

ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Referrals for Review at the: **Coordinated Review Committee Meeting –June 11, 2019 at 3:30pm**
County Planning Board Meeting –June 12, 2019 at 7:00pm

2nd Floor, Conference Room 200, 20 Ontario Street, Canandaigua, NY 14424 - Telephone: 585-396-4455

This document will serve as both the *draft* minutes for the Ontario County Planning Board and as the **Official Notice of Findings and Decision** for the applications reviewed by the CPB. It can also be viewed at the Ontario County Planning Department Website <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/index.aspx?nid=516>

Attendance and Minutes.....2
Referral Reviews and Board Action.....2
General Procedures and Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies.....25
Results Key - Recommended referring body action: A = approve, A-M = Approve with Modification, D = disapproval

Referral No	Municipality	Referring Board	Applicant	Application Type	Class	Page
101 - 2019	Town of East Bloomfield	Zoning Board of Appeals	Testa, Ben	Area Variance	AR 2	2
102 - 2019	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Eastside Martial Arts	Area Variance	1	3
103 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield	Planning Board	Beyea, Ryan	Minor Subdivision	1	4
104 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield	Planning Board	Parrish, Lynn & Lisa	Minor Subdivision	Exempt	5
105 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield	Town Board	Town of West Bloomfield	Text Amendment	2	5
106 - 2019	Town of Victor	Town Board	Town of Victor	Text Amendment	2	6
107 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Naan-Tastic Indian Grill	Site Plan	1	6
108 - 2019	Village of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Cretkos Properties LLC	Area Variance	AR 2	7
109 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Zoning Board of Appeals	Venezia Assocaites	Area Variance	AR 2	8
110 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Venezia Assocaites	Technical Review	n/a	10
111 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Zoning Board of Appeals	Earon Moroz, Robert Bussey	Area Variance	1	12
111.1 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Earon Moroz, Robert Bussey	Minor Subdivision	1	12
112 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Marathon Enginneering	Subdivision	1	13
113 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Hospitality Syracuse Inc.	Site Plan	1	13
113.1 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Hospitality Syracuse Inc.	Special Use Permit	1	14
114 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua	Planning Board	Town of Canandaigua	Local Law	2	14
115 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	46 North Avenue LLC	Site Plan	1	14
115.1 - 2019	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	46 North Avenue LLC	Area Variance	1	16
116 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	Site Plan	1	16
116.1 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	Special Use Permit	1	16
117 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	Site Plan	1	16
117.1 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	Special Use Permit	1	17
118 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Blanding, Dan	Site Plan	1	17
119 - 2019	Town of Farmington	Planning Board	Farmington Chamber of Commerce	Site Plan	1	18
119.1 - 2019	Town of Farmington	Planning Board	Farmington Chamber of Commerce	Temporary Use Permit	1	18
120 - 2019	Town of Farmington	Planning Board	Sonbryne Sales	Special Use Permit	1	18
121 - 2019	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Lorenze, Brian	Site Plan	1	21

122 - 2019	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Leier, Bill	Area Variance	AR 2	21
122.1 - 2019	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Leier, Bill	Area Variance	AR 2	22
123 - 2019	Town of Hopewell	Planning Board	Staples, Chris	Site Plan	1	22
123.1 - 2019	Town of Hopewell	Planning Board	Staples, Chris	Subdivision	1	24

Cities	Member name in bold if on local legislative, planning, or zoning board	P-Present, E – Excused Absence, A – Absent, V – Vacant		
Canandaigua	Thomas Lyon		E	
Geneva	Paul Passavant	P		
Towns				
Bristol				V
Canadice	Stephen Groet	P		
Canandaigua	David Wink	P		
East Bloomfield	Mike Woodruff	P		
Farmington	Patti Wirth		E	
Geneva	Steven High	P		
Gorham	Jack Dailey	P		
Hopewell	Bill Namestnik	P		
Manchester	Ruby Morrison	P		
Naples	Carol O'Brien	P		
Phelps	Glen Wilkes	P, term expired, reappointment pending		
Richmond	Leonard Wildman	P		
Seneca	Timothy Marks		E	
South Bristol	Albert Crofton			A
Victor	Marty Avila	P		
West Bloomfield	Sue Boardman	P		

Guests: Brian Lorenze representing Dick’s Sporting Goods; James Cretkos/ BME and Fred Rainaldi representing Valentown Plaza; Joe Crane/incoming T. Bristol CPB representative.

Call To Order/Roll Call: Chair Wildman called the 6-12-19 CPB meeting to order at 7:05, and requested Ms. Frasca to do roll call. Ms. Frasca presented roll call and reported that there were twelve (12) voting members present, meeting the quorum requirement.

Minutes: Motion made by Sue Boardman to approve the May minutes as presented, seconded by David Wink. **Motion passed** with 1 abstentions: Ruby Morrison.

101 - 2019	Town of East Bloomfield Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: AR 2
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Testa, Ben	
Property Owner:	Duerr, William	
Tax Map No(s):	81.00-1-63.000	
Brief Description:	Area variance to increase the number and square feet of signage at a multi-use commercial building at 6610 SR 5/US 20 near the intersection of SR 64 in the Town of East Bloomfield.	

The existing building houses a restaurant and a new tenant, Aqua Source, is occupying space formerly occupied by EMP Collectibles. The restaurant has a pre-existing non-conforming sign pole 52”x72”, a building sign, and lettering on the front window. In 2008 the

property received a variance to There is also an existing broken 12’x3’ wall mounted sign on the west facing side of the building which was previously used by EMP Collectibles.

Town Code allows either a building mounted sign or window signage as well as a sandwich board sign and pennants or banners displayed when the business is open. The allowable size of building mounted signage is based on the building frontage and distance from ROW. The Aqua Source space is allowed 31 SF of building mounted signage. Window signage shall not exceed 25% of window area or 5 SF.

Aqua Source would like to repair and use the 36 SF the wall mounted sign, add a ± 25 SF ground mounted sign, and have two 5 SF window signs. They would need area variances for the size of the building mounted sign, to allow both building mounted and window signage, and to allow the ground mounted sign. The code would also allow continued display of the banners (2) and the sandwich sign when the business is open.

Policy AR-7B: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified SR 5/US 20 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County: The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible.

1. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation – Denial

Comments

1. The referring body should grant the minimum variance necessary.

102 - 2019	Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Eastside Martial Arts	
Property Owner:	Gupta, Amit	
Tax Map No(s):	15.00-1-11.100	
Brief Description:	Area variance for 53 SF wall sign when allowable sign area based on the tenant building frontage in multi-use building at 7263 SR 96 in the Town of Victor would be 9.5 SF. Total signage will not exceed allowable SF of building signage	

The sign is proposed on an industrial building in the Light Industrial district. The building has 151 feet of building frontage and under code regulations a maximum of 151 SF of signage on the building façade is allowed. The code further stipulates that Individual tenants are eligible for signage based on the linear feet of their building frontage. Eastside Martial Arts will occupy approximately 1/3 of the building, however due to the building configuration, only 9.5’ of building frontage along SR 96 and therefore, their allowable signage would be 9.5 SF. Existing building signage includes 42 SF and 25 SF signs. Total building signage with the

proposed sign would be 120 SF, less than the signage allowed for the entire building. The reason for the area variance is related to the allocation of sign area among tenants and not the number of signs or overall sign area.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

103 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Minor Subdivision	
Applicant:	Beyea, Ryan	
Representative:	Michael Ringrose	
Tax Map No(s):	51.00-1-93.230 51.00-1-93.240	
Brief Description:	Re-subdivision of 2 lots to create 3 lots on the north side of CR 14 just east of CR 35 in the Town of West Bloomfield. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18219/103-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18220/103-2019-subdivision	

The existing lots are 5.1 acres and 6.4 acres with 450' and 370' of road frontage respectively. Following re-subdivision, the western lot (R1C) will have 2.9 acres and 200' of road frontage; the eastern lot (R1D) will have 3.5 acres and 420' of road frontage; and the center lot will have 200' of road frontage, straddle the stream and encompass 5.2 acres, primarily behind the eastern lot. There will be a 15' access easement from the eastern lot to the proposed home site on the back lot to avoid driveway construction in the floodplain.

According to OnCOR, the properties and all surrounding land are in an agricultural district and based on the 2018 aerial, the subject property and portions of adjacent lots are actively farmed. OnCOR also indicates a 1.1 acre floodplain along the northern portion of the creek which flow south to north through the proposed center parcel. The properties eventually drain to Irondequoit Creek.

