
Appendix

AA

County Planning Board Recommendations
(October 8, 2008)



Planning Board

Draft Minutes for October 8, 2008

Introduction	<u>2</u>
General Procedures	<u>2</u>
Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies	<u>2</u>

Staff Summaries & Board Action

Note: The page numbers listed below refer to the applicable board action.

App #	Municipality	Applicant	Application Type	Page #
143-08	Town of Victor	Turvic Partners, LLC	Map Amendment	13
144-08	Town of Victor	Eastview Mall LLC	Area Variance	4
145-08	Town of Farmington	Ruston Paving Co., Inc	Site Plan	4
146-08	Town of Farmington	Mike Nasello	Site Plan	5
147-08	Town of Manchester	Easy Street Software, LLC	Special Use Permit	6
148-08	Town of Manchester	Easy Street Software, LLC	Site Plan	6
149-08	Town of Canandaigua	Pioneer Library	Site Plan	4
150-08 & 158 thru 174-08	Town of Canandaigua	RSM West Lake Rd, LLC	Various	12-13
155-08	City of Geneva	Geneva City Council	Text Amendment	8
156-08	City of Geneva	Cornell Ag & Food Tech Park	Site Plan	8
157-08	City of Geneva	Chris Button	Site Plan	4

- 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 heard by the CPB. It can also be viewed at the Ontario County Planning Department Website:

<http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/planning/cpbsch.htm>

- General Procedures -

The Ontario County Planning Board meets once each month to review referred local actions for intermunicipal and countywide impacts. They are separated into two categories: Class 1 & Class 2. Class 1's are applications that the CPB has formally decided have little potential intermunicipal or countywide impact. The CPB will identify such an impact for Class 2 applications before voting to approve, modify or deny.

- Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies -

Class 1

If an application has been returned to the referring agency as a Class I, then the only requirement is that they consider any Board comments forwarded to them by the CPB. Referring agencies are asked to read any Board Comments into the minutes of a meeting or hearing held for the subject application.

Class 2

If the CPB has voted to **deny or modify** a referred application then the local board needs a majority plus one vote of their full board to act contrary to that decision. **CPB approvals without modification** require no extraordinary local action. However, in all cases, the referring agency is still required to consider CPB comments as they would for Class 1 applications.

- Incomplete Applications -

Referrals need to meet the definition of “full statement of such proposed action” in NYS General Municipal Law. The CPB’s determination regarding the completeness of a particular application is supported by factual findings and is made, whenever practical, after consulting with the submitting official or the chairs of referring agencies. The CPB will not make a recommendation on an application that they have determined to be incomplete.

[NYS General Municipal Law, Article 12-b Section 239-m \(c\)](#)

- Reporting back to the CPB -

“Report of final action. Within thirty days after final action, the referring body shall file a report of the final action it has taken with the county planning agency or regional planning council. A referring body which acts contrary to a recommendation of modification or disapproval of a proposed action shall set forth the reasons for the contrary action in such report.”

[NYS General Municipal Law, Article 12-b Section 239-m, Part 6.](#)

County Planning Board Members

Cities:

Canandaigua - John Thompson

Geneva - Mary Bogin*

Towns:

Bristol - Vacant

Canadice - **Stephen Groet***

Canandaigua - Mary Prince

East Bloomfield - Arthur Babcock*

Farmington - Mary Neale*

Geneva - Alan Deuel*

Gorham - **George McCadden**

Hopewell - Vacant

Manchester - **Jaylene Folkins, Chair***

Naples - Terrence Hopper*

Phelps - **Glen Wilkes***

Richmond - Bruce Campbell*

Seneca - **Clifford Kunes***

South Bristol - Peter Osborne*

Victor - **John Palomaki***

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

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

** Indicates attendance at the CRC meeting*

Ex-Officio Members Present

Tim Jensen - Ontario County Planning Department

Guests

Shirley Schumacher

Peter Schumacher

Doug Eldred

Tom Walsh

Rick Bolton

Mike Livecchi

Michael Nasello

Rocky LaRocca

Jon Kammerdiener

At 7:30 staff gave a 25-minute presentation describing past and present transportation planning projects in Ontario County.

After the presentation roll was taken and referral review began at 8:00pm with 12 members present.

