



# Ontario County Planning Board

Draft Minutes for December 8, 2010

Page #

Introduction, General Procedures, & Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies.....	3
Attendance .....	4
Other Business .....	27

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

<b><u>REFERRAL #/CLASS:</u></b>	<b><u>MUNICIPALITY</u></b>	<b><u>APPLICANT</u></b>	<b><u>TYPE</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE #:</u></b>
204-2010 – EX	Town of Richmond	Town of Richmond	Text Amendment	5
205-2010 – EX	Town of Canandaigua	Michael Reinhard	Area Variance	5
206-2010 – EX	Town of Canandaigua	Michael Rinehard	Sign Site Plan	5
207-2010 – AR	Town of Canandaigua	Michael Rinehard	Area Variance	6
208-2010 – AR	Town of Canandaigua	Michael Rinehard	Sign Site Plan	6
209-2010 – Class 1	Town of Victor	Morrell Builders	Text Amendment	6
210-2010 – Class 1	Town of Victor	Morrell Builders	Map Amendment	8
211-2010 – Class 2	Town of Gorham	Town Board	Text Amendment	8
212-2010 – Class 2	Town of Victor	Phoenix Mills Plaza	Site Plan	9
213-2010 – Class 2	Town of Victor	Phoenix Mills Plaza	Subdivision	12
214-2010 – Class 1	Village of Bloomfield	Village of Bloomfield	Text Amendment	12
215-2010 – EX	Village of Victor	Mead Square Commons, LLC	Interpretation	13
216-2010 – Class 1	Village of Victor	Mead Square Commons, LLC	Use Variance	13
217-2010 – 1	Village of Victor	Mead Square Commons, LLC	Area Variance	14
218-2010 – AR	Town of Gorham	Aggressive Co., Inc.	Area Variance	15
219-2010 – AR	Town of Canandaigua	Michael Rinehard	Area Variance	15
220-2010 – Class 1	Town of Canandaigua	Finger Lakes Cerebral Palsy Assoc.	Special Use Permit	15
221-2010 – Class 1	Town of Canandaigua	Finger Lakes Cerebral Palsy Assoc.	Site Plan	18
222-2010 – AR2	Town of Canandaigua	Andrew Means	Site Plan	19
223-2010 – AR2	Town of Canandaigua	Andrew Means	Area Variance	19
224-2010 – Class 1	Town of Canandaigua	Lisa Toth	Special Use Permit	19

225-2010 – Class 1	Town of Canandaigua	Lisa Toth	Site Plan	20
226-2010 – Class 1	Town of Victor	Steve Sanna	Use Variance	20
227-2010 – AR	Town of Victor	Henderson Dev. Co., LLC	Area Variance	22
228-2010 – Class 1	Village of Naples	Steve Rennoldson Great Bear Holdings, LLC	Site Plan	22
229-2010 – Class 1	City of Canandaigua	Todd Henderson	Use Variance	26

**- 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 1s 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	P	Geneva	Mary Bogin	E
-------------	---------------	---	--------	------------	---

Towns:

Bristol	Thomas Neary	P	Canadice	<b>Stephen Groet</b>	P
Canandaigua	Mary Prince	P	East Bloomfield	<b>Arthur Babcock</b>	E
Farmington	<b>Mary Neale</b>	P	Geneva	Howard E. Meaker	P
Gorham -	<b>George McCadden</b>	P	Hopewell	Kirk Locus	E
Manchester	<b>Jaylene Folkins, Chair</b>	P	Naples	Terrance Hopper	P
Phelps	<b>Glen Wilkes</b>	P	Richmond	Bruce Campbell	P
Seneca	<b>Clifford Kunes</b>	P	South Bristol	Peter Osborne	P
Victor	<b>John Palomaki</b>	P	West Bloomfield	<b>Richard DelVecchio, V.Chair</b>	E

*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:** Greg McMahan, McMahan LaRue Associates; Todd Henderson; Kevin Bruckner; Jim Knittel; Peter Vars, BME

**Call to Order/Roll Call:** Chair Jaylene Folkins called the December 8, 2010 County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.; with Ms. Frasca doing roll call and reporting that 14 members were present meeting the requirement to establish a quorum.

**Minutes:** Motion to approve the November 10, 2010 County Planning Board minutes as presented made by Mary Neale. Motion seconded by John Palomaki. Motion unanimously carried.