OnCOR does not indicate development constraints related to wetlands or steep slopes. Soil characteristics are as follows:

<u>Odessa silt loam</u> , 0-3 %	4.6 acres	3 - 8 %	=	3.8 acres
Prime Farmland if drained				
Permeability: moderately		Erodibility:	very high	
Hydrological Group C/D		Partially Hydric		
<u>Schoharie silty clay loam</u> , 3-8 %	2.6 acres	0-3 %		.23 acres
Prime Farmland				
Permeability: moderately high		Erodibility:	very high	
Hydrological Group C/D		Not Hydric		
<u>Rhinebeck silty clay loam</u> , 0-3 %	.43 acres			
Prime Farmland if drained				
Permeability: moderately high		Erodibility:	very high	
Hydrological Group C/D		Partially Hydric		

Adjacent land uses include single family homes with access off CR 35 to the west and north, agricultural lands to the west, and a horse farm with access off CR 35 to the south.

Comments

1. Consider requiring deep hole tests to ensure soils are suitable for on-site wastewater treatment system.
2. The referring body should require a joint maintenance agreement to be filed with the access easement.

- The proposed shared driveway protects CR 14 from the negative impacts of closely spaced driveways. Any future re-subdivision of these lots should be required to use such access points.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

104 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield Planning Board	Class: Exempt
Referral Type:	Minor Subdivision	
Applicant:	Parrish, Lynn & Lisa	
Tax Map No(s):	51.00-1-11.100	
Brief Description:	Subdivision of a 55 acre lot at 8786 CR 14 in the Town of West Bloomfield into a 22 acre and a 33 acre lot.	

105 - 2019	Town of West Bloomfield Town Board	Class: 2
Referral Type:	Text Amendment	
Applicant:	Town of West Bloomfield	
Brief Description:	Zoning text amendment to add regulations for solar energy systems and related definitions to the code of the Town of West Bloomfield. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18221/105-2019-w-bloom-solar	

The proposed zoning amendments

- Defines terms roof-mounted, ground mounted, and large and small scale solar energy systems.
- The regulations permit roof mounted systems that meet district height limits without site plan review.
- Small scale solar energy systems are permitted in all but the General Mixed Use, Mobile Home Park, and Senior Housing districts and do not require site plan review.
- Large scale systems covering more than 1,000 SF and generating energy for sale to off-site users are allowed only in the Agricultural, Surface Mining-Agricultural, and General Industrial zoning districts and subject to special use permit standards and site plan review. Special use permit standards include required submission of lease/easement documentation, operation and maintenance plan including plans for remaining property, and a decommissioning plan.
- The regulations indicate solar projects shall not result in a substantial decrease in available prime agricultural lands in the Town and minimize removal of vegetation or offset with plantings elsewhere on the property..
- The regulations define abandonment and a due process procedure for determining a project has been abandoned and should be decommissioned.

Comments

- The local law should be written as an amendment to the zoning code. Having a stand alone local law with provisions that impact and relate to zoning standards is not efficient and may lead to conflicts between laws. For example Large Scale Solar Systems should be listed as a specially permitted use in desired districts with special use permit standards added to the appropriate section. Similarly, Small Scale Energy Systems should be listed as an allowed accessory use in districts as desired. With this change, the authority should reference zoning enabling statutes in Town Law of the State of NY and separate enforcement procedures are not necessary.
- Reference to signed plans should include requirement of licensure by NYS Department of Education.
- Local codes should not require Code Enforcement Officers to apply discretionary standards such as the aesthetic consideration of C (1) (c). Such discretionary review authority undermines the CEO’s unqualified immunity from personal liability.
- If encouraging use of renewable energy systems is a goal of the Town, such language should be integrated into the site plan and subdivision review criteria and any administrative checklists used by the CEO.

5. Regulations should require notification of any transfer of ownership, notice of any updated emergency contact, updating on-site signage for emergency contacts, and specify that the system operator, landowner, and others could all be responsible for any violations.
6. Standards regarding impact on prime agricultural soils, D (1) (e), and removal of vegetation, C (9,) are vague; consider refining and linking to public purposes such as maintaining rental prime farmland necessary for farm viability or buffering and stormwater/water quality management.
7. SUP standards should require Town to receive notice of any lapse or non-renewal of surety and that any such lapse is grounds for immediate revocation of the special use permit.
8. Regarding procedures to assure proper management of construction and post-construction stormwater, the special use permit and/or site plan procedures and standards should be amended to require submission of a soil erosion and sediment control plan and stormwater management plan. The Town should preserve the option to have the municipal engineer and/or the Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District representatives review such plans.

CRC Comments The local law outlines a process of determining abandonment based on failure to completed construction or failure to generate and transmit electricity as a rate of 10 % of rated capacity over 12 months, but does not require operator to submit reports documenting energy generation.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral 105-2019 as a Class 2 and return it to the local board with recommendation of approval with comments.

Motion made by: Carol O’Brien

Seconded by: David Wink

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention **Motion carried**

106 - 2019	Town of Victor Town Board	Class: 2
Referral Type:	Text Amendment	
Applicant:	Town of Victor	
Tax Map No(s):	27.00-1-28.000	
Brief Description:	Zoning text and map amendment to repeal establishment of the 7200 Rawson Road Planned Development District in the Town of Victor. The property will revert to previous zoning as Light Industrial.	

The planned development district was approved in 2015. The approval was conditioned on approval of a site plan or subdivision plan within 1 year of adoption of the local law which has not transpired.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral 106-2019 as a Class 2 and return it to the local board with recommendation of approval with comments.

Motion made by: Carol O’Brien

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention **Motion carried**

107 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Naan-Tastic Indian Grill	
Property Owner:	Main Street Stops LLC	
Representative:	Benderson Development Company LLC	
Tax Map No(s):	6.04-1-78.000	
Brief Description:	Site plan for modification of sidewalk, access road, and parking to accommodate Naan-Tastic at Victor Crossing Shopping Center, 400-441 Commerce Drive in the Town of Victor. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18222/107-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18223/107_19-Site-Plan https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18224/107_19-Grading-Plan	

The proposed modifications are intended to support occupancy of 8,000 SF of vacant space in the center of the south facing leg of building A at Victor Crossing. The modifications will allow patio space in front of the 3 vacant spaces including 2,078 SF to be operated by Naan-Tastic as a 66 seat fast casual Indian restaurant. The modification will involve re-location of the drive aisle to the south and a raised pedestrian crossing to the sidewalk that connects to the building on the opposite side of the northern parking area and occupied by Breathe Yoga and Orange Theory.

The modifications will result in the loss of 8 parking spaces in front of building A. Restaurant occupancy instead of retail occupancy will also increase required parking. Overall, after modification the site will have 1,582 parking spaces when 1,612 are required. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Board waive the need for the additional 30 parking spaces.

In support of the parking waiver request, the applicant hired SRF & Associates to complete a parking utilization study for the overall site and the parking between building A and Breathe Yoga.

The parking study was conducted during peak hours on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday peak periods March 7 to 9, 2019. The utilization of the northern parking area between building A and Breath Yoga ranged from 25 to 30 %, that of the overall site from 22 to 38 %. The peak usage of the northern parking area and the overall site were at different times based on the characteristics of the specific generators. In the northern parking area there were 260 to 280 available parking spaces during peak use periods. Overall there were nearly 1,000 of 1,582 parking space unoccupied during any given peak hour.

