

**ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

Referrals for Review at the: **Coordinated Review Committee Meeting –Tuesday May 10, 2022, at 3:30pm –  
County Planning Board Meeting –May 11, 2022 at 7:00pm [Hybrid Meeting Click Join Meeting hyperlink below](#)**  
Telephone: 585-396-4455

This document will serve as both the **draft** minutes for the Ontario County Planning Board and as the **Official Notice of Findings and Decision** for the applications reviewed by the CPB. It can also be viewed at the Ontario County Planning Department Website <http://www.co.ontario.ny.us/index.aspx?nid=516>

**Attendance and Minutes.....2**  
**Referral Reviews and Board Action.....3**  
**General Procedures and Legal Obligations for Referring Agencies.....17**  
**Results Key - Recommended referring body action: A = approve, A-M =Approve with Modification, D = disapproval NA = No Action**

Referral #	Municipality	Applicant	Application Type	Class	Page
78	Town of Victor	Steve Barbash Irrevocable Trust	Area Variance	1	3
79	Town of Victor	Ryan Homes	Area Variance	1	3
80	Town of Geneva	Cary & Cynthia Fox	Site Plan	1	4
81	Town of Farmington	Lloyd Twitchell	Special Use Permit	1	5
82	Village of Clifton Springs	Village Board	Text Amendment	2/A	6
83	Town of Naples	Karly Ingerick	Site Plan	1	7
84	Town of Naples	Karly Ingerick	Special Use Permit	1	8
85	Town of Bristol	Bristol Extracts, LLC	Site Plan	1	8
86	Town of Canadice	Catherine Crane	Subdivision	AR1	9
87	Town of Hopewell	Finred LLC	Site Plan	1	10
88	Town of Hopewell	Steven Schreiner	Site Plan	1	11
89	Town of Hopewell	Steven Schreiner	Area Variance	1	12
90	Town of Hopewell	Jeffry Bittel Properties LLC	Use Variance	2/D	12
91	Town of Canandaigua	Casey Kunes, President	Site Plan	1	14
92	Town of Farmington	Town Board	Text Amendment	2 Late Referral	14
93	Town of Geneva	Town Board	Text Amendment	2 late referral	15
94	Town of West Bloomfield	Planning Board	Subdivision	AR1 Late referral	15

**Linda Phillips is inviting you to a scheduled Webex meeting.**



ern Time (US & Canada) | 2 hrs 30 mins

**More ways to join:**

**Join from the meeting link**

**Join by joining a mobile device (attendees only)**  
<https://ontario-county.ny.webex.com/ontario-county/j.php?MTID=m3173dc415a7f6337daf6388f4aa41f20>

Meeting number (264595868) #234526865 Toll

Meeting password: zhMGYb968iK

**Join from a video system or application**

Phone: 1-844-288-8383 United States Toll [ontario-county.ny.webex.com](https://ontario-county.ny.webex.com)

Webex URL: <https://webex.zoom.us/j/234526865> and enter your meeting number.

Need help? Go to <https://help.webex.com>

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

**Call To Order/Roll Call:** Vice-chair Paul Passavant called the 5/11/22 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 four (4) voting members and one (1) alternate present virtually and seven (7) voting members physically at 20 Ontario Street, meeting the quorum requirement.

**Staff:** Linda Phillips, Senior Planning and Erin Holley, Senior Clerk

**Guests:** Catherine Crane, applicant and Ted Maywood, Planning Board Chair Town of Canadice; Tammy Worden, incoming CPB representatives from the Town of Manchester.

**Minutes** Motion made by Doug Dello-Stritto to approve the April 13, 2022 minutes as revised to reflect in Title block and descriptions that referral 77-2022 is in the Town of East Bloomfield, seconded AJ Magnan. **Motion carried.**

78 -2022                                      Town of Victor   Zoning Board of Appeals                                      Class: 1  
Type: *Area Variance*

Applicant: *Steve Barbash Irrevocable Trust*

Property Owner: *same*

Tax Map Parcel #: *27.01-1-69.000*

Brief Description: *Area variance for installation of solar panels in the front yard of a home at 7471 Dryer Road in the Town of Victor.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34333/78-2021-solar-panel-area-on-aerial>

The lot is on the southside of the road. Presumably the panels will face south, away from the road. The submitted materials show a solar panel area that extends to both sides of the driveway and appears to be closer to the road than the setback of the adjacent house to the west with no setback measurement provided. There is existing screening vegetation, including some evergreen trees, along the existing east and west property boundaries and deciduous vegetation along the road frontage. To the south and west of the property is the Town of Victor Dryer Road Park.  
**Comment** At a minimum, the solar panels should be setback in accordance with the minimum building setback.