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

Class 1's

157 -2008

City of Geneva Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Chris Button*

Representative: *Mark Costich*

Tax Map Parcel #: *104.019-1-1.1*

Brief Description: *A 12,120sf building expansion and other related improvements (lighting, jogging track, fencing, etc) to the Hobart & William Smith Colleges football sports complex.*

Location: *South side of Route 5 and 20, 1/3 mile west of Pulteney Street*

Staff Summary: The new building will be located between an existing parking lot and the football field. It will also serve as grandstand seating and house locker rooms training rooms and other sports related functions. The football field will be covered with artificial turf. A landscaped berm will be installed along Route 5 and 20. At the CRC meeting Ed green indicated that the grandstand seating would reduce from 4,000 seats to 3,200.



Comments:

1. The City and applicant should ensure that the new lighting is, to the extent practical dark skies, compliant.

➔ *Citing a lack of potential countywide or intermunicipal impact, Peter Osborne made a motion that was seconded by Glen Wilkes to abstain from making a formal recommendation on application 157-08 and to send all Board comments to the referring agency for their consideration.*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

149 -2008

Town of Canandaigua Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Pioneer Library*

Tax Map Parcel #: *71.00-1-74.200*

Brief Description: *Parking lot expansion for existing building (2557 State Rt 21 - Pioneer Library)*

Location: *South of State Rt 21, 0.6 miles east of the City of Canandaigua boundary*

Staff Summary: The existing lot will be re-striped and 14 new spaces added to the east end. A storm water detention area south of the parking lot along the east property boundary is also proposed.

➔ *Citing a lack of potential countywide or intermunicipal impact, Glen Wilkes made a motion that was seconded by Bruce Campbell to abstain from making a formal recommendation on the following applications and to send all Board comments to the referring agency for their consideration: 144-08, 145-08 & 149-08*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (17)

145 -2008 Town of Farmington Planning Board Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Ruston Paving Co., Inc*

Representative: *Thornton Engineering LLP*

Tax Map Parcel #: *29.00-1-4.000*

Brief Description: *3,150sf building expansion for an existing paving company (Ruston Paving).*

Location: *North end of Mertensia Rd, west side of State Rt 332*

Staff Summary: Zoning is General Industrial. The 6.6acre parcel accommodates an existing paving business with a 4,350sf building and parking. The applicant is proposing three additions to the existing building, including additional shop space (1,600sf), office space (975sf) and a lean-to (575sf) for storage. Site access will remain the same.



Board Comments:

1. The Town and applicant are encouraged to consider additional landscaping as a visual buffer to State Rt 332

146 -2008 Town of Farmington Planning Board Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Mike Nasello*

Property Owner: *Soper Power Sports*

Representative: *Parrone Engineering*

Tax Map Parcel #: *29.00-1-73.110*

Brief Description: *Use of existing building and expansion of parking lot to accommodate an urgent care facility (6144 State Rt 96)*

Location: *North side of State Rt 96, 1/3 mile west of State Rt 332*

Staff Summary: Zoning is general business. Public water and sewer are available. No changes to the building footprint are proposed. 20 parking spaces will be added to the 16 existing. Though no variance request has been formally submitted, it appears the applicant will need one for the number of parking spaces. 98 would be required by code. 36 are proposed.



Board Comments:

1. Instead of a variance the applicant should commit the acreage on an approved site plan for all 98 spaces, then build only the spaces they expect to need. The rest (62 spaces) could be land banked and built later only if needed.

➔ *Citing a lack of potential countywide or intermunicipal impact, Mary Bogin made a motion that was seconded by Terrence Hopper to abstain from making a formal recommendation on application 146-08 and to send all Board comments to the referring agency for their consideration.*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

147 -2008 Town of Manchester Planning Board Class: 1

Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals: *148-07*

Applicant: *Easy Street Software, LLC*

Property Owner: *HFS Realty New York LLC*

Tax Map Parcel #: *11.00-2-34.121*

Brief Description: *Use of existing building for an adult care facility (Bickford Country Home - 630 Curran Rd)*

Location: *West side of Curran Rd, 2 miles north of the NYS Thruway*

Staff Summary: This site was previously used as an adult care facility. Public water and on site septic are available. There's no information regarding the capacity or functionality of the on site septic. The 4.4-acre lot accommodates a 7,200sf building and a small storage shed. Other than an updated sign no expansion or changes to the exterior are proposed. Applicant estimates that there will be a maximum of 27 residents, 10 full time and part time employees, and 1 to 4 visitors daily. Applicant also indicates that a NYSDOH license will be needed as well.

