



# Planning Board

## Draft Minutes for August 11, 2010

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction, General Procedures, & Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies.....	2
Attendance.....	3
Referrals.....	4
Other Business.....	19

### **Reviewed Applications** *Note: The page numbers refer to the applicable Board action .*

<b>Ref. #</b>	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Page</b>
137	T. Canadice	Thomas Wicker	1	6
138	T. Canadice	Thomas Wicker	1	6
132	T. Manchester	Robert Burkwit	1	7
134	T. Seneca	Seneca Energy II	1	9
141	C. Canandaigua	David Geneco	2	10
140	T. Canandaigua	Jeff LaDue	2	Withdrawn
145	T. Canandaigua	Town Board	2	13
130	T. Farmington	Kessler Family LLC	2	15
128	T. Victor	Bluestone Creek LLC	2	Withdrawn

**- 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 A Geneva - Mary Bogin P

Towns:

Bristol - Thomas Neary E Canadice - **Stephen Groet** P  
Canandaigua Mary Prince P East Bloomfield - Arthur Babcock E

-  
Farmington **Mary Neale** P Geneva - Howard E. Meaker P

-  
Gorham - **George McCadden** P Hopewell - Kirk Locus P  
Manchester **Jaylene Folkins,** E Naples - Terrance Hopper P  
**Chair**

Phelps - **Glen Wilkes** P Richmond Bruce Campbell P

Seneca - **Clifford Kunes** P South Bristol Peter Osborne P

Victor - **John Palomaki** P West Bloomfield **Richard DelVecchio, Vice** P  
**Chair**

*Names in bold are members that currently serve on a local Legislative body, Planning Board or ZBA.*

*(P) Indicates present at the meeting, (E) indicates CPB member has been excused – (A) absent without notification.*

County Staff Present:

Maria Rudzinski, Sr. Planner, Ontario County Department of Planning  
Linda Frasca, Administrative Assistant, Ontario County Department of Planning

Guests: Karl Essler, Douglas C. McCord; George VanGelder for R. Burkwit, Ted Mayhood, Thomas & Tanya Wicker.

Call to Order/Roll Call: Chair Jaylene Folkins called the August 11, 2010 County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.; with Ms. Frasca doing roll call and reporting that 13 members were present meeting the requirement to establish a quorum.

Let the record show the following additional CPB Member(s) arrived after roll call as indicated below:

7:34 p.m. – Mary Bogin

7:37 p.m. – Glen Wilkes

**Total CPB Members present at the July 14, 2010 CPB meeting: 15**

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

Class 1 Referrals

**137 - 2010 Town of Canadice Thomas Wicker Site Plan Class 1**  
**138 - 2010 Town of Canadice Thomas Wicker Special Use Permit Class 1**

**REFERRAL NUMBER: 137 & 138 - 2010 LINKS**

**REFERRING AGENCY:** Town of Canadice Planning Board  
**APPLICATION TYPE:** #137-Site Plan #138 Special Use Permit  
**CLASSIFICATION:** Class 1  
**SITE ADDRESS:** 9369 Ace Road  
**TAX MAP NO.:** 163.00-1-14.200

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The property owner owns adjoining property in the Towns of Richmond and Canadice. The Canadice property is land locked and has no public road access. The property owner wishes to operate a sawmill on the Canadice property and the move them to a kiln and workshop area on the Richmond property. Installation of the sawmill on the Richmond property will not meet setback requirements.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

Acres	6 Acres	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use	Vacant Land	Public Water	No
Land Cover	Forested	Public Sewer	No
Zoning	Rural	Site Access	Ace Road

**Site Comments** • Sawmill will be operated with a wooded area approx. 800 feet from the closest residential structure

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	Middle Honeoye Creek	NYS DEC	No
Flood Zone	No	NWI	No
Aquifer	No	Hydric Soils	No
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	Slow	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	Medium	Prime Ag Soils	No
Slope	3-8 Percent	Ag District	No

**Environmental Comments**

**COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS**

<b>Land Use-Cover</b>		<b>Historical Site</b>	
North	Residential/Forested	National	No
South	Forested	State	No
East	Forested	Local	No
West	Forested		
<b>Scenic Views</b>		<b>Transportation Corridor</b>	
From Site	No	CPB Gateway	No
To Site	No	Corridor Study	No

