

Ontario County Planning Board

Jaylene Folkins, Chair
Mary Neale, Vice Chair

Draft County Planning Board Meeting March 14, 2012

Introduction, General Procedures, & Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies:..... 2
 Attendance and Minutes:..... 4
 Referral Reviews and Board Action..... 5

Referral #	Locality	Municipality	Referring Board	Application	Type	Class	Page
31	2012	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Max Vasta, Anywhere, Anytime Towing	Area Variance	EX	5
32	2012	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Half Moon Creative Salads Victor	Site Plan	1	5
33	2012	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	Lee Panzica	Area Variance	W	5
34	2012	Town of Victor	Planning Board	Beachland Consulting LLC	Site Plan	2	6
35	2012	City of Geneva		Geneva Historical Society	Area Variance	AR2	9
36.1	2012	Town of Manchester	Planning Board	Huldah Gibbs Estate-Gibbs Living Trust	Subdivision	1	9
36.2	2012	Town of Manchester	Zoning Board of Appeals	Huldah Gibbs Estate-Gibbs Living Trust	Area Variance	1	10
37	2012	Town of Gorham	Planning Board	Burnell Reiff	Site Plan	AR1	10
38	2012	Town of Gorham	Town Board	Gorham Town Board	Moratorium	1	11
39.1	2012	Town of Gorham	Planning Board	Curtis Martin	Site Plan	2	12
39.2	2012	Town of Gorham	Planning Board	Curtis Martin	Special Use Permit	2	12
40	2012	Town of Phelps	Town Board	Town of Phelps	Text Amendment	2	18
41	2012	Town of Phelps	Town Board	Town of Phelps	Text Amendment	1	18
42	2012	Town of Farmington	Planning Board	Victor Assoc. of Cultural/Performing Arts	Site Plan	1	20
43.1	2012	City of Geneva	Zoning Board of Appeals	Verizon/Cellular Connection	Area Variance	AR2	22
43.2	2012	City of Geneva	Planning Board	Verizon/Cellular Connection	Special Use Permit	AR1	22
44	2012	Town of Victor	Zoning Board of Appeals	John Welch	Area Variance	EX	22
45.1	2012	City of Canandaigua	Planning Commission	Cafua Management Co.	Site Plan	1	23
45.2	2012	City of Canandaigua	Planning Commission	Cafua Management Co.	Special Use Permit	1	23

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn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 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.](#)

Administrative Reviews The Ontario County Planning Department prepare administrative review of referrals as authorized, in accordance with the CPB bylaws. The bylaws include criteria that identify applications that are to be reviewed administratively and specify the applicable recommendations that are to be made to the municipality. AR-1 is an administrative review that is a Class 1 and AR2 is a review as a Class 2 and require local board action if disapproved. The following table summarizes the administrative review policies specified in the bylaws.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

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

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

County Planning Board Members Attendance March 14, 2012

Cities						
Canandaigua	John Thompson	P		Geneva	Mary Bogin	P
Towns:						
Bristol	Sandra Riker	P		Canadice	Stephen Groet	P
Canandaigua	Mary Prince	P		East Bloomfield	Arthur Babcock	P
Farmington	Mary Neale, V. Chair	E		Geneva	Howard E. Meaker	E
Gorham -	George McCadden	P		Hopewell	VACANT	V
Manchester	Jaylene Folkins, Chair	P		Naples	Carol O'Brien	P
Phelps	Glen Wilkes	P		Richmond	Bruce Campbell	P
Seneca	Clifford Kunes	E		South Bristol	Peter Osborne	P
Victor	John Palomaki	P		West Bloomfield	Richard DelVecchio	P

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

(P) Present at the meeting

(E) CPB member has been excused

(A) Absent without notification.

(V) Vacant

County Staff Present: Maria Rudzinski, Sr. Planner; Linda Frasca, Sr. Administrative Assistant, Julie Gotham, Senior Planner, Kristen M. Hughes, Director

Guests: Patrick Murray, HMCS; Marilyn DeRuyter; Michelle Preston; Curtiss Martin; Daniel Long

Call to Order/Roll Call: Chair Jaylene Folkins called the March 14, 2012 County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.; with Ms. Frasca doing roll call and reporting that fourteen (14) members were present meeting the requirement to establish a quorum.

Minutes: Minutes: Motion to accept the draft February 8, 2012 CPB minutes as presented made by Stephen Groet, seconded by Glen Wilkes. Approval of the 2/8/12 minutes not carried as Sandy Riker, Bruce Campbell, Peter Osborne, Art Babcock, George McCadden, and Richard DelVecchio abstained, therefore, a quorum was not met. The motion was tabled until the April 11, 2012.

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

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

31 - 2012 Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: EX

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Max Vasta, Anywhere, Anytime Towing*

Property Owner: *Michael Skidmore*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *15.01-1-30.000*

Brief Description: *Area variance to locate Anytime Anywhere Towing in an existing building that is less than 1,000 ft. from a residence to allow a change of use in an existing industrial building at 7500 State Road 251 in the Town of Victor.*

32 - 2012 Town of Victor Planning Board Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Half Moon Creative Salads Victor*

Property Owner: *FJR Associates*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *16.17-2-17.000*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval to relocate an existing patio from the side to the front (SR 96 side) of the Half Moon Creative Salads building at 202 High Point Dr. in the Town of Victor.*

[SitePlan](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

Project Description: The applicant proposes to remove an existing 130 sq. ft. patio located on the east side of Half Moon Creative Salads and relocating it to the Rt. 96 facing side of the building.. The old patio area will be replaced with landscaping. The size of the patio remains the same.

Comments None.

Board Motion: Referral 32-2012 is retained a Class 1 and returned to the local board with comments.

