

Ontario County Planning Board
2021 Annual Report with revised resource links
December 30, 2021

ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
20 ONTARIO ST.
CANANDAIGUA, NY 14424
585-396-4455
WWW.CO.ONTARIO.NY.US/PLANNING

Executive Summary

Membership and Training

1. The Board welcomed 8 new members in 2021.
2. Board positions were vacant 15% of the time.
3. OCPD organized two community-wide virtual training programs covering the National Heritage Area Feasibility Study and Farmland Preservation and Agricultural Viability attended by nearly 50 municipal, planning, and zoning board members and interested community members.

Referrals

1. The number of referrals reviewed in 2021 was 284 similar to the 279 referrals reviewed in 2020.
2. The number of referrals from the Town of Canandaigua declined from 75 in 2020 to 55 in 2021; the number of referrals increased substantially in the Town of Victor (from 30 in 2020 to 50 in 2021) and the City of Canandaigua (from 3 to 21). The number of referrals from the Town of South Bristol declined from 20 in 2020 to 2 in 2021.
3. Site plans (91 referrals) and area variances (64 referrals) continue to be the most frequent referral types. The number of Technical Reviews declined from 18 in 2020 to 3 in 2021. The number of subdivisions continues to increase, though many of the 2021 subdivisions involved commercial lots. The number of map amendment increased from 3 in 2020 to 12 in 2021.
4. In 2021, there were 132 class 1 referrals and 65 class 2 referrals.
5. In 2021 14 of the 17 class 2 administrative reviews (AR 2s) recommended for disapproval were related to a lot coverage, side, and/or lakeside setback area variances and 3 were for signage variances related to the size or number of signs.
6. The CPB voted to accept a total of 19 late referrals in 2021, down from 33 in 2020.

Action on Referrals

1. The Board voted to recommend disapproval of 6 referrals, all use variances.
2. The Board voted to change the class of 4 referrals from class 1 to class 2 in recognition of their potential for county-wide or intermunicipal impact. Reasons for elevation to class 2 included potential impact to State and County Roads and potential impact to preservation and viability of prime farmland. All referrals elevated to class 2 were recommended for approval with one or more modifications.
3. Six referrals in 2021 were subject to modifications including the 4 discussed above that were elevated from class 1 to class 2. Additional modifications also related to potential for impacts to State and County Roads, including bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the character of primary tourism corridors.

Trends, Innovations, and Concerns

1. Many municipalities in Ontario County opted to not allow Retail Sale or On-Site Consumption of Cannabis. Those municipalities that plan to allow such uses have adopted varied frameworks of allowing such uses in existing zoning districts or new overlay districts.
2. Municipalities, including non-lakefront communities, continue to adopt and amend regulations for short term rentals.
3. An Ad Hoc Committee of the Ontario County Planning Board was established in February 2021 to identify development concerns within the County and provide ideas to better integrate and balance growth with protection of natural resources. Current and long-term concerns outlined in the Ad Hoc Committee report include improving communication between CPB and BOS and providing the diverse housing stock needed by Ontario County's aging population. The report also requested the Board of Supervisors to complete a County Comprehensive Plan and to establish a fund for purchase of development rights/conservation easements to maintain the rural character of Ontario County. The full Ad Hoc Committee report is included as an appendix to this report

1. Introduction

This report is submitted in fulfillment of requirements of the Ontario County Planning Board (CPB) Bylaws (Article 5) for submission of an annual report of the previous year to the Ontario County Board of Supervisors (BOS). This report provides an overview of the number of referrals by municipality, class, and type for 2020 and additional information on County Planning Board membership, attendance, activities and land use trend issues in 2021.