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

79 -2022                                      Town of Victor   Zoning Board of Appeals                                      Class: 1  
Type: *Area Variance*

Applicant: *Ryan Homes*

Property Owner: *NVR, Inc*

Tax Map Parcel #: *40.02-1-1.000*

Brief Description: *Area variances for community fence and sign located in the front yard of houses at 1505 Beaumont Way and 6420 Claremont Court in the Blumont Estates subdivision south of CR 41 near East Victor Road in the Town of Victor.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34334/79-2022-sketch-plan>

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

80 -2022

Town of Geneva Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: 19-2022

Applicant: *Cary & Cynthia Fox*

Property Owner: *Fox Living Trust*

Tax Map Parcel #: *133.00-1-17.110 & 133.00-1-18.112*

Brief Description: *Site plan for silvo-pasture operation at 59-acre site at 4182 SR 14 in the Town of Geneva.*

[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://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34336/80-2022-sktch-plan>

The referred materials include previously reviewed materials and a sketch plan with setbacks and a sketch plan with 10' contours and planned grassed drainage areas, both dated 3/23/22. The plans show approximately 2,700 lf of proposed driveway, 3 planned houses, and 7 additional buildings each with an estimated footprint of 800 SF or 5,600 SF, and 14 yurts estimated to be 25' in diameter spaced a minimum of 50' apart, though the spacing shown is closer to 100'.

The yurts are setback a minimum of 60' from the western property line and other site buildings are generally 120 to 175' from property lines. Five buildings and one house on the front half of the site will sheet flow to SR 14. There is no documentation that the planned ponds have sufficient storage area and elevation to function as drawn. The plans do not show proposed fencing or silvo-pasture areas.

The following repeats description of area land use, environmental features, zoning and staff, CRC, and CBP comments from previous review of a sketch plan and EAF referred with the PUD referral in February 2022 as referral 19-2022.

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.

### February 2022 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.

### February 2022 CRC Comments

1. Does the applicant anticipate wholesale or retail sale of mushrooms, milk or meat 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. What standards will apply to the guest accommodations?
4. What is the size of the mushroom facility? the livestock building? What is the size and use of the processing facility?
5. What is the size, use, water source, and outflow location of the farm ponds?
6. 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?
7. 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.

### February 2022 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 referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

81 -2022

Town of Farmington Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Special Use Permit*

Related Referrals:40-2022

Applicant: *Lloyd Twitchell*

Tax Map Parcel #: *42.00-1-24.100*

Brief Description: *Renewal of special use permit to operate a farm and construction equipment repair and painting business in existing farm buildings at 5107 Shortsville Road in the Town of Farmington.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34357/81-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34337/81-2022-sup-site-plan>

This operation has been successfully operated since 2013 under two 5-year temporary special use permits. In March 2022 (referral 20-2022) the Town of Farmington amended its zoning code to allow such uses by special use permit in four zoning districts including the A-80 district where this property is located. The special use permit criteria require any outdoor storage of equipment to be in a bermed and/or landscaped area not visible from any residential properties or the public road.

**Comments**

1. Previous temporary use permits were not transferable and did not authorize hiring of employees. Will these conditions be retained?

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

82 -2022 Village of Clifton Springs Village Board Class: 2  
 Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: 222-2021

Applicant: *Village Board*

Representative: *Jeff Graff*

Brief Description: *Text amendment to add short term rental regulations to the zoning code of the Village of Clifton Springs.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34338/82-2022-STR-II>

The Village of Clifton Springs referred a different local law for regulating short-term rentals in November 2021 (#222-2021). The proposed local law is an amendment to the Village Zoning Code. It allows short-term rentals in any district unless otherwise restricted. Owners must apply for a 2-year renewable permit, maintain up to date ownership and contact information, and meet all NYS building code requirements. It requires all owners to reside in the Towns of Manchester, Phelps, or Hopewell or their respective villages and to be humans not corporation, limited liability company, partnership, joint stock company, estate, or trust.