Motion Made By: George McCadden

Seconded: John Thompson

Vote: **Motion unanimously carried.**

33 - 2012 Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: W

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Lee Panzica*

Property Owner: *Robert Gianniny*

Representative:

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

Tax Map Parcel #: 38.00-1-93.340

Brief Description: Area variance to build a garage forward of the front line of the existing residence at 7707 CR 41 in the Town of Victor.

34 - 2012

Town of Victor Planning Board

Class: 2

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Beachland Consulting LLC*

Property Owner: *Sue-Ellen Spence and James Smith*

Representative: *BME Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: 6.00-2-9.00

Brief Description: *Site plan approval to develop a new 7,870 sq. ft.. retail building and to restore the 1,800 sq. ft. cobblestone school house located at 236 High St. in the Town of Victor.*

[Site Plan](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

[Final Rendering](#)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The CPB reviewed the PDD rezoning application associated with this project in June, 2011. At that time, the applicant proposed one new building (7000sf) for “mixed specialty office, retail and/or restaurant” restoration of the existing cobblestone house, on site parking for 73 cars, street parking (along High St. Extension) for 29 cars, (total 102 spaces). sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping. This site plan application now includes a 7,800 sq. ft. building which is an increase of approximately 800 sq. ft. The number of parking spaces has decreased to 92 spaces. The applicant has submitted the project to the Town Architectural Review Board.

The table below updates the referral review comments from the June, 2011 CPB meeting minutes.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS			
Acres	1.7	Active Agriculture	No
Land Use		Public Water	Yes
Land Cover	Lawn, Trees	Public Sewer	Yes
Zoning		Site Access	Rt. 96 and High St.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS			
Hydrology		Wetlands	
Watershed	Irondequoit Cr.	NYS DEC	0
Flood Zone	No	NWI	No
Aquifer		Hydric Soils	No
Soils & Topography		Agriculture	
Permeability	Rapid	Active Ag	No
Erodibility	Medium	Prime Ag Soils	Yes
Slope	Primarily 0-15%	Ag District	No

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS			
Land Use-Cover		Historical Site	
North	Retail	National	No
South	Eastview Mall	State	No
East	Retail-Restaurants	Local	Valentown Historic District

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

West	Retail-Strip Mall	A Historic Conservation Easement is indicated around the Cobblestone building.
Scenic Views		Transportation Corridor
From Site	North to Valentown	CPB Gateway
To Site		Corridor Study
Aesthetics		
Historic Context		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant indicates that the project’s architecture was designed “to create historical looking structure.” This objective is not readily evident from the materials provided. The application only provides a footprint (no elevation), which is in the shape of an asterisk and bears little resemblance to traditional, historical massing in the region.
Signage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No signage included
Noise		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable
Lighting		Lighting plan included
Traffic & Circulation		
Access Management		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two points of access onto High Street Extension. The applicant proposes an extension of High Street Extension to Route 96, which will allow right-out/right-in access to/from Route 96 northbound. The purpose is to divert traffic exiting the site away from the High Street/Route 96 intersection. Narrow lane widths, low speed limits, stop signs, and on-street parking are intended to discourage the use of High Street Extension as a cut through from High Street to Route 96 NB.
Site Circulation		Internal circulation accessed from one location off High St. Ext.
Parking		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking spots are on the smaller than the typical 10’x20’. Proposed 9’x18’
Pedestrian Access		Sidewalks and crosswalks are indicated.
Traffic Impacts		No traffic study was included with the referral
Natural Features		
Stormwater Management		See comments below.
Open Space/Recreation		Site plan indicates 42% open space.
Landscaping & Buffering		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has setback the building to provide for vegetative screening.
Code Compliance		
Setbacks		
Lot Size		
Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Character/Visual Appearance This parcel is the gateway parcel to the local Valentown Historic District. The Cobblestone School is the defining structure surrounded with traditional landscaping. It also provides visual context to the historic themed development to the north. As proposed the single building is out of scale and will dominate the Cobblestone School rather than maintain it is the focal point of the site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Footprint: The cobblestone building footprint is +/- 2,000 sq. ft. The proposed building is 7,800 sq. ft. an increase of 800’ over what was shown in the rezoning application. Parking – The number of parking spaces has decreased though the square footage of the building has increased. There is no explanation of the mix of uses that were used to come up with the number of spaces. Given existing parking problems associated with the Olive Garden Restaurant, the planning board should limit the allowed uses on the site to those that can be accommodated with available parking. The mix of uses allowed should not require more parking than is present on site. This would require approval for any change of use proposed for the new retail or Cobblestone building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the applicant land bank areas for parking? 		

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
EX: Exempt
W: Withdrawn

- **Access Management** – They NYSDOT has given approval to the concept of a right turn in/right turn out configuration to the intersection point of the Town road at Rt. 96.
 - **Buildout of Parcels on Town Road.** A 3 acre residential parcel is located across the street which is between the Valentown Historic Society parcel and Historic High Point development (Olive Garden et al) While currently zoned Residential, considering the surrounding commercial land use, it is reasonable to assume that there would be a future request for a zoning change to PDD that would include uses that would generate substantially more traffic to the town road and Rt. 96. The planning board should consider the impact of buildout of the parcel across the street when reviewing the project.
- **Town Road** – The town road is functionally being used as what is generally part of the internal circulation and access points that are on private property.
 - Does the town intend to continue to operate this as a public road?
 - What operational standards will be used for the road (speed, snow removal regulations, parking, etc.?)
 - Will the town be responsible for maintenance and repair?
 - As a public road, law enforcement would be responsibility of the Ontario County Sheriff.
 - **Town Road Parking:** The applicant is including on street parking as part of the estimate of parking spaces needed. It is not clear if on-street parking is allowed on town roads with no restrictions.
 - Can parking spaces on public (town) roads be used to fulfill a project’s parking requirement since the spaces cannot be dedicated for the exclusive use of a private landowner/development?
 - Does this set a precedent for other commercial projects that cannot provide sufficient parking for the intended uses?