**Comments**

## Class 1 Referrals

SITE PLAN REVIEW	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An acoustical test has been performed on the sawmill unit. Inside of the structure decibel levels reach 91.5db (the equivalent of a noisy urban street) however at all property lines the decibel levels drop to around 41db.</li> <li>• Noise could be a potential problem in a rural setting. The property owner should address noise issue/concerns prior to final decision being rendered.</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic &amp; Circulation</b>	
Access Management Emergency Vehicle Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sawmill will be accessed via a driveway located along Ace Rd in the Town of Richmond. This existing driveway will be extended to reach the location of the sawmill.</li> <li>• Driveway should be improved to allow emergency vehicles to easily reach the sawmill site.</li> <li>• Use of drive should be limited to activities related to the processing related to the woodworking business conducted by the resident landowner.</li> </ul>
Site Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Pedestrian Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Features</b>	
Stormwater Mgmt.	If construction will disturb an acre or greater, the applicant must comply with the requirements of the NYS SPDES GP 010-001 for stormwater discharges. Information can be found at <a href="http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/43133.html">http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/43133.html</a>
Open Space/Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Landscaping & Buffering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sawmill will be surrounded by mature forested lands and will not be seen from any public road.</li> </ul>
<b>Code Compliance</b>	
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project meets all setback requirements.</li> <li>• Sawmill can not be installed in the Town of Richmond because it does not meet setback requirements.</li> </ul>
Lot Size/Dimensional requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This parcel does not meet the minimum frontage requirements of 250'. The need for an area variance should be investigated.</li> <li>• If Timber Harvesting is to take place on this or surrounding properties section 120-82 of the Town Code should be followed.</li> </ul>
Special Use Permit	A sawmill is not listed as a use requiring a special use permit. There is no other use on this parcel. The Rural District allows all uses except those prohibited, subject to a special use, or accessory use.
Notification of Adjoining Municipality	Note—This project is subject to Sec. 239 nn of NYS General Municipal Law which requires notification of another locality of a proposed land use action that is within 500' of the proposed project.
Other comments	<p>It's recommended that the planning board incorporate specific standards for the type, scale, and intensity of use is being approved to avoid future ambiguity of what is allowed on the site should the owner change the operation. The following is recommended, at a minimum, to be addressed/delineated in the site plan approval document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The local planning board should require that the area on the parcel subject to the site plan approval be delineated to avoid any misunderstanding regarding where the sawmill and related activities can take place on the site—'development envelop.'</li> <li>▪ Sufficient detail on the type, size of sawmill, location of outside storage, etc.</li> <li>▪ Mitigation measures to minimize impacts on residences such as hours of operation, noise limits, etc.</li> <li>▪ Specify type of commercial activity –i.e. processing wood for personal business use.</li> </ul>

Class 1 Referrals

➔ **Board Action:** *Citing a lack of potential for countywide or intermunicipal impact Peter Osborne made a motion that was seconded by John Palomaki to abstain from making a formal recommendation on application 137-2010 and 138-2010 and to return them with comments to the referring agency.*

*Motion carried with a vote of 14 with 1 abstention (Stephen Groet).*

**132-2010      Town of Manchester      Robert Burkwit      Class 1**

**REFERRAL NUMBER:      132-2010      LINKS**

**REFERRING AGENCY:**      Town of Manchester Planning Board  
**APPLICATION TYPE:**      Site Plan  
**CLASSIFICATION:**      Class 1  
**SITE ADDRESS:**      2896 State Rt 96  
**TAX MAP No.:**      33.00-1-42.210

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The property owner proposes to expand the existing warehouse/shop building located on the property. This 32' x 48' (1536 sq ft) addition would take place to the north of the existing building and will have minimal visual impact on State Rt 96.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS			
Acres	6	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use	Commercial/Residential	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Disturbed/Scrub	Public Sewer	No
Zoning	Commercial	Site Access	St Rt 96
<b>Site Comments</b>			
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS			
<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	Canandaigua Outlet	NYS DEC	No
Flood Zone	No	NWI	Yes
Aquifer	No	Hydric Soils	Yes
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	Rapid-Slow	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	Low	Prime Ag Soils	Yes
Slope	Simple	Ag District	No
<b>Environmental Comments</b> • Expansion of the existing facility will not impact the Wetland area located on the site.			

