

**ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Referrals for Review at the: **Coordinated Review Committee Meeting –Tuesday Feb 8, 2022, at 3:30pm – County Planning Board Meeting –February 9, 2022 at 7:00pm [Hybrid Meeting Click Join Meeting hyperlink below](#)**

Telephone: 585-396-4455

Referral #	Municipality	Applicant	Application Type	Class	Page
18	Town of Phelps	Dendis Sand & Gravel	Area Variance	1	2
19	Town of Geneva	Jacob Fox	Map Amendment	2	3
20	Town of West Bloomfield	John & Julie Vandemar	Subdivision	1	4
21	Town of Victor	Michell Design Build	Area Variance	1	5
22	Town of Victor	Crown Castle	Special Use Permit	1	6
23	Town of Manchester	John Yates	Special Use Permit	1	6
24	Town of Manchester	John Yates	Site Plan	1	7
25	Town of Manchester	John Yates	Sign Permit	1	8
26	Town of East Bloomfield	Town of East Bloomfield	Other Recreation Master Plan	1	8
27	Town of Geneva	Greg Missick	Subdivision	1	9
28	Town of Farmington	TOMRA NY Recycling LLC	Site Plan	1	11
29	Town of Farmington	A Safe Place Storage	Area Variance	1	11
30	Town of West Bloomfield	Simple Self Storage	Site Plan	Late referral 2	11
31	Town of West Bloomfield	Simple Self Storage	Site Plan	Late referral 2	15
32	Town of Canandaigua	Town Board	Text Amendment	Late referral 2	15

Wednesday, February 9, 2022

7:00 PM | (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada) | 2 hrs 30 mins

[Start meeting](#)

**More ways to join:**

**Join from the meeting link**

<https://ontariocountyny.webex.com/ontariocountyny/j.php?MTID=m0f6682c36e06ac1302f45f2222835f1f>

**Join by meeting number**

Meeting number (access code): 2345 339 5864

Meeting password: e6rVVbFhN52

**Tap to join from a mobile device (attendees only)**

[+1-408-418-9388](tel:+14084189388),23453395864## United States Toll

**Join by phone**

+1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

[Global call-in numbers](#)

Cities	Member name in bold if on local legislative, planning, or zoning board	P-Present V – Virtual A – Absent, E – Excused Absence,	
Canandaigua	Doug Dello Stritto	V	
Geneva	Paul Passavant	P	
<b>Towns</b>			
Bristol	<b>AJ Magnan ZBA</b>	V	
Canadice	<b>Stephen Groet PB</b>	P	
Canandaigua	Shawna Boneshak	V	
East Bloomfield	<b>Mike Woodruff PB</b>		A
Farmington	Ted Liddell	V	
Geneva	Steven High	P	
Gorham	<b>Jack Dailey PB</b>		A
Hopewell	Vacant	-----	-----
Manchester		-----	-----
Naples	Marion Mueller	V 7:07	
Phelps	<b>Glen Wilkes ZBA</b>	P	
Richmond	<b>Leonard Wildman PB</b>	P	
Seneca	Vacant	-----	-----
South Bristol	<b>Bessie Tyrrell PB</b>		A
Victor	Mike Crowley	V	
West Bloomfield	<b>Ruth Cahn ZBA</b>	V	

**Call To Order/Roll Call:** Chair Wildman called the 2/9 /22 CPB meeting to order at 7:02 and requested Ms. Holley to do roll call. Ms. Holley presented roll call and reported that there were (6) members present virtually and ( 5) members physically at 20 Ontario Street meeting the quorum requirement. Marion Mueller joined at 7:07 before discussion of referrals bringing the total number of attendees to 12.

**Guest:** \_Trevor Haut/Passero Associates, Bayview Heights; Mathew Newcomb/Passero Associates, Bayview Heights; Nathan Cooley, community member,

**Minutes:**

- In light of 3 required abstentions -Glen Wilkes, Shawna Bonshak, Steve Groet, quorum not available to approve 1/12/22 minutes.

18 -2022                                      Town of Phelps Zoning Board of Appeals                                      Class: 1  
 Type: *Area Variance*  
 Applicant: *Dendis Sand & Gravel*  
 Property Owner: *HLD Properties*  
 Representative: *Jason McCormick*

Tax Map Parcel #: 49.00-1-36.100

Brief Description: *Area variance for two 80' concrete silos at Dendis Sand and Gravel on the north side of SR 96 southeast of the SR 96/SR 14 cloverleaf in the Town of Phelps. Associated site development includes a 1,600 SF building, 4 storage bins, and new septic system.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32715/18-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32716/18-2022-plan--nys-rte-96---dendis>

The height limit for the property is 45'. The location of the proposed development area for the silos, building and other site modifications is 346' to 400' from all property lines. The applicant owns an adjoining 59 acres property to the northeast occupied by a mining operation.

**Comments**

1. Will the proposed structures increase vehicle/truck traffic on SR 96?

**CPB Comments**

1. Is it feasible/preferable for the applicant to develop more than 2 lower silos to avoid the need for a height variance?

2. Would aviation lighting be required on an 80' silo at this location?

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 18-2022, as class 1 and return it to the local board with comments. **Motion made by:** AJ Magnan **Seconded by:** Steve Groet.

**Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Glen Wilkes) **Motion carried.**

19 -2022

Town of Geneva Town Board

Class: 2

Type: *Map Amendment*

Applicant: *Jacob Fox*

Property Owner: *Brian Nicholas*

Tax Map Parcel #: *133.00-1-17.110*

Brief Description: *Map amendment to create a PUD at 4182 Route 14 in the Town of Geneva. Planned uses for the 59-acre property include 3 homes, a silvo-pasture farm, farmstand near Big Alice Brewery, and a glamping area.*

[https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32718/19-2022\\_13300-1-17110\\_Aerial-Photo-Map](https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32718/19-2022_13300-1-17110_Aerial-Photo-Map)

<https://ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32820/19-2022-site-plan>

Adjacent land uses include, Bayview Heights, a suburban density residential subdivision to the south, White Springs Brook and agricultural fields to the west, vacant forested land and several 1.5-to-7-acre residential lots to the north, and vacant land, 2 residential lots of less than 1 acre, Big aLIce Brewing and White Springs Winery along SR 14 in front of the property to the east. The potential PUD extension/farm market property is north of Big aLIce Brewing along SR 14.

