

Town of Stanford
Zoning Commission Meeting

Thursday, April 30, 2026

Present: Thomas Angell, Charlie Cunningham, Don Smith, Wendy Burton, Steven Horowitz, Nina Peek (EDR Planning Consultant), Bob Butts (Town Attorney)

Absent: Eric Haims

Meeting begins at 7:02 pm

Kathy Zeyher made public comment on Local Law #1. Ms. Zeyher wanted it to be clear that the law was presented as only reorganization, efficiency, and clarity, but as she and others started to go through the law, it was apparent that there were changes being made, and the changes were not outlined anywhere and difficult to interpret unless you had both hard copies of the current code and the new law. Ms. Zeyher also commented that there are no paper copies of the document available, and any attempt to get one from the Town needed to be FOIL'ed and cost .25 cents a page. Ms. Zeyher said the library only has a 2016 updated version of the Town Code. Ms. Burton gave her hard copy of the Local Law #1 to Ms. Zeyher to keep. Ms. Zeyher commented that there is a column on the worksheet that indicates many components of the code that "need further discussion" and with a public hearing scheduled for May 14, it is confusing how a law could be passed with pieces that have not been discussed it and seemed uncomplete. Ms. Zeyher also pointed out that the use table is now sorted by areas, not alphabetically, and that other Towns follow the alphabetical sorting method, and our Town method used seems confusing. Ms. Zeyher said the spreadsheet which was provided is hard to interpret where the changes were made. Ms. Zeyher commented that the use table has both primary and accessory use are listed but neither are defined, and this could change setback requirements. Ms. Zeyher also said you would have to decide and which use is primary and which is accessory, and that the use table is very minimal and anything not listed is just a prohibited use and that becomes a subjective decision about what is allowed by the Town Board. Ms. Zeyher gave Clinton Corners as an example of a Town code that has a good use table and precise definitions.

Ms. Peek responded to Ms. Zeyher's comments. Ms. Peek started with saying getting a copy at the library should not be an issue and the Commission agreed. Ms. Peek clarified the spreadsheet attached to the Local Law has "further discussion" comments because those are items that the Commission would address after the reorganization of the Code is passed. Ms. Peek explained that there are 3 Phases to the baseline review. The first part was a structural analysis of the Code. The second part was to check the Code's consistency with the comprehensive plan. The third part was to provide the Zoning Commission with additional recommendations. Ms. Peek said the baseline review is available to view. Ms. Peek said the only substantive changes were moving Scenic Road section to its own chapter as it is not a zoning item as well as the creation the use

table.

Ms. Peek then responded to Ms. Zeyher's other other regarding the accessory use table and stated that was correct in that there is no accessory use table at this time and that would be something the Zoning Commission addresses at some point. Ms. Peek agreed with Ms. Zeyher that there are a lot of definitions listed in the table but not in definitions or vice versa and that could be something the Zoning Commission would tackle in the next round of substantive changes. Ms. Peek clarified that the third column in the matrix for the Local Law #1 does not include changes that were made in this draft, those are strictly for discussion points moving forward and for the next phase.

Mr. Angell explained that there are certain items that were flagged and not worked into the resolution for this Local Law #1 as Mr. Horowitz wanted further clarification.

Mr. Cunningham said he believed that having the matrix presented along with the resolution for the Local Law #1 could be confusing with the points for further discussion, but also agreed that it is hard to distinguish line by line what changes may have been made to the Zoning Code.

Mr. Angell said that there was a Planning Board meeting last night where the Board went through the Local Law #1 and they noticed that guest cottages and accessory apartments had been removed, which would be a change to the current Zoning Code, but it had been discussed it would no longer be needed with the new ADU law in place. Mr. Angell also mentioned that the current code has two separate sections for resort and recreation and now resort has been removed. Ms. Peek confirmed that Mr. Angell is correct that there were inconsistencies with the ADU law and current zoning code and those changes were folded in to keep everything consistent. Ms. Peek mentioned that the word "family" was being used in the Code, but it is not really an enforceable term. Ms. Peek said that the term "resort" was duplicative and removed, and referred to the next phase for substantive consideration. Mr. Angell confirmed with Ms. Peek that the removal of guest cottage, accessory apartment, resort, and the relocation of Scenic Roads are the identified substantive changes to this Local Law #1.

Mr. Angell and Mr. Horowitz agree if there is a way to communicate to the public a list of what has actually been changed, it should be done. Mr. Butts asked if it would be possible to generate the list prior to the May 14 public hearing. Mr. Angell asked Ms. Peek to do an analysis to confirm that the only code changes are structural and any differences are highlighted for the public. Mr. Butts did mention that any small edits to text or titles could be added in subsequent amendments.

Mr. Horowitz is concerned that the Zoning Commission have their own priorities, and Ms. Peek has laid out other items for discussion and to the public it may look confusing about what is being worked on. Ms. Burton explained that having town board members on the Commission will help direct the meetings.