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS			
<b>Land Use-Cover</b>		<b>Historical Site</b>	
North	NYS Thruway	National	No
South	Vacant & Ag	State	No
East	Vacant & Ag	Local	No
West	Manufactured Home Park		
<b>Scenic Views</b>		<b>Transportation Corridor</b>	

Class 1 Referrals

From Site	No	CPB Gateway	Yes - State Rt 96
To Site	No	Corridor Study	Yes - State Rt 96
<b>Comments:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rt. 96 and the NY Thruway are important travel and tourist corridors that contribute to the visual character of the county. This is an opportunity for the improvement of visual appearance of the site and the streetscape.</li> <li>Additional buffering of the residential land use to the west is recommended.</li> </ul>			
<b>SITE PLAN REVIEW</b>			
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
Lighting		• No specifics provided	
Signage		• No specifics provided	
Noise		• No specifics provided	
<b>Traffic &amp; Circulation</b>			
Access Management		• Access to the site is through an existing curb cut that serves both this commercial business and a single residence.	
Site Circulation		• N/A	
Parking		• N/A	
Pedestrian Access		• N/A	
<b>Natural Features</b>			
Stormwater Mgmt.		• No Stormwater Management plan was submitted	
Open Space/Recreation		• N/A	
Landscaping & Buffering		• This site is buffered from State Rt 96 by mature vegetation and a residential structure.	
<b>Code Compliance</b>			
Zoning		• The town has determined the commercial use located on this property is the primary use and conforms to the allowable uses in the C-1 district.	
Setbacks		• Setback requirements have been meet.	
Lot Size		• Minimum lot size has been met.	
<b>Additional Comments</b>			
<p>The site plan should also delineate where outdoor storage area is allowed.          The parcel is visible from Rt. 96 and the Thruway—which are major travel corridors. Opportunities for improving the visual appearance of the site and Rt. 96 streetscape should be considered.</p>			



**Board Action: Citing a lack of potential for countywide or intermunicipal impact Glen Wilkes made a motion that was seconded by Bruce Campbell to abstain from making a formal recommendation on application 132-2010 and to return it to the referring agency with comments.**

**Motion unanimously carried.**

**134 - 2010 Town of Seneca Planning Board Class: 1**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Class 1 Referrals

Applicant: *Seneca Energy II*

Property Owner: *Ontario County*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *102.00-1-35.111*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for existing building alteration and site construction to add an additional CAT 3516 engine-generator set and ancillary equipment at the Ontario County Solid Waste Management Facility in the Town of Seneca.*

<p>The applicant seeks to alter the existing landfill gas to electricity facility at the Ontario County Landfill in order to add an additional CATS 3516 engine-generator set and ancillary equipment. The expansion would be located on the east side of the building and have a footprint of approximately 1225 square feet. Within the overall site, the facility is located adjacent to Routes 5 &amp;20, north of the proposed Stage 8 wrap-around of the landfill. The engine will be surrounded by a 10 foot wall.</p>		
Review Area	Description	Review Comment
<b>Existing/ Neighboring Land Uses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site: Ontario County Landfill</li> <li>▪ North: Agriculture, Vacant, Single Family</li> <li>▪ South: Landfill</li> <li>▪ East: Wetlands</li> <li>▪ West: Landfill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ These engines reportedly produce minimal noise; one additional engine is not likely have a discernible impact on ambient noise levels—particularly given noise already generated by 5 &amp;20 and landfill operations</li> <li>▪ Air quality impacts have been reviewed and approved by DEC.</li> </ul>
<b>Soils/Land Cover</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Located on soils with moderate permeability, low erodability, and prime agricultural value.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The soil conditions appear suitable for proposed use.</li> </ul>
<b>Agriculture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This site is located on prime agricultural soils.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Although this will be placed on land with prime agricultural soils, given adjacent uses it is highly unlikely this location would ever be used for agriculture.</li> </ul>
<b>Zoning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ M-1: General Industrial District (Article IX, §55)</li> <li>▪ Article XII: Requirements applying to all Districts. Section A.2 requires at least 20% of the site shall be landscaped in industrial areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The use meets setback requirements.</li> <li>▪ Pursuant to §107.0 Air Quality, the applicant has obtained necessary permits from DEC.</li> <li>▪ The site plan does not indicate any plans for vegetative buffering as is required in Article XII. See comments under landscaping</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure (water, sewer, drainage)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pursuant to the application, existing stormwater swales shall be reconstructed as necessary to complete the stormwater collection system.</li> <li>▪ Upon completion of work, all disturbed areas shall be topsoiled (4 inches min), seeded, and mulched.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<b>Signage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No signage is proposed</li> </ul>	