According to Oncor, the property is in OC Agricultural District #1. The NWI indicates a potential federal wetland along White Springs Brook along the west property boundary, likely the 1.1-acre wetland referenced in the application materials. There is also an area of 16-30 percent slope in the southwest corner of the site.

The site's R-1 zoning allows single family homes and short-term rental in accordance with Town regulations. The R-1 district does not explicitly allow agricultural uses, though such use is protected as long as the property is in the county agricultural district. The Geneva Town Code does not include a definition for campground, and it is not an allowed use in any district. The Lake View Overlay District permits agricultural tourism enterprises not operated as part of a farm, event facilities, lodging with not more than 14 rooms, restaurants, tourist-oriented retail sales, and cannabis on-site

consumption establishment. Re-zoning to PUD would replace all development standards of the R-1 and Lake View Overlay districts with standards and thresholds outlined by the town board in its review of the preliminary development plan or by the planning board in its review of the final development plan.

### Comments

1. In developing the silvo-pasture farm and management plan, care should be taken to select species, breed, and type of animals and size of herd able to make use of planned trees in a rotational grazing pattern without trampling existing vegetation and creating risk for erosion.
2. Given the narrow lot frontage and existing driveway density, it is desirable to identify a shared access point with White Springs Winery and/or Big aLICe Brewing.
3. Any PUD approval should clearly define the access point, circulation system, number and location of residential uses, and guest accommodations, scale and location of farmstand and special event parking, and any limits on special events frequency, size, or nature. The development plan should also establish appropriate setbacks and identify natural features to be preserved as part of the 35 percent open space.

### CRC Comments

1. Does the applicant anticipate wholesale or retail sale of mushroom and milk or meat livestock products produced on the farm? What number of vehicle trips and parking will the farm business entail?
2. The referring body should consider requiring retention of vegetative buffers along the property perimeter to protect the agricultural activities from adjacent residential uses.
3. Where is the location of the third home?
4. What standards will apply to the guest accommodations?
5. What is the size of the mushroom facility? the livestock building? What is the size and use of the processing facility?
6. What is the size, use, water source, and outflow location of the farm ponds?
7. Will the requirements of the Lake View Overlay District regarding 100' side setbacks for some uses, use of quality exterior materials, hours of operation, etc. be continued?
8. This segment of SR 14 appears to be developing the mix of residential and commercial uses anticipated in the Town Center Mixed Use district. The referring body should consider how to safely accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel between residential uses along the lake and in Bayview Heights, and commercial uses such as restaurants/breweries/wineries, potential farm stand, etc. from the City line to Turk Road.

### CPB Comments

1. Is parcel 1 included in the PUD?
2. Will this project be phased?
3. Does Town Code allow more than 1 home/business on a lot? Will homes and commercial buildings be located to allow subdivision, if desired, in the future?
4. How will the new trees be protected from grazing livestock or how long after trees are planted will livestock be introduced?
5. Applicant and/or Town Board needs to specifically outline thresholds for impervious surfaces; frequency, size, and type of special events; and other development parameters typically included in zoning district regulations.
6. When next updating its Comprehensive Plan, the Town of Geneva should focus attention on the appropriate uses, development standards, and bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for this rapidly developing mixed use segment of SR 14 from the City line to Turk Road.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 20-2022, as class 2 and return it to the local board with comments and a recommendation for approval. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve Groet

**Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

20 - 2022      Town of West Bloomfield Planning Board  
Type: *Subdivision*

Class: *1*

Applicant & owner: *John & Julie Vandemar*:

Representative: *James H. Missell & Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *50.00-1-78.100 & 50.00-1-78.210*

Brief Description: *Subdivision to create 3 frontage lots of 5.6, 9, and 10 acres with 300', 600', and 250' of frontage and a 44.5-acre remainder lot on the south side of SR 65 at CR 14 and Hickory Lane in the Town of West Bloomfield.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32734/20-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32719/20-2022-CONTEXT3-PSPSHEET1>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32720/20-2022-vandemar-map>

This subdivision is a re-subdivision of 2 lots with 14 and 55 acres. The proposed subdivision will reduce the western most residential lot from 14 to 9 acres as lot R-A, re-allocating creek frontage/floodplain area to the remainder lot (Lot R-1A). Lot R-A and the remainder lot includes easements to the City of Rochester and Iroquois Gas Company.

There are 2 existing residential lots surrounded by the 55 acres parcel and the proposed subdivision would create 2 additional frontage lots (lots R-1B and R-1C). The proposed frontage lots have 250' and 305' feet of frontage; the existing lots have 200; and 630' of frontage and all have 500' to 800' or more feet of depth. The creek frontage is either floodplain or has slopes of 16 to 30 percent.

Proposed lot R-A is zoned R-2 permitting duplex and single-family homes; multi-family, place of worship, and various types of in-home care with site plan review; and allowing office, service, and small-scale retail uses by special use permit. The other lots are zoned R-1 permitting single family residential and agricultural uses.

**Comments**

1. The referring board should request a sight distance analysis of the suitability of the remainder lot frontage for an access point to the maximum number of lots allowed by current zoning and consider noting the preferred alignment of such future access connection in relation to CR 14 and Hickory Lane on the subdivision plan. The sight distance analysis should also identify an appropriate location for the access point for lot R-1B to avoid conflict with vehicle movements at the Y intersection where CR 14 intersects SR 65.
2. This subdivision must also be referred to the Livingston County Planning Board. As it is within 500' of the Livingston County/Town of Lima boundary.
3. Who owns what appears to be a drainage easement from SR 65 to Honeoye Creek?
4. Does Irondequoit Gas Corporation operate a gas line in the former Canandaigua & Niagara Falls Railroad ROW?