Comments

1. Consider installing marked cross walks and stop signs at both ends of the raised sidewalk between building A and Breathe Yoga.
2. The parking utilization study needs to be evaluated in light of overall project occupancy. There appears to be 5,984 SF of additional vacant space in building A by the proposed patio, 4,945 SF of vacant space in other areas of building A, 1,425 SF of vacant space by Pi Pizza and a 3,868 SF restaurant vacancy behind Breathe Yoga. The site plan also shows 7,796 SF of vacant space opposite the proposed patio, however, since no space is labeled Breathe Yoga or Orange Theory, these spaces have not been included in the rough re-analysis of what parking usage could be if vacant spaces were occupied. The re-analysis anticipates that the vacant spaces adjacent to the patio area and the space by Pi Pizza will be restaurant uses. Based on the ratio of seats to square feet at Naan-Tastic, the restaurant occupancy of the remaining vacant space likely to use the northern parking area would accommodate 244 seats and could require 122 parking spaces for customers plus 25 for employees compared to 33 parking spaces required for retail space. Retail occupancy of other retail space likely to use the northern parking area would require 22 spaces. It seems the parking utilization study focused on 458 of the 563 existing spaces in the northern parking area. This re-analysis suggests the 260 to 280 available parking spaces in the northern parking area would be sufficient to accommodate the estimated 169 additional parkers at full occupancy of vacant spaces likely to use the northern parking area.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.
Motion made by: David Wink
Seconded by: Marty Avila
Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

108 - 2019	Village of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: AR 2
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Cretekos Properties LLC	
Property Owner:	Cretekos, Nicholas	
Tax Map No(s):	16.17-2-51 Parcel B	
Brief Description:	Area variance to change pre-existing nonconforming sign at 265 West Main Street in the Village of Victor	

There is an 8.5' tall, 5' wide pre-existing nonconforming ground sign on the property that exceeds the allowable maximum size of 16 SF. The current sign advertises two businesses in separate buildings under common ownership. The sign is located by a shared driveway. A new owner will be taking over one of the businesses and changing the name.

The proposed sign panel would be 25 SF, replacing a portion of the existing sign. No information is provided about existing or proposed wall or window signage.

The Village code allows the following signs in business districts such as the Gateway Corridor district:

1. One wall sign per occupant with a maximum sign size of .5 SF per linear foot of building fronting street or parking lot but not more than 30 SF.
2. One ground or monument sign near the primary entrance with a maximum height of 5’ and a maximum size of 16 SF.
3. Window and door signage not exceeding 30 percent of window area.
4. Use of flags, balloons, banners, or other attention-getting devices shall be limited to One 30 day period per calendar year.
5. One portable sign per parcel displayed during business hours.
6. Multiple building complexes may also have a single sided directory sign with 1 SF per tenant.

Additionally, the sign code requires any nonconforming sign to conform to the revised standards within one year of its passage in 2008.

Policy AR-7B: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified SR 5/US 20 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County: The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible.

A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation – Denial

Comments

1. The referring body should grant the minimum variance necessary.
2. What is the SF of the existing sign?
3. Is the area of the 3rd panel with black letters on white background part of the existing sign or does it require an area variance as a temporary sign?

109 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: AR 2
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Venezia Assocaites	
Property Owner:	Blazak, Eric & Bree	
Tax Map No(s):	127.05-2-9.000	

Brief Description:	Area variance for a 120 SF storage shed exceeding the allowable 100 SF limit, a 15' height exceeding the 10' height limit, and no front setback when 55' is required. Shed to be located on lakeside of lot at 4134 West Lake Road in the Town of Canandaigua and to include a bathroom and mini kitchen.
--------------------	---

A site plan for construction of a replacement home on the westside of CR 16 was referred in February as referral29-2019. OCDPW's comments on the house site plan have not been addressed and are repeated below following restatement of the CPB administrative review policy regarding encroachment in county ROWs. There are also additional OCDPW comments on the currently referred plan for modifications to the lakeside portion of the lot.

Code allows 2 accessory structures – a private garage not exceeding 16' in height and a storage shed not exceeding 10' in height. The lot includes an accessory building on the upland portion of the lot.

February 2019 Project Description

The existing home is pre-existing non-conforming with regard to lot width. The existing lot coverage is 19%. The proposed development would add 2,200 SF of building footprint, deck, porch, driveway, walls, and stairs. The impervious surface coverage adjusting for the use of porous driveway materials would be 31.1 %. The shoreline changes will replace a concrete wall with rip rap. The house will continue to be connected to the public sewer.

Policy AR-5: Single-Family Residential Lots

The intent of this policy is to:

- Address residential development that may infringe on County ROW's or easements for roads and other infrastructure.
 - Address traffic safety along intermunicipal corridors by encouraging proper placement of residential driveways along County roads.
 - Address impacts to ground and surface waters
- A. Development infringing on a County owned property, right of way, or easement.

Final Classification: Class 2

Findings

1. Addressing encroachment on County owned property, rights of way, and easements is an intermunicipal issue for reasons of access, maintenance and ultimately, public safety.
2. This issue can be addressed by consulting with the Ontario County DPW.

Final Recommendation shall be for approval with the following modification:

The applicant and referring agency shall contact the Ontario County Department of Public Works and ensure that the development is not improperly encroaching on the CR 16 ROW.

February 2019 OCDPW Comments

The department has reviewed the site plan. Detailed comments are included in a February 11 e-mail to the Town Development Office and summarized below.

1. A highway work permit and proof of contractor insurance will be required for any work within the highway right-of-way.
2. Additional documentation will be required if the project involves more than 1 acre of site disturbance and requires a SWPPP.
3. The County does not consent to on-street parking along CR 16 and will not permit the pull-off shown within the ROW.
4. The proposed retaining walls must be placed out of the county ROW. Additionally the County outlined areas of concern regarding design, materials, and contractor safety.
5. The proposed replacement stairs shall be positioned such that the near edge of the proposed stairs is no closer than 8' from the edge of pavement. An encroachment agreement shall be required for any stair placement within the ROW,
6. Include additional engineering calculations and design details to be reviewed by County regarding the driveway, guide rail transition at the stair, work zone traffic control, shoulder restoration, and drainage structures.
7. All underground utilities must be installed under CR 16 using trenchless methods.

February 2019 Canandaigua Lake County Sewer District Comments

Detailed district comments are in a letter to Erin Venezia Joyce dated February 7, 2019 and summarized below.

1. If the applicant wishes to reuse the existing sewer lateral, it must be televised in the presence of District staff or a video shall be provided to the District Supervisor.

2. Additional comments related to materials, clean-outs, plan notes, and details for penetration of foundation.

June 2019 Comment – Does the accessory building required a lakeside or mean high water line setback variance?

June 2019 OCDPW Comments

The department reviewed the site plan for lakeside modifications and offered detailed comments in an e-mail to the Town Development Office. These comments are summarized below:

1. The proposed Boat Accessory Structure extends into the CR 16 ROW
2. The plan shows proposed utility lines in the CR 16 ROW. Such installations will require additional review by the Town of Canandaigua Water District, Canandaigua Lake County Sewer District, and OCDPW.

110 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: n/a
Referral Type:	Technical Review	
Applicant:	Venezia Assocaites	
Property Owner:	DAGAR	
Tax Map No(s):	97.04-2-100.100, 97.04-2-101.000, 97.04-1-6.121	
Brief Description:	Technical review of a sketch plan to subdivide 3 parcels with 69 acres between CR 16 and Middle Cheshire in the Town of Canandaigua into 70 single family lots. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18225/110-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18226/110-2019-Lacrosse-Circle-2019-05-17-Site-Plan	

Two different sketch plans have been reviewed: 86-2018 in June 2018 for the eastern 44 acre Ashton Place parcel and 204-2018 in December 2018 for the 3 parcels now under consideration. The June 2018 sketch plan showed 12.2 acres of conserved land but claimed to conserve 19.8 acres. The December 2018 plan showed 13.6 acres of conservation area but claimed to conserve 23 acres.

The currently proposed sketch plan, like the December 2018 Plan, combines the undeveloped Ashton Place property with access of CR 16 and 2 undeveloped lots remaining in the Foxridge subdivision with access indirectly off Middle Cheshire Road.

The current sketch plan notes indicate the presence of 9 acres of constrained land including 5 acres of woods and 4 acres of slopes greater than 15% on the eastern Ashton Place lot and 4.4 acres of constrained lands including 1 acre of woods and 3.4 acres with slopes greater than 15% on the two Foxridge parcels or combined acreage of constrained land of 13.4 acres. The currently proposed sketch indicates 13.4 acres of undeveloped conserved land and 4.4 acres of conserved land to be developed as a stormwater detention facility. The sketch plan indicates the Foxridge parcels are 24.9 acres while OnCOR indicates the combined parcel acreage as 22.5. The difference may be land in a previously filed subdivision roadway.

The submitted documents do not show the location of constrained lands in relation to proposed lands to be conserved. However, based on OnCOR, the largest conserved area appears to contain much of the area of 16 to 30 % slope, though the proposed road passes over the northern end of the steeply sloped area. Other conserved areas provide a buffer to the lots to the north on Bedford Drive and a .5 acre green space in the western portion of the development.