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



207 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board    Class: AR  
 Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Michael Reinhard*

Property Owner: *Keuka Park*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *56.00-1-55.111*

Brief Description: *Area variance to replace an existing sign for Centerpointe Apartments and Townhomes and locate it closer to Rt. 332 and Yerkes Rd. in the Town of Canandaigua*

208 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board    Class: AR  
 Type: *Sign Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Michael Reinhard*

Property Owner: *Keuka Park*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *56.00-1-55.111*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval replace an existing sign for Centerpointe Apartments and Townhomes and locate it closer to Rt. 332 and Yerkes Rd. in the Town of Canandaigua. (See #207-2010.)*

209 -2010                      Town of Victor   Town Board    Class: 1

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Morrell Builders*

Property Owner: *Morrell Builders*

Representative: *BME Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.03-1-1.100 & 28.03-1-1.000*

Brief Description: *Rezzone 32.2ac of 56.2 acre parcel located at State Rt. 444 at the Village line in the Town of Victor, from R-2 to s 1.8 acres as S-C Senior Citizen and 30.4acres as MD Multiple Dwelling. (Previously reviewed by CPB, May, 2010 as #59-2010 – Class 1)*

<b>Project Update:</b> The applicant has submitted a revised request for a text amendment to reflect issues previous raised the town’s local boards. The applicant acquired a residential frontage parcel that will now become part of the area to be rezoned Senior Citizen S-C. There is no change in the number of buildings or dwelling units.		
The following are an update of the May 2010 comments		
<b>Review Area</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Review Comment</b>

<b>Zoning</b>	<p>Total Parcel – +/- 59 acres (2.5 acres are in the Village of Victor and zoned Industrial)</p> <p>Proposed Zoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential 2 District – 24 acres</li> <li>• Multiple Dwelling District – 30 acres</li> <li>• Senior Citizen District – 1.82 acres</li> </ul>	
<b>Comp Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town comprehensive Plan and supporting Strategic plan specifically call for provision of a wide range of housing types and price ranges, and specifically a need for senior housing opportunities.</li> </ul>	<p>The project could provide a wider range of housing price options. Current project has a base price of \$230K (affordable to a family earning approximately \$80,000/yr).</p>
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public sewer and water</li> <li>• Private drainage</li> <li>• Stormwater</li> </ul>	<p>More than adequate capacity for public water and sewer. Project should be sized to use available capacity as densely as possible.</p> <p>“Green infrastructure” should be considered as an integral part of stormwater management for a development this large.</p>
<b>Traffic/Highways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This parcel fronts on SR444.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SR 444 is a high-traffic hill sloped toward the Village that can create hazardous situations when new intersections are created.</li> <li>• A careful traffic analysis should be undertaken that identifies the magnitude and scale of traffic impacts based on buildout under current and proposed zoning.</li> <li>• Consideration should also be given to the traffic impact on nearby major intersections such as at Rt. 444 and 96, and Boughton Hill Rd. due to</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Resources</b>	<p>The conceptual plan indicates the preservation of 20.8 acres or 56% of the site’s woodlands and 56% open space.</p>	<p>Previously, the S-C zone was located in the northwestern portion of the parcel where development would require loss of woodland</p> <p>This is a text amendment. The specific acreage will be determined if the amendment is approved and a site plan is formally submitted.</p>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<p>The conceptual plan indicates that an existing residence will be demolished to allow for construction of the senior facility.</p>	<p>RPS records for the parcel indicate that the house was built in 1900.</p> <p>While these dates are often approximate in nature, the Town historian should be consulted for any information on the parcel.</p> <p>The NYS Historic Preservation Office should be contacted to see if a cultural resource inventory has been completed as part of any past NYSDOT project.</p>



**BOARD ACTION:** Mary Neale made a motion of approval, seconded by Glen Wilkes, of application #211-2010 1 as a Class 2 and return it to the referring municipality with comments stated above. Motion carried with George McCadden abstaining.

212 -2010

Town of Victor Planning Board

Class: 2

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Phoenix Mills Plaza*

Property Owner: *Hendley Associates, LLC*

Representative: *DDS Companies, Engineers*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.12-1-20.000*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for expansion of Phoenix Mills Plaza including demolition of an existing house, construction of a 9,000 sq. feet commercial building, and additional 9,300sq. feet parking area at 6389 State Rt.96 in the T. of*

**REFERRAL NUMBER: 212 & 213-10 LINKS**

**REFERRING AGENCY:** Town of Victor  
**APPLICATION TYPE:** Site Plan & Subdivision  
**CLASSIFICATION:**  
**SITE ADDRESS:** 6389 State Rt 96  
**TAX MAP NO.:** 28.12-1-20.000 & 19.110

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Applicant wishes to construct a 9,000 sq ft building within the existing Phoenix Mills Plaza located on State Route 96 in the Town of Victor. This new construction would require the demolition of an existing single family house and merging of two separate tax parcels.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

Acres	1 Acre	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use	Residential	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Moved Lawn	Public Sewer	Yes
Zoning	Com Lt Ind	Site Access	St Rt 96

**Site Comments**

- Site is currently located within the Pheonix Mills Plaza and accessed from State Rt 96. Applicant is proposing to add an additional 9,000 sq ft building on the west portion of the site, once the property is merged with an existing 1 acre residential property. The residential structure and existing curb cut will both be removed. Access to the new building would be from the existing plaza’s curb cut.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	Mudd Creek	NYS DEC	None
Flood Zone	100 Yr Flood Zone	NWI	None
Aquifer	N/A	Hydric Soils	Potentially
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	Medium	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	Low	Prime Ag Soils	N/A
Slope	Simple	Ag District	No

<b>Environmental Comments</b>	Parcel is located within the 100 year FEMA Flood Zone.
-------------------------------	--

**COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS**

<i>Land Use-Cover</i>		<i>Historical Site</i>	
North	Vacant & Residential	National	Not listed
South	Wooded	State	Not listed
East	Commercial	Local	See below
West	Vacant		
<i>Scenic Views</i>		<i>Transportation Corridor</i>	
From Site	N/A	CPB Gateway	State Rt 96
To Site	N/A	Corridor Study	None

<b>Community Comments</b>	<p>RPS records for the parcel indicate that the house was built in 1870.</p> <p>While these dates are often approximate in nature, the Town historian should be consulted for any information on the parcel.</p> <p>The NYS Historic Preservation Office should be contacted to see if a cultural resource inventory has been completed as part of any past NYSDOT project.</p>
---------------------------	---

**NOTE:** The CPB is reviewing three projects within three-quarters of a mile of the four corners of Rt. 444 and Rt. 96 this month that involve demolition of residences that were built either in the 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of the loss of buildings and the incremental loss of the historic character of the Town and Village of Victor.

**Update:** During the review process it came to light that the residence had been demolished.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**Aesthetics**

Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is indicated that lighting will match existing plaza.</li> <li>ALL lighting should be dark sky compliant.</li> <li>Town should require verification that the proposed development will meet or exceed the town's lighting code standards.</li> </ul>
Façade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is indicated that the façade will match the existing buildings.</li> <li>A color rendering of the proposed development should be submitted to the town as required by town code.</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional signage will be added to the site.</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional noise impacts from the additional use</li> </ul>

**Traffic & Circulation**

Access Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the site will be limited to the existing curb cut.</li> <li>Traffic impacts along St Rt 96 should be studied and addressed by the applicant.</li> <li>It is possible that additional traffic control devices are needed to mitigate traffic congestion generated from the site and from the existing residential/commercial area.</li> </ul>
Site Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Circulation is adequate on the existing site. However, it should be noted that the intended use (gymnastics training facility) could create an additional parking overflow problem which could hamper site circulation.</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An additional 30 parking spaces will be added to the existing plaza. Parking Requirements for the intended use indicates that and additional 45 spaces should be</li> </ul>

	<p>added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route 96/251 Overlay District indicates that planning board may reduce the number of required parking spots if the applicant can demonstrate that this will not cause an overflow parking problem.</li> <li>• If special events, recitals, competitions are allowed at the studio, parking may be inadequate.</li> </ul>
Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian circulation within the site should be addressed.
<b>Natural Features</b>	
Storm water Management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional/alternative stormwater management facilities should be considered by the town.</li> </ul>
Open Space/Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space requirements of 355 should be met with the proposed expansion.</li> </ul>
Landscaping & Buffering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No landscaping plan was submitted.</li> <li>• Town should require a landscaping plan to be submitted by the applicant.</li> </ul>
<b>Code Compliance</b>	
Setbacks	Compliant
Lot Size	Compliant
<b>General Comments</b>	
<p>The project is located in a floodplain and in proximity an oxbow of Mud Creek. There is potential for adverse impacts on stormwater quality and quantity. The town is advised to consult with the Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District. (See additional comments below.)</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> The CPB is reviewing three projects within three-quarters of a mile of the four corners of Rt. 444 and Rt. 96 this month that involve demolition of residences that were built either in the 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consideration should be given to the cumulative loss of buildings that will change the historic character of Victor.</p> <p><b>Additional Comments:</b> At the CRC meeting, Mr. Emerick (OCSWCD) said that the oxbow is part of Mud Creek and measurements regarding stream setbacks should be taken from the oxbow. He also stated that there is potential for significant stormwater management issues on this site.</p>	

According to the CPB by-laws (Sections 2.4 and 2.5) the Board has an interest in the protection of natural features including proper management of stream quality and flow and traffic flow and safety along major travel corridors. By their very nature, streams and major roads can ‘flow’ through multiple jurisdictions generating potential adverse impact outside the limited area of a project site.

## Findings

### Traffic and Safety

- Rt. 96 in the Town of Victor is a major regional travel corridor. There are already heavy traffic volumes and hazardous traffic movements entering and exiting the site.
- Internal circulation can currently be hazardous based on the current configuration with vehicles pulling out of parking spaces into a traffic flow lane.
- The addition of 9,000 square ft. of commercial space (currently proposed as a gymnastics studio) will generate additional traffic flow onto Rt. 96. and internal to the current plaza. Limited information is available on the traffic impacts associated with the proposed use. Additional parking is provided but it does not indicate if would accommodate visitors for special events such as recitals or competitions.

### Water Quality and Stormwater Management

- Mud Creek flows parallel to the south of the property which is located in a floodplain. No information was provided regarding potential impact on the floodplain due to the increase in impervious surface.
- There is an oxbow on Mud Creek. The oxbow functions as part of Mud Creek. The setback from the oxbow portion of the stream is not indicated based on the information provided.