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 20-2022, 22-2022, 23-2022, 24-2022, 25-2022, 26-2022, 28-2022, and 29-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

21 -2022                                      Town of Victor    Zoning Board of Appeals                                      Class: 1  
 Type: *Area Variance*

Applicant: *Mitchell Design Build*

Property Owner: *Mary Catherine Van Bortel*

Representative: *Mitchell Design Build*

Tax Map Parcel #: *28.04-2-64.00*



Related Referrals: 24-2022 & 25-2022

Applicant: *John Yates*

Property Owner: *same*

Representative: *Marks Engineering*

Tax Map Parcel #: 44.03-1-30.000

Brief Description: *Special use permit, site plan, and sign permit for bistro in existing restaurant building at 1715 SR 21 in the Town of Manchester. The 1,500 SF restaurant will be expanded to include vestibule, enclosing deck area to accommodate bar/dining space, and a 2,400 SF pole barn with 200 SF covered patio to house office and future micro-brewery.*

[https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32726/23-2022\\_4403-1-30000\\_Aerial-Photo-Map](https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32726/23-2022_4403-1-30000_Aerial-Photo-Map)

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32725/23-2022>

<https://ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32821/23-2022-septic>

The Town of Manchester Commercial zoning district allows restaurants with a special use permit. The proposed use will reuse the existing 6'x6' sign structure and existing lighting which is on a timer.

According to Oncor, the 3.2 acres site was previously operated as a snack bar. The property has some areas of 16 to 30 and 31 to 60 percent slope and there is a DEC wetland and floodplain along the outlet to the rear/east of the property. Existing adjacent land use includes a solar array to the south, a motor vehicle service business to the north and residential and agricultural uses across SR 21 to the west.

The proposed pole barn will be located to the rear of the existing parking lot approximately 30' from the southern property line. The applicant proposes to install a grinder pump in the existing septic tank and a force line from the pump tank to the sewer line located on the neighboring property to the north.

#### Comments

1. What provisions are being made for stormwater management related to the 2,400 SF pole barn?
2. The applicant has not submitted a site plan that meets the requirements of 325-75 K (2). If the planning board is waiving the site plan requirements the board must include findings, limit such waiver to elements allowed in the regulations, and document such findings in their minutes.

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 20-2022, 22-2022, 23-2022, 24-2022, 25-2022, 26-2022, 28-2022, and 29-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

24 -2022                      Town of Manchester Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: 23-2022 7 25-2022

Applicant & owner: *John Yates*

Tax Map Parcel #: 44.03-1-30.000

Brief Description: *Special use permit, site plan, and sign permit for bistro in existing restaurant building at 1715 SR 21 in the Town of Manchester. The 1,500 SF restaurant will be expanded to include vestibule, enclosing deck area to accommodate bar/dining space, and a 2,400 SF pole barn with 200 SF*

*covered patio to house office and future micro-brewery.*

See information at 23-2022.

25 -2022                      Town of Manchester   Planning Board    Class: 1  
 Type: *Sign Permit*

Related Referrals: 23-2022 & 24-2022

Applicant & owner: *John Yates*

Tax Map Parcel #: 44.03-1-30.00

Brief Description: *Special use permit, site plan, and sign permit for bistro in existing restaurant building at 1715 SR 21 in the Town of Manchester. The 1,500 SF restaurant will be expanded to include vestibule, enclosing deck area to accommodate bar/dining space, and a 2,400 SF pole barn with 200 SF covered patio to house office and future micro-brewery.*

See information at 23-2022.

26 -2022                      Town of East Bloomfield   Town Board    Class: 1  
 Type: *Other - Recreation Master Plan*

Applicant: *Town of East Bloomfield*

Brief Description: *Updated Recreation Master Plan for the Town and Village of East Bloomfield.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32727/26-2022-e-bloom-parks-plan>

The Town and Village of East Bloomfield updated their 2008 Recreation Master Plan. The 2020 Comprehensive Plan and 2022 Recreation Master Plan identify the recreation mission as offering residents and visitors a balanced system of parklands, open spaces, and leisure opportunities to foster healthy lifestyles, maintain the area's scenic character, and contribute to quality of life.

Existing recreation facilities in East Bloomfield include:

- Elton Park, a 1.9 acre gathering space with gazebo in the village,
- Veterans Park, an 18-acre park on NYS 5/US 20 outside the village with a community building and variety of fields and courts,
- Boughton Park Reserve, a forever wild area with 2 lakes, boat launch, and pavilion owned jointly with Towns of Victor and West Bloomfield for the enjoyment of their residents,
- Pickle Park a pocket park in the village,
- Indoor and outdoor facilities at Bloomfield Central Schools, includes several gyms, tennis courts, athletic fields, and a performing art center,
- a school used cross country course at the privately owned Parkview Fairways Golf Course, and
- 3.4 miles of snowmobile trail C4 managed and maintained by the Finger Lakes Snowmobile Club.

Many of East Bloomfield's volunteer youth recreation organizations (baseball, soccer, lacrosse), and the school district also service those in Bristol, West Bloomfield, and/or Farmington. The existing senior program at Veterans Park is privately operated.