The Ashton Place parcel is zoned SCR-1 with a minimum lot size of 1 acre. The Foxridge parcels are zoned R-1-20/281 with a minimum lot size of 15,000 SF. The notes indicate the continued potential for 35 lots on the Ashton Place parcel and 59 lots on the Foxridge parcels. The Foxridge building potential does not appear to account for any undeveloped land set-aside along with the clustering of the developed lots.

Most of the 70 lots shown on the sketch plan are 21,000 SF to 28,000 SF in size, though 11 lots are 35,000 SF to 57,000 SF in size.

The sketch plan continues to show the frontage on CR 16 being transferred to an adjacent land owner. The sketch plan indicates development of a stormwater detention facility in the conserved land behind properties along CR 16. The materials submitted do

not include any additional stormwater or erosion control information. The Foxridge parcels are on the opposite side of a ridge from the Ashton Place parcel and increased stormwater from this area will likely flow to a different facility.

According to OnCOR there are no floodplains or wetlands on the site. Property to the northwest is in an agricultural district and 42 of the 69 acres are prime farmland. Site soil characteristics are as follows:

- Honeoye loam 3 to 8 percent slope –26 acres, 8 to 15 percent – 19.6 acres, 15-25 percent slope 6 acres
- Prime Farmland** – areas w/ slopes 3 to 8 %, **Farmland of Statewide importance** - areas w/ slopes of 8 to 15 %, **Not Prime Farmland** - areas with slopes 15 to 25%
- Permeability:** Moderately High **Erodibility:** Medium
- Hydrological Group C** **Not Hydric**
- Lima loam 3-8 percent slope- 14 acres
- Prime Farmland**
- Permeability:** Moderately High **Erodibility:** High
- Hydrological Group C/D** **Not Hydric**
- Ovid silt loam 0-3 percent slope- 1.2 acres
- Prime Farmland**
- Permeability:** Moderately High **Erodibility:** High
- Hydrological Group C/D** **Not Hydric**

The subdivision is proposed to have public water and sewers. According to the Ontario County Planning Board computer application, the subdivision will likely have access to the fiber optic network along CR 16.

December 2018 Comments from Resident of 4851 Ashton Place

1. The original subdivision plan for this area envisioned 23 additional lots. Are the sewers along Ashton Place sized to accommodate a 35 lot development?
2. There are springs on the property and portions hold standing water. What stormwater management practices will be used to avoid off-site impacts following development of these lots?

December 2018 Comments

1. It appears that this project will continue to discharge stormwater to CR 16 culvert #79; therefore OCDPW will need to review the stormwater management plan and drainage report.
2. The SWPPP and stormwater management plans should be reviewed by Canandaigua Lake Watershed Manager before approval.
3. In accordance with Town regulations for conservation subdivision in 174-16, a complete preliminary subdivision plan and therefore a complete County Planning Board referral must include a conservation analysis including an analysis of the conservation value of various site features.

June 2019 Comments

1. Are any of the undeveloped lands in the Foxridge subdivision designated at open space in the cluster subdivision previously developed?
2. Is development of a stormwater management facility an allowable activity on unconstrained lands conserved as part of a clustered subdivision?
3. Are constrained lands included in the proposed conserved areas? What is the function of the ½ acre of conserved land on the Foxridge parcel?
4. Is there a stormwater management facility associated with previous development of Foxridge subdivision and does it have or could it be re-designed to accept additional stormwater?
5. How will the proposed development impact drainage of agricultural fields to the north?
6. Is there capacity in the existing Foxridge sewers to serve additional lots?

OC Department of Public Health Comment- What provisions will be made for trails or sidewalks in this subdivision?

CPB Comment If homes will be visible from Canandaigua Lake appropriate standards to maintain the character of such views should be applied to minimize visual impact.

111 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Earon Moroz, Robert Bussey	
Property Owner:	Miller, John	
Tax Map No(s):	97.00-1-60.11	
Brief Description:	Area variance and minor subdivision for a 108 acre property on CR 32 east of Hickox Road in the Town of Canandaigua to establish a 2 acre lot with a reduced width of 129' when 200' is required.	

The property is zoned Agricultural-Rural Residential 2 with a minimum lot size of 2 acres and minimum lot frontage of 200'. The parent lot is currently cropland and appears to have been previously subdivided to create 3 residential lots and a farmstead which may also operate as a storage shed or landscaping business. The residential lots appear to have been subdivided when lower lot size and frontage requirements were in place. The subdivision map indicates areas of federal wetlands along the eastern property boundary and areas of slope greater than 10 % in the center and eastern portion. The proposed lot is removed from these features.

The majority of the acreage of the proposed lot is behind 2 small ½ lots to the west of its frontage. According to OnCOR, the proposed lot is not constrained by steep slopes, wetlands, or floodplains. The parent parcel and all area land are in an agricultural district. Soil characteristics in the area of the proposed lot are as follows:

Lima Loam 3-8 percent.

Prime Farmland

Permeability: moderately high **Erodibility:** high
Hydrological Group C/D **Not Hydric**

Town of Canandaigua driveway spacing standards apply only in commercial and industrial districts; however, closely spaced residential driveways can degrade capacity and safety of collector roads such as CR 32. Typical driveway spacing standard on a collector roads with a speed limits of 45 MPH or higher would be 440'.

Comments

1. The proposed narrow lot frontage leave a small strip (<20') of road frontage. If this is a necessary farm access road it should be indicated on the subdivision map as a temporary farm access road not suitable for servicing future residential lots.
2. The proposed lot shape provides an opportunity to add a landscaped buffer to minimize impact of frontage residential development on the viability of remaining farmland.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

111.1 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Minor Subdivision	
Applicant:	Earon Moroz, Robert Bussey	
Property Owner:	Miller, John	
Tax Map No(s):	97.00-1-60.11	
Brief Description:	Area variance and minor subdivision for a 106 acre property on CR 32 east of Hickox Road in the Town of Canandaigua to establish a 2 acre lot with a reduced width of 129' when 200' is required.	

See information at 111-2019.

112 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Subdivision	
Applicant:	Marathon Engineering	
Property Owner:	S & J Morrell	
Tax Map No(s):	112.19-1-500.100	
Brief Description:	Final site plan for 15 lots on 23 acres in section 9D of Lakeview Meadows subdivision at St. James Place off Middle Cheshire Road in the Town of Canandaigua. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18227/112-2019-site-plan	

The proposed final site plan shows 15 townhouse lots of .07 to .097 acres when the preliminary site plan showed single family homes on larger lots. The reduced lot size appears to shorten the length of the cul-de-sac from 550' to 350'.

According to OnCor, lands to the south of St. James Parkway are farmed and in an agricultural district. To the east and the west of the proposed cul-de-sac are areas of 10 to 15 percent slope. The soils in the area proposed for development at the level highpoint of the field are Honeoye Loam with the following characteristics:

Prime Farmland

Permeability: moderately high **Erodibility:** medium

Hydrological Group C **Not Hydric**

To protect the water quality of Canandaigua Lake the landscaping plan calls for no use of phosphorus at time of planting unless soil testing indicates a phosphorus deficiency that would inhibit establishment of grass and other plantings in which case the minimum necessary based on NYSDEC guidelines may be used.

Comment The landscaping plan includes a planting schedule for a typical 4 unit building with more plantings associated with end units. In the proposed subdivision, all but 1 unit will be end units. Will end unit landscaping quantities apply to all units?

OC Department of Public Health Comment - What walking infrastructure is available to residents of Lakewood Meadows?

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

113 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Hospitality Syracuse Inc.	
Property Owner:	R & F Canandaigua LLC	
Tax Map No(s):	84.00-1-27.200	
Brief Description:	Site Plan and special use permit for 185 SF cooler addition to Taco Bell building in the Raymour Flanigan Plaza at 4404 SR 5/US 20 in the Town of Canandaigua.	

The proposed addition would be located on the southeast side of the building. The project will also involve asphalt resurfacing/restripping, a new canopy at the order intercom and a clearance bar at the drive-thru entry, addition of curb ramps and marked crosswalks, and replacement in kind of signage and several trees.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

113.1 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Special Use Permit	
Applicant:	Hospitality Syracuse Inc.	
Property Owner:	R & F Canandaigua LLC	
Tax Map No(s):	84.00-1-27.200	
Brief Description:	Site Plan and special use permit for cooler addition to Taco Bell building in the Raymour Flanigan Plaza at 4404 SR 5/US 20 in the Town of Canandaigua.	