Class 1 Referrals

<p><b>Lighting</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ §111.0: Lighting.</li> <li>▪ There will be one 100 watt fixture located on the eastern exterior face of the building. This fixture is the same as other exterior fixtures on the existing building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<p><b>Appearance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The exterior of the building will be covered with split faced concrete block with a wall shutter.</li> <li>▪ The expansion will be the same height as the existing buildings, approximately 17' (excl supply fan height)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
<p><b>Landscaping</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ §110.0A.2.c requires that for industrial uses, twenty percent of the site shall be landscaped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The site plan does not indicate any plans for buffering. However, none of the existing building is buffered, and it may look out of place to add shrubbery only around the addition.</li> <li>▪ The Town may consider requiring the applicant to make improvements to the vegetative strip (which is currently in poor condition) along 5 &amp; 20, which is likely a more effective visual buffer anyway. This strip is within the 15 acres leased by IES from the County and it may already be their obligation to maintain it.</li> </ul>



**Board Action: Citing a lack of potential for countywide or intermunicipal impact Glen Wilkes made a motion that was seconded by John Palomaki to abstain from making a formal recommendation on application 134-2010 and to return it to the referring agency with comments.**

**Motion unanimously carried with a vote of 14 with 1 abstention (Clifford Kunes).**

Class 2 Referrals

**141-2010 City of Canandaigua City Council Class: 2**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *David Genecco*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Doug McCord, Landscape, Steve Goldman*

Tax Map Parcel #: *98.07-1-1.2*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for Phase II of Steamboat Landing Hotel and Conference Center, 205 Lakeshore Dr. in the City of Canandaigua.*

The Canandaigua City Council made a negative determination of significance on 7/2/2009 on this project, and approved the modifications to the PUD site plan originally approved for this site in 1990 as modified in 1998. This approval involved changes in the size, location, and design of the hotel and conference center, and reduced the overall size of the proposed facilities. In November, 2009, the site plan approval was further modified to split the project into two phases. In December 2009 the site plan for phase I was referred to the County Planning Board as application 197-2009, and included construction of a 6-story, 99 room hotel including exercise, spa, office, & service rooms. Phase I also included replacing the existing seasonal 12 slip dock with a permanent dock that can accommodate 30 boats which will be owned by the City of Canandaigua. The hotel and restaurant in Phase I will be served by 179 parking spaces (a reduction from the existing 256, 103 of which are owned by the City of Canandaigua).

The present site plan application for Phase II involves the acquisition of an adjacent 5.4 acre parcel which will be used for construction of 324 additional parking spaces, the conference center, and swimming pool. Of the 5.4 acre acquisition, 2.064 acres with 123 parking spaces will be deeded to the City of Canandaigua contiguous to the lakefront property the City already has title to. The remainder of the acquisition will become part of the hotel, restaurant, and convention center property including an additional 201 parking spaces. If the project was not a PUD, the site plan would not meet the city's parking space requirements. A second curb cut onto Lakeshore Drive is proposed at the extreme eastern end of the property, approximately 250 ft. to the east of the existing curb cut.

At its June, 2009 meeting, the CPB reviewed the preliminary site plan for the entire project which did not include the acquisition of the adjacent 5.4 acre parcel and relied upon off-site parking to support the proposed hotel, restaurant, and conference center use. At that time, the CPB recommended denial of the application. Many of the County Planning Board's comments have been addressed in the current application. Listed below are those comments in italics, followed by non-italicized brown text summarizing any changes that address each issue in the current site plan:

1. *This project highlights the need for the City to formally develop a long term strategy/study that addresses parking, access, and traffic flow for the entire lakefront area.* **No new information submitted as part of this application.**
2. *The City is strongly encouraged to work with the applicant and other stakeholders to scope out a full traffic study that includes potential impacts to Routes 5 and 20 as well as other already busy intersections along Lakeshore Dr.* **The city hired an independent traffic engineer (SRF Associates) to evaluate the traffic analysis conducted by Stantec Engineering. The traffic analysis was extended to Route 5 & 20 and Muar St. intersection. NYS Dept. of Transportation traffic counts and seasonal adjustments were used along with national trip generation standards to estimate traffic flows at other intersections in the region which clearly show that the impact is below the nationally recognized threshold requiring further study (for example, at the Lakeshore Drive and State Rt 364 intersection, where signalization and turning lanes already exist).**
3. *How much parking will be off site at peak usage? Will shuttle transportation be needed for only employees or customers as well? It seems as though the need for off site shuttles would discourage anyone looking to use that facility for a large event.* **Off site parking has been eliminated from the proposal for both Phase I and Phase II. The proposed acquisition of an adjacent 5.4 acre parcel is proposed as part of Phase II. That acquisition will provide 332 additional parking spaces.**

## Class 2 Referrals

4. *Formal agreements for offsite parking should be completed before final approval is given. Off site parking is no longer proposed as part of the project.*
5. *The City council is asked to defer as much as possible to the Planning Council, when determining what additional information may be needed for a complete site plan review. The City Zoning Law requires a multiple stage referral to both the City Planning Commission and the County Planning Board.*
6. *There is concern that a negative declaration of significance may limit options for a complete site plan review. On July 2, 2009 the City Council did make a negative determination of significance for both phases of the project, which was amended to reflect the current project changes in November 2009.*
7. *There is a considerable concern that one egress for a facility of this size is insufficient, especially for emergency access. An emergency vehicle only entrance has been proposed just to the west of the sidewalk leading from the site to the lagoon park trail to provide a second means of emergency vehicle access to the site.*
8. *There is also concern that the queuing distance at the entrance may be insufficient. As part of the work performed by the independent traffic engineer retained by the city, queuing distances at the various existing turning lanes (called throat or stacking lengths) were checked and verified as sufficient as they presently exist given current peak traffic counts (which were increased to represent general traffic growth) with the addition of traffic generated by this project.*
9. *A visual simulation of a larger area of the lakeshore with other proposed future buildings such as those between Muar and Booth Streets would help to show how this facility will fit in. A visual analysis, including photo simulations, was done as a supplement to the EAF.*
10. *Has the City considered how this facility might tie in with or otherwise impact Main Street businesses? No further information considered. City Staff points out that the hotel and conference space envisioned would not compete with any existing Main Street commercial uses.*
11. *There is serious concern regarding the height of the hotel and the parking garage and its' potential negative impact on lake views along Lakeshore Dr. See update to Board comment 9 above.*
12. *The referral references design work and a decision made by the City in 1989. The changes in the surrounding area in the past 20 years have been significant and call for a thorough broad based review of potential impacts based on updated information. The City Council's environmental review discusses the potential impacts, and they have issued a negative declaration of significance.*
13. *Has an engineering study been completed to determine if the site can physically support a structure of this design? The City of Geneva experienced such problems during the recent development of their lakefront hotel. No new information on this issue.*
14. *The City and applicant should ensure that this development should comply with current NYSDEC standards and requirements for drainage and erosion control. The stormwater management plan confirms that the project meets those requirements.*
15. *From the application and follow up discussion, the amended PUD appears to remove all rights for development of the adjacent 5ac parcel. It seems unlikely, despite the current zoning, that this parcel will remain undeveloped for long. It would be helpful to understand generally what the eventual development of this parcel could look like and how it might impact the current proposal. The project is now divided into two phases, with the second phase incorporating the adjacent parcel to the east to provide additional parking and eliminate a parking garage as part of the project.*

### Comments:

1. Pedestrian links exist to the Kershaw Park and Lagoon Park trail are proposed, and the city will retain ownership of considerable parking that can be used by the public for access to the city's lakefront property, including the dock that serves the Canandaigua Lady. A trail between the waterfront and the lagoon trail, possibly adjacent to the outlet, needs to be developed as an alternative or an addition to the proposed link that leads from the Lagoon trail through the parking lot to the front door of the conference center.
2. The city will need to address management of parking to ensure that the general public, as opposed to restaurant and hotel guests, continue to enjoy use of the city's parking providing accessibility to the city's lakefront property.
3. The hotel and conference center owner should assume long term maintenance of the parking lot on City property.
4. The parcels to be retained by the hotel and conference center owner should be combined into a single tax parcel to avoid splitting of the many of the facilities such as the pool and pergola on separate parcels.
5. An erosion control plan must be developed and compliance monitored during construction to protect lake water quality.
6. Additional landscaping should be integrated into the parking lot to break up the expanses of asphalt. Buffering the parking lot from Lake Shore Dr. and the City owned lakefront is recommended.