Ms. Zeyher further commented that the new use table has a category for principal and accessory use (A), and there is a change because of the addition of accessory use. Ms. Zeyher said she also

found 6-8 uses that are different than the current code. She listed light manufacturing, resort, guest cottage, the addition of hotel / motel, and home professional office has been changed to home office. Ms. Zeyher asked that those changes be more identified because it is laborious to find the changes. Ms. Peek confirmed that the current code does have 2 accessory uses, accessory dwelling, and accessory apartment, but those were the only ones, but now the ADU law has been adopted. Ms. Peek said the accessory use (A) is a placeholder until the Zoning Commission addresses those uses.

Ms. Zeyher asked what the purpose is to pass this law if there are so many items under consideration. Ms. Peek explained that none of the definitions have been changed; some of them have been eliminated. Ms. Zeyher agreed that the re-organization should be done, but the clarity of what changes have been made is muddled, and it should be made transparent. Mr. Horowitz agreed that a list of changes should be presented, Ms. Peek agreed. Ms. Peek clarified that there is no existing definition for "home office" and it was typo in the current code to include home office in the use table and not list it as home professional office and she will explain that in the outline provided to the public.

Mr. Angell asked Mr. Butts to explain the timeline for adoption of the law. Mr. Butts explained that they are following both Town and General Municipal law. First, they prepare a resolution including the text of the new law, and it is introduced to the Town Board at a Town Board meeting and they are prohibited from taking action on it for at least 10 days in which it generally waits until the next meeting, typically a month. Mr. Butts explained there must be a zoning law amendment and a referral within 45 days from the Planning Board, which they did last night at their April 29 meeting. Mr. Butts said a 239M referral with the County must be completed and the preliminary result was that the County will not be making comments on it. Mr. Butts said they will have to conduct SEQR and have a negative declaration for environmental impact, and a public hearing is scheduled on May 14. Mr. Butts said on May 14 the Town Board could vote to adopt the new local law if the SEQR produces a negative declaration. Mr. Butts said it would then be sent to the Secretary of State office.

Mr. Butts said any changes that the Town Board wishes to make on the resolution will trigger the process to start all over again, as they will need to submit a new resolution to be introduced to the Town Board for them to review.

Mr. Angell asked Ms. Zeyher for her recommendation to the Zoning Commission to relay to the Town Board. Ms. Zeyher said it is a step beyond re-organizing and said that she feels the same points she made tonight will be made at the public hearing on May 14. Ms. Zeyher said the Zoning Commission meetings are not filmed so the information is not public enough. Mr. Angell clarified if Ms. Zeyher would like to see the Town Board not take action at the May 14 meeting. Ms. Zeyher said it is not her decision to make, but she would like to find a way to make it known what the changes are in this law. Mr. Horowitz suggested a two part public hearing because it was troubling hearing that the public cannot tell what changes have been made. Mr. Butts said it would be good to hear if there is actual opposition to the changes to the law, or if it is just a

matter of clarification, and then the hearing could stay open if needed. Mr. Butts further commented that if the language of the law is going to be changed, the process would start all over again, so if it is not a matter of substance for changes, it can be fixed later on in other amendments. Mr. Butts gave an example that the Planning Board gave a recommendation to change the title of one of the sections, but changing the title would start the process over again, and so it could be changed at a later date without the content being affected currently.

Ms. Peek asked if it would be possible to take the comments from the Zoning Commission tonight and the public comments on May 14 and revise the document without triggering the process starting over. Ms. Burton asked if it would be possible for Ms. Peek to provide the Town with the list of changes as soon as possible and then it could be circulated before the Town Board meeting for the public to review.

Mr. Angell commented that part of the process for the Zoning Commission was to be able to receive comments from the public and then let the Town Board know about the comments that the public made in order to help streamline the Town Board's editing of the law. Ms. Zeyher suggested that the public hearing on May 14 stay open, allow the Zoning Commission to hear those comments along with any new comments from the public, and then the Zoning Commission can make recommendations to the Town Board based on those comments. Ms. Zeyher commented that she would rather not rush this law and make small amendment changes later, rather she would like to see the law submitted more completely and to allow the Town Board to spend more time with the law since it was the Zoning Commission that spent the most time with it. Mr. Angell agreed that keeping the public hearing open would be a good way to give the public time to make their comments based on the outline that Ms. Peek puts together.

Mr. Esvandijia he came to hear what the changes were made because it was not clear reading the resolution.

The Commission agreed to proceed with the public hearing, gather comments, and leave the public hearing open so additional comments could be heard at their next meeting. Following that, the Commission would send its recommendations to the Town Board.

Mr. Cunningham asked Ms. Peek to provide the Zoning Commission and Town Board with a memo, and then they will review it and the Zoning Commission will have 24 hours to review it and then it can go out to the public via the Town Board when all are agreed upon its content.

Mr. Antonoff asked Ms. Peek if she could be hyper critical of her work and objective when making the memo. Ms. Peek explained that the changes made have been tracked in meeting minutes and discussed with the Zoning Commission, so there should not be any surprises.

Home Occupations

Mr. Horowitz has been drafting this law for over a year now, it started with the existing draft from the 1980s. This newest draft (Apr 23, 2026) has redline changes made from the October 16, 2025 meeting discussions. Mr. Horowitz has changed the numbering of this document to match the reorganization style from Ms. Peek.