**Comments**

Zoning permits such as variances run with the land/use. In order to be able to terminate a short-term rental permit upon change of ownership and to regulate occupancy based on tenure, the short-term regulations should be enacted based on the municipality's general home rule/regulatory authority to regulate businesses and located outside the zoning chapter of the code. A long-established tenant of zoning law is that the regulations fail (meaning they are struck down in court if challenged) if they are based on ownership. In short, under the zoning authority granted municipalities in New York State, municipalities can regulate the type of land uses, not ownership.

#### **NYSDOS Best Practices**

1. It is not permissible to treat different types of owners differently. It is permissible to define lodging to include short-term rental business and dwelling to require rental for periods of 30 days or more or to define and allow hosted or unhosted short-term rental. It is also possible to restrict the number of days per year any dwellings may be operated as a short-term rental.

#### **CPB Comment**

1. Proposed code changes could run afoul of permissible short-term rental regulations. The referring body should include only permissible regulations not including differentiation based on type of ownership,
2. The two year permit cycle with set renew by/payment date may result in permit terms from 13 to 24 months.
3. Does the Village incur any liability if the permit holder certifies the existence of safety features, but no inspection is made to confirm.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 82-2022 as a class 2 and return to the local board with comments and a recommendation of approval. **Motion made by:** Doug Dello-Stratto **Seconded by:** Steve High **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

83 -2022                      Town of Naples   Joint Town and Village Planning   Class: 1  
Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: 84-2022

Applicant: *Karly Ingerick*

Property Owner: *L.S. Golf Inc.*

Tax Map Parcel #: 203.12-1-12.000

Brief Description: *Site plan and special use permit for operating a dog grooming business in the east end of a self-car wash building at 8633 SR 21 between SR 53 and Eelpot Road in the Town of Naples.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34339/84-2022>

The .27-acre property is located south of SR 21. Adjacent land uses include a single-family home to the west and the secondary golf course access to the east. Site plan indicates 5 parking spaces.

**Comment** Did the approved site plan for the self-car wash identify any required parking? Do proposed parking spaces meet setback requirements?

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried**







**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried**

86 -2022                                      Town of Canadice   Planning Board                                      Class: *AR 1*

Type: *Subdivision*

Applicant: *Catherine Crane*

Tax Map Parcel #: *174.00-2-35.200*

Brief Description: *Three lot subdivision of 32-acre site on west side of CR 36 in the Town of Canadice.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34342/862022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34343/86-2022-subdivision>

The subdivision would create a 3.2-acre lot for existing single-family home, a 4.3-acre lot for existing 600 SF pole barn and four 160 SF cabins, and a 24-acre remainder lot. There are two separate wells and septic systems one for the residence and one for the 4 cabins. The existing lot has approximately 1,115' of frontage. Proposed lots have frontage of 325' to 431'.

According to OnCor, the lot is not in OC Agricultural District #1 and is not constrained by wetlands, or existing or draft floodplains. The entire property has slopes greater than 15 percent slope with slope of all but the frontage exceeding 60 percent.

The property is zoned Rural. The Rural district allows a range of residential, agricultural, woodland, and small-scale commercial uses on large lots with private water and wastewater treatment systems.

#### **Policy AR-6: Single-family residential subdivisions under five lots**

The intent of this policy is to:

1. Address traffic safety along intermunicipal corridors by encouraging proper placement of residential driveways along County roads.
2. Address impacts to ground and surface waters

**Final Classification:** Class 1

#### **Findings**

3. One-and two-family residential uses represent 63% of the 49,354 parcels on the 2017 Ontario County assessment roll. Between 2012 and 2017 1,067 single family residential parcels were added and 13 two-family were removed. These parcels represent 89% of all parcels added county-wide.
4. Collectively individual residential developments have significant impacts on surface and ground water.
5. Proper design of on site sewage disposal is needed to protect ground and surface waters.
6. Proper storm water and erosion control is also needed to achieve that same end.
7. Proper sight distance at access points along County roads is an important public safety issue of county wide significance.
8. Standards related to protecting water quality and traffic safety have been established by agencies such as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and NYSEDC.
9. These issues can be addressed by consulting appropriate agencies during local review and ensuring that those standards are met.