2. County Planning Board Membership, Staffing, and Meeting Format

In 2021 the Ontario County Planning Board is comprised of 18 members representing 16 towns and their villages and 2 city representatives. (Table 1). At its annual organizational meeting in January 2021, the Board re-elected Leonard Wildman as Chairperson and David Wink as Vice-Chairperson. In September of 2021 Paul Passavant succeeded David Wink as Vice Chair. During 2021 the Board welcomed 8 new members including 1 alternate member who was subsequently appointed as a voting member. The new members represent the Towns of Bristol, Farmington, Manchester, Naples, Victor and West Bloomfield and the City of Canandaigua (2 different representatives). At year end, the Board had 3 vacancies in the Towns of Hopewell, Manchester, and Seneca and 2 open at-large alternate vacancies. During 2021, the Board positions were vacant 15 percent of the time. Incoming planning board members bring a wealth of business, recreation, and development experience and once again includes a village resident. CPB would benefit from appointment of a member with agricultural or hospitality business sector experience and/or a representative with interest in historic preservation.

Locality	Representative
Cities (2)	
C. of Canandaigua	Christen Smith (appointed 4/1/21, resigned 10/19/21) Doug Dello Stritto (appointed 12/9/21)
C. of Geneva	Paul Passavant (appointed Vice Chair 9/8/21)
Towns (16)	
T. of Bristol	Sandy Riker (resigned 2/11/21) AJ Magnan (appointed 3/3/21)
T. of Canadice	Stephen Groet
T. of Canandaigua	David Wink, Vice-Chair (served till 7/22/21) Shawna Bonshak (appointed 10/28/21)
T. of East Bloomfield	Michael Woodruff
T. of Farmington	Patti Wirth (term ended 12/1/21) Edward (Ted) Liddell (appointed 12/23/21)
T. of Geneva	Stephen High
T. of Gorham	Jack Dailey
T. of Hopewell	Bill Namestnik (resigned 12/9/21)
T. of Manchester	Sue Kell (resigned 12/6/21)
T. of Naples	Carol O'Brien (resigned 5/13/21) Marion Mueller (appointed 12/9/21)
T. of Phelps	Glen Wilkes
T. of Richmond	Leonard Wildman, Chair
T. of Seneca	
T. of South Bristol	Bessie Tyrrell
T. of Victor	Marty Avila (resigned 7/19/21) Mike Crowley (appointed 10/7/21)
T. of West Bloomfield	Susan Boardman (resigned 6/1/21) Ruth Cahn (appointed 9/1/21)
At-Large Alternate	Doug Dello Strillo appointed 9/16/21, vacated 12/9/2021

3. Changes to Staff, Ex-officio Reviewers, and Review Agency Representatives

During 2021 Senior Planner, Linda Phillips provided primary CPB support and was delegated powers of Secretary as the Director’s designee with assistance from Senior Clerk, Erin Holley.

4. County Planning Board and Coordinated Review Committee Meetings and Attendance

During 2021, the CPB met at 7:00 pm on the second Wednesday of each month except August. From January through June the Board met primarily virtually with only 3 to 4 Board members without adequate internet service or compatible devices attending in-person with screening, masks, and social distancing. In September the Board changed to hybrid meetings with members attending virtually or in person at their discretion. In October in person CRC meetings resumed.

Two CPB members attended all Board meetings. Overall attendance at Board meetings was 64 percent with 15 percent of missed meeting attendance due to Board vacancies. There was an average of 13 Board members and 4 applicants/representatives/community members at full board meetings. The Board did not meet in August based on an expected lack of quorum due to vacancies and vacations.

5. CPB Referral Activity

Number of Referrals vs. Number of Projects

NYS General Municipal Law §239 establishes which local planning board, zoning board of appeals, or elected board/council actions must be ‘referred’ to the County Planning Board for review.

One project (building a small retail center) may require a number of local actions such as site plan approval, area variances, and a special use permit. Though each action is part of one project (the small retail center), each of these local actions is considered as a separate referral to the CPB. The total number of referrals, therefore, does not represent the number of ‘projects’---that number will always be less.

The number of referrals reviewed in 2021 was 284 in line with the 279 referrals reviewed in 2020. The Town of Canandaigua continues to submit the largest number of referrals though the number was only 55 in 2021 compared to 75 in 2020. The number of referrals from the Town of Victor increased from 30 in 2020 to 50 in 2021.

The number of referrals from the City of Canandaigua increased substantially from 3 in 2020 to 20 in 2021 while the number of referrals from the Town of South Bristol declined from 20 in 2020 to 2 in 2021.