Open Space Calculation The planning board should confirm whether the area of steep slope along SR 96 is included in the Rt.96 highway easement. If yes, the board should clarify whether it accepts in an open space calculation land that is under easement to the NYSDOT and may be subject to future development due to road improvements.

Stormwater Management –Below are comments on the site plan from the **OCSWCD:**

- The project appears to be disturbing greater than 1 acre of soil, and a SWPPP and NOI will need to be completed and submitted. A full SWPPP and associated documents were not submitted.
NOTE: The applicant stated in the 2011 rezoning referral that this project is covered by an existing SWPPP. This is not mentioned in this site plan referral. Clarification is needed.
- Erosion control plan drawing Number 07A discusses an underground chamber system. However, step 2 of the sequence of construction states that topsoil will be stripped from storm water management area and fill areas to allow for pond excavation. However, a stormwater pond is not shown on the plan. The next note calls for installation of perimeter diversion interceptor swale. These BMF's are not shown on the plan. The next note calls for stone check dams, interceptor swales and sediment traps, however, none of these BMP's are shown on the plans or shown in the legend.
- How will dust be controlled during construction?

- **Emergency Vehicle Access**

- With parking being proposed for both sides of High St. Ext. will there be sufficient turning radius for emergency vehicles?
- Is emergency access onsite adequate?

Findings

- Rt. 96 is a corridor of concern as a major regional highway and center for commercial development.
- The parcel involved is a gateway parcel to the designated Valentown Historic District as well as containing a cobblestone building that is still in its historic context and is highly visible on the corridor.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

Board Motion: Based on the findings and comments above, the Board moves to retain this referral as a Class 2 and approves it with the following modifications:

1. Prior to planning board final approval, all issues as identified above, related to the town road be addressed.
2. The uses that will be allowed in the development must be limited to those that stay within the available parking spaces which the board allocates to the project (whether on site or if it is determined that parking on a public road can be counted to meet a development's parking requirement. Future changes of use should be limited to those that are within the parking spaces allocated.
3. An approved SWPPP must be in place prior to final approval of the project.

Motion Made By: Sandra Riker

Seconded: Glen Wilkes

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

35 - 2012

City of Geneva

Class: AR2

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Geneva Historical Society*

Property Owner: *Same*

Representative: *Clemen Sign Co.*

Tax Map Parcel #: *104.58-2-24*

Brief Description: *An area variance for a two-sided sign that exceeds dimensional requirements at the Geneva Historical Society located at 543 Main St. in the City of Geneva.*

36.1 - 2012

Town of Manchester Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Subdivision*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Huldah Gibbs Estate-Gibbs Living Trust*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *45.00-1-65.1, 44.00-2-59.1*

Brief Description: *Six lot subdivision of existing farmstead located at 3571 CR 13 in the Town of Manchester.*

[Survey Map](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

[Aerial Photo Rendering](#)

Project Description: This proposed subdivision creates five residential road frontage lots from a 218 acre agricultural parcel located on the south side of CR 13. The sixth parcel is across the street. The parcel is in NYS Agricultural District 6. The lot line between Lot 1 and 2 is located between existing buildings necessitating a side setback variance.

The referring agency and applicant are encouraged to:

1. Find ways to minimize the number of curb cuts by sharing driveways or providing cross access between the parcels.
2. Encouraged to ensure that any required soil percolation tests are completed and considered during subdivision review.
3. Involve all appropriate agencies as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and placement of on site septic and curb cuts.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

4. Consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances for the proposed driveway comply with applicable design standards.
5. To involve the Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and implementation of storm water and erosion control measures.

Conflicts Between Residential and Agricultural Land Uses The expansion of single family residences in an agricultural area creates potential for conflicts between homeowners unaccustomed to the smells, dust, and noises, and pesticide application associated with standard farming practices. Such conflicts can have a long term adverse impact on the desirability of the land for farming since a farmer may not want to deal with complaints and conflicts with neighbors.

Removal of Structures The planning board is encouraged to make a condition of subdivision that the final approval will not take place until removal of the indicated structures takes place.

Compliance with NYS Board of Health Regulations The planning board should make sure that the smaller lots are not considered substandard for onsite wastewater treatment systems.

Non-Conformities Attention should be given to future compliance of mobile homes that may no longer meet the zoning code standards for non-conformities so the appropriate action can be taken.

Board Motion: Referral # 36.1 2012 and 36.2 are retained as Class 1 and returned to the local board with comments.

Motion Made By: George McCadden

Seconded: Carol O'Brien

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

36.2 - 2012 Town of Manchester Zoning Board of Appeals Class: 1

Type: *Area Variance*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Huldah Gibbs Estate-Gibbs Living Trust*

Property Owner:

Tax Map Parcel #: *45.00-1-65.1, 44.00-2-59.1*

Brief Description: *Subdivision creates non-conforming side setbacks between existing residences on new Lots 1 and 2 located at 3571 CR 13 in the Town of Manchester.*

See Referral 36.1 for review.

Board Motion: Referral # 36.1 2012 and 36.2 are retained as Class 1 and returned to the local board with comments.

Motion Made By: George McCadden

Seconded: Carol O'Brien

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

37 - 2012 Town of Gorham Planning Board Class: AR1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Burnell Reiff*

Abbreviations

- AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
- AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
- EX: Exempt
- W: Withdrawn

Property Owner: *Thomas and Joel Bay*

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *155.00-1-33.10*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval for a conforming sign located 5144 State Road 364 in the Town of Gorham.*

38 - 2012

Town of Gorham Town Board

Class: 2

Type: *Moratorium*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Gorham Town Board*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Proposed one year moratorium to prohibit the establishment, placement, relocation, construction, reconstruction, enlargement, modification or erection of any kennel anywhere in the Town of Gorham.*

Comments

§1 Statement of Legislative Intent states, “The present regulations on kennels in the Town Code do not address the emergence of large-scale kennels. When unregulated or improperly regulated, these facilities can be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the dogs or other domestic animals in these kennels, to the public who will work in, patronize, visit, conduct business with or otherwise come in contact with or feel the effects of such kennels to the environment”

- The review for Referral 39.2-2012 contains a brief summary of regulations applicable to wholesale dog breeding facilities. NY state does not have statewide regulations for these facilities. The USDA regulations defer to other state or local regulations for wastewater treatment and waste management providing only general statements about proper operation.
- New York municipalities, by default, are responsible determining if the use is allowed and determining standards through local zoning regulations.