148 -2008 Town of Manchester Planning Board Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: *147-08*

Applicant: *Easy Street Software, LLC*

Property Owner: *HFS Realty New York LLC*

Tax Map Parcel #: *11.00-2-34.121*

Brief Description: *Use of existing facility for an adult care facility (630 Curran Rd)*

Location: *West side of Curran Rd, 2 miles north of the NYS Thruway*

Staff Summary: Refer to application 147-08, above.

➔ *Citing a lack of potential countywide or intermunicipal impact, Terrence Hopper made a motion that was seconded by Clifford Kunes to abstain from making a formal recommendation on applications 147-08 & 148-08 and to send all Board comments to the referring agency for their consideration.*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

144-2008 Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals Class: 1

Type: *Area Variance*

Applicant: *Eastview Mall LLC*

Representative: *BME Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *6.00-1-12.500*

Brief Description: *Variance for the number of parking spaces for the Eastview Mall properties to accommodate new retail construction (LL Bean)*

Location: *Eastview Mall, west of State Rt 96 just north of intersection with State Rt 490*

Staff Summary: Requesting a reduction in the number of required parking spaces for the entire mall complex. Currently 5 spaces are required for every 1,000sf of floor space. The applicant is requesting that it be reduced to 4.5 spaces. Beyond 4.5 spaces /1,000sf of space the site will have

an additional 661 spaces.



Board Comments:

1. The Town and applicant are encouraged to explore options to maximize use of existing parking such as shuttles from the more remote parking areas.

Class 2's

155 - 2008

City of Geneva City Council

Class: 2

Type: *Text Amendment*

Applicant: *Geneva City Council*

Brief Description: *Proposed lakefront and downtown development plan*

Staff Summary: The 15 year plan is for development of the lakefront area. It includes establishing and enhancing connections between the city and the lakefront. Proposed improvements include a farmers market, visitor's center, mixed use development, residential uses, another hotel and an enhanced public marina.



Board Comments:

1. The CPD would like to commend the City for taking this thoughtful planned approach to development in the City.
2. There is concern that building 12 and others near the lakefront will block views from existing development and in other ways undermine the intent to fully connect downtown to the lake.
3. The City should consider re-arranging and redesigning the various elements of the plan to as much as possible preserve views and the visual connection between the downtown area and Seneca Lake.
4. The height of Building 12 is a concern.
5. The City is encouraged to come up with strategies for reducing the amount of land consumed with parking such as shared spaces, parking garages, etc.
6. Because it is consuming so much undeveloped green space, there is also a concern that building 12 and other development may ultimately have a negative impact on community character and tourism.
7. Pedestrian access between this development and downtown will be critical.
8. To the extent practical existing trails and sidewalks throughout the lakefront area should be preserved.



Findings

1. The proposed plan is for extensive development of the lakefront to increase tax revenue and tourism.
2. One of the key elements of the plan is to reconnect downtown to the lakefront
3. The City has used an extended program of public outreach as well as a thoughtful approach to arrive at the current draft of the plan.

4. The draft will be the subject of additional review and revision by the City of Geneva.
5. This Board has expressed concerns about specific parts of the plan in non-binding comments.
6. This Board believes that the process will ultimately result in a plan that, when properly implemented, will benefit the City of Geneva and Ontario County.

➔ *Based on the above findings Stephen Groet made a motion that was seconded by Terrence Hopper to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for application 155-08*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

156 -2008

City of Geneva Planning Board

Class: 2

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Cornell Ag & Food Tech Park*

Representative: *C.T. Male Associates, P.C.*

Tax Map Parcel #: *104.01-1-3.000*

Brief Description: *99,277sf grape crushing facility with on site wastewater pre-treatment and parking (NY Wine Services Corp Custom Crush Facility)*

Location: *South of Empire Blvd, west of Pre-emption Rd (Co. Rd 6) 1/2 mile South of County Road 4*

Staff Summary: The facility will be accessed from a road internal to the Ag & Food Tech Park campus. Public water and sewer are available. A “Custom Crush” plant manufactures, bottles stores and distributes wine for small local wineries. Phase 1 is a 61,630sf processing and storage building, 1,800sf wastewater pre-treatment facility and 32 parking spaces. Phase 2 is a 35,847sf building expansion and 16 parking spaces. After pretreatment processing wastewater will empty into the municipal sewer.