10. It is the position of this Board that properly designed residential subdivision under five lots have little countywide or intermunicipal impact.

**Final Recommendation:** The CPB will make no formal recommendation to deny or approve single family residential subdivisions under five lots.

#### Comments

1. The applicant and referring agency should Consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances and spacing for the future driveways can comply with local standards and standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). A highway work permit is required for any driveway or other disturbance of the ROW.
2. The referring agency is also encouraged to ensure that any required soil percolation tests are completed and considered during subdivision review.
3. The applicant and referring agency are also strongly encouraged to involve Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and placement of on-site septic.
4. The applicant and referring agency are strongly encouraged to involve the Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and implementation of storm water and erosion control measures.

87 -2022

Town of Hopewell Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Finred LLC*

Representative: *Marks Engineering*

Tax Map Parcel #: *99.00-1-7.000*

Brief Description: *Site plan for conversion of an existing residential building into a professional office building involving expansion of the parking area and widening of the existing driveway at 4303 SR 5/US 20 by Fall Brook Creek in the Town of Hopewell.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34344/87-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34345/87-2022-site-plan>

Property borders Fall Brook Creek to the west and FLCC to the east and south. Topsoil and other soil will be removed from the proposed 23 space parking area and placed at the western end of the site.

**Comments** Will any of the existing roadside vegetation be retained?

#### OCSWCD Comments

1. Consider secondary layer of slit fence near edge of class C stream.
2. Consider stormwater or green infrastructure practice to manage runoff from increased hard surfaces
3. Concrete truck washout not shown on plans

**CLCSD Comment** Owner will be subject to sewer rent reassessment.

**NYSDOT Comment** The site plan calls for a wider entrance and for NYSDOT to reconfigure Routes 5 & 20. The driveway modification will require a highway work permit. The regional office would determine any driveway changes. Also, I do not see the NYSDOT reconfiguring the existing driveway turning radius at the highway to accommodate a private business.

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried**

88 -2022

Town of Hopewell Planning Board

Class: 1

Type: *Site Plan*

Related Referrals: 89-2022

Applicant: *Steven Schreiner*

Tax Map Parcel #: 99.00-1-35.111

Brief Description: *Site plan and area variance for convenience store and gas station at 3929 SR 5/US 20 at the corner of SR 247 in the Town of Hopewell.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34347/88-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34348/88-2022-site-plan>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34346/88-0222-landscape>

The 3-acre site is proposed for development with a 6,000 SF convenience and 6 gas pumps. The site plan proposes a right-in/right-out only access from SR 5/US 20 and unrestricted access from SR 247. The site plan proposes 5 parking spaces along the corner roadway frontage, 25 spaces around the store, and 21 spaces to the south. The landscape plan indicates 6 trees along the SR 247 frontage and screening landscaping to the rear of the building and south of the proposed building and parking. It also shows a stormwater management facility in the southwest corner of the site. The site and surrounding properties are zoned C-2 Low Intensity Commercial. The intent of the Low Intensity Commercial district is to provide smaller scale (<15,000 SF) commercial uses which retaining the rural character of the corridor.

The area variance is to locate the gas canopy 19' from the front property line when 75' is required.

According to OnCor the site is not constrained by wetlands, floodplains, or steep slopes.

#### Comments

1. The referring body should ensure there is an access easement and maintenance agreement in place for the shared SR 5/US 20 access point and to allow cross access to provide access from any direction to the adjacent site that currently shares the driveway.
2. The convenience store is likely to be a desirable pedestrian location for students and residents of all ages living in the nearby mobile home park. The Hopewell Town Code requires sidewalks along all dedicated roads within 1,000' of a residential concentration. The referring body should consider what additional pedestrian and bicycle accommodations are required.
3. Does the proposed SR 247 driveway align with the driveway across the street?
4. The referring body should confirm all outdoor lighting is dark sky compliant and does not spill onto adjacent properties. In particular, the canopy lighting should be recessed to avoid off-site visibility.
5. The referring body should consider desirability of landscaping along the SR 5/US 20 frontage east of the driveway. If a tree is not desirable because it would obscure the sign, a planting bed of shrubs, grasses, and/or perennials should be considered. No foundation plantings are proposed. The referring body should also consider the desired character of the streetscape in this area. Evenly spaced trees create an urban character while clustered vegetation including a mix of trees, shrubs, and ground covers provides a rural character.
6. Similarly, the referring body should consider the appropriate architectural character for this area. The proposed flat roof structure and gas canopy does not reflect rural building forms.
7. Where will the dumpster be located?
8. The applicant may want to consider future location for an electric vehicle charging station.