George McCadden removed himself from the room for this referral and for #39.1 and #39.2-2012 because he is a member of the T. of Gorham Planning Board.

Board Motion: Based on the findings and comments above, the Board moves Change classification from Class 1 to Class 2.

Motion Made By: Mary Bogin

Seconded: Mary Prince

Vote: **Thirteen (13) ayes. George McCadden abstained.**

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

39.1 - 2012 Town of Gorham Planning Board Class: 2

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Curtis Martin*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *128.00-1-21.000*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval to construct an 8,800 sq. ft. breeding kennel facility with associated parking and onsite wastewater treatment system on a 20 acre site with existing residence at 4446 SR 247 in the Town of Gorham.*

[Site Plan](#)

[Scaled Site Plan](#)

[Septic Plan](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

[Watershed Map](#)

[Elevation Drawings](#)

See referral 39.2 -2012 for review.

Before consideration of the referral began, George McCadden removed himself from the room because he is a member of the T. of Gorham Planning Board.

Board Motion: Based on the findings and comments, the Board moves to retain referrals # 39.1-2012 and #39.2-2012 as Class 2 and, based on the above findings, disapproves both applications.

Motion Made By: Steven Groet

Seconded: Mary Bogin

Vote: Thirteen (13) Ayes. George McCadden abstained.

39.2 - 2012 Town of Gorham Planning Board Class: 2

Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Curtis Martin*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #: *128.00-1-21.000*

Brief Description: *Special use permit to operate and construct an 8,800 sq. ft. breeding kennel facility with associated parking and onsite wastewater treatment system on a 20 acre site with existing residence at 4446 SR 247 in the Town of Gorham.*

Project Description: An 8,856 sq. ft. wholesale dog breeding facility is proposed to be constructed on a 20 acre parcel located northwest of the intersection of Lake to Lake Rd. and St. Rt. 247. The structure will be accessed from the existing drive serving the residence. The applicant currently operates a wholesale dog breeding facility in the Town of Varick and wants to relocate their business to the parcel.

In addition to the kennel operation, the applicant intends to use the balance of open land for hay and pasture for a small flock of sheep. These are allowed uses and subject to any zoning permits.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

- The applicant’s business plan indicates that:
 1. The facility will have between 240 and 640 breeding dogs depending on the size of the animal.
 2. No outside employees will be hired. The operation will be run by the applicant and his wife with help from their children as they get older.
- All operations are contained within the building. A list of interior and exterior kennel biosecurity measures is included.
- Mr. Martin has a Class B Dealer license under the US Department of Agriculture Animal Welfare Act which is included with the application. Mrs. Martin holds a USDA breeders license.
- Since this is a wholesale operation, there is no retail traffic from the general public. Delivery trucks, suppliers, etc. will access the site.
- A storage trailer located on site is a dry van trailer used for the extended family’s trucking business. When not in use, it is parked on site and used for overflow storage.
- Two onsite wastewater treatment facilities are proposed. One system will be for the use of workers (restroom, kitchenette, etc.) The other system will be for disposal of animal waste.
- Animal remains will be composted according to Cornell composting standards.

Site Characteristics		Adjoining Land Use/Land Cover		Infrastructure	
Acres:	20	North:	Ag./Residence	Public water:	No
Land Use:	Agriculture/Residence	South:	Ag./Residence	Public sewer:	No
Land Cover	Primarily farmland	East:	Agriculture	Municipal Stormwater:	No
		West:	Agriculture	Public road:	SR 247
				Existing subsurface existing drainage	Farmland likely tilled.
Water Resources		Wetlands		Agriculture	
Major watershed	Canandaigua Lake	NY DEC	NO	Prime etc soils	Prime if drained
Sub-watershed	Deep Run	NWI	No	NY Ag. Dist.	#6
Stream/Lake	On site .25 ac. Pond	Hydric soils	Potentially Hydric: Darien	Active Ag.	Yes
Aquifer	No information			500 ft. of Ag. Dist.	Not applicable
Well Head study	No				
Drainage		Cultural/Historic Resources		Scenic Views/Viewshed	
Slope	< 8%	National	No information	From Site	No information
Erodibility	Low	State	No information	To Site	No information

Soil permeability: Slow.

The Darien soil type located where the structure and septic system is propose is classified by the USDA Interpretive Soil Report as “Severe” for use as septic absorption field due to wetness and slow percolation.