Before construction the developer will clean up contaminated soils in compliance with a NYSDEC approved 2004 soil remediation plan. Storm water runoff will be piped to the existing treatment facility designed and constructed for the entire park. Information on potential traffic impacts was submitted by email 10/08/08.

✂ Findings

1. Development of this scale invariably has intermunicipal impacts related to traffic drainage community character and the economy.
2. The proposed park appears to conform to standards and established during a review of the overall Ag Tech Food Park.
3. The applicant has addressed other site plan related issues to the satisfaction this Board.

➔ *Based on the above findings Stephen Groet made a motion that was seconded by Mary Neale to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for application 156-08*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

Ontario County Planning Board – Staff Summary of Referrals – October, 2008

N/A (see below) Town of Canandaigua Zoning Board of Appeals Class: 2

Type: *Area Variances, Subdivision and Site Plan* (See table below for referral #'s)

Related Referrals: *130 thru 134-08*

Applicant: *RSM West Lake Rd, LLC*

Property Owner: *German Brothers Marina*

Representative: *BME Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *112.00-1-24.100 & 113.13-1-10.000*

Brief Description: *West Lake Marine Club – Residential subdivision and clubhouse*

Location: *Both sides of County Road 16, 1,000' south of Wyffels Rd*

Staff Summary: The CPB reviewed several applications related to this proposal in August. A recommendation was made only on the special use permit for the clubhouse. Modifications have been made to the proposal eliminating the need for selected variances. Three additional variances have also been identified. All of the remaining variances, site plan and subdivision have been renumbered and placed on the October 8th agenda. They are described in the table below

Public water and sewer are available. About ¼ of the development area (closest to the lakeshore) is zoned lakefront residential with a minimum lot size of 20,000sf. The remaining land is being considered zoned 1ac Residential (SCR-1). The two different zoning classifications increase the complexity of the project as they have different subdivision, lot size and other requirements.

The overall development area is 75.6ac. The applicant is proposing to purchase a lakefront parcel (3.5ac) currently used as a commercial marina and redevelop it as “private water oriented recreational facility” for use by the residents of the proposed 70 single family homes on the upland side. The CPB voted in August to recommend approval of a special use permit for the private water oriented recreational facility. A single curb cut along County Road 16 will provide the sole access to 67 of the residential lots. Two options for the recreational facility have been submitted and separate variances (described in the tables below) will be needed for both.

Ref #	Exhibit	Type	Description
150-08	n/a	Subdivision	Clustered or “Conservation” subdivision - 70 residential lots on 72.4ac on the upland side of County Road 16
159-08	n/a	Area Variance	Lots 7-13 in the residential subdivision need a front setback variance. 60' is required 30' is proposed.
160-08	n/a	Area Variance	Lots 7-15 need a building height variance. 25' is the maximum allowed. 35' is proposed.
161-08	n/a	Area Variance	Applicant would like to have lots 7-15 located partially in the SCR-1 zone without counting towards the overall SCR-1 lot density requirements
162-08	n/a	Area Variance	23.18 acres in the SCR-1 District have been set aside for the residential subdivision. 27.84ac is required. It has been requested that 7.79ac of open space conserved in the Residential Lakefront District count toward the requirement for the SCR-1 portion.
171-08	n/a	Area Variance	The proposed flagpole is 35'. 25' is the maximum allowed.
174-08	n/a	Site Plan	Site plan for the docking and mooring structures. The existing marina has 68 seasonal dock or mooring spaces for boats. The applicant is proposing to have 135 permanent