Use Variance – Town Law 267-b, similar in City Law 81 B. Village Law 7-712-A

2. Use variances.

(a) The board of appeals, on appeal from the decision or determination of the administrative official charged with the enforcement of such ordinance or local law, shall have the power to grant use variances, as defined herein.

(b) No such use variance shall be granted by a board of appeals without a showing by the applicant that applicable zoning regulations and restrictions have caused unnecessary hardship. In order to prove such unnecessary hardship the applicant shall demonstrate to the board of appeals that for each and every permitted use under the zoning regulations for the particular district where the property is located,

(1) the applicant cannot realize a reasonable return, provided that lack of return is substantial as demonstrated by competent financial evidence;

(2) that the alleged hardship relating to the property in question is unique, and does not apply to a substantial portion of the district or neighborhood;

(3) that the requested use variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; and

(4) that the alleged hardship has not been self-created.

(c) The board of appeals, in the granting of use variances, shall grant the minimum variance that it shall deem necessary and adequate to address the unnecessary hardship proven by the applicant, and at the same time preserve and protect the character of the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the community.

**CRC Comments**

1. The referring body should consider whether the applicant has met the 4 standards for granting a use variance including demonstration of financial hardship for every permitted use.
2. The referring body could consider whether to allow Indoor Recreational uses in the Industrial zoning district.

**CPB Comments**

1. The applicant could request the Town Board to add Indoor Recreation use to the list of allowable uses in the Industrial district or request that the site be rezoned to SB-MU Small Business-Multiple Use and that Indoor Recreation be added as an allowable use in that district.
2. Alternatively, the applicant could request a ZBA interpretation to include yoga studio in the definition of private school and request the Town Board to rezone the property to SB-MU where schools are a permitted use.

**Findings**

1. County Planning Board has an interest in ensuring local boards carefully consider the implications of granting use variances and adhere to the four prong unnecessary hardship test outlined in NYS statute.
2. County Planning Board has an interest in ensuring local boards grant the minimum use variance necessary to alleviate identified hardship.
3. Granting a use variance represents a permanent legal entitlement. County Planning Board encourages local bodies to consider alternatives that preserve, to the maximum extent, the municipality's ability to adjust allowable uses over time.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 90-2022 as a class 2 and return to the local board with comments and a recommendation of denial. **Motion made by:** Paul Passavant **Seconded by:** Roslyn Grammar **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

91 -2022                      Town of Canandaigua   Planning Board                      Class: 1  
 Type: *Site Plan*

Applicant: *Casey Kunes, President*

Property Owner: *Ontario County Agricultural Society*

Tax Map Parcel #: *84.00-1-12.100*

Brief Description: *Site plan for 1,600 SF open sided pole barn for pig exhibit barn at 2820 CR 10 in the Town of Canandaigua during Ontario County Fair Week.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34351/91-2022-aerial>

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34362/91-2022-CR-10-2820-2022-04-07-Pig-Barn-setback>

The proposed pig barn would be constructed to the west of the largest existing fair building in the northwest portion of the site

**Board Motion:** To retain referrals 78-2022, 79-2022, 80-2022, 81-2022, 83-2022, 84-2022, 85-2022, 87-2022, 88-2022, 89-2022, and 91-2022 as class 1s and return them to the respective local boards with comments. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** AJ Magnan **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried**

**Board Motion:** To accept late referrals 92-2022, 93-2022, and 94-2022. **Motion made by:** Steve High **Seconded by:** Paul Passavant **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

92 -2022                      Town of Farmington   Town Board                      **Late Referral** Class: 2  
 Type: *Text Amendment*

Applicant: *Town Board*

Brief Description: *Miscellaneous zoning code text amendments to add definitions, edit supplemental regulations regarding commercial speech signs and accessory uses and edit special use permit standards for mini warehouse uses in the Town of Farmington.*

<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/34358/92-2022--LL--of-2022-Special-Use-Permit-Mini-warehouse-Structures-1>

Added definitions include mini-warehouse, conditioned space, and unconditioned space. The amendment clarifies allowable building signage when a building has frontage on more than one public street; allows awning signs for building fronting SR 332; and provides requirement for planting areas around ground mounted signs. The amendment clarifies that any lot of less than 1 acre may have only one private garage with a maximum size of 800 SF with a non-combustible floor surface; all carports must be securely anchored. In most districts, the maximum size of other accessory structures is 300 SF, and the maximum height is 15'. In a mobile home park, the maximum size of an accessory structure, excluding a private garage, is 100 SF, the maximum height is 8', and it must be located 5' from any lot line.