Transportation Corridor	
CPB Gateway	No
Corridor Study	No

SITE PLAN ELEMENTS			
Community Character Elements		Vehicle & Pedestrian Circulation	
Lighting Plan	No lighting indicated	Access Management	Use existing residential 12’ drive
Signage Plan	None included	Internal Circulation	Driveway extended to new structure
Noise	Below ambient road noise according to testing at current	Pedestrian Linkages	Not applicable

Abbreviations

- AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
- AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
- EX: Exempt
- W: Withdrawn

	Varick facility.		
Landscape Plan	No landscaping indicated	Parking	5 parking spaces provided
Streetscape	Not applicable		
Building Façade	Farmstead-style		
Stormwater Management		Parks, Recreation, Open Space	
SWWP	See below comments	Outdoor Recreation	Not applicable
Green Infrastructure	No	Linkages	Not applicable
Other		Dedicated open space	Not applicable
Code Compliance			
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Gorham zoning code (§31.10) Definitions “Lot” states “Only one (1) principal use is permitted on a lot.” A single family residence is present on the lot. A wholesale breeding facility is a commercial use and could be considered a second principle use. The Definition of “kennel” in the zoning code defines it as a structure for the shelter or incarceration of animals... It does not specifically define a use of a kennel for “breeding”. This should be clarified in the zoning code. 		
Lot Size			

Background Information on Regulation of Dog Breeding Operations

- Zoning & Land Use** NYS Town Law grants towns the authority to regulate the use of land through adoption of a zoning ordinance that is based on the town’s comprehensive plan. The local town planning board or zoning board of appeals is vested with the authority to implement the zoning code and has final approval authority for approvals or permits required by the zoning code.
 - Note: This project requires a “special use permit”. This permit is not given to a particular owner but allows that use to take place on a particular property regardless of the owner. The permit cannot be taken away from an owner for non-compliance. Through an enforcement action the owner may be required to cease the use for non-compliance but the use can resume if the violations are remedied.
 - County Planning Board** NYS General Municipal Law §239 authorized creation of a county planning board that is charged with reviewing certain types of projects that are before local planning or zoning boards of appeal, or elected boards to assess their potential for countywide or intermunicipal impacts. This board makes recommendations to the local board of approval, approval subject to certain changes, or disapproval of an application. The local board can accept the recommendations or they can disregard modifications or disapproval recommendations by a majority vote plus one of the local board.
- Agricultural Operations** Dogs and cats are not classified as farm animals by NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets (NYSDAM). Operations related to wholesale dog breeding, etc. are not subject to the provisions and protections provided by Art. 25-AA Agricultural Districts for agricultural operations.
- Pet Dealers** The NYSDAM does administer the NYS Pet Dealer Licensing Law (Article 26-A) which regulates business that sell more than 25 dogs or cats a year that are sold to the public. The breeding facility proposed in this application is wholesale and not subject to that regulation.
- Water Quality Regulation of Confined Animal Feeding Operations.** State and federal water quality regulations that apply to confined animal feeding operations do not apply to dog or cat related commercial facilities. Those regulations apply to farm animals.
- US Department of Agriculture (USDA)** The USDA under the federal Animal Welfare Act licenses persons as dealers, brokers or breeders. (CFR Title 9, Chapter I, Part 2, Subpart A. Licensing). The breeding facility itself is not subject to any federal permit.

Part 3 Standards Subpart A Specification for the Humane Handling, Care, Treatment and Transportation of Dogs and Cats establishes facilities and operating standards that the licensees must follow.

- USDA and Local Regulation** Sec. 3.101 Facilities , General Waste Disposal of the previously site federal register states that all

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

waste disposal must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to pollution control, protection of the environment and public health. The USDA regulations do not override local laws.

7. **Canandaigua Lake Watershed Rules and Regulations** This project is located in the Canandaigua Lake watershed and is subject to these regulations for the protection of the public drinking water supply. The regulations are applicable to sewage and other waste matter. A permit is required for the onsite wastewater treatment systems and handling of all waste is subject to the review of the Watershed Inspector.
8. **NYS Department of Environmental Conservation State Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit (SPDES)** A SPDES permit is required when the daily flow (water) exceeds 1,000 gallons per day. It is not yet known if this facility will exceed that threshold.

Comments

1. **Water Quality/Waste Disposal** (See attached letter from the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Inspector)

- The application includes a preliminary design for two onsite wastewater treatment systems. No documentation is provided in support of the preliminary design. The applicant asserts that less than 1,000 gallons of water will be used per day. This is not supported by any operational standards for a facility that is managing 240-640 breeding dogs plus puppies according to the cleaning and sanitation requirements for kennel operation. (As noted above, the soil present onsite is classified as "Severe" for location of a septic absorption field.)

For purpose of general comparison, the Ontario County Animal Control Facility ("Happy Tails") has 40 kennels and is approximately 4,800 sq. ft. The water usage, based on the facility's water bills for the past two years is approximately 55-60,000 gallons per month which is +/- 2,000 gallons per day. The Facility is regulated by the NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets.

- The application states that dead animals will be disposed of by composting (Mortality Composting Facility) based on Cornell University standards. No information is provided regarding the size, location, etc. of this facility and how stormwater will be handled.
 - No information is provided regarding how the compost material will be used or its suitability for use as fertilizer.
- The Watershed Inspector's correspondence states that since the facility is non-residential it will have to comply with NYS DEC Design Standards for Wastewater Treatment Works (1988). Watershed regulations also require that waste matter which includes garbage, refuse, dead animals or parts thereof must be addressed.

The Watershed Inspector will be looking for a "Waste Management Plan" for the facility to include, but not be limited to:

1. Method of wastewater treatment and disposal from breeding facility.
2. Method of dead animal disposal (Mortality Composting Facility).
 - a. animals with infectious diseases may not be ideal for composting
 - b. method of excluding scavengers that will disperse carcasses into surrounding area (i.e. streams & other properties)
 - c. anticipated use of composted material
 - (1) bedding
 - (2) fertilizer, or
 - (3) export
3. Method of stormwater run-off around composting facility
 - a. diversion/ terraces
 - b. channel
 - c. natural topography or
 - d. other

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

4. Method of handling pharmaceutical wastes.
 - a. drugs
 - b. paraphernalia (i.e. syringes etc.)

2. Potable Water Supply – The existing well will be used to supply the facility as well as the existing residence. Since daily water use at the facility will require more documentation, the applicant will need to show that the well can meet the water needs for all uses and has adequate recovery time so proper sanitation can be maintained.