See information at 113-2019.

114 - 2019	Town of Canandaigua Planning Board	Class: 2
Referral Type:	Local Law	
Applicant:	Town of Canandaigua	
Brief Description:	Local law to expand list of energy generation project types not exempt from real property taxes in the Town of Canandaigua. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18229/114-2019-2019-05-16-DRAFT_LL-Tax-Exemption	

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral 114-2019 as a Class 2 and return it to the local board with recommendation of approval with comments.

Motion made by: Ruby Morrison

Seconded by: David Wink

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention **Motion carried**

115 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	46 North Avenue LLC	
Property Owner:	46 N. Avenue LLC & Linton Associates LLC	
Representative:	Cretkos, James	
Tax Map No(s):	6.02-2-48.00	
Brief Description:	Site plan and area variance to add 33 parking spaces at 300 High Street/7720 Pittsford-Victor Road in the Town of Victor. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18230/115-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18231/115_19-Site-Plan	

Valentine Plaza encompasses 7.7 acres. Lot 1 is the former site of Pizzeria Uno. Lot 1 has right-in/right-out access from High Street and has been approved for construction of a bank. Lot 2 is a Long Horn Steakhouse and has a right-in/right-out access from SR 96. Lot 3 accommodates the 25,000 SF of which 14,000 SF is operated by brewery and restaurant NY Beer Project. Lot 3 has an all movement signalized access point across from Valentown Road. All 3 lots have shared parking and access agreements in place.

The engineer's letter indicates the proposed site plan would add 11 parking spaces to Lot 3 and 22 spaces to Lot 2. The site plan appears to show the addition of 15 or 16 parking spaces to Lot 3 plus a second dumpster enclosure and removal of a landscaped parking island. The proposed modifications would disturb approximately .6 acres and add 11,370 SF of impervious surface.

The site plan notes indicate following the expansion of parking, lots 2 and 3 will meet zoning parking requirements of 141 parking spaces for Lot 2 and 136 for Lot 3. There is no indication of whether parking expansion area was land banked at the time of initial development or is required by changes in tenants.

The proposed parking on Lot 2 would require a modification of the existing area variance. The current variance allows 35' setback from SR 96 for parking when 80' is required. The proposed site plan requires a 30' setback from SR 96. A variance is also necessary

to accommodate 6 of proposed 22 parking spaces on Lot 2. Following parking development, impervious surface coverage would be 47 % on Lot 2 and 52% on Lot 3.

The proposed modifications also involve removal of landscaping on Lot 2 and the relocation of several light poles on both lots. The landscaping to be removed includes most of the row of shrubs west of the parking on Lot 1 and a row of cedars near SR 96 and most of the trees along the SR 96 access drive on Lot 2. Replacement landscaping with dogwoods is proposed west of the new parking aisle on Lot 2.

Comment

1. The proposed internal access to the new parking aisle on Lot 2 would be located 44’ from the SR 96 ROW. This does not provide adequate corner clearance from the right-in/right-out access from SR 96. The location is also on a curve. What volume of traffic is expected to use this access point and what is the potential to create queuing on SR 96 as vehicles decelerate to make a 2nd turn? Is adequate site distance available for vehicles exiting left from this driveway to exit right onto SR 96 or will access connection create unsafe exit left turns?
2. The proposed parking on Lot 2 would remove 1 large and 5 smaller trees along the existing SR 96 access and retain 1 tree. Parking construction would remove 12 shrubs from the existing edge of parking and 11 cedars partially screening the parking area from SR 96. Replacement landscaping includes 21 dogwoods along the proposed edge of parking on Lot 2. What is the impact of these changes on site character and landscaping?
3. The site plan appears to show 16 not 11 additional parking spacing on lot 3.
4. The proposed parking expansion involves creating engineered steeply sloped areas and a retaining wall on Lot 3. What impact will this change have on the visual character of the walking trail between the site and Meadowlark Lane and from SR 96? The site plan also indicates an engineered steeply sloped bank facing SR 96 with the potential for change in the visual character.
5. Since the drive aisle in front of the building on Lot 3 is a main route to the full movement access point for all 3 lots, consider adding a crosswalk from the Lot 3 parking to the building.
6. Shared access and parking easements are reportedly in place. There should also be a shared maintenance agreement.

OCSWCD Comments

1. A no phosphorus starter fertilizer is recommended for all seeding applications.
2. The silt fence should be tapered upslope at each end to prevent loss of sediment during rain events.

Comments from resident at 304 High Street

1. Concern about light pollution in home from car lights; limited screening options because of site topography.
2. Concern about cars backing out of spaces along the signalized site driveway.
3. Comments regarding area variance standards:
 - a. The need for additional parking is self-created as the applicant asked that required parking be reduced at the site plan review in 2014;
 - b. The benefit sought can be achieved by altering the development density of lot 1.
 - c. The area variance sought represents a substantial 62 % deviation from the required setback of 80’.

CPB Comments

Applicant representative reviewed clarifications and site plan modifications made in response to staff comments and discussions with referring body including:

1. The new parking aisle on Lot 2 will be reduced by 4 spaces and will no longer connect to the SR 96 driveway.
2. The setback variance would apply to 4 of the 18 spaces proposed on Lot 2.
3. Parking spaces along the driveway on Lot 3 will be angled parking.
4. The right-in/right-out from Lot 1 to High Street will be demarcated with flexible bollards not a concrete median and will be signed to prohibit cross travel to High Street extension.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral 115-2019 and 115.1-2019 as Class 1s and return it to the local board with comments.

Motion made by: Ruby Morrison

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

115.1 - 2019	Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	46 North Avenue LLC	
Property Owner:	46 N. Avenue LLC & Linton Associates LLC	
Representative:	Cretokos, James	
Tax Map No(s):	6.02-2-48.00	
Brief Description:	Site plan and area variance to add 33 parking spaces at 300 High Street/7720 Pittsford-Victor Road in the Town of Victor.	

See information at 115-2019.

116 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	
Property Owner:	Monroe County Water Authority	
Representative:	Lusk, Jared	
Tax Map No(s):	15,00-2-74.000	
Brief Description:	Site plan and special use permit for removal of 12 antennas and installation of 6 antennas and supplementall equipment at existing installation on water tower at 701 High Street in the Town of Victor.	

Facility modifications are intended to increase wireless capacity of Verizon network in the area south of I-90 and north of Dryer Road and including businesses along SR 96 and SR 251. All proposed supplemental ground equipment will be located in the existing equipment buildings.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

116.1 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Special Use Permit	
Applicant:	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	
Property Owner:	Monroe County Water Authority	
Representative:	Lusk, Jared	
Tax Map No(s):	15,00-2-74.000	
Brief Description:	Site plan and special use permit for removal of 12 antennas and installation of 6 antennas and supplementall equipment at existing installation on water tower at 701 High Street in the Town of Victor.	

See information at 116-2019.

117 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	
Property Owner:	7385 Willowbrookd Road LLC	

Representative:	Lusk, Jared
Tax Map No(s):	15.00-2-33.000
Brief Description:	Site plan and special use permit to construct a 50' pole mounted small cell wireless telecommunication facility at 7385 Willowbrook Road in the Town of Victor.

Pole to be located in 5'x 5' leased space to the northeast of an existing building in a Commercial/Light Industrial zoning district. Installation will include two 1'x4' antennas and related ground equipment located at the pole base. Facility intended to serve an area of high intensity use near I-90 Exit 45.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

117.1 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Special Use Permit	
Applicant:	Bell Atlantic/Verizon	
Property Owner:	7385 Willowbrookd Road LLC	
Representative:	Lusk, Jared	
Tax Map No(s):	15.00-2-33.000	
Brief Description:	Site plan and special use permit to construct a 50' pole mounted small cell wireless telecommunication facility at 7385 Willowbrook Road in the Town of Victor.	

See information at 117-2019.

118 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Blanding, Dan	
Property Owner:	Blanding, Dan	
Tax Map No(s):	28.12-1-24.000	
Brief Description:	Site plan to construct a 900 SF addition to the front of a detached garage at 6431 SR 96 at McMahon Road in the Town of Victor. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18232/118-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18233/118-2019-site-plan	

Existing buildings on the 1.2 acre site include a single family home and detached garage. The property and nearly the entire SR 96 frontage east of the Village of Victor are zoned Commercial/Light Industrial. The building addition is expected to serve as a showroom for a custom picture framing business located in the detached garage. The applicant has indicated the buildings formerly housed an office furniture showroom.

