage restriction. Ms. Peek suggested regulations for “plazas” so it contains multiple businesses.

Ms. Daigle pointed out that a detached accessory dwelling unit requires the same setback requirements as an accessory structure, and asked if it should be referring to 164.15.1, the Commission agreed yes.

Ms. Peek mentioned that the new ADU law theoretically would require more parking than the principal, so the Commission agreed 2 parking spots as a minimum would suffice.

Ms. Daigle asked to discuss farm housing.

Ms. Daigle suggested rephrasing this language to limit the number of bedrooms and this would also address the parking requirements.

Ms. Daigle said that cluster development is written in the negative, so could be rephrased to be less confusing, the Commission agreed.

Ms. Daigle said they will address “Other Provisions” to make the language less confusing.

Next meeting will be September 18, 2025 at 7 PM, Ms. Peek and Ms. Daigle plan to attend to continue the discussion on the reorganization of the code.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01 PM