



# Planning Board

Draft Minutes for April 14, 2010

Page #

Introduction, General Procedures, & Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies.....	2
Attendance .....	3
Other Business .....	9
Reviewed Applications <i>Note: The page numbers refer to the applicable Board action.</i>	

#-2010	Municipality	Applicant	Type	Page
42-2010	Village of Clifton Springs	Planning Board	Subdivision	17
43-2010	Town of Canadice	John & Karen Scheele	Area Variance	17
44-2010	Village of Naples	Village of Naples – Donald Brown	Text Amendment	7
45-2010	Town of Victor	Morrell Builders	Subdivision	9
46-2010	Village of Bloomfield	DHD Ventures of NY LLC	Site Plan	16
47-2010	Village of Bloomfield	DHD Ventures of NY LLC	Subdivision	16
48-2010	Town of Seneca	Ronald Stringham	Site Plan	16
49-2010	Town of Farmington	Town Board – Ronald Brand	Text Amendment	14
50-2010	Town of Farmington	Town Board – Ronald Brand	Map Amendment	14
51-2010	City of Geneva	Rakesh Patel	Site Plan	10
52-2010	City of Geneva	Zotos International, Inc.	Site Plan	4
53-2010	City of Geneva	City Council	Text Amendment	12
54-2010	Town of Canandaigua	Sally Jean Gulvin	Area Variance	17

## **- Introduction -**

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/planning/cpbsch.htm>

## **- 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 1's are applications that the CPB has formally decided have little potential intermunicipal or countywide impact. The CPB will identify such an impact for Class 2 applications 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 I, 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 \(c\)](#)

## **- 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 disapproval 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.](#)

County Planning Board Members: -

Cities:

Canandaigua - John Thompson\*

Geneva - Mary Bogin (E)

Towns:

Bristol - Thomas Neary\*

Canadice - **Stephen Groet (E)**

Canandaigua - Mary Prince\*

East Bloomfield - **Arthur Babcock\***

Farmington - Mary Neale\*

Geneva - Alan Deuel\*

Gorham - **George McCadden (E)**

Hopewell - Kirk Locus

Manchester - **Jaylene Folkins, Chair(E)**

Naples - Terrence Hopper\*

Phelps - **Glen Wilkes\***

Richmond - Bruce Campbell\*

Seneca - **Clifford Kunes\***

South Bristol - Peter Osborne\*

Victor - **John Palomaki\***

West Bloomfield - **Richard DelVecchio, Vice Chair\***

*\*Indicates attendance at the meeting. Names in bold are members that currently serve on a local Legislative body, Planning Board or ZBA.*

*(E) Indicates CPB member has been excused*

County Staff Present:

Maria Rudzinski, Sr. Planner, Ontario County Department of Planning

Linda Frasca, Administrative Assistant, Ontario County Department of Planning

Julie Gotham, Sr. Planner, Ontario County Department of Planning

Kristen Mark Hughes, Director, Ontario County Department of Planning

Guests:

Sean McCracken – Reporter – Finger Lakes Times

**Call to Order/Roll Call:** Vice Chair Richard DelVecchio called the April 14, 2010 County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:31; with Ms. Frasca doing roll call and reporting that 11 members were present meeting the requirement to establish a quorum. Let the record show the following additional CPB Members arrived after roll call as indicated below:

7:32 p.m. – Alan Deuel

7:55 p.m. – Glenn Wilkes

Total CPB Members present at the March 10, 2010 CPB meeting: 13

The actions described below are not necessarily listed in order of occurrence.

**CLASS 1 REFERRALS:**

**52- 2010 City of Geneva Planning Board Class: 1**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Zotos International, Inc.*

Property Owner: *Zotos International, Inc.*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *91.13-1-1.00*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for a 3,320' sq. addition to Zotos International 624,000' sq. manufacturing building at 300 Forge Ave. to produce powder.*

<b>Review Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Review Comment</b>
<b>Land Use</b>	The addition is part of a manufacturing facility adjoining	
<b>Community Character</b>	The addition will front on Preemption St.	This project is subject to the City's Architectural Review process.
<b>Stormwater</b>	No specific mention is made to stormwater management.	
<b>Infrastructure</b>	Public water and sewer service is available.	
<b>Traffic/Access Mgt.</b>		There is no mention of additional employees or traffic associated with this expansion.