Based on analysis of community demographics, land use, a survey, and interviews with current recreation providers, this



Recreation Master Plan identifies the following desired facilities and activities:

- Additional rectangular fields to prevent overuse and allow maintenance of existing fields; potential need for additional baseball/softball fields as well.
- Trail connections between neighborhoods, parks, and intermunicipal trail systems. The former railroad ROW, though currently in private ownership, may provide an opportunity to link the village and Veterans Park.
- Improve the Annex building at Veteran Park to provide additional community meeting/gathering space. Other park needs include water and electrical service extensions, tree planting, storage, grills, signage, restrooms, and potential access from SR 444.
- Secure funding for needed improvements/expansion at Boughton Park Reserve: dam remediation, dock maintenance, more portable restrooms, more on-site canoe/kayak storage, trails, educational programs, and potential for additional parking.
- Ensure lands, facilities and programs accommodate persons of differing abilities, include those with disabilities.
- A pull-off or picnic spot to allow greater enjoyment of 1 or more key vistas along SR 444.
- Consider additional sidewalks at Pickle Park and the commercial area at NYS 5/US 20 and SR 444.
- Publicize historic markers, buildings, and districts and increase community awareness of community scenic, historic, and cultural assets.
- Retain a recreation director/coordinator to work with the School District on scheduling facilities and activities.
- East Bloomfield would consider partnering with user groups to establish a skatepark, teen center and/or equestrian trails.
- Community may undertake larger role in recreational programming and services for seniors.
- East Bloomfield considering adoption of stream buffers to protect water quality and provide opportunity for future trails.
- Appropriately support any facility or program expansion with an analysis of sources of development and maintenance funds and invest in park Master Plans and quality design to minimize long-term operating and maintenance costs.

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 20-2022, 22-2022, 23-2022, 24-2022, 25-2022, 26-2022, 28-2022, and 29-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

27 -2022

Town of Geneva Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Greg Missick*

Property Owner: *same*

Representative: *Passero Associates*

Tax Map Parcel #: *133.11-2-61.000, 133.11-2-00.100, 133.00-1-20.000*

Brief Description: *Amended subdivision of 35 acres in phase 3 of Bayview Heights to allow 92 SF lots and associated open space, stormwater management, and access from SR 14 via Bayview Heights and from Turk Road in the Town of Geneva.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32735/27-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32737/27-2022-color-overall-siteplan>

This site plan amendment involves re-subdivision of 3 to 5 parcels. The main parcel is 35.5 acres, The site plan proposed also includes a stormwater management facility and walking trails on a 5-acre park property set aside as part of the

previously developed subdivision. The proposed site plan also includes road D connecting all phases of Bay Heights subdivision to Turk Road via approximately 850' of dedicated road on a portion of a 146 acre parcel the applicant owns under a different LLC. The proposed development will include sidewalks along one side of all proposed roads. The proposed site plan also appears to include 2 or possibly more previously subdivided lots in earlier phases of the Bay Heights subdivision (133.11-3-98.000, 133.11-3-4.00, 133.11-3-5.00, 133.11-3-6.00).

According to Oncor, adjacent land uses include existing single family residential subdivision to the north and east, White Spring Brook on the property at the western boundary with larger lot single family development along a private road further west, and undeveloped lands owned by the applicant north and south of Turk Road. Oncor also indicates area of 16 to 30 percent slope east of White Springs Brook.

#### Comments

1. Existing and proposed areas of steep slopes should be shown on the plans. The cover sheet shows the location of proposed lots on an aerial photo. This image suggests some disturbance to the woods and potentially steep slope areas along the western site boundary, particularly the lots at the north end of roads B and C.
2. Where will the stormwater from road D, road connection to Turk Road, be directed?
3. Is private stormwater management pond an allowable use of the 5-acre lot set aside as parkland in conjunctions with previous phases of Bayview Heights subdivision.?
4. Is there an existing and/or proposed homeowners association to maintain the park and stormwater management facilities or will they be dedicated to the Town?
5. The project record should clearly indicate the number of lots and acreage of lands previously platted that will remain unchanged and the lots and acreage included in the currently proposed 92 lots.
6. The submitted materials indicate previously approved lots are 60' x 110' while proposed lots are 70'x115' (8,750 SF) The R-1 district currently requires 90 x 110 lots and overall density of 1 unit per 10,000 SR of site area. Will lot size or density variance be required?
7. Sheet 23 should include a street tree planning schedule.
8. Will untreated runoff from steeply slopes areas between homes in drainage subareas 1B and 2B lead to undesirable erosion or water quality impacts?

#### OCSWCD Comments

1. Consider a no P fertilizer unless soil test indicates a need.
2. Concrete truck washout should be installed during the construction of sidewalks and be available on site.
3. Silt fence is needed downslope of proposed storm water pond shown on C114 behind homes 1-3
4. Topsoil stockpiles have not been indicated on plans
5. Areas of steep slopes should be stabilized quickly using a specified steep slope seed mix. Consider the use of rolled erosion control fabric as well.

#### CRC Comments

1. All roads, the stormwater management facility, and walking trails will be dedicated to the Town.
2. Demolition debris from the former airport building should be recycled if possible or disposed of in an appropriate facility.
3. What is the acreage of woods around the lot perimeter to be dedicated to the town?
4. Will development be phased? If so, additional soil stockpile, truck wash, and stabilized entrances may be needed.
5. This segment of SR 14 appears to be developing the mix of residential and commercial uses anticipated in the Town Center Mixed Use district. The Town Board and Planning Board should consider how to safely accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel between residential uses along the lake and in Bayview Heights, and commercial uses such as restaurants/breweries/wineries, potential farm stand, etc. from the City line to Turk Road.

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 27-2022 as a class 1 and return it to the local board with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** Steve High

**Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

28 -2022 Town of Farmington Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*Applicant: *TOMRA NY Recycling LLC*Property Owner: *same*Representative: *Nicole Lake*Tax Map Parcel #: *17.00-1-25.110 & 17.00-1-25.200*Brief Description: *Site plan for glass processing system upgrade at TOMRA Recycling, 5923 Loomis Road in the Town of Farmington.*<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32730/28-2022><https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32740/28-2022-site-plan>

The associated site modifications will disturb .51 acres of the existing parking area. Site modifications are location near the glass processing line in the southeast corner of the existing building and include changes to the weigh station and site stormwater management system.