3. Stormwater Management The runoff from the structure’s roof will be directed to an existing pond. The applicant states that the pond is expected to be cleaned of existing debris and deepened by approximately 1.5 feet to accommodate the intake. No design is presented. “As-Built” drawings should be provided prior to the final certification of the facility so it can be inspected to determine if it is working.

- Additional information is required regarding stormwater runoff from the composting facility as noted above..

4. Emergency Management/Response

- The Ontario County Animal Emergency Response Plan was prepared in 2008.

“The purpose of this plan is to establish procedures for large scale emergencies, disasters, and evacuations involving animals. It is important to ensure the humane care and treatment of animals in situations that can cause animal suffering. These guidelines are intended to encourage planning for the care of animals and should be utilized when there is a need to access resources to provide for animals and their owners in emergencies, disasters, or evacuations.”

When the plan was prepared, there were no large scale commercial dog breeding facilities in Ontario County so their specific needs were not included in the plan. . The plan does state that it is the responsibility of the domestic animal owner to plan for emergency needs.

Currently, the Ontario County Dog Control Facility has 40 kennels which generally operate almost at capacity. The purpose of the facility to provide shelter for those stray dogs impounded by the Humane Society Dog Control Officers or those involved in law enforcement situations. It only accepts owner surrendered dogs on a limited basis if space is available. Municipalities contract with the County for dog control and enforcement of dog control laws.

In operational practice, when first responders are called to a situation where dog(s) are involved, a Dog Control Officer is dispatched and is responsible for caring for any dogs involved. The existing facility and staff would not be able to handle an emergency situation involving a large scale breeding facility and would be overwhelmed. The facility and staff would not be able to respond to the municipality’s day-to-day dog control enforcement if involved with large scale emergency response.

- The application does not mention that the operators have an emergency plan for the proposed facility.

6. Regulatory Gaps The USDA standards only address internal operational conditions. The functioning of the septic system, stormwater management for both the structure and the compost facility is not addressed by the USDA and is left to federal, state and local government. The NYS DEC and the NYS Board of Health do not have design standards for onsite wastewater treatment system that is handling large amounts of dog waste. The absence of standards, however, does not relieve the watershed inspector for assuring that any permit considered will not degrade water quality.

5. Storage USDA has standards for the storage of food, bedding etc. used by the facility to reduce vermin and contamination. Since the tractor trail van is used for other family members’ trucking business, will there be adequate storage at the facility when it is not available?

6. Zoning compliance The Town should determine if this facility constitutes a second principle use of the site and clarify the definition of “kennel”.

Findings

Based on the following issues’ potential for significant adverse county-wide and intermunicipal impacts, the COORDINATED REVIEW COMMITTEE recommends disapproval of this referral:

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

1. **Canandaigua Lake** Canandaigua Lake watershed surface and subsurface water quality is a natural resource of concern to the CPB as established in the Board's bylaws. USDA regulations leave the responsibility to other units of government—in this case, primarily the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Inspector. Based on the information provided by the applicant there is no supporting engineering calculations of water use and septic system loading characteristics on which a system could be designed.

- i. Design standards for such systems are not available from NYS DEC or NYS Board of Health for this type of facility to assure water quality in the watershed is maintained.
- ii. No information is provided on handling and disposal of other solid waste associated with the facility such as pharmaceuticals and associated disposables, bedding, etc.
- iii. Operational details for the dead animal composting facility are not provided.

2. **Ontario County Emergency Management** The current county plan to handle emergencies involving dogs does not address commercial scale breeding operations. The County Animal Control officers have specific legal responsibilities regarding emergency or law enforcement situations related to dogs. The current animal control facility does not have the capacity to respond to any emergency, etc. that would be associated with a wholesale breeding facility of this scale. Resources required to respond to an emergency at the facility would be at the expense of meeting their primary responsibility to the municipalities for dog control and enforcement.

Findings

1. **Canandaigua Lake** Canandaigua Lake watershed surface and subsurface water quality is a natural resource of concern to the CPB as established in the Board's bylaws. USDA regulations leave the responsibility to other units of government—in this case, primarily the Canandaigua Lake Watershed Inspector. Based on the information provided by the applicant there is no supporting engineering calculations of water use and septic system loading characteristics on which a system could be designed.

- iv. Design standards for such systems are not available from NYS DEC or NYS Board of Health for this type of facility to assure water quality in the watershed is maintained.
- v. No information is provided on handling and disposal of other solid waste associated with the facility such as pharmaceuticals and associated disposables, bedding, etc.
- vi. Operational details for the dead animal composting facility are not provided.

2. **Ontario County Emergency Management** The current county plan to handle emergencies involving dogs does not address commercial scale breeding operations. The County Animal Control officers have specific legal responsibilities regarding emergency or law enforcement situations related to dogs. The current animal control facility does not have the capacity to respond to any emergency, etc. that would be associated with a wholesale breeding facility of this scale. Resources required to respond to an emergency at the facility would be at the expense of meeting their primary responsibility to the municipalities for dog control and enforcement.

Before consideration of the referral began, George McCadden removed himself from the room because he is a member of the T. of Gorham Planning Board.

Board Motion: Based on the findings and comments, the Board moves to retain referrals # 39.1-2012 and #39.2-2012 as Class 2 and, based on the above findings, disapproves both applications.

Motion Made By: Steven Groet

Seconded: Mary Bogin

Vote: Thirteen (13) Ayes. George McCadden abstained.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

40 - 2012

Town of Phelps Town Board

Class: 2

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Town of Phelps*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Revised amendment to Chapter 82 (Farming) regulating manure related facilities, not regulated by the NYS DEC or designed by a qualified professional, that are in proximity to potable water facilities in the Town of Phelps.*

Comments

This text amendment was reviewed by the CPB as referral #186-2011 at the November, 2011 meeting. The Board retained it as a Class 2 and returned it to the Town with comments.