Class 2 Referrals

7. The applicant and the City are currently working with the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Manager on improving the stormwater management. Consideration should be given to integrating permeable pavement into the parking lot design to reduce the amount of runoff.
8. Though not a part of this referral, the City of Canandaigua should consider integrating non-boater pedestrian use and fishing access into the design of the docking facility.
9. The City should undertake a comprehensive traffic analysis that looks at the cumulative impacts of all current and future developments within the area from Rt. 5 and 20 to Lakeshore Drive between Rt. 332 and Rt. 364.
10. Any fencing of areas within the Steamboat Landing development –around the tent, gazebo, pool, etc.—to delineate space used by patrons from general public use should be delineated and the type of fencing should be visually ‘open’ to minimize limiting lake views.

**BOARD ACTION:** *George McCadden made a motion seconded by Mary Neale to make a recommendation of approval of application 141-2010 as a Class 2 and return it to the referring municipality with the following reasons and comments stated above.*

*Motion unanimously carried.*

**140-2010                      Town of Canandaigua                      Planning Board                      Class: 2 WITHDRAWN**

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Jeff LaDue*

Property Owner: *Admar Supply Company*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *70.00-1-8.211*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for expansion of asphalt and gravel area, new landscaping and fencing at Admar Supply Company on 2390 State Rt. 332 in the Town of Canandaigua.*

**No Board action required.**

**145-2010                      Town of Canandaigua                      Town Board                      Class: 2**

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Town of Canandaigua*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Text amendment to the RLD Residential Lake District to remove "semi-public buildings and grounds" as a specially permitted use in the Town*

Class 2 Referrals

*of Canandaigua.*

**Proposed Zoning Text Amendment Changes:**

**A. § 220-21. RLD Residential Lake District:** The ‘allowable uses’ section is changed to allow only publicly-owned recreational facilities thereby avoiding a private owner’s assertion that they can have large scale docking and mooring facilities under the “All Other Land Use category of the Uniform Docks and Moorings Local Law UDML.

“The following Public Uses:

- (a) parks and recreational facilities owned and operated by a municipal, county, state or federal government;
- (b) Fire, ambulance and public safety buildings.

**B. § 220-41. “Semipublic buildings and grounds.”** are no longer allowed in the RLD Residential Lake District which will also preclude the “All Other Land Use” situation with the UDML.

**C. 220-48.** “Marinas, boat launches, special anchorage areas and associated boating facilities and structures.” is hereby deleted in its entirety.

**Pools and Hot tubs:** Hot tubs are now included within the definition of a swimming pool. Additional changes related to pool regulations were made to make them consistent with State Building Code.

**➔ BOARD ACTION:** *George McCadden made a motion seconded by Richard DelVecchio to make a recommendation of approval of application 145-2010 as a Class 2 and return it to the referring municipality with the following reasons and comments stated above.*

*Motion unanimously carried.*

**130 - 2010**

**Town of Farmington**

**Anthony Valenti**

**Class 2**

**REFERRAL NUMBER:**

**130 - 2010**

**LINKS**

**REFERRING AGENCY:** Town of Farmington Planning Board

**APPLICATION TYPE:** Site Plan, Special Use Permit

**CLASSIFICATION:**

**SITE ADDRESS:** 6146 State Route 96, Farmington

**TAX MAP NO.:** 29.00-1-74.000

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant is seeking to add between 100-150 square feet to the existing building (Beal’s Auto Service) at 6146 Route 96. This space would be used as a used automobile sales office and would have a separate entrance from the rest of the building. The applicant also proposes to allocate space along Route 96 for the display of 17 cars and dedicate five spaces for customer parking.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

Acres	1.5	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use	Beal’s Auto Garage	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Disturbed	Public Sewer	Yes
Zoning	GB	Site Access	Route 96 (1 entrance)

**Site Comments**

- GB: §165.28

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	∴ S. Bk-W/S Divide to Hathway	NYS DEC	∴ No

Class 2 Referrals

	Brook		
Flood Zone	No	NWI	No
Aquifer	Unconfined	Hydric Soils	Potentially hydric
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	Low or slow	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	Low	Prime Ag Soils	Yes, if drained
Slope	0-15%	Ag District	
<b>Environmental Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gravel lot is located on potentially hydric soils</li> </ul>		