**BOARD ACTION:** Motion made by Mary Neale, seconded by John Thompson, that application #52-2010 be retained as a Class 1 and returned to the municipality.

**Motion carried.**

**44 -2010 Village of Naples Village Board Class: 1**

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Village of Naples*

Property Owner: *Village of Naples*

Representative: *David P. Miller, Esq.*

Tax Map Parcel #: Not applicable

Brief Description: *Text amendment to allow outdoor recreation in C-1 and C-2 subject to a*

*special use permit in the Village of Naples.*

Review Area	Description	Review Comment
<b>Definition of “recreation”</b>	As stated: shall mean the pursuit of leisure time activities in an outdoor setting....	This is a very broad definition that can include everything including a campground, outdoor theatre, BMX track (non-motorized vehicles are allowed), stadiums, competitive and non-competitive sports, rock wall climbing, etc. The planning board will have a hard time saying ‘no’ to a use that doesn’t involve vehicles or guns and arrows.
<b>C-1 and C-2 Zoning Districts</b>	There size and character of the parcels in these areas varies widely. C-2 includes a large parcel of land in the southern end of the village that could be used for large scale outdoor uses such as campground, miniature golf course, multiple use activity center, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As currently drafted, there are no specific development standards (lot coverage, lighting, etc) for any recreation facilities.</li> <li>▪ Does the village want to differentiate between a commercial/noncommercial recreation area?</li> <li>▪ Does the Village want to allow multiple use facilities –For example: mini-golf, batting cages, game arcade and concession stand?</li> </ul>
<b>Primary Structure vs. Accessory Structure</b>	The following are the current definitions: Structure: “Excluding driveways and paved walkways, anything that is erected, built or constructed of parts joined together with a fixed location on the ground, or attached to something having a fixed location in or on the ground, and shall include buildings, walls or any sign, but does not include fences which do not exceed six feet.” & Accessory Use or Structure: A use or structure subordinate to the principal use of a building on the same lot and serving a purpose customarily incidental to the principal use of the lot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some outdoor recreation uses may require no fixed structures but could have bleachers, concession stands restrooms, etc.</li> <li>▪ How will ‘portable/seasonal’ recreational facilities be reviewed – basketball cages (like those that are set up at a fair) etc.</li> <li>▪ Accessory structures may be ‘larger’ than the recreation facility ---restroom, concession stand. Portable concession buildings or comfort stations.</li> </ul>

<b>Parking standards</b>	There is a standard for places of assembly – 1 space/4 seats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific standards for different recreational uses are established.</li> <li>▪ Considering the broad definition of recreation, there may be a need to have additional standards that would accommodate staff, teams, deliveries, spectators, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>§6. Gas or diesel powered vehicles</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To include other fuel sources add “motorized vehicles”</li> <li>▪ Are bicycles &amp; non-motorized dirt bikes allowed?</li> </ul>
<b>§ 8. Supervision requirement;</b>	States that planning board can establish supervision requirements. No mention of how that would be determined.	The village should check out what liability it may be assuming for requiring supervision. This provision gets away from regulating the use and impacts of land to operational issues not related to land use regulation.
<b>§11. User regulations/guidelines</b>	Requires a code of conduct, use of safety equipment, and safety guidelines.	As in comments for § 8. - Village should check on liability if it could be construed that the Village ‘approved’ a set of rules, safety equipment use, etc. These have more to do with operational issues than impacts on the use of land.
<b>§ 10 Equipment standards</b>	States that equipment purchased or provided for shall meet industry standards and lacking those, then installed in a workman like fashion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The site plan requires a stamped drawing. If an architect or engineer stamps the site plan, installation would be measured based on specifications approved in the plan.</li> <li>▪ Regulating equipment is straying from regulating the impacts of the use of land. Again, the village could be assuming considerable liability if no industry standards exist and the CEO must rely on “safe and workmanlike fashion” as an enforcement standard.</li> </ul>
<b>Time limit on special use permit</b>	§ 14 mentions ‘...three violations notices are issued within the term of the special use permit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The village should make clear whether the recreation area, as a use, is granting a permanent property right or rather is creating a ‘temporary’ right.</li> <li>▪ There is no mention as to establishing the duration of a special use permit.</li> </ul>