The Town Board has subsequently revised the text amendment to address the comments and has asked that the revision be referred to the CPB again.

- All comments have been thoroughly addressed by the revision and the Town is commended for the revisions made.
- The NYS Department of Agricultural and Markets has reviewed the text amendment and found that it is an appropriate local regulation of a farming activity and in keeping with NYSDAM regulations.

Board Motion: Based on consideration of the referral review comments for application #40-2012 , the Board finds that there is no potential for significant adverse county-wide and inter-municipal impacts and moves to retain said application as a Class 2 and approve the proposed action.

Motion Made By: George McCadden

Seconded: Sandra Riker

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

41 - 2012

Town of Phelps Town Board

Class: 1

Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Town of Phelps*

Property Owner:

Representative:

Tax Map Parcel #:

Brief Description: *Text amendment to create a "Mining Overlay District" where a special use permit is required for mining in the Town of Phelps.*

[Working Map](#)

[Draft Overlay Map](#)

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

Project Description:

The text amendment creates a Mining Overlay District located primarily in the southeast portion of the town where mineral resources are located. A special use permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required for any mining activity that takes place in any of the Zoning Districts in the MO Overlay. In addition to the M-1 zoning district, mining will also be allowed in the C-1, C-2 and Agriculture-Residential Districts which are covered by the MO Overlay District.

1. The special use permit use permit requirements parallel the NYS DEC permit requirements.
 - a. An applicant can use the DEC permit mining plan information as part of their application as long as the ZBA is satisfied that all requirements are met.
 - b. A reclamation plan is required. The reclamation plan included in the DEC application may be used for the application if the ZBA is satisfied that all requirements are met.
 - c. All documents submitted to the DEC with the permit are required.
 - d. A completed EAF SEQR form is required.
2. The proposed law brings under town regulation mining activities that are not regulated by the NYS DEC and non-conforming mines.

Comments

1. The current code (Art. V. Special Uses §145-19 Excavations) requires a special use permit for excavations which are only allowed in the M-1 Zoning District. The proposed law repeals that section and adds the MO District in Article IV District Regulations as §145-8.2. The ZBA can issue a special use permit for mining anywhere within the MO District boundaries regardless of the underlying zoning district.--- C-1, C-2 and Agriculture-Residential.
 - a. A special use is considered an allowed use that is subject to certain criteria related to compatibility with other allowed land uses. Denial must be directly related to the inability of the use to conform to the criteria.. No specific criteria are provided that address the unique differences between the allowed land uses in the three non-industrial districts. The ZBA must use the same limited criteria to determine if a mining operation can be conditioned such that it is compatible next to a farm, a residence, or a commercial use. Lacking specific criteria for each of the zoning districts included in the overlay district makes it difficult to determine if mining will “Ensure harmony and compatibility with surrounding land use patterns.”
2. The application for the special use permit incorporates virtually all information included in a NYS DEC Mine Land Reclamation Law Permit. It incorporates elements related to the actual conduct of the mining operation and allows the ZBA to include a special use permit condition that allows local enforcement of the state mining permit (See: §B.(6) (d) Conditions) NY courts have limited local zoning regulation of mining activity to areas not involved with the actual mining operation. This overlaps with the NYS DEC authority to regulate and enforce mining operations.

For clarity, this proposed law should specifically identify what restrictions/regulations that can be placed based on the Town’s zoning authority to regulate the use of the land versus the actual operation that is regulated by state law.

3. **SEQR Compliance** – If a landowner is applying for a DEC permit, the state conducts a coordinated review which allows the Town, as involved agency because of its special use permitting authority, to either agree to allow the DEC to be the lead agency or request that the Town be lead agency (which rarely, if ever happens) This process is designed to incorporate the regulatory issues and concerns of the Town into the DEC permitting process. Once the SEQR process is concluded by DEC as lead agency, the process for the Town’s SEQR requirements for the special use permit has also been concluded. There should be no outstanding issues related to the applicant’s special use permit and the SEQR process.
 - a. Section B.(3) (f) requires submission of an environmental assessment form so the ZBA may perform any SEQR obligations. This is confusing and should be clarified to reflect the SEQR relationship between the Town and the DEC through the coordinated review process.

Board Motion: Referral 41-2012 is retained a Class 1 and returned to the local board with comments.

Motion Made By: Mary Bogin

Seconded: Mary Prince

Vote: **Motion unanimously carried.**

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

42 - 2012

Town of Farmington Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Victor Association of Cultural/Performing Arts*

Property Owner:

Representative: *Patrick Laber*

Tax Map Parcel #: *41.00-1-38.100*

Brief Description: *Proposed new 11,000 sq. ft. multi-use building with associated parking for the Cobblestone Arts & Ed. Center to the west of the existing building at 1622 State Route 332 in the Town of Farmington.*

[Site Plan](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

Project Description:					
Site Characteristics		Adjoining Land Use/Land Cover		Infrastructure	
Acres:	14	North:	Shrub/scrub	Public water:	Yes
Land Use:	Arts center	South:	Wooded	Public sewer:	Yes
Land Cover	Buildings on 2.4 ac.	East:	Rt. 332	Municipal stormwater:	No
	Balance is wooded	West:	Wooded	Public road:	SR 332
				Existing subsurface existing drainage	No information.
Water Resources		Wetlands		Agriculture	
Major watershed		NY DEC	No	Prime etc soils	Not applicable
Sub-watershed	Mud Cr.	NWI	No	In NY Ag. Dist.	No
Stream/Lake	No	Hydric soils	Hydric:Lakemount through center of parcel. Balance – Odessa Potentially hydric	Active Ag.	no
Aquifer				500 ft. of Ag. Dist.	no
Well Head study	No				
Drainage		Cultural/Historic Resources		Scenic Views/Viewshed	
Slope	< 5%	National	No information	From Site	No
Soil permeability	Low	State	No information	To Site	No
Erodibility	Medium	Local	No information		
Floodplain					
Transportation Corridor					
CPB Gateway	Yes – Rt. 332				
Corridor Study	NYSDOT Corridor plan				
SITE PLAN ELEMENTS					
Community Character Elements			Vehicle & Pedestrian Circulation		
Lighting Plan	Yes		Access Management	Existing curb cut	
Signage Plan	No signage proposed		Internal Circulation	Interior loop off existing parking lot.	
Noise	Not applicable		Pedestrian Linkages	No sidewalk/crosswalk linkage to the existing building is indicated. No pedestrian connection to sidewalk on Rt. 332.	
Landscape Plan	Yes		Parking	Meets standard.	
Streetscape	No improvements on Rt. 332				
Building Façade	No building detail provided				
Stormwater Management			Parks, Recreation, Open Space		