Municipality	2019	2020	2021
C. Canandaigua	5	3	11
C. Geneva	9	7	7
T. Bristol	2	2	2
T. Canadice	1	0	1
T. Canandaigua	74	75	55
T. E. Bloomfield	9	7	9
T. Farmington	33	32	28

T. Geneva	7	21	23
T. Gorham	10	12	14
T. Hopewell	20	22	25
T. Manchester	8	5	10
T. Naples	1	1	4
T. Phelps	6	7	10
T. Richmond	18	6	10
T. Seneca	3	1	1
T. South Bristol	6	20	2
T. Victor	75	30	50
T. W. Bloomfield	12	1	4
V. Bloomfield	2	2	2
V. Clifton Springs	5	3	2
V. Manchester	6	6	4
V. Naples	5	5	1
V. Phelps	0	0	0
V. Rushville	0	0	1
V. Shortsville	0	0	0
V. Victor	6	4	6
OC AEB/Adj. towns	4	7	2
Totals	327	279	284

Referral Type

Site plans (91 referrals) and area variances (64 referrals) continue to be the most frequent referral types. The number of subdivisions continues to increase, though many of the 2021 subdivisions involved commercial lots. The number of map amendments increased from 3 in 2020 to 12 in 2021.

Table 3. Referral Type	2019	2020	2021
Site Plan	116	95	91
Area Variance	65	64	64
Moratoria	2	3	4
Signage Permit/Sign Site Plan	3	-	3
Special Use Permit	41	25	26
Subdivision	14	25	34
Text Amendment	31	23	25
Use Variance	4	8	6
Major Subdivision	2	-	3
Map Amendment	7	3	12
Minor Subdivision	8	3	3
Technical Reviews	13	18	3
Local Laws	5	1	6
Comprehensive Plans	5	4	2
Temporary Use Permit	4	-	-
Other	7	1	2
Totals	327	279	284

In recent years, the Ontario County Planning Department (OCPD) has encouraged municipalities to submit projects for Technical Review early in the project review process to define project parameters that minimize project impacts. County concerns can be addressed more cost effectively and without undue delay when identified early in the process. Projects that are referred for Technical Review must still be referred to CPB when preliminary or final site plan, special use permit, subdivision, or other applications are made. In 2021 there were 3 Technical Reviews down from 18 in 2020.

Referral Classifications

Referrals are initially reviewed and classified by Ontario County Planning Department (OCPD) staff.

Class 1 referrals are those applications that have little potential for countywide or intermunicipal impacts. For these referrals, the CPB minutes include non-binding CPB, staff, and ex-officio reviewer comments for the local body's consideration before action on the application.

Class 2 referrals are those applications that have potential for significant countywide or intermunicipal impacts. This includes the cumulative impact of numerous small impacts. The CPB votes to recommend approval, approval with modification(s) {list of measures that must be met by the local board prior to taking action} or disapproval of each class 2 referral.

In 2021, there were 132 class 1 referrals and 65 class 2 referrals. In 2021, 14 of the 17 class 2 administrative reviews (AR 2s) recommended for disapproval were related to a lot coverage, side, and/or lakeside setback area variances and 3 were for signage variances related to the size or number of signs.

Table 4 summarizes the initial classification of referrals by OCPD. Table 5 summarizes the administrative review policies.

Table 4. Classification of Referrals by OCPD			
Class	2019	2020	2021
Class 1	187	119	132
Class 2	57	58	65
Administrative Review: Class 1	23	34	21
Administrative Review: Class 2	35	28	20
Exempt	9	15	33
Incomplete	-	1	4
Withdrawn	2	6	6
Technical Review	14	18	3
Total	327	279	284

Table 5 Administrative Review (AR) Policies:– Ontario County Planning Board By-Laws Appendix D

Note: Except as noted, all administrative reviews are Class 1 – Comments provided but no action.