<b>Relevant History</b>	<p>January 15, 2010 – Town Planning Board approved sketch plan.</p> <p>February 2, 2010 – Filed for “preliminary subdivision review” before the Town PB.</p> <p>March 9, 2010 – Town PB considered preliminary subdivision approval.</p>	<p>Proposal will subdivide the remaining 14 acres of land of the Quail Ridge Subdivision. The sketch plan has been deemed complete by the Town Planning Board. 7.2 acres of total is designated as conservation easement area to meet open space requirements for Section 3 of the Quail Ridge subdivision. The remaining 6.8 acres are proposed for this current application and development.</p>
<b>Zoning</b>	<p>Residential R-2 zone and Residential Overlay District “C” designation.</p>	<p>District requires 1 lot per acre and 50 percent designation as open space (3.4 acres). Lot standards meet the requirements for an R-2 zoning district. No variances are requested.</p>
<b>Public Services</b>	<p>Public Water is available on Lane Road.</p> <p>Public Sewer is to be made available by extending service from Quail Ridge, Section 3, and Phase 2.</p> <p>Lots will have gas service, electric and telephone.</p>	
<b>Site Access</b>	<p>Access is proposed off Lane Road Extension with a proposed 20’-wide dedicated road and cul-de-sac to serve all six (6) lots.</p> <p>Road to be constructed to required Town Standards and offered for dedication.</p> <p>Sidewalks will be provided along lot frontage on Lane Road.</p>	
<b>Stormwater/Drainage</b>	<p>Storm Sewers have been designed to discharge to existing stormwater facility to the West.</p>	

<b>Open Space</b>	Technically meets acreage requirements of 50 percent.  The open space is configured as extensions of the residences back yards making them 'large lots. There is no mention of what legal tool (deed restriction, etc.) will be used to assure that the open space is used in the manner desired by the Town.	Proposed area is established to provide an effective buffer from proposed house sites, the existing conservation area to the west and the surrounding older residential neighborhood. Site plan should specifically describe management limits required for this area so that all potential home owners are aware that this is a conservation buffer and not to be planted in grass or other non-native vegetation. This would be an excellent opportunity to provide an afforested area by the developer prior to construction and to limit construction activities within the building envelope. Absent such protections, the designation is likely to have no effect to preserve this area as designated in the plan.
<b>Historic Preservation</b>	No issues.	
<b>Community Character</b>		Proposed design is consistent with the existing Quail Ridge Subdivision.
<b>Parking and Traffic – Public Safety</b>		Meets all code requirements for single family housing.

**BOARD ACTION: Motion made by Mary Neale, seconded by Arthur Babcock, that application #45-2010 be retained as a Class 1 and returned to the municipality with the above comments.**

**Motion carried.**

**CLASS 2 REFERRALS**

**51-2010 City of Geneva City Council Class: 2**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Rakesh Patel*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Bradley Prozeller*

Tax Map Parcel #: *90.76-1-3.200*

Brief Description: *Site plan for Redemption Center (formerly a diner) at 140 N. Exchange St. No proposed change in the existing building footprint. Improvements: two signs, landscaping, and location of a storage trailer screened by a privacy fence to rear of building.*

<b>Review Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Review Comment</b>
--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