<b>COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>Land Use-Cover</b>		<b>Historical Site</b>	
North	Soper Powersports (motorcycle dealership)	National	N/A
South	Wades Market	State	N/A
East	Vacant land	Local	N/A
West	Same as North		
<b>Scenic Views</b>		<b>Transportation Corridor</b>	
From Site	N/A	CPB Gateway	Yes
To Site	N/A	Corridor Study	No
<b>Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a commercial area with many automobile-related businesses in close proximity</li> </ul>		

<b>SITE PLAN REVIEW</b>	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant is proposing to install one light pole to the north of the display area. There is no information about the height of the light pole or other specifications. (§165-64). Lighting should be dark skies compliant.</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new, internally illuminated sign is to be attached to the existing sign on Route 96. No information provided about sign size. (§165-43.B.2) No indication if existing sign is illuminated.</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic &amp; Circulation</b>	
Access Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new roads or entrances are to be constructed. No additional curb cuts on 96 are positive.</li> </ul>
Site Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will remain the same as existing.</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant proposes to allocate five spaces for customer parking.</li> <li>The cars are to be parked on an existing gravel area that will be resurfaced with millings.</li> <li>Will the five spaces be clearly delineated with signage, different striping? §165.37.A.1.c requires that individual spaces be delineated by a double yellow stripe. This may be a challenge to maintain on a gravel lot. §165.37.A.3 requires parking be surfaced with dustless, durable all-weather pavement.</li> <li>Given demand, would it be feasible to share the existing lot in front of the building and decrease the size of the gravel area?</li> </ul>
Pedestrian Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant is proposing to put a new sidewalk along entire 96 frontages. This sidewalk appears as though it will connect to the parcel to the west, a motorcycle</li> </ul>

Class 2 Referrals

	dealership. However, that sidewalk does not connect to anything else.
<b>Natural Features</b>	
Stormwater Mgmt.	If the addition will disturb an acre or greater of soil, the addition will be subject to the conditions of the NYS SPDES GP 010-001 for storm water discharges. Also, because Farmington is an MS4 community, special conditions related to this permit will apply. Additional information on this permit can be found at <a href="http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/43133.html">http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/43133.html</a>
Open Space/Recreation	• N/A
Landscaping & Buffering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant is proposing minimal vegetative buffering. While he/she would not want to obscure view of inventory, some additional, low-lying vegetation could be added for visual appeal—particularly given that Route 96 is a major corridor.</li> <li>• The gravel lot will need to be continuously maintained or it will become unsightly.</li> </ul>
<b>Code Compliance</b>	
Setbacks	• N/A
Lot Size	• N/A
Other Comments:	Outdoor storage areas for vehicles should be identified including the type (operational, salvage, etc.) of vehicles and duration of storage.

➔ **BOARD ACTION:** *Glen Wilkes made a motion seconded by George McCadden to make a recommendation of approval of application 130-2010 as a Class 2 and return it to the referring municipality with the following reasons and comments stated above.*

*Motion unanimously carried.*

**128 - 2010 Town of Victor Planning Board Class: 2 WITHDRAWN**

Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Bluestone Creek, LLC*

Property Owner:

Representative: *BME Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *14.02-1-6.100*

Brief Description: *Major two phase cluster subdivision approval for 56.3 acres into 12 light industrial lots with a maximum buildout of about 535,000' ft on County Road 42 ( Wangum Rd.) in the Town of Victor.*

Maria Rudzinski briefly reviewed the withdrawn project for Board members and answered all questions presented.

**No Board action required.**

## Administrative Reviews

### Administrative Reviews

142 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board                      Class: *AR1*  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Joe Stavalone*

Property Owner: *R & F Canandaigua LLC*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *84.00-1-26.120*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for a pole sign at Raymour and Flanigan Plaza, 80-170 Raymour & Flannigan Plaza adjoining State Rt. 5 and 20 in the Town of Canandaigua.*

143 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board                      Class: *AR1*  
Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Gregory Westbrook*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *97.00-2-63.111*

Brief Description: *Four lot residential subdivision at 5275 Parrish St. Ext. in the Town of Canandaigua.*

144 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board                      Class: *AR1*  
Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Rocco Venezia*

Property Owner: *Amy Morrissey*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *82.00-1-42.000*

Brief Description: *Three lot subdivision located at 3261 Hopkins Rd. in the Town of Canandaigua.*