Ontario County Planning Board – Staff Summary of Referrals – October, 2008

			spaces, including 9 for visitors.
158-08	B	Site Plan	Development of a 2,960sf clubhouse with fuel pump structure, office and storage. Separate fuel pump house/office no longer proposed.
163-08	B	Area Variance	County Road 16 separates all but 6 of the parking spaces from the clubhouse. Local law requires 20 parking spaces on the same side of the road.
164-08	B	Area Variance	Parking for the clubhouse cannot be in the front or side yards. All 51 spaces on both sides of County Road 16 are in the front or side yard.
165-08	B	Area Variance	A 38' front setback is proposed for the clubhouse. 60' is required.
166-08	B	Area Variance	A 4' setback from the mean high water mark is proposed. 25' is required.
167-08	B	Area Variance	A 4' rear setback is proposed. 25' is required (see above).
172-08	F	Site Plan	Development of a 1040sf clubhouse with fuel pump structure, office and storage as well as development of a separate 2960sf clubhouse on the upland side.
168-08	F	Area Variance	The clubhouse has been determined to be a residential accessory structure. A variance will be needed, as the proposed size is 1040sf. 100sf is the maximum allowed.
169-08	F	Area Variance	The proposed height 1,040sf accessory structure is 16'. 10' is the maximum allowed
170-08	F	Area Variance	The proposed 1,040sf accessory structure will have electric, phone, sewer and water. Town code only allows electricity.
173-08	F	Area Variance	Parking for the clubhouse cannot be in the front or side yards. All spaces on both sides of County Road 16 are in the front or side yard.

At the CRC meeting staff gave an overview and staff advised the CPB to make a recommendation on all the referrals submitted. That includes two different proposals for development of the private water oriented recreational facility. Doug Eldred gave clarification regarding how the variances applied to the two proposals.

At the full Board meeting Tom Walsh, attorney for the applicant objected to the CPB's intent to provide a recommendation for several referrals related to this development that the CPB had not been able to take action on at the submitted for the August meeting. Staff made it clear that the previous to not make a recommendation in August did not preclude them from revisiting the issues now. They also indicated that any recommendation that did go back would be accompanied by an explanation of how the action complied with the requirements specified in NYS General Municipal Law.

In a 15-minute presentation, staff walked the members through the various referrals needed for the revised plan including the two scenarios for development of the private water oriented recreational facility. Doug Eldred followed with a 15-minute presentation describing other changes to the project as well as specific impacts to water quality, community character and traffic. Rick Bolton was also given a chance to speak.



Board Comments:

1. Sureties should be in place so that the plan for remediation of the contaminated soils is completed in an a manner and on a specific schedule acceptable to the Town and NYSDEC.
2. Clean up should precede any re-use or redevelopment of the site.
3. Town and applicant should be confident that the plan for limiting use of fertilizers and other lawn products that phosphorous can be easily and consistently enforced over the long term.
4. There is also concern regarding how the prohibition on pruning trees that currently block lake views from the residences will be enforced.
5. Provisions should be made to ensure proper implementation of all storm water and erosion control measures.
6. In the interest of public safety every measure should be taken to provide a second access to this development.
7. The Town is asked to consider if the subdivision layout truly achieves the intent of conservation (clustered) subdivision.

Note: The following points fully substantiate the position that the CPB recommendations contained in this document related to the RSM development are valid and in compliance with the requirements of NYS General Municipal Law.

- The recommendation made in August did not preclude the CPB from revisiting the applications and making a formal recommendation. In fact the recommendation was “to abstain from making a formal recommendation at this time...” on the area variances, subdivision and site plan. We think the intent of this language is clear.
- NYS General Municipal Law provides that if the a CPB recommendation is returned after the initial thirty day review period but more than two days before the referring board takes action, a supermajority is required to override recommendations to deny or modify the proposal.
- A second review of the entire project was also warranted because of the additional variances and the fact that the plan submitted for consideration in October had been revised significantly since August and now included a second alternative for the lakefront development, with the private water oriented recreational facility split into two buildings on opposite sides of County Road 16.

It is hoped that the Town finds this argument clear and reasonable and considers the CPB’s recommendations as being in compliance with the requirements of NYSGML.



Findings

1. This application because of its’ location, scale, and layout will likely have countywide and intermunicipal impacts to water quality, traffic and community character.
2. The lot in question is located on the lakefront and upland sides of County Road 16
3. The residential development is a clustered 69-70 unit residential subdivision on 72.4ac on the west side of County Road 16.
4. The lot is zoned both SCR-1 (1ac residential) and Lakefront Residential
5. The request in includes an option for a 2,960sf clubhouse located on the lakeshore for use by residents of the 70-unit development (Exhibit B).
6. It also includes a second option for a 2,960sf clubhouse located on the west side of County Road 16 with a 1,040sf utility building on the east (lakeside) portion of the lot (Exhibit F).
7. The CPB is concerned that improper placement and development of such a structure could have

negative impacts on public safety, traffic congestion along County Road 16, and the water quality of Canandaigua Lake.