<p>Site plan for Redemption Center (formerly a diner) at 140 N. Exchange St. No proposed change in the existing building footprint. Improvements: two signs, landscaping, and installation of a storage trailer screened by a privacy fence to rear of building.</p>		
<p><b>RT. 14 Gateway Corridor Aesthetics</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The site does not contain nor is adjacent to a registered historic site.</li> <li>▪ The applicant proposes a landscaped berm in which a sign will be placed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This project is located along State Rte 14 north of the city of Geneva—a primary corridor for visitors to the Finger Lakes region. Redevelopment of this property is an opportunity to implement recommendations of the Rt. 14 Corridor study regarding improving the streetscape and its overall visual appearance.</li> <li>▪ The applicant may have to apply for a sign variance per GMC Chapter 350, Section 30 (B)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing/ Neighboring Land Uses</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Parcels: vacant 785 sq ft building</li> <li>▪ North: Residential/Commercial/Industrial</li> <li>▪ East: Rail Line &amp; Geneva Industrial Park</li> <li>▪ South: Strip Mall</li> <li>▪ West: Residential/Commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal fits in with the surrounding uses.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Land Cover</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Currently, the parcel has a building, gravel parking area and a wooded area in the rear of the parcel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No changes to the exiting gravel or building foot prints are proposed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Zoning</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ F1 – Industrial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City ZBA has determined that the proposed redemption center is an allowable use within the F1 district</li> </ul>
<p><b>Traffic/Access Mgt.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An exiting curb cut along State Rte 14 will be used to access the property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City investigate opportunities to make access management improvements to this parcel.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stormwater Drainage</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With no changes to the exiting gravel parking area and building footprint the impact on stormwater drainage should be minimal.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lighting</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The applicant has not indicated if exterior light will be added to the structure or signage.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Agriculture</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This parcel is not in an agricultural district, nor does it contain prime ag soils</li> </ul>	

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Clifford Kunes, seconded by Mary Prince, the Board recommends approval of application #51-2010 as a Class 2 and returned to the municipality with the above comments.**

**Motion carried.**

**53 -2010 City of Geneva City Council Class: 2**

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Geneva City Council*

Property Owner:

Representative: *David L. Foster, City Attorney*

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Text amendment to allow renewable energy facilities by special permit in all zoning districts.*

Review Area	Description	Review Comment
<p>The City of Geneva is proposing a text amendment to their zoning code to that allows a renewable energy facility in any zoning district subject to receipt of a special use permit.</p>		
<p><b>Definition</b></p>	<p>The proposed law defines renewable energy facility as:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A renewable energy facility is a facility that generates energy from natural source such as sunlight, wind, rain, tides and geothermal heat, which are renewable (naturally replenished).</p>	<p>The definition, by saying ‘<u>such as</u>’ is very broad and could include facilities not envisioned by the city. For example NYSERDA uses: “Renewable energy is defined as energy from resources that are not depletable or are naturally replenished when used at sustainable levels. Renewable energy resources included here are hydropower, solar, wind, biomass, ocean, and landfill gas.”<sup>1</sup> It goes on to include fuel cells.</p>
<p><b>Differentiation of facilities by size or type.</b></p>	<p>All facilities are considered the ‘same’ from a regulatory standpoint. Solar panels on a residence are reviewed in the same manner that a 300’ wind generating facility.</p>	<p>The city could consider a different permitting structure for small, residential scale facilities vs. large scale projects. Some facilities may only need a building permit such as a residential geothermal heat pump, passive solar swimming pool heater, etc. Others, such as a biomass fuel plant or wind farm should require a more detailed review.</p>

<sup>1</sup> NYSERDA State Energy Plan Section 3, pg.3-40 <http://www.nyserdera.org/sep/sepsection3-3.pdf>



<p><b>Zoning</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Local Law states, “Currently, there is no land zoned LC Land Conservation District on the Official Zoning Map.” Draft Zoning Map lists A-80, RR-80, RS-25, R-1-10, R-1-15, R-7.2, R-2, RMF, RB, NB, GB, LI, GI, T.L. Sect. 278, PD, IZ, MTOD.</li> <li>• The AUO Adult Use Entertainment Establishment Overlay District is not represented on the Official Zoning Map as it should be according to 165-14,A,2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town may want to consider maintaining this district for future scenarios. Even though it is not currently used, it may be an important distinction based on future, unpredictable development trends.</li> <li>• The Town may want to review other “underused” districts (ex: AUO, according to the Official Zoning Map) for possible repeal or revision.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State and Federal Protections</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Local Law states, “The Town Board finds that the protection of the Town’s natural resource features that are identified in this section are adequately protected by regulations in place elsewhere in the Town Code by administration and enforcement of federal and state law; and by established environmental protection standards and procedures that are applicable to all zoning districts.</li> <li>• The Town Comprehensive Plan mentions Environmentally Sensitive Areas as a priority. These include floodplains, freshwater wetlands, and areas susceptible to ponding, bedrock outcroppings, steep slopes, drumlins, mature woodlots, historic sites, scenic corridors and scenic vistas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State and Federal regulations may not be stringent enough as development continues.</li> <li>• The Town may want to consider adding and maintaining a certain level of local protection regarding natural resources above and beyond the State and Federal protections.</li> <li>• How are environmentally sensitive areas such as mature woodlots, scenic corridors, and scenic vistas protected at a State and Federal level? Do these levels provide enough protection to fulfill the town vision?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Zoning Code Language</b></p>	<p>Draft Local Law states, “This Section of the Town Code is confusing and if allowed to remain would be unnecessarily cumbersome to administer and enforce.”</p> <p>On 3/17/10, R. Brand (Dir. Of Planning and Dev.) provided an extensive review of the current LC code language, pointing out the language deficiencies in each section. He also provides recommendations for improvement in certain sections.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than altogether repealing the confusing language and intent of this section, it may be prudent to, first, fix it (by rewriting the section based on the deficiencies uncovered by R. Brand), second, repeal the current section, and, third, replace it with the rewrite.</li> <li>• Simple fixes may be to better define “development”, “steep slopes”, “areas prone to flooding”, “recurring basis” as pointed out by R. Brand.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sources of Data</b></p>	<p>Draft Local Law states, “The basis for the determination of LC Land Conservation District boundaries is based upon studies, maps, and documents that are outdated, that are no longer available, or that do not exist.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Planning may be able to assist with the location of up-to-date studies, maps, and documents in order to produce accurate map boundaries. (Much of this data is now publicly available on the county’s ONCOR web site.)</li> </ul>

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion by John Palomaki, seconded by Glen Wilkes, the Board recommends approval of application #49-2010 as a Class 2 and returned to the municipality with the above comments and the following modifications.**

Based on the County Planning Board’s interest in the protection of the county’s natural features (See Article 8 Sec. 2.4) and its concern that repeal of this local law not leave the natural resources of the Town of Farmington without appropriate protections the following should be undertaken prior to repeal of the local law:

1. Prepare an analysis of regulatory protection measures (i.e.: a table, etc.) listing the Environmentally Sensitive Area that is a priority for protection in the Town’s comprehensive plan (which includes floodplains, freshwater wetlands, and areas susceptible to ponding, bedrock outcroppings, steep slopes, drumlins, mature woodlots, historic sites, scenic corridors and scenic vistas) and the state or federal regulation that provides regulatory protection of that resource. If no other measure except SEQR is available, the standard which a local board should use to determine level of significance should be identified.
2. Consult with the town’s planning and zoning boards and other advisory boards after the analysis is complete and prior to repeal of the law.

**Motion carried with 12 ayes and 1 nay by Terrence Hopper.**

**50 -2010                      Town of Farmington    Town Board                      Class: 2**

Type: *Map Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Farmington Town Board*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Ron Brand*

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Adoption of the Official Zoning Map of the Town of Farmington necessitated to correct procedural flaws in previous map amendment*

The Town of Farmington is adopting an updated zoning map. This map has been reformatted by the Ontario County Planning Department and reviewed by town staff to ensure its accuracy. It is the understanding of the Planning Department that ALL recommended revisions were previously adopted. The town has indicated that they would like the map readopted to ensure proper procedures have been followed.

**BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mary Neale, seconded by John Palomaki, the Board recommends approval of application #50-2010 as a Class 2 and returned to the municipality.**

**Motion carried.**

**48 -2010                      Town of Seneca    Planning Board                      Class: 2**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Ronald Stringham*

Property Owner: *Steve Seely*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: 101.20-1-14.100

Brief Description: *Six site plan approvals for temporary use permit for food service trailer in Hamlet of Flint on Rt. 5 and 20.*

Review Area	Description	Review Comment
	<p>A seasonal 7'x11' food service trailer (hot dog stand) is not allowed based on the current zoning. The landowner requested an interpretation from the ZBA if the trailer would be considered an allowable temporary use.</p> <p>The ZBA determined it was a temporary use and the applicant submitted six temporary use permit requests for site plan approval to the planning board. The applicant proposes to prepare and sell food from the trailer. Patrons could either eat outside or inside the building which had previously been a convenience store/restaurant. If granted, the use would run from April 27<sup>th</sup> to October 23, 2010.</p>	
<b>Current Zoning</b>	The project is located in the C-1 Mixed Use District though is not an allowed permanent use.	<p>The town should consider reviewing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The C-1 District to determine if it reflects the type of development desired in the hamlet setting as characterized in the District's purpose and intent statement.</li> <li>▪ The temporary use regulations should be reviewed.</li> <li>▪ Allowing six consecutive temporary use permits sets a precedent that the Board may not want to follow in the future.</li> <li>▪ If temporary food service trailers are a desirable use, that the zoning code should be revised to allow them in specified zoning districts under certain conditions.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use/Agriculture</b>	There are currently two separate buildings on the site. The parcel to the east is in Agriculture and in Ag. 6. The parcel. A private residence is to the west.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The building had previously been used as a convenience store/ice cream stand.</li> <li>▪ The adjoining ag parcel has been used as a corn maze and open to the public.</li> </ul>
<b>Rte 5 &amp; 20: Gateway Corridor</b>	The proposed food stand will be located immediately west of the eastern building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As a temporary use, the trailer's appearance will not result in a permanent change to the character of the corridor if it is removed and not allowed to become a 'permanent seasonal use'.</li> <li>▪ Art. XI §105.0 Landscaping, Buffering, Screening establishes landscape standards for projects in C-1.—minimum 15% of site landscaped excluding lawn areas. No Landscape plan is included.</li> </ul>
<b>Stormwater</b>	The site plan indicates a catch basin located behind the eastern building.	The trailer is occupies 77' sq. and should not have a significant impact on drainage.
<b>Infrastructure</b>	Public water is available. The eastern building has a septic system.	

<b>Traffic/Access Mgt.</b>	There are no designated entrances/exists to this parcel.	Unregulated access points to this parcel can result in unsafe traffic movements. The Town participated in a Rt. 5&20 Corridor Management plan -- See "Sec. 2.2 Traffic Calming" The Town is encouraged to adopt access management regulations.
----------------------------	--	--

**BOARD ACTION:** On a motion by Terrence Hopper, seconded by Bruce Campbell, the Board recommends approval of application #48-2010 as a Class 2 and returned to the municipality with the above comments and recommendation as follows:

**Recommendation:** Town should revisit their zoning code use permits and seasonal regulations  
**Motion carried.**

**WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

**46 -2010 Village of Bloomfield Planning Board Class: I**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *DHD Ventures of NY LLC*

Property Owner: *DHD Ventures of NY LLC*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Site plan for two six unit buildings known as The Elms in the Village of Bloomfield on a 12 acre site at Elm and Main T.*

**Referral Number:** 46-2010, 47-2010

**Referring Agency:** Village of Bloomfield

**Application Type:** Site Plan (46), Subdivision (47)

**Referral Classification:** Class II

**Address:** No address; at the corner of Elm Street and East Main Street in V. of Bloomfield (Parcel A: 68.13-1-8.100; Parcel B: 68.13-1-16.100)

**47 - 2010 Village of Bloomfield Planning Board Class: I**

Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *DHD Ventures of NY LLC*

Property Owner: *DHD Ventures of NY LLC*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Subdivision to allow construction of two six unit buildings known as "The Elms" in the Village of Bloomfield on a 12 acre site at Elm and Main T.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND REFERRALS NOT REQUIRING REVIEW (EX)**

**54 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Zoning Board of Appeals                      Class: AR**

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Sally Jean Gulvin*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *98.15-59.000*

Brief Description: *Area variance for side setback for residence at 3482 Sandy Beach Dr. adjoining Canandaigua Lake in the Town of Canandaigua.*

**43 -2010                      Town of Canadice   Zoning Board of Appeals                      Class: EX**

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *John & Karen Scheele*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *174.00-1-55.000*

Brief Description: *Area variance for addition to single family home.*

**42 -2010                      Village of Clifton Springs   Planning Board                      Class: EX**

Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Village of Clifton Springs*

Property Owner: *Steve LeRoy*

Representative: *Jeff Graff, Esq.*

Tax Map Parcel #: *34.17-1-66 LC & 34.17-1-69 R2*

Brief Description: *Two lot subdivision.*

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Minutes:**

**February 10, 2010 minutes** – Due to four (4) CPB members (Neale, Prince, DelVecchio, and Palomaki) abstained from voting on the approval of the February 10, 2010 meeting minutes and therefore a quorum was no longer available the matter was tabled till the May 12, 2010 CPB meeting.

**March 10, 2010 minutes** – Motion to approve the March 10, 2010 minutes as presented made by Mary Neale and seconded by John Thompson. Motion carried with P. Osborne, Clifford Kunes, and Arthur Babcock abstaining.

**Water Resource Council Update:** John Palomaki reported the WRC met on Friday, 3/12/2010 and provided a

handout on the topics discussed.

**Historic Preservation Committee Update:** J. Palomaki briefly reported that the Historic Resources Committee presented their finding to the County Historians on 4/10/2010 and shared that the historians were very interested the committee's findings. L. Withrow, Sr. Planner will follow up with the area historians and will update will the CPB in the near future. At the request of the Town of South Bristol the H.P.C. will present to the town board in the near future.

**Agricultural Enhancement Board Update:** M. Rudzinski shared that the AEB had met on 4/13/10. Major topic of discussion was the creation of PDR program for Ontario County. A sub-committee was created to work on outlining a PDR process for Ontario County

**Upcoming Training Events:** M. Rudzinski shared upcoming training events available to CPB members and stated that sign up forms are available upon request. Ms. Rudzinski presented the option for CPB members to meet for informal training each month – one (1) hour earlier (6:30 p.m.) – NYMIR training series. Training can be done as a tutorial using office tools. CPB members agreed with Ms. Rudzinski's suggestion and felt it is a good way to achieve 8 hours of required training.

Additional Information: Vice Chair R. DelVecchio shared that the 4/14/10 meeting was Alan Deuel's last meeting. Mr. DelVecchio shared that Mr. Deuel insight would be very much missed by all.

Mr. DelVecchio and Mr. Hughes shared that the City of Canandaigua is holding a meeting tomorrow evening at the Hurley Building regarding the proposed lakefront development and that all CPB members were invited to attend.

**Adjournment:** Being no further business for discussion **motion to adjourn the 4/14/2010 was made by John Thompson seconded by Alan Deuel. Motion unanimously carried.** The 4/14/2010 CPB meeting adjourned 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Linda R. Frasca*

Administrative Assistant