**Based on the above findings, it is the position of this Board that the project be approved with the following modifications:**

1. A traffic study be prepared that assesses the impacts associated with traffic to be generated from the proposed use on Rt. 96 that includes any necessary mitigation measures.
2. Assess the functioning and safety of internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation pattern based on the proposed use and identify needed improvements.
3. Consult with the OC Soil and Water Conservation District to verify the delineation of the Mud Creek so an accurate
4. Review the proposed project with the OC Soil and Water Conservation District for compliance with stormwater management regulations.
5. Determine the floodplain boundaries per FEMA standards to determine any impacts that are associated with the project.

**BOARD ACTION: Glen Wilkes made a motion of approval, seconded by Cliff Kunes, of applications #212-2010 and 213-2010, as a Class 2 and return them to the referring municipality with modifications and comments stated above. Motion unanimously carried.**

213 - 2010 Town of Victor Planning Board Class: 2  
 Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Phoenix Mills Plaza*

Property Owner: *Hendley Associates, LLC*

Representative: *DDS Companies, Engineers*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.12-1-20.000*

Brief Description: *Consolidation of two parcels to allow expansion of Phoenix Mills Plaza and demolition of an existing house, construction of a 9,000 sq. feet commercial building and additional 9,300sq. feet parking area at 6389 State Rt.96 in the T. of Victor.*

**(See 212-2010 for comments and Board action.)**

214 - 2010 Village of Bloomfield Village Board Class: *Withdrawn*  
 Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Village of Bloomfield*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Creation of a new VC Village Center Zoning District to encourage small-scaled, mixed use development for shopping and services in a pedestrian-friendly context with associated design standards for the Village of Bloomfield.*

**This project has been withdrawn to allow for additional time to review the text amendment. It will be resubmitted for consideration at the January, 2011 CPB meeting.**

215 -2010 Village of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: EX  
Type: *Interpretation* **CPB bylaws exempt from review ZBA action related to a code interpretation.**

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Mead Square Commons, LLC*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Kate Gruenfelder*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.05-1-27.1*

Brief Description: *Interpretation of Business District Code to determine if apartments are allowed in the district in the Village of Victor.*

216 -2010 Village of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: 1  
Type: *Use Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Mead Square Commons, LLC*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Kate Gruenfelder*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.05-1-27.1*

Brief Description: *Use variance to allow a formula fast-food restaurant (Subway) in the Central Business District Zone at 49 Main St. in the Village of Victor.*

**Comments:** Maintaining a distinct between the type and intensity of uses appropriate the central business district and the gateway areas is a key component of The Village of Victor master plan and zoning code. Formula fast food restaurants have a different pattern and intensity of use than restaurants providing table service with only incidental 'carry-out'. If gateway uses begin to encroach on the central business district through use variances, there is potential for incremental and cumulative loss of the character of the Village central district.

The use variance test requires that the landowner meet all the criteria--cannot realize a reasonable return accompanied by competent financial documentation, hardship is unique and doesn't apply to a substantial portion of the area, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, and has not been self-created.

**Historic/Culture Resources:** The applicant intends to demolish a residence containing five apartments. No information is provided on the age of the building and none is listed the Real Property Tax Records. the village historian should be consulted for any information available on the building. The NYS Historic Preservation Office should be contacted to see if a cultural resource inventory has been completed as part of any past NYSDOT project.

**NOTE:** The CPB is reviewing three projects within three-quarters of a mile of the four corners of Rt. 444 and Rt. 96 this

month that involve demolition of residences that were built either in the 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consideration should be given to the cumulative loss of buildings that will change the historic character of Victor.

**Additional Information:**

**Planning Process** The following information was provided by the Village Clerk, Planning and Zoning Board Clerk, and Chair of ZBA regarding the project's application process.

1. The Village Board, at their November 15, 2010, passed a resolution to amend the zoning code to allow all R-3 uses in the B District, Business.
2. No site plan review application has been submitted to the planning board for review. It is their understanding that the applicant will submit the drawings and renderings to the village planning board at their next meeting.
3. The area variance was submitted ZBA prior to submission of the site plan review application.

**Historic Preservation:** John Palomaki provided additional documentation regarding the existing buildings historical significance. To summarize, building has been degraded to the point that the property is not worth saving.

**Building Design:** Because all sides of the proposed building are visible, all four sides of the building should be designed to present a 'main street' appearance.

**NOTE:** The Board had additional questions that were related to the site plan. The Board noted that the Village Zoning Code (*Chapter 133 - Site Plan Review*) which has lists the specific requirements for consideration. The CPB will review the site plan when it is referred to the County.

**Board Action:** Terrence Hopper made a motion seconded by Tom Neary to change the classification of application #216-2010 AR Administrative Review to Class -1, and to return it with comments to the referring agency. Motion unanimously approved.

217 - 2010 Village of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: 1  
Type: *Area Variance* Related Referrals: *n/a*  
Applicant: *Mead Square Commons, LLC*  
Property Owner:  
Representative: *Kate Gruenfelder*  
Tax Map Parcel #: *28.05-1-27.1*  
Brief Description: *Area variance for reduction in setbacks and increase in lot coverage for mixed use building at 49 Main St. in the Village of Victor.*

**Comments:** This application is dependent on approval of a use variance (see #216-2010). Consideration of this application is premature. (No type of site plan was submitted with this referral.)