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	Variances for the number and/or size of 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)

Occasionally, the full CPB votes to change the class of a referral. Four referrals were changed from class 1 to class 2 by vote of the full Board in 2021 in recognition of their potential for county-wide or intermunicipal impacts. Reasons for elevation to class 2 included potential impact to State and County Roads and potential impact to preservation and viability of prime farmland. All referrals elevated to class 2 were recommended for approval with one or more modifications.

The CPB is rigorous in its review of use variances, directing local communities to grant them only in cases of true unique hardship. In some cases, amending the zoning map is preferable to granting a use variance. The 6 referrals recommended for disapproval by CPB vote were all use variances.

Six referrals in 2021 were subject to modifications including the 4 discussed above that were elevated from class 1 to class 2. Additional modifications also related to potential for impacts to State and County Roads, including bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the character of primary tourism corridors

If a local referring board wishes to approve without satisfying the modification(s) put forth by the CPB or override an administrative review recommendation or Board vote for disapproval, a majority plus one vote of the local referring board is required.

6. CPB Operating Procedures: Late Referrals and Block Voting

The CPB continues to vote on whether to accept late referrals based on time available to staff and ex-officio members to review the project. The CPB voted to accept 19 late referrals down from 33 in 2020. The only months without late referrals were May, August, and December. The CPB also occasionally votes to determine a referred application as incomplete, meaning the board believed the applications did not meet the municipality's submission requirements and the board needed additional information to determine intermunicipal or community wide impacts. During 2021, the Board determined 4 referrals were incomplete as submitted.

In 2021 the CPB continues the practice of block voting to streamline handling of simple class 1 referrals and to allow additional discussion of class 2 referrals, making comments to improve class 1 applications, and discussing trends and issues of county-wide significance.

7. Areas of Review

CPB review focuses on the areas of review in Article 8 of the By-laws and includes links to resources related to the following areas of review:

Economic Resources and Tourism

Agricultural Resources

Other Natural Resources

Transportation (including roads, hiking/biking/snowmobile facilities, public transit, airport, and railroads)

Other County and State Services and Facilities

Cultural and Historic Resources and Community Character

Recommended Standards for Local Planning and Zoning Regulations

The CPB is sometimes entreated by concerned residents to weigh in on matters of local concern. While not required by statute to take public comment, the CPB continues its policy to hear and report all public input. Comments and recommendations on character are, however, limited to referrals that impact county-wide quality of life or tourism, and the CPB avoids making findings, recommendations, and even comments based on questions of appropriate neighborhood character and other local impactful matters.

CPB and agencies involved in its coordinated review committee continue to make non-binding comments regarding:

- Appropriate character of signage and lighting in non-residential development along tourist corridors.
- Need for detailed engineering analysis to document adequate stormwater management and inclusion of appropriate stormwater quality treatment.
- Alignment and spacing of access connections to maximize safety and preserve road capacity
- Impact of filling and grading changes in areas at risk of flooding.
- Consideration of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Accommodating Ontario County's aging population.
- Comments on proposed local law and text amendments.

8. Trends, Innovations, and Concerns

A. Response to Legalization of Cannabis Use/Pending License of Retail Sales & On-Site Consumption

Many municipalities in Ontario County opted to not allow Retail Sale or On-Site Consumption of Cannabis. Those municipalities that plan to allow such uses have adopted varied frameworks of allowing such uses in existing zoning districts or new overlay districts.

Local municipalities should also consider appropriate local policy for public use of Cannabis.

Municipalities should be aware that they must regulate smoking of tobacco and cannabis products consistently, which is to say they can allow or prohibit both activities on municipal property (offices, parks, sidewalks) but may not allow one and not the other.

B. Regulation of Short-Term Rentals

Municipalities, including non-lakefront communities, continue to adopt and amend regulations for this emerging land use.

Municipalities are reminded that if they wish to regulate based on rentals vs. ownership, they must do so under GML authority to regulate businesses and not under zoning authority to regulate land use (the state's zoning enabling statute do not include authority to regulate ownership versus rental and New York State has a long history of case law consistently striking down zoning regulations that do so). Thus, short term rental regulations should be located in the municipal code outside the zoning code, though they should be cross referenced in the zoning chapter.