Mr. Horowitz eliminated the word “limited” in 164-D-19-2-A because it doesn’t seem to have any significance or meaning, and it causes confusion. The Commission agreed that is fine.

Mr. Horowitz changed 164-D-19-3-K “limousine or taxi services” to “Ride-Hail service” to broaden the terms. The definition is also now included in the definitions section. Mr. Horowitz also included permitted “minor” uses for contractor yards, landscape business, ride hail services and their definitions.

Mr. Horowitz explained that he added or modified definitions in 164-F-3. Mr. Horowitz also explained that this code update is not to apply to contractor yards as businesses in the Town, but this is specifically for home occupations.

“Contractor Yard: Any space, whether inside or outside a residential unit, and if outside is located on the same lot as the residential unit, used for the storage or keeping of construction supplies, materials, equipment, machinery or vehicles, or parts thereof, which are in active use by a construction contractor.² “

Mr. Cunningham clarified if the existing businesses would be grandfathered in. Mr. Angell explained that this new draft has a safe harbor provision in sections 6 and 7. The Commission recognized that the draft 6-a and 7-a are a bit redundant, so Mr. Horowitz will try to combine them. Mr. Angell wanted it to be clear that any existing home occupations that are not permitted by the current code and would not be permitted in the new law, but as long as they register their non-complying home occupation they can be permitted, but if they don’t register within the window they are subject to violation.

Mr. Butts commented it does not seem fair to the people that did comply with the home occupation special use permits and received one to get the same treatment as the people that did not get a special use permit and now will just get a pass as long as they register when this law is adopted. Mr. Butts said he is concerned it may set a precedent to allow people just to non-comply. Mr. Butts say it is also an unknown of what we would be approving since these businesses are non-complying and not known formally.

Mr. Horowitz pointed out that the end of 6-a highlights that there are still some limitations outlined for pre-existing home occupations regarding noise, smell, dangerous materials, that it is not an instant grandfathered-in situation. Mr. Angell asked if a use that was in existence since the

1960s and then the Town decides you can't do it anymore, would that be legal. Mr. Butts agreed with Mr. Horowitz that it is supposed to be a balance between using private property as you like and be able to make money, but not being a nuisance. Mr. Butts further commented you probably cannot address every nuance of each business. Ms. Burton pointed out that there will always be non-compliant people that make it very difficult to enforce. Mr. Angell explained that in order to truly enforce violations the Town would have to take the violator to the New York Supreme Court.

Mr. Horowitz listed the definitions for:

LANDSCAPE BUSINESS YARD. Any space, whether inside or outside a residential unit, and if outside is located on the same lot as the residential unit, that is used for the storage, keeping or offer for sale of landscape and landscape construction supplies, materials (including plants, trees, soil, gravel and similar materials), equipment, machinery or vehicles, or parts thereof, which are in active use by a landscape or construction contractor.

MINOR CONTRACTOR YARD.³ A Contractor Yard which complies with the restrictions and conditions set forth in this §164-D-19, including subsections 4(a) through (f).

MINOR LANDSCAPE BUSINESS YARD. A Landscape Business Yard which complies with the restrictions and conditions set forth in this §164-D-19, including subsections 4(a) through (f).

MINOR RIDE-HAIL SERVICE. A Ride-Hail Service [taxi, Uber or limousine service] which complies with the restrictions and conditions set forth in this §164-D-19, including subsections 4(a) through (f).

RIDE-HAIL SERVICE. A service for travel directly to a destination, typically for a private trip, including (i) a taxi, (ii) a limousine service, or (iii) a company that, via websites and mobile smartphone apps, connects one or more passengers with drivers of private vehicles for hire that cannot legally be hailed from the street.

Mr. Horowitz said 4a-f are the provisions to make the uses small enough or lowest disturbance to allow them to become home occupations.

Mr. Cunningham would like to remove "Uber" from minor ride-hail definition and from "4c" since it is a brand name. Mr. Horowitz will find a synonym for Uber.

Mr. Angell pointed out typo in 4e (the of – of the)

Mr. Butts commented that home professional office is in 2a but it is a different use than home occupation and the home professional office is defined in the general zoning code definitions.

Mr. Butts wants to find a better place for home professional office since it is buried in this section and it is hard to find and it is in fact a different use. Mr. Butts suggested it become another section in the local law. Mr. Angell said if a permit is not required for a home professional office then it becomes difficult to adhere it to the standards set out in home occupations. Mr. Butts said it could be in its own section and picked up at the same time as home occupations. Mr. Angell suggested that all of clause 2-a-iii be removed since home professional office is not a home occupation. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Horowitz will continue to work on the redline changes and the Commission will still need to review the use table.

Mr. Horowitz will draft a way to incorporate retail into home occupation and how to distinguish between “working from home” and “home occupation.”

The next Zoning Commission meetings will be May 18 and June 18 at 7 pm.

Ms. Burton motioned to approve the meeting minutes from October 16, 2025. Mr. Horowitz seconded. All in favor, Mr. Angell, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Smith, Ms. Burton, Mr. Horowitz. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 PM