The special use permit standards for a mini-warehouse use specify a maximum size for an unconditioned mini-warehouse structure of 6,000 SF. Such a use may include parking for up to 3 vehicles, trailers etc. for rent and outdoor storage of travel trailers, recreation vehicles, trailer, boats etc. as shown on an approved site plan and fully screened by a solid fence, berm and/or landscaping from adjacent highways, parkland, and residential neighborhoods. Designated



off-street parking may not be used for such outdoor storage. The special use permit standards also specify 40' driveway length outside any access fence, 25' driveway width between buildings, 6' of perimeter landscaping, and need for emergency vehicle access throughout the site. The standards prohibit retail sales, automotive repair, cabinet making, and living within a stored RV or boat and require any storage of hazardous or flammable materials to comply with the NYS Fire Codes.

**CPB Comments** – The maximum size of a wood frame structures may not exceed 5,000 SF unless the building is sprinklered.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 92-2022 as a class 2 and return to the local board with comments and a recommendation of approval. **Motion made by:** Steve Groet **Seconded by:** Glen Wilkes **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

93 -2022                                      Town of Geneva    Town Board                                      Class: 2  
 Type: *Text Amendment*

Related Referrals: 60-2022

Applicant: *Town Board*

Brief Description: *Text amendment to add standard site plan conditions applicable to agricultural commerce and agricultural tourism uses in the Agricultural zoning district in the Town of Geneva.*

The proposed text amendment limits hours of operation to 7 am to 10 pm, noise to 75 dBA at the property line, number of weekly events involving outdoor activities to 3, and establishes maximum occupancy, including occupancy of outside areas, for uses with a NYS Liquor Authority in accordance with the NYS Uniform fire Prevention and Building Code.. The standards also require buffering along property lines adjacent to residential parcels or uses.

**Comments**

1. Referring body may want the proposed noise standards ( and the standards in I (5) b of the 165-10 Lake View Overlay District ) to reference Town Code chapter 106 Noise to clearly apply the noise measurement standards of Chapter 106.
2. The referring body should consider amending Chapter 106 to reflect addition of R-3 Residential Lakefront, R-4 Residential Medium Density, R-5 Residential High Density, Town Center Mixed Use, and Town Center Arterial districts.
3. The referring body should consider whether the standards should also apply to Agricultural Commerce and Agricultural Tourism uses allowed in the Lake View Overlay District.

**CRC Comments**

1. The referring body could consider whether to make live outdoor entertainment a specially permitted use.

**Board Motion:** To retain referral 93-2022 as a class 2 and return to the local board with comments. **Motion made by:** Doug Dello-Stritto **Seconded by:** Glen Wilkes **Vote:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions **Motion carried.**

94 -2022                                      Town of West Bloomfield    Planning Board                                      Class: *AR I*  
 Type: *subdivision*

Applicant: *Howard Schlenker Estate*

Tax Map Parcel #: 66.00-1-28.100



Brief Description: *Subdivision of 87 acre property with access from both SR 5/US 20 and Elton Road in the Town of West Bloomfield into 3 lots.*

Lot 1 5.2 acres with frontage on NYS 5/US 20, includes house at 8424 ST 5/US 20, farm building, and a portion of the cultivated field to the north. NYS 5/US 20 frontage has 3 access points for house, main farm buildings, and building at eastern edge of property. Lot 2 63 acres includes remaining cultivated fields. Lot 3 27 acres wooded area and ponds to be joined to existing 4.3 acre residence at 2408 Elton Road tax ID 66.00-1-49.000

The OnCor property record includes a house, detached garage and 7 outbuildings on the parent parcel. The OnCor imagery shows a building along the eastern frontage of Elton Road that is not shown on the improvements detail.