C. Text & Map Amendments

CPB commends communities that amend their codes as needed to address unclear or conflicting provisions and to review their zoning district regulations boundaries to ensure they continue to appropriately guide development and to bring them into compliance with their comprehensive plans.

D. Summary of Ad Hoc CPB Committee Report to BOS

An Ad Hoc Committee of the Ontario County Planning Board was established in February 2021 to discuss deteriorating character of primary tourism corridors in Ontario County and brainstorm actions to take to preserve the quality of life and tourism assets of Ontario County. The Ad Hoc Committee presented its report to the full CPB and the CPB voted to send the report to the BOS.

The report is intended to assist the County Planning Board (CPB), County Planning Department (CP), and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to better integrate and balance growth with protection of natural resources and community character. Additional current and long term concerns outlined in the Ad Hoc Committee report include improving communication between CPB and BOS and providing the diverse housing stock needed by Ontario County's aging population. The report also requested the Board of Supervisors to complete a County Comprehensive Plan and to establish a fund for purchase of development rights/conservation easement to maintain the rural character of Ontario County. The full Ad Hoc Committee report is included as an appendix to this report

9. Training for CPB and Local Elected and Appointed Officials

As listed below, OCPD organized two community wide virtual training opportunity one with presenters from the National Parks Service regarding the Finger Lake Heritage Area Feasibility Study and one with presenters from NYSDOS and OCPD on farmland protection and agricultural viability and an additional National Parks Service training before a CPB meeting. Over 50 municipal, planning, and zoning board members and other interested community members attended these training sessions.

- Wed. April 14 , 6:30 -7 pm 2021 National Park Service/OCPD , Overview of and Community Input to Feasibility Study for Designating 14 Finger Lakes Counties as a National Heritage Area
- May 4 NPS, 2021 5:30 to 6:30 pm National Parks Service/OCPD Overview of and Community input to Feasibility Study for Designating 14 Finger Lakes Counties as a National Heritage Area.
- October 18, 2021 6 to 8 pm NYSDOS and OCPD Farmland Protection and Agricultural Viability.

During 2021, OCPD posted and circulated information on more than 60 virtual training opportunities primarily provided by NYSDOS in conjunction with regional planning councils but also provided by the NYS Preservation League, Seneca Watershed Intermunicipal Organization, GFLRPC, Center for Creative Land Recycling, Scenic Hudson, and MRB.

County Planning Board members attended over 71 hours of training in 2021. This does not include 44 hours of training that was rolled over by Board members from 2020. Twelve of 15 current CPB members completed required training for 2021. Notification will be made to the three supervisors who recommended members that have not completed required 2021 training hours.

10. Future CPB Bylaws Updates

Since adoption of the new By-laws in March of 2019, the following possible revisions have been identified