**OCSWCD Comments**

1. Will all existing drainage that is scheduled to be removed during demolition be capped? How will existing drainage infrastructure be protected during demolition?
2. Silt fence should be installed around the perimeter of disturbance prior to the removal of existing asphalt.
3. Location of concrete truck washout has not been identified.
4. Location of stabilized construction entrance has not been identified

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 20-2022, 22-2022, 23-2022, 24-2022, 25-2022, 26-2022, 28-2022, and 29-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

29 -2022 Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals

Class: 1

Type: *Area Variance*Applicant & Owner: *A Safe Place Storage*Related Referrals: *148-2021 July, 6-2022 and 17-2022 January 2022*Tax Map Parcel #: *29.00-2-1.120*

Brief Description: *Area variances to allow a mini storage building to be 131' wide when a maximum of 40' is allowed; interpretation and/or variance to allow outdoor vehicle storage including parking of moving vehicles associated with applicant's moving business on the site when code prohibits outdoor storage of goods and materials.*

<https://ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32457/6-2022-aerial><https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32732/29-2022-safe-place-variance-site-plan>

A previous site plan was reviewed as referral 148-2021 in July 2021. An updated site plan and a special use permit were reviewed as referrals 17-2022 and 6-2022 in January 2022 Relevant comment from previous review are repeated below. The variance site plan submitted with this referral relocates outdoor storage from the center of the site over the force main easement to replace 3,000 SF building G along Denny Drive, increases the number of outdoor storage parking spaces from 9 to 15, and increases the size of climate controlled building A from 15,295 to 16,929.SF. No revisions to the landscaping plan were submitted. Denny Drive is a private road, and the January site plan does not show landscaping

that would screen the proposed outdoor storage from Denny Drive. There is landscaping proposed along Commercial Drive and on the east side of the entrance from Denny Drive.

Farmington Zoning Code allows mini-warehouses and temporary (up to 18 months) outdoor storage of materials by special use permit in the LI district.

**July 2021 Comments**

1. Does the site plan provide minimum required green space, given that the existing sanitary sewer easement area cannot be used in the calculation of green space?
2. What pedestrian facilities are planned to allow access by residents southwest of Collett and Hook Roads to the commercial facilities along SR 332?

**July 2021 OCSWDC Comments**

1. SWPPP not provided, difficult to make comments.
2. Does silt fence enclose all disturbed areas?
3. Plant species for bio-retention facility and planting plan not shown on landscape plans

**January 2022 Comment**

1. Clarify whether building F is 4,200 SF as stated on site plan or 5,400 SF as indicated on Erosion Control Plan, Landscape Plan, and Utility Plan.
2. The landscape plan appears to show tree and shrub planting very close or within steeply banked stormwater management facilities.

**January 2022 OCSWCD Comments**

1. Concrete truck washout should be located a minimum of 100 feet from all stormwater inlets, streams or waterbodies.
2. Pocket pond outlets to a regulated class C stream. Use extreme caution during construction to prevent any water quality violations.

**February 2022 Comments** Does proposed landscaping meet the requirements of Town code 165-84.1 Y and Z?

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 20-2022, 22-2022, 23-2022, 24-2022, 25-2022, 26-2022, 28-2022, and 29-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

**Board Motion:** To accept late referrals 30-2022, 31-2022, and 32-2022. **Motion made by:** Len Wildman **Seconded by:** Mike Crowley

**Vote:** 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

30 -2022 Town of West Bloomfield Planning Board late referral Class: 2  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: 31-2022, 13-2022, 203-2021

Applicant: *Jeremy Fisher*

Property Owner: *same*

Tax Map Parcel #: 65.00-1-19.000

Brief Description: *Site plan and special use permit for development of 22-acre parcel with 12 mini storage buildings and 4 single family homes at 2370 SR 65 at CR 35/Baker Road in the Town of West Bloomfield.*

A subdivision associated with this project was previously reviewed as referral # 203-2021 in October 2021 and referral #13 -2022 January 2022. The following text and comments were draft in October 2021. The subdivision/site plan submitted in January shows a fire lane along much of the frontage of Lot 4 but no access

limitation. The January letter of intent also references 15 parking spaces to the rear of the existing building and the need for a Planning Board waiver of the additional 15 parking spaces that are required by code. Other elements of the project description and comments remain relevant following OCPD and OCSWCD review of revised plans.

The proposed subdivision would cede 2 areas encompassing .5 acres to existing adjacent residential uses at the SR 65 curve and near the southern property boundary. The lot for the existing commercial use (Lot 4) would be 1.2 acres with approximately 200' of frontage and 239' of depth. The existing use has no defined access point.

The 2 proposed residential lots west of the SR 65 curve are approximately 27,000 SF and have 115' and 120' of frontage and 225' of depth. The 2 proposed residential lots south of the SR 65 curve are 20,000 SF lots with 110' of frontage and 182' of depth.

The property is zoned General Mixed Use. The purpose of the district is to ensure town residents are adequately served by retail, service, and office uses. The district allows a range of residential and commercial uses. The district has a minimum lot width of 80' and minimum lot size of 20,000 SF for single family uses and 10,000 SF for non-residential uses and maximum building and lot coverages of 35% and 50% for residential use and 50% and 60% for non-residential use.

Code section 140-121 requires landscaping on 15 percent of any commercial use lot including 1 shrub for every 10' of lot perimeter and 1 tree (existing or new) for every 40' of lot perimeter and a 25' densely planted vegetative buffer adjacent to any residential use or district.

According to OnCor, adjacent property to the west and south excluding frontage lands are in OC Agricultural Districts #1 and there is a wetland area along the western SR 65 frontage. Site slopes are generally less than 8 percent with small areas of 16-30 percent slope along the southern property boundary and off-site at the western edge of the corner lot. The dominant soil type on the property is Schoharie silty clay loam with 3 to 8 percent slope. The soil is very highly erodible, moderately highly permeable, in hydrologic soil group C/D, and prime farmland.