8. The proposal shown in Exhibit B requires variances the lakeside setback.
9. CPB policy establishes their position that such variances have an incremental but significant negative impact on water quality and community character.
10. The proposal shown in Exhibit F avoids the necessity of setback and lot coverage variances,
11. It is the position of this Board that proposal in Exhibit F is a reasonable alternative to Exhibit B.
12. It is the position of this Board that proposal in Exhibit F, to the extent practical, minimizes negative impacts to water quality, community character and reduces potential problems with pedestrian and vehicular traffic along County Roads 16. .
13. Applicant has indicated that the number of docks and moorings has been reduced to number now used by German Brothers.
14. The number proposed is within allowances described in the Uniform Docking and Mooring Law.
15. The CPB has reviewed photo simulations showing the development from the east side of Canandaigua Lake.
16. It is the position of this Board that the residential development does not have an unduly negative impact on the existing landscape.
17. The applicant indicates the plan for storm water and erosion control complies with NYSDEC requirements.
18. The applicant has addressed all other site development issues to the satisfaction of this Board.

➔ *Based on the above findings, Mary Bogin made a motion that was seconded by Peter Osborne to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for all variances and the site plan required for the lakefront development shown in Exhibit F: 168-08, 169-08, 170-08, 172-08 and 173-08.*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12).

➔ *Based on the above findings, Arthur Babcock made a motion that was seconded by Mary Neale to forward a recommendation of denial and all Board comments to the referring agency for variances and the site plan required for the lakefront development shown in Exhibit B: 158-08, 163-08, 164-08, 165-08, 166-08, & 167-08*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12).

➔ *Based on the above findings, Terrence Hopper made a motion that was seconded by Bruce Campbell to forward a recommendation of approval to the referring agency for the site plan for the docking and mooring structures (174-08).*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12).

➔ *Based on the above findings, Peter Osborne made a motion that was seconded by Alan Deuel to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for the variances and subdivision related to the conservation subdivision: 150-08, 159-08, 160-08, 161-08, & 162-08*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12).

➔ *Based on the above findings, Arthur Babcock made a motion that was seconded by Clifford Kunes to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for the*

variance for the flagpole (171-08).

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12)

143 -2008

Town of Victor Town Board

Class: 2

Type: *Map Amendment*

Related Referrals: *124-08 & 125-08*

Applicant: *Turvic Partners, LLC*

Property Owner: *Jon J Kammerdiener*

Representative: *DDS Engineers, LLC*

Tax Map Parcel #: *1.02-1-7.000*

Brief Description: *Rezoning a 2.1 ac parcel from Planned Development to Commercial*

Location: *South of Turk Hill Rd, 850' east of State Rt 96*

Staff Summary: The Forest Park PDD consists of two parcels (about 3½ac) just north and east of Eastview Mall and Cobblestone Court. The existing zoning allows a mix of low intensity retail, office uses, and residential. The CPB reviewed referrals related to this site in 2007 and in August of this year. The planning board will address issues such as traffic, drainage and landscaping during site plan review. At the full Board meeting John Palomaki left the room before deliberations began.



Board Comments:

1. The Town should be careful to allow development that serves as a needed transition between the very high intensity commercial and residential uses to the north.



Findings

1. It is the position of this Board that the site is generally suitable for commercial use.
2. It is also the position of this board that proper application of existing standards related to traffic landscaping, buffering, lighting and other issues will result in development that minimizes potential negative impacts.

➔ *Based on the above findings Stephen Groet made a motion that was seconded Clifford Kunes by to forward a recommendation of approval and all Board comments to the referring agency for application 143-08.*

John Palomaki abstained from voting.

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (11)

John Palomaki re-entered the meeting after the vote was taken.

Other Business

John Palomaki talked briefly about the swap shop program underway in the Town of Victor, he passed out materials and generally encouraged others to consider a similar program in their municipality.

➔ *Mary Neale made motion that was seconded by Cliff Kunes to accept the draft September 2008 CPB minute as correct and final.*

The motion passed by a unanimous vote (12).

A motion was made and seconded and the meeting adjourned at 10:30pm