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

SWWP		Outdoor Recreation	None indicated.
Green Infrastructure	Bioretention area indicated	Linkages	Not applicable
Other		Dedicated open space	None indicated
Code Compliance			
Setbacks	No variances required. The site plan indicates a property line dispute. Are the setbacks calculated assuming a delineation that is most restrictive to the parcel.		
COMMENTS			
Stormwater Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the disturbance is going to be greater than 1 acre, a SWPPP and associated documents will be required for this project, None was submitted. • It appears that the site abuts a federal wetland. Construction limits should be set if work will be near the wetland. • On page C-5 note 6 calls for construction of diversion swales and sediment basins - none of these BMP's are shown on the plans. • The site plan indicates that there is a property line dispute regarding the northwestern property line. This area should be clearly delineated and shown in the field using orange construction fencing. (The property line dispute should be settled prior to any pre-construction meeting.) 			
Parking Is the parking adequate for the maximum capacity of an event? As currently shown there is only one access point to the new building area. This could become a choke point for cars entering and exiting the parking area for the new center.			
Pedestrian Linkages			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pedestrian circulation plan should be done that indicates the walkway/sidewalk connections between the proposed and existing buildings • A dedicated walkway or sidewalk connecting the school campus to the public sidewalk should be considered to separate pedestrians from vehicles entering and moving within the parcel. 			
Emergency Vehicles Access for vehicles should be reviewed.			
Access to St. Rt. 332			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the width of the current curb cut of adequate width to handle additional traffic that will occur during special events. NYSDOT should be consulted. ○ Is the existing driveway adequate to handle increased traffic. Either side of the existing drive is indicated as land banked for parking. The site plan should show the circulation pattern should the land banked area be developed. ○ A complete SWPPP should be required prior to final board approval. 			
Findings			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Route 332 is a major regional gateway corridor to the Finger Lakes. Assuring that corridor development is done with consideration to safe access by motorists. The proposed multi-use facility will attract visitors for performances, etc. which may create more traffic and congestion during special events than current operations do. • Assuring proper stormwater management practices on individual projects promotes overall in the entire watershed. 			

Board Motion: Change referral 42-2012 from Class 1 to Class 2 because of its potential for county-wide and intermunicipal impacts.

Motion Made By: George McCadden

Seconded: John Thompson

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

Board Motion: Based on the findings and comments, the Board moves to retain this referral as a Class 2 and approves it with the following modifications: Prior to planning board final approval the following must be done:

1. An analysis of internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation must be done giving special attention to
 - The dead end parking area circulation (one way in/one out when accessing the multi-use parking;
 - Adequacy of existing driveway to handle increased traffic and movements of emergency vehicles;
 - Circulation plan for area if land banked parking is developed;
 - Adequacy of the dimensions of the existing curb cut to handle additional traffic; and
 - Pedestrian linkages within the campus and to the sidewalk on Rt. 332.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1
 AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2
 EX: Exempt
 W: Withdrawn

45.1 - 2012 City of Canandaigua Planning Commission Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Cafua Management Co.*

Property Owner: *1258 Group LLC*

Representative: *Brian Bouchard*

Tax Map Parcel #: *84.18-1-36.1*

Brief Description: *Site plan approval to construct an 1,800 sq. ft. drive-thru Dunkin' Donuts with associated site improvements at 170 Eastern Blvd. (Rt. 5 & 20) next to the Rite Aid Drugstore in the City of Canandaigua.*

[Site Plan](#)

[Flood Map](#)

[Wetlands Map](#)

[Aerial Photo](#)

Comments: A subdivision is associated with this project has not been referred to the CPB by the City. Since the subdivision will also require referral and is part of the project, referral # 45.1 and 45.2 -2012 are recommended to be considered incomplete.

Board Motion: The project associated with Referrals 45.1 & 45.2 – 2012 involves a subdivision which was not submitted with referrals, the Board, therefore, returns it to the referring agency as Incomplete.

Motion Made By: John Thompson

Seconded: Mary Bogin

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

45.2 - 2012 City of Canandaigua Planning Commission Class: 1

Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals: *n/a*

Applicant: *Cafua Management Co.*

Property Owner: *1258 Group LLC*

Representative: *Brian Bouchard*

Tax Map Parcel #: *84.18-1-36.1*

Brief Description: *Special use permit to construct an 1,800 sq. ft. drive-thru Dunkin' Donuts with associated site improvements at 170 Eastern Blvd. (Rt. 5 & 20) next to the Rite Aid Drugstore in the City of Canandaigua.*

Board Motion: The project associated with Referrals 45.1 & 45.2 – 2012 involves a subdivision which was not submitted with referrals, the Board, therefore, returns it to the referring agency as Incomplete.

Motion Made By: John Thompson

Seconded: Mary Bogin

Vote: Motion unanimously carried.

Motion to Adjourn: John Thompson

Seconded: Richard DelVecchio

Vote: Motion unanimously carried. The 3/14/2012 CPB meeting adjourned at 9:50pm.

Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn