

Ontario County Planning Board

2020 Annual Report

January 15, 2021

ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
20 ONTARIO ST.
CANANDAIGUA, NY 14424
585-396-4455
WWW.CO.ONTARIO.NY.US/PLANNING

Executive Summary

Membership and Training

1. The Board welcomed 1 new member and 1 returning member in 2020.
2. Board positions were vacant 8% of the time.
3. OCPD organized 1 in-person training for CPB members and three virtual training programs attended by over 100 municipal, planning, and zoning board members and interested community members.

Referrals

1. The number of referrals reviewed in 2020 was 279 down 15 percent from 327 referrals in 2019 but in line with the 274 referrals in 2018.
2. The number of referrals from the Town of Victor decreased from 75 in 2019, to 40 in 2020. The number of referrals increased substantially in the Towns of Geneva (from 7 to 21) and moderately in South Bristol (from an average of 12 each year for 2018 and 2019 to 20 in 2020). The number of referrals from the Towns of West Bloomfield and Richmond declined.
3. Site plans (95 referrals) and area variances (65 referrals) continue to be the most frequent referral types. The number of site plans referred has declined 18 percent while the number of area variances has remained consistent. The number of special use permits decreased 40 percent.
4. Six communities referred 18 Technical Reviews up from 13 in 2019.
5. In 2020, there were 119 class 1 referrals and 58 class 2 referrals. The number of class 2 referrals with potential to have county-wide or intermunicipal impact remained stable from 2019 to 2020; the number of class 1 referrals not likely to have county-wide or intermunicipal impacts declined by 36 percent from 2019 to 2020.
6. In 2020 2/3 of the class 2 administrative reviews (AR 2s) recommended for disapproval were related to a lot coverage, side, and/or lake/side setback area variances and 1/3 were for signage variances related to the size or number of signs.
7. The CPB voted to accept a total of 33 late referrals

Action on Referrals

1. The Board voted to recommend disapproval of 7 referrals, all use variances.
2. The Board voted to change the class of 2 referrals from class 1 to class 2 based on potential impacts along primary tourist corridors.
3. The Board voted to recommend approval with modifications for 3 referrals, two referrals had modification related to tourist corridor characteristics, one of these also has a modification related to water quality impacts. A third referral had two modifications related to minimizing potential impacts of invasive species and addressing current code violations.

Trends, Innovations, and Concerns

1. Local municipalities are encouraged to make sure their land use plans and zoning regulations for Commercial Solar Generation Facilities are suitable to guide siting and development of 100 to 1,000 acre developments.
2. Building on previous discussions of the Ontario County/CPB role in preparing for the climate crisis and creating physical and social infrastructure to make Ontario County an age friendly community, in May CPB members shared their observations of the lessons of the Covid-19 Pandemic.
3. In November, CPB had an extended discussion of the importance of local municipalities working with developers to create desirable character along primary tourist corridors as outlines in section 8.6 of the CPB By-laws and reflected in Board votes to change referral class from 1 to 2 and recommend approval with modifications.

1. Introduction

This report is submitted in fulfillment of requirements of the Ontario County Planning Board (CPB) Bylaws (Article 5) for submission of an annual report of the previous year to the Ontario County Board of Supervisors (BOS). This report provides an overview of the number of referrals by municipality, class, and type for 2020 and additional information on County Planning Board membership, attendance, activities and land use trend issues in 2020.

2. County Planning Board Membership, Staffing, and Meeting Format

In 2020 the Ontario County Planning Board is comprised of 18 member municipalities and their appointed representatives (Table 1). At its annual organizational meeting in January 2020, the Board re-elected Leonard Wildman as Chairperson and David Wink as Vice-Chairperson. During 2020 the Board welcomed 1 new member, 1 returning member, and 1 alternate member filling vacancies in the towns of Bristol and South Bristol. During the course of the year, there were also 2 re-appointments. At year end, the Board had 3 vacancies in the City of Canandaigua and the Towns of Manchester and Seneca and 2 open at-large alternate vacancies due to resignations. During 2020, Board positions were vacant 8 percent of the time. CPB would benefit from appointment of a member with business experience, ideally someone in the agricultural or hospitality sector, someone with interest in historic preservation, and/or a village resident.