**Additional Information:**

**Planning Process** The following information was provided by the Village Clerk, Planning and Zoning Board Clerk, and Chair of ZBA regarding the project's application process.

1. The Village Board, at their Nov. 15, 2010 meeting, passed a resolution to amend the zoning code to allow all R-3 uses in the B District, Business.



Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: 83.00-1-3.111

Brief Description: *Amend special use permit to allow a 7,000 sq. feet addition to the current building, and construction of 32 transitional housing units, 120 housing units, a rec. center, & admin. building, a storage barn at Happiness House 5415 CR 30 in T. Canandaigua.*

<b>REFERRAL NUMBER: 220, 221-2010</b>	<b>LINKS</b>
---------------------------------------	--------------

**REFERRING AGENCY:** Town of Canandaigua

**APPLICATION TYPE:** Special Use Permit; Prelim Site Plan Review

**CLASSIFICATION:** 2

Site Plan 2

**SITE ADDRESS:** 5415 County Road 30

Rendering

**TAX MAP NO.:** 83.00-1-3.111; 83.00-1-3.112

Subdivision Map

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The property owner would like to amend the existing special use permit (Semipublic Buildings and Grounds) to allow for the following construction project on 30.26 acres. On the site of the existing Happiness House facility (22,000 sq. ft.), the property owner is proposing to construct the following additional facilities with the associated parking and utilities. The work is proposed to be phased with completion in approximately 15 years:

**Phase 1** - Transitional housing (32 units – 8 units/building in 4 buildings),

**Phase 2** - Affordable housing (120 units – 20 units/building in 6 buildings),

**Phase 3** - 7,000 sq. ft. expansion of existing facility,

**Phase 4** - 5,000 sq. ft. recreation facility, 5,000 sq. ft. storage and grounds keeping building, and 3,000 sq. ft. administrative office.

**Phase 5** - One mile of walking trails throughout the parcel.

This review encompasses the special use permit, the preliminary overall site plan review, and the site plan review for Phase 1 (transitional housing). Two parcels are being affected with this development. It is not clear if any future subdivision action will be requested.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS			
Acres	348 total	Active Agriculture	Yes – 20 acres
Land Use	Agriculture, Other	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Meadow, Grass	Public Sewer	Yes
Zoning	AR-2 (Ag Rural Res)	Site Access	Yes
<b>Site Comments</b>			
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS			
<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	Canandaigua Lake, Sucker Brook	NYS DEC	No
Flood Zone	No	NWI	No
Aquifer	Creeks and streams on property	Hydric Soils	No
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	90% poorly drained	Active Ag	Yes – 20 acres

Erodibility	No	Prime Ag Soils	Yes
Slope	0-10%	Ag District	Yes
<b>Environmental Comments</b>	Consider the proximity to waterways in relation to the impervious surfaces on the parcel in terms of future drainage, runoff, and stormwater management.		

<b>COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>Land Use-Cover</b>		<b>Historical Site</b>	
North	Agriculture, Residential	National	No
South	Agriculture, Residential	State	No
East	Agriculture, Residential	Local	No
West	Agriculture, Residential		
<b>Scenic Views</b>		<b>Transportation Corridor</b>	
From Site	No	CPB Gateway	No
To Site	No	Corridor Study	No
<b>Community Comments</b>	Follow design standards to preserve and enhance agricultural community character; use appropriate design and materials during construction in order to align with existing agricultural aesthetics and context.		

<b>SITE PLAN REVIEW</b>	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the addition of lighting near the main entry and throughout the parking lots and around each new building for safety purposes; make sure lighting is dark sky compliant to reduce impacts on neighboring properties.</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider new signage that compliments the existing community character; consider new signage for entries and parking lots that indicates new traffic patterns; consider signage that defines pedestrian walkways. Consider signage at roadside that indicates each building within complex. Provide directional signage on campus for each building.</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the addition of buffers at edges of development to minimize noise disturbance from institutional activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic &amp; Circulation</b>	
Access Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the purpose of the new road connecting County Road 30 with Outhouse Road; Check in with the Ontario County Highway Department in regards to traffic generation from new development (increasing staff, residents, and visitors) and how to adequately handle traffic along County highway; Consider a preliminary traffic study to determine future traffic generation and impacts on existing and proposed access points.</li> <li>Pending results of further traffic analysis, one access points should be limited to one each on CR 30 and Outhouse Rd.</li> </ul>
Site Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the entities that will be maintaining the private drive (especially during the winter months); Consider the use of speed humps (or similar) to keep traffic slow along private drive (especially if pedestrians will be crossing drive). Consider wide aisles in parking lot to allow for adequate clearance of emergency vehicles and access for delivery vehicles; Designate fire lanes and “no parking” markers for fire lanes; Make sure there is a plan for access, parking, safety, and circulation during construction.</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make sure there is adequate parking proposed for each new phase due to increased</li> </ul>