## Administrative Reviews

129 -2010                      Town of Geneva   Planning Board                      Class: *ARI*  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Ken Brown*

Property Owner: *Treadwell Enterprises*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *103.04-1-25.121*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for exterior and interior renovation and change of existing sign for the KFC/Taco Bell at 800 Rt. 5 and 20 in the Town of*

133 -2010                      Town of Manchester   Planning Board                      Class: *ARI*  
Type: *Other: Sign Permit*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *James Russell*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *2.01-1-36.00*

Brief Description: *Approval of a permit for a 3'x5' sign to be located on the Modern Manufacturing Services building at 298 Canandaigua Rd. in the Town of Manchester.*

131 -2010                      Town of Victor   Planning Board                      Class: *ARI*  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Kessler Family, LLC*

Property Owner: *Great Eastern Mall, LLC*

Representative: *Kenneth Bracker*

Tax Map Parcel #: *6.00-1-12.100*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval to install a 262' sq. outdoor seating area for Friendly's Restaurant at Eastview Mall in the Town of Victor.*

## Administrative Reviews

136 -2010                      Town of West Bloomfield   Planning Board                      Class: AR1  
Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Wayne Schultz*

Property Owner: *Wayne Schultz*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *65.00-1-8.11*

Brief Description: *One lot residential subdivision on 2300 Olmstead Rd. in the Town of West Bloomfield.*

139 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Zoning Board of Appeals                      Class: AR2  
Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Neil Gottfried*

Property Owner: *Admar Supply Company, Inc.*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *70.00-1-8.211*

Brief Description: *Area variance for front setback and site plan approval for a ground signet 2390 State Rt. 322 in the Town of Canandaigua.*

135 -2010                      Town of Gorham   Zoning Board of Appeals                      Class: AR2  
Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Patrick and Rosemary Sandone*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *141.17-1-6.00*

Brief Description: *Area variance for side yard setback and lot coverage exceedance to remove a garage and replace with an addition to the residence at 4938 East Lake Rd. in the Town of Gorham.*

## Administrative Reviews

127 -2010                      Town of Victor   Zoning Board of Appeals                      Class: *EX*

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Widewaters Route 96 Co. III, LLC*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *6.00-1-16.12*

Brief Description: *Area variance for frontage requirements for the Victor Outparcel  
Development located at 7635 Rt. 96 in the Town of Victor*

---

### **OTHER:**

**Tutorial Pre-Meeting Training** – Ms. Rudzinski informed the Board that there would be a pre-meeting training session on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) – Shovel Ready Program if Board members were interested. CPB members agreed it would be interesting and good to know and are definitely be interested in receiving training on EIS – Shovel Ready Program.

Training will be provided at the September 8, 2010 CPB meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**Docks & Mooring Public Meeting Notice** – Ms. Rudzinski reported that there are two (2) informational Docks & Moorings public meeting scheduled as follows:

Tuesday - 8/17/2010 at 6:30 p.m. at the South Bristol Town Hall; and

Wednesday – 8/18/2010 at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Canandaigua Public Works Building

CPB members are encouraged to attend and can receive one (1) hour of training if they do attend.

**New Referral Summary Format** - George McCadden stated that he enjoyed the new referral summary format provided by planning staff – felt it was much easier to read. Ms. Folkins stated that the new format was very nice but preferred the old format as there was a “Fact” column and “Comment” column. Ms. Rudzinski will continue to revise the summary in order to make it read easy and be understandable at the same time.

**Historical Preservation Committee** - Ms. Folkins reported that the Historical Preservation Sub-Committee had recently met and had come up with a small homework assignment for CPB members to complete in the near future. Further information on the matter will be provided at the September meeting.

**CPB Annual Picnic** – Ms. Folkins shared that this year’s annual CPB picnic would be held at Onanda Park, West Lake Road, courtesy of Tim Jensen, Town of Canandaigua Director of Development. The picnic will be held on September 12, 2010 from 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Ms. Folkins and Ms. Rudzinski will provide the meat.

## Administrative Reviews

CPB members and their family will bring a dish to pass. A map to the park will be provided at the 9/8/10 CPB meeting.

**Adjournment:** Being no further business for discussion **motion to adjourn the August 11, 2010 was made by Glen Wilkes, seconded by Bruce Campbell. Motion unanimously carried.** The 8/11/2010 CPB meeting adjourned 9:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Linda R. Frasca*

Administrative Assistant