According to OnCor (2018) the site appears to accommodate outdoor storage of building materials to the rear of the site. Such storage may encroach on the floodplain that covers much of the property to the south also owned by the applicant. OnCor shows the subject property is not in an agricultural district nor constrained by wetlands or steep slopes.

Comments

1. The existing residential driveway does not meet minimum recommended access connection off-set from McMahon road or driveways on adjacent parcels. The referring body review should identify appropriate future access connection location to safely accommodate intensification of use on this and adjacent properties and set in place necessary cross access easements.
2. The applicant should be required to address any pre-existing nonconforming outdoor storage and encroachment in the floodplain.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

119 - 2019	Town of Farmington Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Farmington Chamber of Commerce	
Property Owner:	Farmington County Plaza Inc	
Tax Map No(s):	41.00-1-35.100	
Brief Description:	Site plan and temporary use permit for farmers market at 1560 SR 332 south of Terrace Lane in the Town of Farmington. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18234/119-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18235/119-2019-site-plan	

The Farmington Chamber of Commerce has applied to operate a weekly Farmers Market at Farmington County Plaza. Establishing a farmers market was a recommendation of the adopted Farmington Farmland Protection Plan. The farm market would operate weekly on Fridays June 28 to September 27 from 3 pm to 7 pm.

The site plan indicates 14 vendor stalls of 10' by 15' each in the grass area in front of the miniature golf operation. Vendors and customers would park in the parking stalls to the rear of the building to the south and in spaces adjacent to the golf operation. The farmers market will be advertised with a portable sandwich board sign on market days.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

119.1 - 2019	Town of Farmington Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Temporary Use Permit	
Applicant:	Farmington Chamber of Commerce	
Property Owner:	Farmington County Plaza Inc	
Tax Map No(s):	41.00-1-35.100	
Brief Description:	Site plan and temporary use permit for farmers market at 1560 SR 332 south of Terrace Lane in the Town of Farmington.	

See information at 119-2019.

120 - 2019	Town of Farmington Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Special Use Permit	
Applicant:	Sonbryne Sales	
Property Owner:	6215 Route 96 Associates LLC	
Representative:	Bruynelle, Christian	
Tax Map No(s):	29.00-1-48.100	
Brief Description:	Special use permit for 6 fuel pumps proposed as part of redevelopment of a 1.99 acres lot at 6215 Mertensia Road in the Town for Farmington as a 4,232 SF Bryne Dairy convenience store/ gas station. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18271/120-2019-C201_06-03-19	

A site plan for this project was previously reviewed as referral 91-2019 in May. The currently referred site plan dated May 2019 includes a marked pedestrian access from the SR 96 sidewalk, replacement of paved island at SR 96/Mertensia with lawn, of paved and adds 2 bio retention basins in response to previous comments 1, 5, and 6. The site plan has also been revised to show an enlarged stormwater management area at the corner of SR 96 and Mertensia and the building and fuel canopies shifted 20' west to accommodate this change. Other elements of the project description and previous comments remain unchanged. Newly submitted materials include stormwater calculations and illumination mapping. Lighting levels are highest on the north and west sides of the building and under the canopy. See end of narrative for additional comments on lighting.

The submitted stormwater calculations indicate portions of the site will continue to drain to SR 96 storm sewer (.55 acres mostly grass), to Pat Drive (1.8 acres with 1.2 acres impervious, 1.5 acres of which will drain to the stormwater management facility before discharge to Pat Drive), and to the Mertensia Road storm sewer (.1 acres impervious). All drainage facilities ultimately will discharge to Beaver Creek located 700' south of the site via Mertensia Road or 1,300' southwest of the site and the adjacent mobile home park for discharges from the Pat Drive storm sewer. The report indicates peak discharge rates for the 1, 10, and 100 years storm events will decrease from existing conditions.

May 2019 Site Plan Referral Project Description

In addition to the 4,232 SF building, proposed site features includes 6 fuel pumps with 12 fueling locations under a 24' canopy. Development activities are expected to disturb 1.6 acres. Following site development the lot coverage will include 11 % for building and fuel canopy, 42 % for pavement, and 47 % pervious cover including stormwater management facility. The engineer's project narrative indicates the stormwater management facility discharges to the Mertensia Road storm sewer.

Site plan indicates a dumpster in the southwest corner near the stormwater management facility and locations of eleven 17' light poles, 12 recessed canopy lights, and 5 wall mounted lights, all dark sky compliant. No photometric plan was provided. No circulation plan or lighting for the proposed ATM is indicated on the site plan. The site plan includes provision of 33 parking spaces when 26 are required. Applicant will construct 390' of 5' sidewalk along SR 96.

Landscaping appears to include a 12' buffer of evergreens along Pat Drive and the southern portion of Northrup Lane, street trees in the 27' setback along the SR 96 frontage and remaining portion of Northrup Lane, and plantings is the island on the east side of the SR 96 entrance and around the sign 16' from the ROW near the intersection of SR 96 and Mertensia Road. No landscaping is indicated along the Mertensia Road frontage. The site plan appears to indicate retention of a tree along the SR 96 frontage and several along the western property line in the vicinity of the closest mobile home driveway but not along Pat Drive or the interior of the site. Proposed signage includes a 49 SF building sign and a 64 SF 15' high freestanding sign, both of which are internally illuminated. No canopy signage is proposed.

The site is zoned GB and in the Major Thoroughfare Overlay District. Adjacent land uses includes a mobile home park to the west and to the south of the Mertensia Road access at Pat Drive; undeveloped land and a secondary access drive to the Tops grocery store at Farmington Market Center to the east; and a car wash, a power sports vehicle dealer, and a residence to the north of SR 96 all zoned GB.

The included traffic study indicates existing operating speeds are 47 to 52 mph in the 45 mph zone and existing gaps in traffic are sufficient to accommodate projected 140 peak hour trips. Site trip generation is based on 60% bypass traffic and background traffic increase is projected at 1 % per year.

According to the NYSDEC Environmental Resource Mapper, there are no DEC wetlands on or within 100' of the site. According to the US Fish and Wildlife Service Wetland Online Mapper there are no Federal wetlands on the site. According to the National Flood Insurance Program Flood Boundary and Floodway Map the site is not in the 100 year flood plain.

The existing site driveways operate at Level of Service (LOS) C with 15 to 25 second peak hour delay. Following development, site driveways operation will decline to LOS D with 25 to 35 second peak hour delay.

May 2019 Comments

1. The site plan indicates pedestrian access to the building from the Mertensia Road sidewalk, but not from SR 96.
2. To tie this site into the Town Center anchored by Tops, the streetscape treatments and light poles should be consistent. In any case pedestrian scale lighting (12 to 14’ poles) is desirable.
3. How does the internal site circulation discourage cut through traffic? Vehicles exiting the site to Mertensia Road by making a left turn will be required to stop at the stop sign and likely again in the intersection. Locating the building adjacent to the grass area along Mertensia Road would avoid this intersection and provide a location for outdoor tables which can be accessed without introducing vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The site circulation would still have to address how to discourage cut through traffic.
4. Is a 64 SF sign needed for readability given the proximity of the freestanding sign to the road?
5. Will the applicant plant grass or other low vegetation in the area between the curb and the sidewalk in the NYSDOT ROW?
6. Will green infrastructure be incorporated at the parking area perimeter?
7. The applicant should justify provision of parking in excess of code requirements.
8. Locating buildings near the sidewalk, parking to the rear, and transparent windows contributes to a pedestrian friendly streetscape.
9. The distance from the proposed driveway to Northrup Drive is less than the 220’ required by the MTOD regulations.
10. A motor vehicle service station also requires special use permit and re-referral to CPB.
11. Planning Board to ensure the proposed buffer to residential uses to the west and south complies with the requirements of 165-57 and the Route 96/Route 332 Corridor Development Plan.

May 2019 CRC Comments

1. Site plan should indicate lighting and circulation for the ATM.
2. Demolition debris should be recycled or disposed of at a licensed facility.
3. In response to questions, the applicant indicated site plan will be altered to indicate pedestrian corridor from SR 96, to clean up and seed the area in the SR 96 ROW between the existing pavement and the property line, and install streetscape landscaping and pedestrian scale lighting as identified by the Town for all parcels in the Town Center.