	staff, residents, and visitors on the Happiness House campus.
Pedestrian Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider sidewalks throughout campus to connect each building adequately and safely.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Features</b>	
Stormwater Mgmt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing storm pond on site (near new transitional housing); Provide Stormwater Management Plan for overall proposed development (not just Phase1); Plans need to include location of proposed drains, culverts, retaining walls, and fences during each Phase; Coordinate with Ontario County SWCD and Kevin Olvaney regarding the nearby Stormwater Management Facility and where the culverts on the property direct drainage flow; Encourage Stormwater Sustainability guidelines; Since waterways are nearby, be sure that there is adequate drainage, grading, and slopes to direct runoff from buildings and parking lots away from waterways.</li> </ul>
Open Space/Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is plenty of green space on both parcels; However, as development expands, consider the addition of some pervious surfaces, landscaping, trees, buffering in the future to enhance drainage and aesthetics. Consider future a trail system that would provide linkages to parks, other trail systems, and community areas of interest from the Happiness House.</li> </ul>
Landscaping & Buffering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider providing adequate landscape and buffering (vegetation) to enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety, increase the pervious surfaces to handle runoff, and to improve the aesthetics of the Happiness House campus.</li> </ul>
<b>Code Compliance</b>	
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area variance will be necessary for the Phase 3 proposed addition on north end of the existing building because it does not comply with the 60' setback requirement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other Comments:</b>  This phased project will meet a very significant need for housing types and services that are of very limited availability in Ontario County.  <b>Additional Comments from OC Dept. of Public Works (DPW) Rec'd 12/8/2010:</b> The County Highway Dept. and Canandaigua Lake Sewer District will be involved agencies and will be conducting reviews for the project. DPW concurs with the need for a traffic impact study based on the number of housing units at build out. An engineering report showing the estimated sewage flow at build out will also be needed. (Contact DPW for more information.)</p>	

**Board Action:** *Mary Neale made a motion, seconded by Peter Osborne to retain application # 220-2010 and 221-10 as a Class 1 and to return it with comments to the referring agency. Motion unanimously carried.*

221 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua Planning Board  
Type: *Site Plan*

Class: *1*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Finger Lakes Cerebral Palsy Assoc.*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *83.00-1-3.111*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for a 7,000 sq. feet addition to the current building, and construction of 32 transitional housing units, 120 housing units, a rec.*

center & admin. building, a storage barn at Happiness House 5415 CR 30 in T. Canandaigua.

(See #220-2010 for Board recommendation/action.)

222 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board    Class: AR2  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Andrew Means*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *98.09-1-43.100*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for residence at 3329 CR 16 in the Town of Canandaigua.*

223 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Zoning Board of Appeals    Class: AR2  
Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Andrew Means*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *98.09-1-43.100*

Brief Description: *Area variance to allow construction of two driveways instead of the one allowed for residence to be constructed at 3329 CR 16 in the Town of Canandaigua.*

224 -2010                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board    Class: 1

Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Lisa Toth*

Property Owner: *Barbara Allen*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *83.00-1-17.000*

Brief Description: *Special use permit for a Small Commercial Establishment (music studio) at 5411 Rt. 5 & 20 in the Town of Victor.*

**Description** A music studio is proposed in part of a building that is contains a private residence. No new construction is proposed. Because the resident of the home is a renter and not the owner of the business, town law requires a special use permit be issued.



Property Owner: *JLMMLJ Associates, LLC*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *15.00-2-31.1*

Brief Description: *Use variance to install a wood burning boiler to heat greenhouses at Bristol Garden Center at 7454 State Rt. 96 in the Town of Victor.*

<b>REFERRAL NUMBER:</b>	<b>226-10</b>	<b>LINKS</b>
-------------------------	---------------	--------------

<b>REFERRING AGENCY:</b>	Town of Victor	<a href="#">Aerial Photo</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE:</b>	Use Variance	<a href="#">Site Plan 1</a>
<b>CLASSIFICATION:</b>		
<b>SITE ADDRESS:</b>	7454 St Rt 96	
<b>TAX MAP NO.:</b>	15.00-2-31.100	

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Installation of outdoor wood furnace on the Bristol’s Garden Center property located at 7454 State Route 96 in the Town of Victor.

<b>SITE CHARACTERISTICS</b>
-----------------------------

Acres	4.7 Acres	Active Agriculture	N/A
Land Use	Commercial	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Garden Cntr	Public Sewer	Yes
Zoning	Com Lt Ind	Site Access	St Rt 96 & Rowley Rd
<b>Site Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor wood furnace will be installed within the existing developed garden center parcel. No addition site disturbance will occur.</li> </ul>		

<b>SITE PLAN REVIEW</b>
-------------------------

<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No lighting will be placed along with the furnace</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No signage will be placed along with the furnace</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No noise impacts from the placement of furnace</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic &amp; Circulation</b>	
Access Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</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>Code Compliance</b>	
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor Furnaces are ONLY allowed in Residential Districts.</li> <li>Chimney must be 3 ft taller than nearest residential structure. Chimney Height is not identified in referral.</li> <li>Chimney should be a minimum 3 ft above the roof lines of the buildings located on site to protect employees and customers against smoke hazards.</li> </ul>
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed installation location will meet all setback requirements</li> <li>Furnace will be located within 40 ft of existing greenhouse</li> <li>Regulation states ‘may not be placed within 50 ft of any habitable structure)</li> </ul>
Lot Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum 2 acre lot is needed for installation (Subject Property 5 Acres)</li> </ul>



Tax Map Parcel #: 201.18-1-79.000

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for addition to Bob and Irv's Shursave located 136 S. Main St. in the Village of Naples.*

**REFERRAL NUMBER: 228-2010**

LINKS

**REFERRING AGENCY:** Village of Naples

**APPLICATION TYPE:** Site Plan Review

**CLASSIFICATION:** 2

**SITE ADDRESS:** 136 S. Main St., Naples, NY 14512

**TAX MAP NO.:** 201.18-1-78.000

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The applicant would like to add 700 sq. ft. to the existing supermarket, re-side the building, relocate the entry to the building, and change the main entry to the parking lot from NYS Route 21.

**SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

Acres	1.12	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use	Commercial	Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Building & Parking	Public Sewer	No
Zoning	C-1 (Commercial)	Site Access	Yes

**Site Comments** • Densely populated rural village setting; historical setting; village consists of many small businesses; No public sewer system in Village of Naples.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

<b>Hydrology</b>		<b>Wetlands</b>	
Watershed	Yes	NYS DEC	No
Flood Zone	No	NWI	No
Aquifer	No	Hydric Soils	No
<b>Soils &amp; Topography</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>	
Permeability	No	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	No	Prime Ag Soils	No
Slope	0-15%	Ag District	No

**Environmental Comments** Consider the impervious surfaces on the parcel in terms of future drainage, runoff, and stormwater management; Consider increasing the amount of green space on the parcel.

**COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS**

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

**Community** Follow design standards to preserve and enhance rural village community character; use appropriate

<b>Comments</b>	design and materials when residing and expanding in order to align with existing village aesthetics and context.
-----------------	--

**SITE PLAN REVIEW**

<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the addition of adequate lighting near the main entry and throughout the parking lot for safety purposes; make sure lighting is dark sky compliant to reduce impacts on neighboring properties.</li> </ul>
Signage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider new signage that compliments the existing community character; consider new signage for main and rear entries and parking lot that indicates new traffic patterns; consider signage that defines pedestrian walkways.</li> </ul>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the addition of buffers at edges to minimize noise disturbance from retail activity.</li> </ul>

**Traffic & Circulation**

Access Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalize rear entry if the decision is to keep it open for traffic coming to market and cutting through to residential area. New main driveway configuration may help to define the entryway, improve access, and enhance safety; however, there may need to be more protections in place to keep vehicles from entering through driveway for other business to the south (the former Cornish garage); this currently happens very frequently. If not addressed, this could defeat the purpose of the new driveway design. Traffic and pedestrian safety need to be considered in this driveway area; Consider a comprehensive access management plan that includes the access to the Cornish garage as well; Consider a blockade of sorts to keep vehicles from entering through the Cornish driveway. This area is difficult to pull in and out of due to reduced sight lines from the parallel parking along NYS Route 21 and vehicle congestion; Consider the removal of some parallel parking spaces closest to the driveway. Consider techniques to minimize vehicle cut through from NYS Route 21 to the rear residential area (and vice versa). If a cut through is desired, be sure to provide directional signage and safety precautions for those entering through the rear driveway.</li> </ul>
Site Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider wide aisles in parking lot to allow for adequate clearance of emergency vehicles and access for delivery vehicles; Designate fire lanes and “no parking” markers for fire lanes. Are 25’ aisles wide enough? What is the width of aisle in the rear of parking lot? Is this wide enough for adequate turning radii for large vehicles? Is the 30’ entry wide enough for vehicle turning radii in and out? Is there enough clearance for delivery vehicle turning radii in the rear of the building due to parking at Laundromat? The plan shows a large open area in the front of the new store entrance. Is this for loading and unloading? If so, consider the safety of pedestrians in this high traffic area; Make sure there is a plan for access, parking, safety, and circulation during construction of addition.</li> </ul>
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need 1 parking space for each 200 ft. of retail space (3 more spaces needed at a minimum with 700 sq. ft. expansion); Are additional handicapped spaces needed as a result of the building addition? This is not clear on site plan. It appears that there will be a large empty space between the new parking along the building and the building; this seems like an awkward design and configuration. Is this space here for future additions to building? Are parking spaces being reconfigured and restriped? This is not clear on site plan. Consider a way to keep customers from parking in old spaces along side of building since this area is still open.</li> </ul>
Pedestrian Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make sure new sidewalk is clearly defined as a sidewalk so no vehicles mistake it for</li> </ul>