- A. Chapter 4.0 – add procedures for resigning from CPB including notice to Town and CPB and statement that NYS statute requires that training hours be up-to-date for re-appointment.
- B. Section 4.2 add Wayne/Ontario Resident Engineer at NYSDOT as an ex officio member
- C. Section 6.1- mention selection of a CPB representative to the Water Resources Council as a nominating committee responsibility and an annual meeting activity
- D. Section 6.1 -consider formalizing the practicing of canvassing all members each year regarding current or future interest in serving as Chair, Vice-Chair, or Water Resources Council representative
- E. Section 6.10 reference requires recusal on referrals Board rep will vote on locally.
- F. Section 7.5 A.- add to language regarding characteristics used to classify Class 2 referrals to include something about infrastructure impacts and location.
- G. Add resource links including:
 - o NYSDAM Guidelines for Solar Energy Project Construction Mitigation for Agricultural Lands <file:///C:/Users/lindapp/Downloads/NYSAGM-guidelines-for-solar-construction-mitigation-ag.pdf>
 - o Stormwater Guidance Manual for Local Officials (to 8.3.1) <https://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/9007.html>
 - o Town and Village of Naples Reconnaissance Level Historic Resource Inventory (to 8.6.1) <https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/27000/Naples-Historic-Survey-Report-final-copy>
 - o Hamlet of Port Gibson Reconnaissance Level Historic Resource Inventory <https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/26999/Port-Gibson-Historic-Survey-Report-2019>
 - o City of Canandaigua Complete Street policy https://www.canandaiguanyork.gov/vertical/sites/%7BA388F052-E1B1-4CA4-8527-A8BB46320BB9%7D/uploads/Complete_Streets_Policy.pdf
 - o Town and Village of Victor Access Management Plan (to 8.7.1) <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/20047/Victor-Access-Management-Plan-FINAL-9-17-2019>
 - o Resources for dark sky compliant lighting <https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-industry/fsa/>
 - o Resources for appropriate sign readability-American Planning Association PAS Report 580 Street Graphics and the Law 4th edition 2015 and <https://www.signazon.com/help-center/sign-letter-height-visibility-chart.aspx>. (to 8.6.1)
 - o NYSDOT standards for Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS). <https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/real-estate/repository/cevms-criteria-for-website.pdf>
 - o Airport Master Plan <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/15928/16-2019>
 - o Update on Manchester Yard Redevelopment Project Implementation activities. http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/DocumentCenter/View/25336/Manchester-Yard-Redev-Project-Update_9_2020pptx?bidId= (to 8.5.1)
 - o Digital FEMA flood insurance rate mapping <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>
 - o FEMA Flood Risk update study - study material on this [web viewer](#) most recent info from 10-2020 community meeting re hydraulic analysis, next community meeting expected spring 2022.
 - o Feb 2022 draft maps [Draft Flood Hazard Viewer](#).
 - o 2 page summary from 2017 Census of Agriculture <https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32799/2017-ag-census>

- OCSWCD Agricultural Environmental Management Program
https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32800/FINAL-AEM-STRATEGIC-Plan-2020_2025
- Economic Development Strategic Plan
<https://ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27785/Strategic-Plan-2020>
- 2021 National Park Service Finger Lakes Natural Heritage Area Feasibility Study
https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/32951/Finger-Lakes-NHA-feasibility-study_NPS
- H. Add in Section 8.4 language regarding provision of sidewalks or trail connections from proposed subdivisions and multi-family development to promote active lifestyle and public health.
- I. Consider moving member training requirements from 4.5 under Membership to 5.2 under Responsibilities.

County Planning Board has not proceeded with examination of the exemption list to decide whether it is advisable to make changes. Such changes would require Board of Supervisors' approval and local municipal board approval from all 26 municipalities in Ontario County of a new intermunicipal agreement. The Board has also not reviewed the Administrative Review Policies. The Board, without Board of Supervisor or local municipal board approval, can change these policies.

Planned Activities for 2022

CPB members have expressed interest in additional pre-meeting training related to water quality from organizations such as FLCC, Canandaigua Lake Watershed Council, and/or OCSWCD.

We anticipate scheduling additional training sessions. Future topics may include how to encourage a more diverse housing stock, zoning to accommodate accessory dwelling units, and becoming more age friendly. OCPD is also open to providing additional training formats including more informal training with multiple boards in a single municipality or 2 or more communities with an interest in a particular topic.

OCPD staff will also continue to share information regarding likely impacts of climate change and adaptation and mitigation activities to increase resiliency and reduce such impacts.

Appendix A

County Planning Board Ad Hoc Committee Report
Submitted to Board of Supervisors 8/5/21

To: Ontario County Board of Supervisors
From: Ontario County Planning Board
Subject: Current and Long-Term Development Concerns
Date: July 19, 2021

The Ad Hoc Committee of the Ontario County Planning Board was established in February 2021 to identify developmental concerns within the County and provide ideas that might assist the County Planning Board (CPB), County Planning Department (CP), and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to better integrate and balance growth with protection of natural resources.

The Committee met 3 times via zoom, considered many issues affecting development in our County and has identified the following as important current and long-term concerns. The Ad Hoc committee report was reviewed by the full CPB on May 12, 2021. On July 14, 2021 the CPB voted to forward this revised report for consideration by the BOS.

OBSERVATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

MAKING OUR REGION AN EVEN BETTER PLACE TO LIVE/WORK

Current Observations/Concerns

1. The development along corridors to Ontario County (SR332, SR96, SR14, SR5&US20) from Interstate 90 and Interstate 490 are becoming far less inviting to travelers/tourists/residents. These routes are **Gateways** to Ontario County as well as the entire Finger Lakes region. Are we developing these corridors into an eyesore similar to Jefferson Road or Henrietta Road in the Rochester region?
2. The importance of local rule is recognized. However, are we seeing sufficient attention paid to the **County's Core Values**, including stewardship of natural, economic, cultural and historic resources? The **Ontario County Economic Development** web page highlights the "picturesque, welcoming environment Ontario County offers." The **Visit Finger Lakes** website calls us to explore "our open spaces, sparkling lakes, rolling hills, and vineyards." Are we placing these resources in jeopardy?

Do we need to strengthen inter -municipality planning and cooperation to insure that a benefit in one community is not a detraction to an adjacent community? Alternately, are we compromising recognized County resources? Do local City/Town Comp Plans reference County Core Values? Should they?

The Ontario County Planning Board encourages the Board of Supervisors to consider preparation of a County Comprehensive Plan. A County Comprehensive Plan would outline umbrella goals and policies and assist local municipalities to develop land use goals and policies in concert with a larger County vision.

3. County Planning Board (CPB) would like to strengthen communication from CPB to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and to local municipal boards and communication from the BOS to CPB. Currently the CPB submits an annual report to the BOS of its activities including areas of concern. There does not appear to be any formal feedback to the CPB on those issues. The CPB, through comments on referrals, also communicates concerns to local municipal boards. CPB By-laws direct members to talk with the supervisor or mayor of the municipality they represent about how to share CPB information with elected and appointed board members. NYS statute requires local referring boards to notify CPB of the action take on referred applications. Many municipalities do not provide notice of local action.

Members of the BOS are encouraged to direct their local staff and municipal boards to be aware of key items CP and CPB are considering. Inviting the municipality's CPB representative to formal board meetings periodically for updates is encouraged. Alternately, informal updates to the municipality's staff/boards might be considered. Either scenario provides an opportunity to become better informed of County issues that may affect and inform local decisions. Another opportunity for improved CPB communication with local municipalities and the BOS is regarding County and NYS infrastructure investments, for example, status of traffic relief in Victor.

Longer Term Observations

1. The older population in the County is increasing substantially. From 2010 to 2019 the American Community Survey reported Ontario County added 3,400 residents. Changes by age segment are varied; the largest increase in population is 4,400 additional residents age 65 to 74. Over the period there were also 1,200 more County residents age 75 and over and nearly 400 more residents age 18 to 24. The increase in the number of residents age 55 to 64 (+2,500) is slightly more than the decrease in the number of residents age 45 to 54 (-2,100). Over the last decade, the number of school age residents age 5 to 17 decreased by 1,950, the number of residents age 24 to 44 decreased by nearly 800, and the number of residents less than 5 decreased by 264.
2. As we seek projects which will help further diversify our County, care should be taken to insure we have a mix of housing to avoid stratification by area.
3. Many of the projects currently being built/considered are apartment complexes. Such projects generally provide shelter at reasonable cost. This is particularly important to certain demographic groups – those who are young, those aging, those who have lost a spouse, and those separated or divorced. The growing age segments in the County-- young adults, empty nesters, and seniors -- may want or need rental housing. Care should be taken to integrate such projects into the community with consideration of the need for public transportation, bike paths, pedestrian ways, and recreational areas. Care should also be taken to assure the market is bringing a balanced housing stock to the market.
4. We recommend the County consider establishing a fund that can be used to assist in purchase of development rights, conservation easements, and related supports for preservation of property viewed as important in maintaining the rural character of our area.
5. We encourage the County to work with local governments to develop predictive data (modeling) as to the flow of population and industry in the County over the next 5, 10, and 20-year intervals. Such predictive information would provide the basis for planning to accommodate these changes as we look to the future.