The NYSDOT functional classification of SR 65 in this section is major collector. Desirable access connection spacing for a collector road with speed limit of 40 mph is 245' including existing and proposed streets and driveways on both sides of the road.

The mini-storage use will require a special use permit.

#### **Comments October 2021**

1. The referring body should require applicant to identify a single access point to Lot 4 and eventually to add landscaping to limit access along the remaining frontage in accordance with 140-123.
2. The referring body should require deep hole and percolation tests to document feasibility of septic system before subdividing the residential lots.
3. The number/spacing of proposed driveways is not desirable. The referring body should consider opportunities for requiring shared/adjacent driveways to minimize the traffic safety impacts of proposed lots and driveways.
4. A cross access easement and maintenance agreement would be required for Lot 1 and Lot 4 to share one or both proposed commercial access connections.
5. The General Mixed-Use district has limits on the number of storage sheds (2) and the number of commercial (1) or recreation vehicle (2) that may be stored on the site. Based on the subdivision plan and OnCor aerial, existing commercial use appears to exceed these limits. Unless these accessory uses

and structures are pre-existing, non-conforming conditions, the referring body should require the applicant to bring existing site activities into compliance with district standards by removing some accessory uses and structures or obtaining variances and comply with associated buffering standards for vehicles storage areas in code section 140-106.

6. The special use permit and site plan must be referred to OC Planning Board.

#### **OCSWCD Comments October 2021**

1. Topsoil stockpile area not indicated on plans.
2. Will residential lots be developed at the same time as the commercial lot? Sequencing and phasing not provided
3. Detail not provided regarding storm water management facility.
4. Erosion, and sediment control not shown on residential lots.
5. No soil investigation data provided (deep hole and percolation rates) for every system location.
6. Federal wetlands present (northeast and north). 100' setback not shown to leach areas/disturbances.
7. Poor draining soils present (schoharie silty clay loam).

#### **NYSDOT Comments October 2021**

1. A NYSDOT highway permit will be required for an additional access point to commercial uses on this site. NYSDOT may or may not grant a second access point for commercial uses.

#### **CPB Comments October 2021**

1. The Town Board should request NYSDOT to review design, speed and accident records for the SR 65, CR 35, Baker Road intersection and address whether any curve warning sign or speed limit change is recommended. This analysis should also address whether signage is necessary to alert CR 35 and Baker Road travelers that SR 65 traffic does not stop.
2. Referring body to make applicant aware that any SR 65 driveways require a NYSDOT permit.

#### **October 2021 Findings**

1. Ontario County has a substantial interest in protecting and improving the function of its intermunicipal transportation infrastructure.
2. The Ontario County Planning Board encourages referring bodies to properly consider road capacity and traffic safety of referred projects.
3. This subdivision is situated at the Intersection of SR 65 with CR 35 and Baker Road.
4. Proliferation of access connections may have negative impacts on roadway capacity and safety.
5. The proposed subdivision includes 5 new access connections to SR 65 along this 40-mph segment.

**Board Motion October 2021:** To change referral 203-2021 to class 2 in recognition of the potential intermunicipal impact of proposed subdivision at the intersection of a state, county, and local road. **Motion made by:** Glen Wilkes  
**Seconded by:** Mike Woodruff

**Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

**Board Motion: October 2021** To retain 203-2021 as a class 2 and return it to the local board with comments and a recommendation of approval with three modifications. **Motion made by:** Ruth Cahn **Seconded by:** Mike Woodruff  
**Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

#### **October 2021 Modifications**

**Modification #1:** The referring body to review state, county, and local accident records for SR 65, CR 35, Baker Road intersection with guidance from professional traffic safety consultant as appropriate.

**Modification #2:** The referring body to require side by side or shared driveway(s) as recommended by professional traffic safety consultant to proposed lots 5 and 6 located west of the intersection of SR 65, CR 35, and Baker Road.

**Modification #3:** the referring body with appropriate professional guidance to identify appropriate location and width of single direct access connection from Lot 1 to SR 65 and/or shared access point for commercial lots 1

and 4.

**January 2022 Board Motion:** To retain referral 13-2022, as class 2 and return it to the local board with comments and recommendation for approval with three previous modifications **Motion made by:** AJ Magnan **Seconded by:** Mike Woodruff.

**Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

### February 2022 Comments

1. The applicant has submitted a special use permit application but not provided any evidence of how the proposed self-storage development meets the requirements of 140-151 regarding special use permit criteria.
2. The Town of West Bloomfield Code allows the Planning Board to waive subdivision requirements in 121-33. Chapter 133 Zoning does not appear to authorize Planning Board waiver of parking standards. A parking variance may be required.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 30-2022, as class 2 and return it to the local board with comments and recommendation for approval with three previous modifications **Motion made by:** Len Wildman **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan

**Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

31 -2022                      Town of West Bloomfield    Planning Board                      **late referral** Class: 2  
Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals: *30-2022, 13-2022, 203-2021*

Applicant: *Jeremy Fisher*

Property Owner: *same*

Tax Map Parcel #: *65.00-1-19.000*

Brief Description: *Site plan and special use permit for development of 22-acre parcel with 12 mini storage buildings and 4 single family homes at 2370 SR 65 at CR 35/Baker Road in the Town of West Bloomfield.*

### February 2022 Comment1

1. The applicant has submitted a special use permit application but not provided any evidence of how the proposed self-storage development meets the requirements of 140-151 regarding special use permit criteria.