May 2019 CPB Comments

1. Local board to work with applicant to identify ATM lighting that meets bank and NYS requirements and minimizes light level at the fixtures and potential impact on adjacent residences.
2. A crosswalk across Pat Drive may improve the pedestrian safety of children and other store customers walking to the site from the homes directly to the south.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral 91-2019 as a Class 1 and return it to the local board with comments.

Motion made by: Sue Boardman

Seconded by: Marty Avilla

Vote: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention **Motion carried**

June 2019 Comments

1. From the illumination mapping provided, it appears light levels of 5 to 10 foot-candles will extend beyond the landscape screen to Pat Drive and potentially the residents of the mobile homes south of Pat Drive. The photometric plan reports light spill in this area less than 4.2 foot-candles. The photometric plan should be reviewed once a decision is made regarding consistent Farmington Town Center light fixtures and appropriate lighting for the proposed ATM.

June 2019 CRC Comments

1. Consider adding a pedestrian connection to the site from the intersection of Northrup Drive and Fred Road.
2. Consider requiring a split rail fence around the stormwater management facility located in close proximity to the sidewalk and the seating area.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink
Seconded by: Marty Avila
Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

121 - 2019	Town of Victor Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Lorenze, Brian	
Property Owner:	Seritage SRC Finance, LLC	
Tax Map No(s):	6.00-1-9.00	
Brief Description:	Site Plan for DICK's Sporting Goods to reoccupy 103,000 sq. ft. in the vacant SEARS building at Eastview Mall in the Town of Victor.	

In addition to remodeling and occupying the vacant building, site modifications include a new façade with 50' elevated entry structure, on-line order pickup parking and entrance, an indoor climbing wall that will extend approximately 12' above existing 30' roof, a suspended indoor running lane with stairs and elevator that will extend approximately 2' above the existing roofline, and an outdoor 112'x160' turf athletic field demo/test/practice area at the northwest end of the building. The field will be lit from 63' light towers and surrounded by a 47' net fence. The field and lights will only be in use during store operating hours. For comparison, the existing mall main entry structure, parking light poles, and the 2 story Macy's building are all 60'.

The changes will remove 60 parking spaces but retain the perimeter sidewalk around the field area.

Comments

1. The on-line order pick-up entrance is shown to the northwest of the proposed elevation but the pick-up parking is shown to the southeast of the store entrance.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referral as a Class 1 and return it to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: Ruby Morrison

Seconded by: Mike Woodruff

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

122 - 2019	Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: AR 2
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Leier, Bill	
Property Owner:	East Brook Properties LLC	
Representative:	Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP1	
Tax Map No(s):	6.00-1-12.210	
Brief Description:	Applicant is requesting an area variance at project location - 40 Eastview Mall Drive to allow Stickley Audi & Co. signage to exceed 20 sq. ft., and to allow sign to list two tenants/businesses, and to allow a second freestanding sign for Stickley per Code 165-5(B).	

The 3.6 acre Stickley site includes a 40,000 SF building. The existing Stickley building is oriented with its front entrance facing Eastview Mall Drive, its parking lot, and the mall. The building is approximately 150' from SR 96 and the eastern building face closest to SR 96 is partially blocked from view by the City Mattress building. Existing signage includes a sign over the front entrance and a second 97 SF wall sign on the elevation facing SR 96. Stickley also has a panel on the BJs sign location on the mall property. This existing signage will remain.

La-Z-Boy proposes to lease the portion of the building closest to SR 96 for operation of a La-Z-Boy showroom. The La-Z-Boy project will require site plan approval for a 2nd entrance and ZBA approval of 2 walls signs, one at the entrance facing the parking area (141 SF proposed when 124 SF is allowed) and a 110 SF sign facing SR 96 (referral 121.1-2019). Given the length of the eastern elevation, a 130 SF sign would be allowed. Proposed signage along this elevation would be 207 SF with the existing Stickley sign and the proposed La-Z-Boy sign.

The Stickley sign variance referred is for a 40 SF monument sign along SR 96 advertising both Stickley and the proposed La-Z-Boy showroom. The sign will include a polycarbonate sign face with vinyl letters mounted to stone columns and base. The closest sign

edge would be located 36’ from the edge of pavement, in line with existing trees and complies with Town code. This sign needs variances to allow: a second freestanding sign for Stickley, the sign to exceed 20 SF, and the sign to list 2 businesses. The additional signage is intended to increase business visibility for customers entering from SR 96 and from High Street.

Policy AR-7B: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified SR 5/US 20 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County: The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible.

A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation – Denial

122.1 - 2019	Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: AR 2
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Leier, Bill	
Property Owner:	East Brook Properties LLC	
Representative:	Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP1	
Tax Map No(s):	6.00-1-12.210	
Brief Description:	Area Variance to allow the existing wall sign to remain on east elevation in addition to proposed La-Z-Boy wall sign at project location - 40 Eastview Mall Drive.	

See information at 122-2019.

123 - 2019	Town of Hopewell Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Site Plan	
Applicant:	Staples, Chris	
Property Owner:	Tuper, Kenneth E.	
Representative:	Marks Engineering, P.C.	
Tax Map No(s):	99.00-2-59.100	
Brief Description:	Site plan and subdivision of 44.5461 acre vacant lot located on Gehan Road (TM# 99.00-2-59.100) in Town of Hopewell to build a new single-family residence on 42.328 acre parcel, and a new 2,400 SF motor vehicle service and repair station for a taxi company on a 2.1 acre parcel. https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18236/123-2019-Aerial https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18237/123-19-overall-site-plan https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/18238/123-19-commercial-site-plan	

The parent parcel has approximately 200’ of frontage on SR 5/US 20 opposite Mumby Road and over 900’ of frontage on Gehan Road. The entire parcel is in the agricultural district. A 12 acre pond with mapped Federal wetlands along the southern and eastern edges separates the two portions of the property. According to OnCOR, there are no floodplains or steeply sloped areas on the

property. Dominant soils in the development areas are Darian silt loam. The home site has slopes of 0 to 3 percent, the business site 3 to 8 percent. Other soil characteristics are as follows:

Prime farmland if drained

Permeability: moderately high **Erodibility:** high

Hydrological Group C/D **Partially Hydric**

The 2.1 acre parcel created on SR 5/US 20 has a depth of 425'; which equals the depth of the adjacent lot to the east. The C-2 low intensity commercial zoning district boundary appears to extend approximately 500' from the road. The repair shop is intended for use by the business only and will not be open to the public. The lot would block access to the portion of the remainder parcel south of the pond. The remainder lot is zoned Agricultural. The proposed home site is within the southern third of the remainder property with a ±250' gravel driveway off Gehan Road. Each use would have its own conventional septic system. The area of disturbance for the home is listed at 26,000 SF and that for the Taxi dispatch and maintenance business is listed as 37,000 SF.

Landscaping for the business includes a double row of blue spruce along the eastern edge of the disturbed area approximately 25' from the property line.

Adjacent land uses include a single family home and then the Beaver Creek Mini Storage to the east along SR 5/US 20. To the west is a 33' access to a residence with a commercial use and then a small commercial use.

Comments

1. The driveway for the Taxi Service business should be aligned with Mumby Road to maximum safety and minimize the adverse impact on the state highway. Since the adjacent lots are zoned commercial, the applicant should also be requested to provide cross access easements to these adjacent lots to be activated if such parcels transition from single family to uses generating an increase in daily trips.
2. The applicant should identify access to the remaining lands between SR 5/US 20 and the pond.
3. Landscaping standards in section 1003 require at least a 5' landscaped area along the ROW and 1 tree to provide shade per 10 parking spaces.
4. If Hopewell requires the business to obtain a special use permit for the motor vehicle repair portion of the business, the Town Board will need to referral that application to County Planning Board.
5. The Town of Hopewell should address potentially conflicting sections of the C-2 regulations permitting gasoline stations (604 B 15) and Transportation Equipment Sales Service and/or Repair (604-B-18), yet requiring Motor Vehicle Repair, Motor Vehicle Service Station and New Motor Vehicles Sales and Service uses to obtain a special use permit. Hopewell may also want to consider whether it still makes sense to permit gasoline stations in C-2 districts and require a SUP in the C-1 district.

OCSWCD Comments

1. Both sites have poorly drained soils.
2. The NYS Department of Health should review the residential home septic design; the taxi business building is designed using the NYSDEC standards.
3. What is the depth of the perc test holes for the residential home?
4. Is there the required 4' of usable soil present on both sites?
5. Fractured shale does not provide treatment of wastewater.