Locality	Representative	
Cities (2)		
C. of Canandaigua	Thomas Lyon (resigned Nov. 5, 2020)	
C. of Geneva	Paul Passavant	
Towns (16)		
T. of Bristol	Sandy Riker (returned Feb. 13, 2020)	
T. of Canadice	Stephen Groet	
T. of Canandaigua	David Wink, Vice-Chair	
T. of East Bloomfield	Michael Woodruff	
T. of Farmington	Patti Wirth	
T. of Geneva	Stephen High (re-appointed January 23, 2020)	
T. of Gorham	Jack Dailey (re-appointed March 4, 2020)	
T. of Hopewell	Bill Namestnik	
T. of Manchester		
T. of Naples	Carol O'Brien	
T. of Phelps	Glen Wilkes	
T. of Richmond	Leonard Wildman, Chair	
T. of Seneca	Tim Marks (resigned Dec 16, 2020)	
T. of South Bristol	Albert Crofton (resigned Aug. 24, 2020) Bessie Tyrrell (appointed Nov.13, 2020)	
T. of Victor	Marty Avila	
T. of West Bloomfield	Susan Boardman	
At-Large Alternate	Matt Sousa (appointed May 25, 2020, resigned Oct. 2, 2020)	

Names in bold are representatives that also serve on a local Planning Board or Zoning Board of Appeals.

3. Changes to Staff, Ex-officio Reviewers, and Review Agency Representatives

During 2020 Senior Planner, Linda Phillips provided primary CPB support and was delegated powers of Secretary as the Director's designee with assistance from Senior Clerks, Chelsea (transferred to Public Works in January 2020) and Erin Holley (started with CPB in March 2020).

Katie Cappiello has taken over review of referrals for proper stormwater erosion control and pollution prevention with Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District and staffing changes at Ontario County Department of Public Works have resulted in the addition of Christopher May and Jack Baum as primary reviewers for county highways and sewers respectively.

4. County Planning Board and Coordinated Review Committee Meetings and Attendance

During 2020, the CPB met on the second Wednesday of each month except April at 7:00 pm. During January, February, and March the Board met as usual on the second floor of the municipal building. The Board did not meet in April due to the Covid-19 Pandemic. In May, Board meetings resumed with applicant representatives and most members attending virtually and the 3 to 4 Board members without adequate internet service or compatible devices attending in-person with screening, masks, and social distancing.

The Coordinated Review Committee (CRC) met regularly January to March. During the remainder of the year the CRC met in a similar hybrid format only in August due to the number and complexity of referrals. During 2021, CRC will continue to meet only as needed to discuss projects in more detail with applicants or their representatives and to identify outstanding questions and additional desirable information prior to consideration by the full Board.

Two CPB members attended all Board meetings. Overall attendance at Board meetings was 70 percent with 8 percent of missed meeting attendance due to Board vacancies. There was an average of 3.8 applicants/representatives/community members at full board meetings.

5. CPB Referral Activity

Number of Referrals vs. Number of Projects

NYS General Municipal Law §239 establishes which local planning board, zoning board of appeals, or elected board/council actions must be 'referred' to the County Planning Board for review.

One project (building a small retail center) may require a number of local actions such as site plan approval, area variances, and a special use permit. Though each action is part of one project (the small retail center), it is considered a separate referral to the CPB. The total number of referrals, therefore, does not represent the number of 'projects'---that number will always be less.

The number of referrals reviewed in 2020 was 279 down 15 percent from 327 referrals in 2019 but in line with the 274 referrals in 2018. The Town of Canandaigua continues to submit the largest number of referrals. The number of referrals from the Town of Victor decreased from 75 in 2019, to 40 in 2020. The number of referrals increased substantially in the Towns of Geneva (from 7 to 21) and moderately in South Bristol (from an average of 12 each year for 2018 and 2019 to 20 in 2020). The number of referrals from the Towns of West Bloomfield and Richmond declined.

Municipality	2018	2019	2020
C. Canandaigua	7	5	3
C. Geneva	8	9	7
T. Bristol	4	2	2
T. Canadice	-	1	0
T. Canandaigua	69	74	75
T. E. Bloomfield	6	9	7
T. Farmington	29	33	32
T. Geneva	7	7	21
T. Gorham	9	10	12
T. Hopewell	20	20	22
T. Manchester	5	8	5
T. Naples	2	1	1
T. Phelps	4	6	7
T. Richmond	10	18	6
T. Seneca	8	3	1
T. South Bristol	17	6	20
T. Victor	42	75	30
T. W. Bloomfield	1	12	1
V. Bloomfield	3	2	2
V. Clifton Springs	4	5	3
V. Manchester	4	6	6
V. Naples	2	5	5
V. Phelps	1	0	0
V. Rushville	1	0	0
V. Shortsville	2	0	0
V. Victor	8	6	4
OC AEB/Adj. towns	1	4	7
Totals	274	327	279

Referral Type

Site plans (95 referrals) and area variances (65 referrals) continue to be the most frequent referral types. The number of site plans referred has declined 18 percent while the number of area variances has remained consistent. The number of special use permits decreased 40 percent. The total number of subdivision referrals increased 17 percent, however, there were no subdivisions identified as major subdivision referred. The number of text and map amendments referred declined.

In recent years, the Ontario County Planning Department (OCPD) has encouraged municipalities to submit projects for Technical Review early in the project review process to define project parameters that minimize project impacts. County concerns can be addressed more cost effectively and without undue delay when identified early in the process. Projects that are referred for Technical Review must still be referred to CPB when preliminary or final site plan, special use permit, subdivision, or other applications are made. Six communities referred 18 Technical Reviews up from 13 in 2019.

Table 3. Referral Type	2018	2019	2020
Site Plan	93	116	95
Area Variance	49	65	64
Moratoria	-	2	3
Signage Permit/Sign Site Plan	7	3	-
Special Use Permit	33	41	25
Subdivision	15	14	25
Text Amendment	29	31	23
Use Variance	8	4	8
Major Subdivision	4	2	-
Map Amendment	9	7	3
Minor Subdivision	7	8	3
Technical Reviews	6	13	18
Local Laws	4	5	1
Comprehensive Plans	3	5	4
Temporary Use Permit	1	4	-
Other	4	7	1
Totals	274	327	279

Referral Classifications

Referrals are initially reviewed and classified by Ontario County Planning Department (OCPD) staff.

Class 1 referrals are those applications that have little potential for countywide or intermunicipal impacts. For these referrals, the CPB minutes include non-binding CPB, staff, and ex-officio reviewer comments for the local body's consideration before action on the application.

Class 2 referrals are those applications that have potential for significant countywide or intermunicipal impacts. This includes the cumulative impact of numerous small impacts. The CPB votes to recommend approval, approval with modification(s) {list of measures that must be met by the local board prior to taking action} or disapproval of each class 2 referral.

In 2020, there were 119 class 1 referrals and 58 class 2 referrals. The number of class 2 Board referrals with potential to have county-wide or intermunicipal impact remained stable from 2019 to 2020; the number of class 1 referrals not likely to have county-wide or intermunicipal impacts declined by 36 percent from 2019 to 2020.

Of the 28 class 2 administrative review referrals, 1/3 were to allow a number or size of sign greater than allowed by local zoning and 2/3 were for lot coverage and/or lake/side setback variances on single family homes expanded or replaced along the Lake. Such class AR 2 referrals are determined to have a potential negative countywide impact and recommended for disapproval as authorized in the CPB By-laws administrative review policies.

Table 4 summarizes the initial classification of referrals by OCPD. Table 5 summarizes the administrative review policies.

Table 4. Classification of Referrals by OCPD			
Class	2018	2019	2020
Class 1	102	187	119
Class 2	90	57	58
Administrative Review: Class 1	40	23	34
Administrative Review: Class 2	19	35	28
Exempt	10	9	15
Withdrawn	7	2	6
Technical Review	6	14	18
Total	274	327	279

Table 5 Administrative Review (AR) Policies:– Ontario County Planning Board By-Laws Appendix D

Note: Except as noted, all administrative reviews are Class 1 – Comments provided but no action.

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 the number and/or size of 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)

Occasionally, the full CPB votes to change the class of a referral. Two referrals were changed from class 1 to class 2 by vote of the full Board in 2020 in recognition of their potential for county-wide or intermunicipal impact due to gateway locations on primary tourist corridors. Both referrals elevated to class 2 were recommended for approval, one with a modification.

The CPB is increasingly rigorous in its review of use variances, directing local communities to grant them only in cases of true unique hardship. In some cases, amending the-zoning map is preferable to granting a use variance. All of the 7 referrals recommended for disapproval by CPB vote were use variances. Only 3 referrals in 2020 were subject to modifications: one related to mitigating potential traffic and water quality impacts, one required documentation of consultant with NYS DOT bicycle and pedestrian safety section regarding signage, pavement markings, or other project elements to safely accommodate proposed use along a state bike route, and one required documentation of consultation with NYS DEC

regarding mitigation potential spread of invasive species in mulch and that applicant address zoning violations and commit to operating within the limited of any approved site plan.

If a local board wishes to approve without satisfying the modification(s) put forth by the CPB or override an administrative review recommendation or Board vote for disapproval, a majority plus one vote of the local board is required.

6. CPB Operating Procedures: Late Referrals and Block Voting

The CPB continues to vote on whether to accept late referrals based on time available to staff and ex-officio members to review the project. The CPB voted to accept 33 late referrals. The only months without late referrals were May, September, and November. The CPB also occasionally votes to not accept for referral incomplete applications. During 2020, the Board voted one use variance application incomplete. This action had not been taken since 2015.

In 2020 the CPB continues the practice of block voting to streamline handling of simple class 1 referrals and to allow additional discussion of class 2 referrals, making comments to improve class 1 applications, and discussing trends and issues of county-wide significance.

7. Areas of Review

CPB review focuses on the areas of review in Article 8 of the By-laws and includes links to resources related to the following areas of review:

- Economic Resources and Tourism
- Agricultural Resources
- Other Natural Resources
- Transportation (including roads, hiking/biking/snowmobile facilities, public transit, airport, and railroads)
- Other County and State Services and Facilities
- Cultural and Historic Resources and Community Character
- Recommended Standards for Local Planning and Zoning Regulations

The CPB is sometimes entreated by concerned residents to weigh in on matters of local concern. CPB, as a public body, hears and reports all public input. Comments and recommendation on character are, however, limited to referrals that impact county-wide quality of life or tourism and avoid comments and recommendations based on question of appropriate neighborhood character.

CPB and review agencies continue to make non-binding comments regarding:

- Appropriate character of signage and lighting in non-residential development along tourist corridors.
- Need for detailed engineering analysis to document adequate stormwater management and inclusion of appropriate stormwater quality treatment.
- Alignment and spacing of access connections to maximize safety and preserve road capacity
- Impact of filling and grading changes in areas at risk of flooding.
- Consideration of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Comments on proposed local law and text amendments.

8. Trends, Innovations, and Concerns

A. Commercial Solar Generation Facilities – Ontario County has not yet seen the large scale 100 to 1,000 acre solar projects as proposed in neighboring counties, however, municipalities should review their land use plans and zoning regulations to make sure they appropriately guide location and development of such projects.

Three communities that have reviewed solar energy projects of 4-5 MW have moratoria in place to allow time to update their solar energy regulations. Changes under consideration include:

- Ensure any definitions or standards related to energy output are still relevant as technologies evolve and interconnection substations are upgraded.
- Require an escrow for legal and engineering fees.
- Eliminate the need for a bond covering the completion of construction.
- Correct inconsistencies with time frames regarding determination of abandonment and removal.
- Require decommission estimate to be prepared and stamped by a licensed engineer, estimate to exclude value of recyclable materials, and to include inflation adjustment and contingency.
- Requirement for site specific operations and maintenance and decommissioning plans and mechanisms of enforcing maintenance activities, including replacement of screening materials.
- Requiring a CESIR report documenting site feasibility as part of a complete application.

OCPD also offers the following recommendations and information regarding renewable energy projects of 20MW or more that are eligible for review under the new NYS Office of Renewable Energy permit review process.

- Adopt or update land use plans and local laws to defensibly address solar and wind siting and development.
- Adopt road use laws and battery energy storage system regulations. See NYS Guidance <https://www.nysed.gov/All%20Programs/Programs/Clean%20Energy%20Siting/Battery%20Energy%20Storage%20Guidebook>
- Assemble professional review team before single required pre-application consultation with municipality.
- To avoid approval/application of default permit conditions, municipality must raise doubt about application's ability to meet statutory criteria that would result in denial of site permit, major modifications, or imposition of substantive permit conditions to trigger an adjudicatory hearing.
- Local law can be deemed unreasonably burdensome if costs to consumers or the needs of customers outweigh benefits of the local law to the community.
- Burden of proof is on the municipality to petition for a ruling that the non-compliance with local laws is substantive and significant.

B. Text & Map Amendments

CPB commends communities that amend their codes as needed to address unclear or conflicting provisions.

C. Discussion on Lessons of Covid-19 Pandemic and Preparing for Future Disruptions of Daily Routine

Building on previous discussions of the Ontario County/CPB role in preparing for the climate crisis and creating physical and social infrastructure to make Ontario County an age friendly community, CPB members shared their observations of the current situation.

- Key identified needs observed are need for information and need for food/meals.

- Questions about who is in charge of re-opening and mask distribution.
- Lack of communications infrastructure for residents to know what is happening. Many but not all cities and towns have moved to fill the information gap, mostly on-line with some FLTV presence, and mail outreach regarding on-line and phone resources.
- Social media and on-line are great for disseminating information but not available to all.
- No awareness of County on-line resources, “town hall” presentations, FLTV briefings or role in addressing need for food, masks, etc.
- Need for collaboration to match early/stored farm crops destined for closed restaurants with those in need of food.
- Would closing some streets to vehicles contribute to ease of pedestrian social distancing in some locations?

D. Suitability of Meeting Room Ventilation

In July, Board Chairman requested OCPD staff to investigate ventilation and filtering capabilities of potential in-person meeting rooms to allow members to decide whether to attend in-person meetings once the Executive Order enabling virtual meetings expires.

E. Discussion Regarding Desirable Character along Primary Tourist corridors.

As outlined in section 8.6 of the CPB By-laws, Ontario County and local municipalities have completed numerous corridor studies which provide detailed recommendations regarding features necessary to preserve the character of primary tourist travel routes. The key principles of these studies are very consistent. Local municipalities play key roles in preserving the safety and capacity of state, county, and local roads by appropriately spacing and aligning access points; providing sidewalks and appropriate lighting and landscaping to make pedestrian use desirable; and appropriately locating buildings and parking while providing internal circulation designed to encourage pedestrian circulation and connection to adjacent uses.

In November, CPB had an extended discussion of the importance of local municipalities working with developers to create desirable character along primary tourist corridors.

9. Training for CPB and Local Elected and Appointed Officials

As listed below, OCPD organized one short training prior to the February CPB meeting, one virtual training opportunity with presenters from NYSDOS and two community workshops as part of the Age Friendly Communities Grant. Over 100 municipal, planning, and zoning board members and other interested community members attended these trainings.

- Bruce Gilman, FLCC professor emeritus and director of the Muller Field Station presented to CPB on February 12, 2020 on the Honeoye Inlet Floodplain Restoration Project.
- June 1, 2020 6:00 to 8:00 pm, joint program with Yates County and NYS Department of State to present and Avoiding Illegal Spot Zoning and Use Variances.
- November 17, 2020 joint program with Lifespan: What Does it Mean to be an Age Friendly Community?
- December 4, 2020 joint program with Ester Greenhouse of Tompkins County’s Age Friendly Center of Excellence on Creating Thriving Communities: Focus on Age Friendly Built Environment

In early 2020, OCPD announced typical spring in-person training opportunities offered by Genesee Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council (GFLRPC), Town of Canandaigua, and NYSDOS in conjunction with

area counties, and Ontario County's own Citizens Academy. During 2020, OCPD posted and circulated information on more than 24 virtual training opportunities primarily provided by NYSDOS in conjunction with regional planning councils but also provided by the NYS Preservation League, Seneca Watershed Intermunicipal Organization, Environmental Facilities Corporation/NYS Federation of Lake Associations, GFLRPC, and Monroe County.

County Planning Board members attended 104 hours of training in 2020. This does not include 116 hours of training that was rolled over by Board members from 2019. Thirteen of 15 current CPB members completed required training for 2020. Notification will be made to the two supervisors who recommended members that have not completed required 2020 training hours.

10. Future CPB Bylaws Updates

Since adoption of the new By-laws in March of 2019, the following possible revisions have been identified

- A. Chapter 4.0 – add procedures for resigning from CPB including notice to Town and CPB and statement that NYS statute requires that training hours be up-to-date for re-appointment.
- B. Section 4.2 add Wayne/Ontario Resident Engineer at NYSDOT as an ex officio member
- C. Section 6.1- mention selection of a CPB representative to the Water Resources Council as a nominating committee responsibility and an annual meeting activity
- D. Section 6.1 -consider formalizing the practicing of canvassing all members each year regarding current or future interest in serving as Chair, Vice-Chair, or Water Resources Council representative
- E. Section 7.5 A.- add to language regarding characteristics used to classify Class 2 referrals to include something about infrastructure impacts and location.
- F. Add resource links including:
 - o NYSDAM Guidelines for Solar Energy Project Construction Mitigation for Agricultural Lands <file:///C:/Users/lindapp/Downloads/NYSAGM-guidelines-for-solar-construction-mitigation-ag.pdf>
 - o Stormwater Guidance Manual for Local Officials (to 8.3.1) <https://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/9007.html>,
 - o Town and Village of Naples Reconnaissance Level Historic Resource Inventory (to 8.6.1) [,https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/27000/Naples-Historic-Survey-Report-final-copy](https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/27000/Naples-Historic-Survey-Report-final-copy)
 - o Hamlet of Port Gibson Reconnaissance Level Historic Resource Inventory <https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/26999/Port-Gibson-Historic-Survey-Report-2019>
 - o City of Canandaigua Complete Street policy https://www.canandaiguanyork.gov/vertical/sites/%7BA388F052-E1B1-4CA4-8527-A8BB46320BB9%7D/uploads/Complete_Streets_Policy.pdf
 - o Town and Village of Victor Access Management Plan (to 8.7.1) <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/20047/Victor-Access-Management-Plan-FINAL-9-17-2019>
 - o Resources for dark sky compliant lighting <https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-industry/fsa/>
 - o Resources for appropriate sign readability-American Planning Association PAS Report 580 Street Graphics and the Law 4th edition 2015 and <https://www.signazon.com/help-center/sign-letter-height-visibility-chart.aspx>. (to 8.6.1)
 - o NYSDOT standards for Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS). <https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/real-estate/repository/cevms-criteria-for-website.pdf>
 - o Airport Master Plan <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/15928/16-2019>
 - o Update on Manchester Yard Redevelopment Project Implementation activities. http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/25336/Manchester-Yard-Redev-Project-Update_9_2020pptx?bidId= (to 8.5.1)
- G. Add in Section 8.4 language regarding provision of sidewalks or trail connections from proposed subdivisions and multi-family development to promote active lifestyle and public health.

- H. Consider moving member training requirements from 4.5 under Membership to 5.2 under Responsibilities.

County Planning Board has not proceeded with examination of exemption list to decide whether it is advisable to make changes. Such changes would require local municipal board approve from all 26 municipalities in Ontario County of a new intermunicipal agreement. The Board has also not reviewed the Administrative Review Policies. The Board, without Board of Supervisor or local municipal board approval, can change these policies.

11. Planned Activities for 2021

CPB members have expressed additional interest in pre-meeting trainings related to water quality from organizations such as FLCC, Canandaigua Lake Watershed Council, and/or OCSWCA.

We anticipate scheduling additional training focused on zoning for agricultural related activities and accommodating accessory dwelling units. OCPD will also be considering additional training formats including more informal training with multiple boards in a single municipality or 2 or more communities with an interest in a particular topic or desiring hands on-training or input on specific local concerns.

OCPD staff will also continue to share information regarding likely impacts of climate change and adaptation and mitigation activities to increase resiliency and reduce such impacts.