See additional project information at 30-2022.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 31-2022, as class 2 and return it to the local board as incomplete. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Glen Wilkes

**Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

32 -2022                      Town of Canandaigua    Town Board                      **late referral** Class: 2  
Type: *Text Amendment*

Applicant: *Town of Canandaigua*

Brief Description: *Text amendment to revise general lot size and arrangement regulations. Existing provisions avoid land locked parcels and prohibit double frontage lots, establish minimum and maximum block length, and allow the Planning Board to reduce the number of lots and/or increase lot size and dimensions*

*in excess of minimum standards to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the community or the environment in the Town of Canandaigua. Proposed amendment would allow double frontage lots in some circumstances.*

**Comment**

1. The Congress for the New Urbanism journal, Public Square June 1, 2004, reports typical standards to promote street connectivity include maximum block length of 300' to 600' and/or a 4 way intersection every 1,320'.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 32-2022, as class 2 and return it to the local board with comments and a recommendation for approval. **Motion made by:** AJ Magnan **Seconded by:** Glen Wilkes

**Vote:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**



## General Information

The Ontario County Planning Board (CPB) was established by the Ontario County Board of Supervisors under the provision of NYS General Municipal Law Article 12-B Section 239-c. County Planning Boards. The state legislature determined in §239-c. 1. (a), (b), (g) & (f):

1. Legislative findings and intent. The legislature hereby finds and determines that:

(a) Significant decisions and actions affecting the immediate and long-range protection, enhancement, growth and development of the state and its communities are made by county planning boards.

(b) County planning boards serve as an important resource to the state and its localities, helping to establish productive linkages between communities as well as with state and federal agencies.

(f) The great diversity of resources and conditions that exist within and among counties requires consideration of such factors by county planning boards.

(g) It is the intent of the legislature therefore, to provide a permissive and flexible framework within which county planning boards can perform their power and duties.

Note: I, (d), and (e) refer to the county comprehensive plan.

The CPB membership consists of one representative from each of the 16 towns and 2 cities who are selected by the town board or city council and formally appointed by the Board of Supervisors for terms of 5 years. Members representing a town, also represent any village(s) located with the town.

## General Summary of CPB Review Responsibilities

This section provides a general summary of the CPB's roles and responsibilities. The specific responsibilities of a county planning board are found in §239 l, m, & n and the CPB Bylaws approved by the Ontario County Board of Supervisors. (Links: Complete §239 text Page 151: [Guide to NYS Planning and Zoning Laws](#) and [Ontario County Planning Board Bylaws under "Quick Links"](#))

The Ontario County Planning Board reviews certain zoning and planning actions prior to the final decision made at the village, town, or city level and makes a recommendation to the municipality. Although CPB review is required, the action is advisory in nature and can be overridden at the local level (super majority if a recommendation for denial or approval without recommended modification).

NYS law spells out the types of actions reviewed by the CPB:

- Adoption or amendment of zoning regulations (text and/or map)
- Comprehensive plans
- Site plan approvals
- Special use permits
- Variances
- Any special permit, exception, or other special authorization which a board of appeals, planning board or legislative body is authorized to issue under the provisions of any zoning ordinance
- Subdivisions

NYS law specifies that CPB is required for the above actions to occur on real property lying within a distance of 500 feet from any:

- Boundary of any city, village, or town boundary
- Existing or proposed county or state park or other recreation area,
- Right-of-way of any existing or proposed county or state parkway, thruway, expressway, road or highway, existing or proposed right-of-way,
- Stream or drainage channel owned by the county or for which the county has established channel lines, or
- Existing or proposed boundary of any county or state-owned land on which a public building or institution is situated.

## 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 to

have little potential intermunicipal or countywide impact. For Class 2 applications, the CPB has determined that there will be potential impacts 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 1, 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 I

### 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 denial 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 prepares administrative reviews 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 AR 2 is a review that is a Class 2. An AR 2 requires a majority plus one for the local board to act contrary to the recommendation for disapproved just like Class-2 referrals reviewed by the full Board. The following table summarizes the policies under which administrative review is allowed and guidance regarding class designation and recommendation based on the CPB bylaws.

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

- **Reminder to complete and return Conflict of Interest forms**
- **Discussion on Climate Change & Climate Council Draft Scoping Plan**  
Board members mentioned potential role of County assisting communities to adapt in the face of stormwater flows/flooding from extreme weather events and other climate impacts, impacts of climate change fall most heavily on vulnerable populations (low income, seniors, plants & animals), common benefits of efforts to address climate change and adopt age friendly development patterns, irony that both addressing and failing to address climate change are expensive, potential to repurpose landfill site to mitigate climate impacts, and necessity of and interest in action at all levels (individuals, organizations, county/cities/towns/village, NYS, and Federal government).  
Interesting elements of Draft Scoping Plan from review of 19 Land Use and Chapter 15 Agriculture and Forestry include focus on preservation of agricultural lands and forest lands to sequester carbon and need for afforestation/reforestation, recommendation for pilot program to pay landowners for eco-system services (including storing carbon and reducing impacts of extreme storm events) provided by undeveloped land, awareness of NYS Climate Smart Communities and Cleaner, Greener Communities programs.
- **Upcoming Training**  
**Thursday February 10th from 6:00pm-7:00 PM Large Scale Agrivoltaics; Solar Grazing on Utility Scale Solar Facilities in Western NY- Part 1: Sheep Grazing.** This webinar is Part 1 of 2 sessions reviewing the findings of the recently published [Mount Morris Agrivoltaic Study](#). [registration link](#).  
**Thursday February 10th from 2 - 3:15 pm Small Businesses Big Moment: Using ARPA Funds to Support Small Business Development.** Institute for Local Self-Reliance & Main Street America [https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_Dq0W0E0cRWaqYZwkX98bg](https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Dq0W0E0cRWaqYZwkX98bg)  
**Thursday February 24 at 6:00 pm Hemlock Woolly Adelgid information hosted by FLCC Muller Field Station.** Register here <https://flcc.webex.com/flcc/onstage/g.php?MTID=e0dea3b1c6e601eee7ad99223d6d27c43>  
**Sunday February 27, 1-3 pm Hemlock Woolly Adelgid Survey Training workshop** at Cumming Nature Center 6472 Gulick Road, Naples <https://forms.gle/AbftphZJF2HvZsUr9>  
**4<sup>th</sup> Thursday 2022 Monthly Municipal Boot Camp Program presented by MRB Group and Hancock Estabrook**  
<https://www.hancocklaw.com/events/the-2022-municipal-bootcamp/>  
January 27, 2022- 6:00 to 7:00 pm Getting it Together - the Basics of Running a Meeting  
February 24, 2022- 6:00 to 7:00 pm Planning for Success - the PB Role in community development  
March 24, 2022- 6:00 to 7:00 pm How Appealing- the role of the ZBA in community development  
April 28, 2022 – 6:00-7:00 pm Here Comes the Sun – shaping solar and battery storage projects  
May 19, 2022 – 6:00 to 7:00 pm Keep the Grass Green and the Water Clean – SEQR review  
June 23, 2022 – 6:00-7:00 pm How it All Fits Together – long-range plans and near-term challenges  
July 28, 2022 – 6:00-7:00 pm Ask Us Anything – hot topics in planning, zoning, & community development  
September 22, 2022 – 6:00-7:00 pm What Not to Say & What Really Not to Do – avoiding sexual harassment  
October 27, 2022 – 6:00 to 7:00 pm A History Lesson – managing projects with historic significant  
December 22, 2022 - 6:00 to 7:00 pm Santa’s Nice and Naughty List – the best and worst of 2022

*New York Planning Federation trainings are free if your municipality is a member.*

*Call or e-mail with membership number or to pay and participate as a non-member. 518-512-5270 or email [nypf@nypf.org](mailto:nypf@nypf.org)*

#### **NYPF Recorded Webinars THE ESSENTIALS OF PLANNING AND ZONING**

Introduction to Planning, Zoning and Land Use

Everything You’ve Ever Wanted to Know About Preparing a Comprehensive Plan

Understanding and Applying SEQRA (NY State Environmental Quality Review Act)

The What, Why, and How of Site Plan Review

Common Mistakes and Mishaps in Site Plan Review

#### **MEETING PROCESS AND COMMUNICATION**

Enhancing Transparency Effectiveness in Planning Proceedings

Innovations and Best Practices for Planning/Zoning Boards  
 Engaging Diverse Communities and Dealing with Difficult People  
 Working with Elected Officials and Understanding Everyone's Role in Planning  
 The Open Meetings Law for Zoning and Planning Boards, Part 2  
 Working with Developers to Foster Investment in the Community  
 Communication, the Media and Social Media  
 Open Government and Planning and Zoning Decision Making

*The NY Conference of Mayors also offers virtual and recorded webinars for member villages and cities <https://www.nycom.org/training/webinars>*

**NYSCOM Annual Convention Sagamore Hotel May 4-6, 2022**

**NYSCOM Fall Village and City Officials Training School      September 12-16, 2022 Saratoga Hilton,  
 Saratoga Springs**

***NYSCOM Recorded webinars***

**ACCESSING FEDERAL FUNDING FROM FEMA (recorded 7-29-20) | Speakers:** Robert T. Kennedy, Mayor of the Village of Freeport and NYCOM President; J. Andrew Martin, CFM, Public Assistance Section Chief, NYS Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services; Janet Plarr, Village Administrator, Village of Blasdell; and Donna Lyudmer, Village of Saltaire

**ADOPTING LOCAL LAWS AND CONDUCTING REFERENDA | (recorded 6-24-21) | Speaker:** Rebecca Ruscito, NYCOM Counsel

**ARPA FUNDING: OVERVIEW OF ALLOWABLE USES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS (recorded 8-3-21)**

| Speakers: Peter Baynes, NYCOM Executive Director and Barbara VanEpps, NYCOM Deputy Executive Director

**CELL TOWERS AND WIRELESS REGULATIONS AND A CASE LAW UPDATE (recorded 12-15-20) | Speakers:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel and Rebecca Ruscito, NYCOM Counsel

**CONDUCT MEETINGS NOW AND DOWN THE ROAD: NAVIGATING THE FUTURE OF MEETINGS AND**

**HEARINGS AS COVID NUMBERS DROP (recorded 3-18-21) | Speakers:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel; John Mancini, NYCOM Counsel and Rebecca Ruscito, NYCOM Counsel

**ETHICS FOR ZBA AND PLANNING BOARD PROCEEDINGS (recorded 12-9-21) | Speaker:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel

**FAIR HOUSING CONSIDERATIONS FOR MUNICIPALITIES (recorded 12-16-21) | Speakers:** Charles Grieco, Bond, Schoeneck & King; Moderator: Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel

**GRANTS TRAIN IS AT THE STATION: GET READY FOR THE RIDE AHEAD! | (recorded 5-6-21) | Speaker:** Jim Thatcher, Manager, Community Development, C.T. Male Associates

**LAWYERS AND ETHICS FOR ZBAS AND PLANNING BOARDS (recorded 12-10-20) | Speaker:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel

**NEW YORK'S MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION: WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS? | (recorded 4-15-21) | Speakers:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel; John Mancini, NYCOM Counsel; Rebecca Ruscito, NYCOM Counsel

**PLANNING AND ZONING HOT TOPICS AND CASE LAW UPDATE (recorded 12-14-21) | Speakers:** Terry Rice, Partner, Law Office of Terry Rice; Moderator: Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel

**REGULATING CANNABIS OPERATIONS (recorded 12-7-21) | Speakers:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel; Corey Auerbach, Barclay Damon, LLP

**SOLAR PANELS, LARGE SCALE ENERGY GENERATION SITING, AND LOCAL ZONING (recorded 12-17-20) | Speakers:** Wade Beltramo, NYCOM General Counsel and Rebecca Ruscito, NYCOM Counsel

• **Privilege of the Floor**

- **Adjournment:** Being no further business for discussion, Chair Wildman requested a motion to adjourn. *Motion to adjourn made by Glen Wilkes seconded by Steve High. Motion carried 2/9/22 CPB meeting adjourned at 9:17 PM.*