	<p>former driveway; Discuss with NYSDOT the location of crosswalk across NYS Route 21 in this area to make sure it is an appropriate location; Consider additional signage to direct pedestrians to new building entry; this area could become congested and cause conflicts with vehicles. The plan shows a new segment of sidewalk and pavers along NYS Route 21. Check to see if design approvals and permissions are needed from the NYSDOT. Consider the addition of defined pedestrian walkways and signage throughout deep parking lot to improve pedestrian safety; Formalize pedestrian access in the vicinity of the rear driveway; Consider extending sidewalk beyond building to new parking along building.</p>
<b>Natural Features</b>	
Stormwater Mgmt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It looks as though the entire parcel is covered by an impervious surface; Be sure that there is adequate drainage, grading, and slopes to handle runoff from buildings and parking lots; Make sure private sewage can handle runoff; Make sure private sewage is not affected by future construction. The Village should consult the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Manager to review stormwater options.</li> </ul>
Open Space/Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little to no green space on this parcel; Consider the addition of some pervious surfaces, landscaping, trees, buffering in the future to enhance drainage and aesthetics.</li> </ul>
Landscaping & Buffering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider providing adequate landscape and buffering (vegetation) to enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety, increase the pervious surfaces to handle runoff, and to improve the aesthetics of the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Code Compliance</b>	
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
Lot Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supermarket operation appears to be on several parcels being used as one parcel; Make sure there are legal agreements on each deed allowing permissions on each parcel for this operation. Consider preparing a whole parcel plan that explains how the multiple parcels work together in this operation. If vehicles continue to cut through this parking lot to get to NYS Route 21 from the rear residential area or vice versa, consider cross access easements. Make sure any future plans for expansion to or demolition of adjacent properties (Laundromat, the former Cornish garage, etc.) take into account the current access management and site circulation to determine if shared access and parking would be desirable and would increase safety and efficiency of vehicle and pedestrian movements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overall Comments:</b></p> <p>Naples is a premier travel destination in Ontario County. Rennoldson Market is a focal point of village activity and a defining downtown building. Its renovation is very positive and the applicant is to be commended for undertaking this project which will improve the visual appearance of market and address longstanding parking problems.</p> <p>The Village is encouraged to particularly to: 1) Define a permanent site access management plan; 2) Either prohibit ‘cut through’ access from the neighboring parcel to the south along Main St. or formalize it as part of the access plan; 3) Delineate an internal circulation plan and provide adequate signage for traffic and/or pedestrian movements; and 4) Work with the Canandaigua Lake Watershed manager (Kevin Olvany) on stormwater management options.</p> <p>Unlike the façade’s of neighboring Main St. buildings whose “front door” faces Main St. the market’s design emphasized the more automobile-centered time when a business’s back was turned away from Main St. with front door now facing the parking lot. The proposed design for the improvements to the Main St. façade of the building should be reviewed to look at cost effective design measures that would break up the long ‘blank’ wall facing Main St. and better integrate it into the traditional village streetscape.</p>	



attending the workshop: M. Rudzinski and L. Frasca; training records have been updated members to reflect the number of hours attended by the above.

**2011 CPB Meeting Dates:** Ms. Rudzinski shared that a draft of the 2011 CPB meeting dates had been handed out and requested permission from the board to change the application due date to one day earlier (from Friday to Thursday) so that a complete review could be accomplished in a timely manner. CPB agreed. **Motion made by Jaylene Folkins seconded by Mary Neale to change the application deadline date from Friday to Thursday effective January 1, 2011.** Ms. Frasca will finalize the 2011 CPB Meeting Date Calendar and will distribute it to all necessary persons.

**P&R Committee Meeting:** Ms. Folkins shared that in light of the Town of Geneva's response to the CPB recommendation to the Town of Geneva - Application 172-10, she had attended the last P&R Committee meeting and had received very positive feedback from the P&R Committee on what a great job the CPB was doing. The P&R Committee stated they are very pleased with CPB actions to date; and recommended the board continue to move forward and work on the relationship between the Town of Geneva and the CPB.

**RMS (Town of Canandaigua) – Victor Crossing Update:** Ms. Folkins shared that Supervisor Casella stated that he was tremendously pleased with how the CPB handled the RMS – Victor Crossing matter. Stated the board laid it right out there as it should be, and wanted the board to keep up the great work.

**Town of Gorham – Application Recommendations Request –** The Town of Gorham has requested that the CPB provide a write up of all denials to the Town. Ms. Folkins requested staff assistance in seeing that the Town's request is met. Ms. Rudzinski and Ms. Frasca will follow up accordingly.

**Staff Recognition:** Bruce Campbell thanked Ms. Rudzinski and Ms. Frasca for their time in arranging and providing a wonderful dinner for the CPB before 12/16/10 meeting. CPB members agreed with Mr. Campbell and reiterated his thanks.

Cliff Kunes shared with fellow CPB members that they should consider inviting their Towns/City/Village board members to the CPB meetings.

**WRC Update:** John Palomaki shared that it had been a great year for the WRC and that he and P.J. Emerick had been re-elected to serve as Chair and Vice Chair respectively in 2011.

**Adjournment:** Being no further business for discussion **motion to adjourn the December 8, 2010 was made by John Thompson, seconded by George McCadden. Motion unanimously carried.** The 12/8/2010 CPB meeting adjourned 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Linda R. Frasca**  
Administrative Assistant