CRC Comments

1. The referring body should ensure measures are in place to minimize and contain any spills of toxic materials used in motor vehicle repair.
2. The applicant should clarify the extent of any outdoor storage of vehicles, supplies, or other equipment.

Board Motion: A motion to retain referrals 102-2019, 103-2019, 107-2019, 111-2019, 111.1 2019, 112-2019, 113-2019, 113.1-2019, 116-2019, 116.1-2019, 117-2019, 117.1-2019, 118-2019, 119-2019, 119.1-2019, 120-2019, 123-2019, and 123.1-2019 as Class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: David Wink

Seconded by: Marty Avila

Vote: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention Motion carried

123.1 - 2019	Town of Hopewell Planning Board		Class: 1
Referral Type:	Subdivision		
Applicant:	Staples, Chris		
Property Owner:	Tuper, Kenneth E.		
Representative:	Marks Engineering, P.C.		
Tax Map No(s):	99.00-2-59.100		
Brief Description:	Site plan and subdivision of 44.5461 acres vacant lot located on Gehan Road (TM# 99.00-2-59.100) in Town of Hopewell to build a new single-family residence on 42.328 acre parcel, and a new motor vehicle service and repair station for a taxi company on a 2.1 acre parcel.		

See information at 123-2019.

General Information

The Ontario County Planning Board (CPB) was established by the Ontario County Board of Supervisors under the provision of NYS General Municipal Law Article 12-B Section 239-c. County Planning Boards. The state legislature determined in §239-c. 1. (a), (b), (g) & (f):

1. Legislative findings and intent. The legislature hereby finds and determines that:

(a) Significant decisions and actions affecting the immediate and long-range protection, enhancement, growth and development of the state and its communities are made by county planning boards.

(b) County planning boards serve as an important resource to the state and its localities, helping to establish productive linkages between communities as well as with state and federal agencies.

(f) The great diversity of resources and conditions that exist within and among counties requires consideration of such factors by county planning boards.

(g) It is the intent of the legislature therefore, to provide a permissive and flexible framework within which county planning boards can perform their power and duties.

Note: l, (d), and (e) refer to the county comprehensive plan.

The CPB membership consists of one representative from each of the 16 towns and 2 cities who are selected by the town board or city council and formally appointed by the Board of Supervisors for terms of 5 years. Members representing a town, also represent any village(s) located with the town.

General Summary of CPB Review Responsibilities

This section provides a general summary of the CPB's roles and responsibilities. The specific responsibilities of a county planning board are found in §239 l, m, & n and the CPB Bylaws approved by the Ontario County Board of Supervisors. (Links: Complete §239 text Page151: [Guide to NYS Planning and Zoning Laws](#) and [Ontario County Planning Board Bylaws under "Quick Links"](#))

The Ontario County Planning Board reviews certain zoning and planning actions prior to the final decision made at the village, town, or city level and makes a recommendation to the municipality. Although CPB review is required, the action is advisory in nature and can be overridden at the local level (super majority if a recommendation for Denial).

NYS law spells out the types of actions reviewed by the CPB:

- Adoption or amendment of zoning regulations (text and/or map)
- Comprehensive plans
- Site plan approvals
- Special use permits
- Variances
- Any special permit, exception, or other special authorization which a board of appeals, planning board or legislative body is authorized to issue under the provisions of any zoning ordinance
- Subdivisions

NYS law specifies that CPB is required for the above actions to occur on real property lying within a distance of 500 feet from any:

- Boundary of any city, village, or town boundary
- Existing or proposed county or state park or other recreation area,
- Right-of-way of any existing or proposed county or state parkway, thruway, expressway, road or highway, existing or proposed right-of-way,
- Stream or drainage channel owned by the county or for which the county has established channel lines, or
- Existing or proposed boundary of any county or state owned land on which a public building or institution is situated.

General Procedures

The Ontario County Planning Board meets once each month to review referred local actions for intermunicipal and countywide impacts. They are separated into two categories: Class 1 & Class 2. Class 1s are applications that the CPB has formally decided have little potential intermunicipal or countywide impact. For Class 2 applications, the CPB has determined that there will be potential impacts before voting to approve, modify or deny.

Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies

Class 1: If an application has been returned to the referring agency as a Class 1, then the only requirement is that they consider any Board comments forwarded to them by the CPB. Referring agencies are asked to read any Board Comments into the minutes of a meeting or hearing held for the subject application.

Class 2: If the CPB has voted to deny or modify a referred application, then the local board needs a majority plus one vote of their full board to act contrary to that decision. CPB approvals without modification require no extraordinary local action. However, in all cases, the referring agency is still required to consider CPB comments as they would for Class 1 applications.

Incomplete Applications

Referrals need to meet the definition of “full statement of such proposed action” in NYS General Municipal Law. The CPB’s determination regarding the completeness of a particular application is supported by factual findings and is made, whenever practical, after consulting with the submitting official or the chairs of referring agencies. The CPB will not make a recommendation on an application that they have determined to be incomplete. NYS General Municipal Law, Article 12-b Section 239-m 1

Reporting back to the CPB

Report of final action – Within thirty days after final action, the referring body shall file a report of the final action it has taken with the county planning agency or regional planning council. A referring body which acts contrary to a recommendation of modification or denial of a proposed action shall set forth the reasons for the contrary action in such report.”

NYS General Municipal Law, Article 12-b Section 239-m, Part 6.

Administrative Reviews

The Ontario County Planning Department prepares administrative reviews of referrals as authorized, in accordance with the CPB bylaws. The bylaws include criteria that identify applications that are to be reviewed administratively and specify the applicable recommendations that are to be made to the municipality. AR 1 is an administrative review that is a Class 1 and AR 2 is a review that is a Class 2. An AR 2 requires a majority plus one for the local board to act contrary to the recommendation for disapproved just like Class-2 referrals reviewed by the full Board. The following table summarizes the policies under which administrative review is allowed and guidance regarding class designation and recommendation based on the CPB bylaws.

Administrative Review (AR) Policies:– Ontario County Planning Board By-Laws Appendix D	
AR Policy 1	Any submitted application clearly exempted from CPB review requirements by intermunicipal agreement
AR Policy 2	Applications that are withdrawn by the referring agency
AR Policy 3	Permit renewals with no proposed changes
AR Policy 4	Use of existing facilities for a permitted use with no expansion of the building or paved area (Applications that include specially permitted uses or the addition of drive through service will require full Board review)
AR Policy 5 A. Class 2 Denial	Applications involving one single-family residential site infringing on County owned property, easement or right-of-way.
AR Policy 5 B. Class 2 Denial	Applications involving one single-family residential site adjoining a lake that requires an area variance
AR Policy 5 C.	All other applications involving a site plan for one single-family residence.
AR Policy 6	Single-family residential subdivisions under five lots.
AR Policy 7 A. Class 2 Denial	Variations for signs along major designated travel corridors.
AR Policy 7 B.	Applications involving conforming signs along major travel corridors.
AR Policy 8	Co-location of telecommunications equipment & accessory structures on existing towers and sites (Applications that require a special use permit or for new towers or increasing the height of an existing tower require full Board review)

Other Agenda Items

- Review CPB member responsibilities in new By-laws
- Volunteers to plan Summer Social
- Clearing House Reviews
- 1. Request for \$2.8 million in federal financing for 11,500 SF building to house Linger Lakes Area Counseling & Recovery Agency administrative offices, Care Management program, Supportive Living Program, SOTI staff, Vocation Service program, and several ancillary service departments. An 1,000 SF addition will also be made to the current Opioid Crisis Center building on the site at 71 Kendall Street in the Village of Clifton Springs.
- 2. \$54 million for Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund including \$9 million in state funds.
- 3. \$56,575 for personal to enhance the timely survey and inventory of brownfields in NYS, oversee remediation and cleanup plans to ensure they are protective of public health, and provide meaning opportunities for public participation
- Training

June 17, 2019 12-1 pm

Smart Solar Siting Webinar: Designing Solar Land Use Laws that Protect Productive

To participate in this webinar, please register [here](#) by May 30th

Adjournment: Being no further business for discussion, Chair Wildman requested a motion to adjourn. ***Motion to adjourn made by David Wink, seconded by Glen Wilkes. Motion carried.*** The June 12, 2019 CPB meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Phillips

OCPD Senior Planner