**Policy AR-6: Single-family residential subdivisions under five lots**

The intent of this policy is to:

- Address traffic safety along intermunicipal corridors by encouraging proper placement of residential driveways along County roads.
- Address impacts to ground and surface waters

**Final Classification:** Class 1

**Findings**

1. One-and two-family residential uses represent 63% of the 49,354 parcels on the 2017 Ontario County assessment roll. Between 2012 and 2017 1,067 single family residential parcels were added and 13 two-family were removed. These parcels represent 89% of all parcels added county-wide.
2. Collectively individual residential developments have significant impacts on surface and ground water.
3. Proper design of on site sewage disposal is needed to protect ground and surface waters.
4. Proper storm water and erosion control is also needed to achieve that same end.
5. Proper sight distance at access points along County roads is an important public safety issue of county wide significance.
6. Standards related to protecting water quality and traffic safety have been established by agencies such as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and NYSEDC.
7. These issues can be addressed by consulting appropriate agencies during local review and ensuring that those standards are met.
8. It is the position of this Board that properly designed residential subdivision under five lots have little countywide or intermunicipal impact.

**Final Recommendation:** The CPB will make no formal recommendation to deny or approve single family residential subdivisions under five lots.

**Comments**

1. The applicant and referring agency should Consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances and spacing for the driveways can comply with local standards and standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). A highway work permit is required for any driveway or other disturbance of the ROW.
2. The referring agency is also encouraged to ensure that any required soil percolation tests are completed and considered during subdivision review.
3. The applicant and referring agency are also strongly encouraged to involve Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and placement of on-site septic.
4. The applicant and referring agency are strongly encouraged to involve the Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation District as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and implementation of storm water and erosion control measures.

## 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 Page151: [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 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)

- Report on discussion of CPB Ad Hoc committee report at 5/2/22 Planning & Environmental Quality Committee (PEQ) of BOS

At its meeting on May 2, 2022 the Planning and Environmental Quality Committee discussed the report the County Planning Board Ad Hoc Committee submitted as an informational item on the July 26, 2021 PEQ agenda and was e-mailed by Chair Singer to BOS September 13, 2021 in advance of the BOS September 16, 2021 meeting at which supervisors were requested to review and submit any comments.

The Ad Hoc committee report outlined observations and requests of the BOS as follows:

1. Requested improved communication between the BOS and the County Planning Board (CPB).
2. Questioned whether the market is producing housing and jobs needed by existing and future county residents and requested BOS to complete population and employment projections.
3. Questioned whether local municipalities are cooperating effectively to protect the character of County gateways/primary tourism corridors and requested the BOS to complete a County Comprehensive Plan.
4. Requested the BOS to establish a fund for purchase of development rights/conservation easements.

At the May 2, 2022 PEQ meeting here was some support for completion of a County Comprehensive Plan. There was some concern about the prospect of limiting the home rule authority of local municipalities to regulate land use and acknowledgment that Ontario County lacks authority to direct land use. There was recognition of the potential for disconnect between local governments and their CPB representative. It was also mentioned that although the BOS often approves resolutions of appreciation for CPB members when they resign, there is no on-going recognition of their volunteer service.

There was general recognition of the value of the planning process:

- convening of diverse stakeholders,
- consideration of existing conditions and trends, and
- articulating an overall vision and implementation plan.

There was also general recognition of the value of subject specific plans such as NYS highway corridor studies, agricultural enhancement plan, rail freight corridor plans, active transportation plans, future economic development sites study, facility planning, and pending parks and recreation master plan and county-wide housing study. This category could also include economic development and tourism strategic plans, community health improvement plan, and capital improvement plan. There was a suggestion that OCPD convene stakeholders and conduct training.

PEQ requested the Ontario County Planning Department (OCPD) to recommend how to proceed. OCPD is considering the following:

1. E-mail to all members of the BOS explaining CPB and its role in local development reviews and assembling comments from state and county stakeholders and neighboring municipalities as appropriate; request that Supervisors and Mayors establish line of communication with the CPB representative representing their Town/Village or City; and provide link to information on development and regulatory trends and County and State documents in the CPB Annual Report and By Laws.
2. OCPD to proceed with writing RPFs and grants and conducting analyses related to subject matter planning studies as appropriate.
3. PEQ/BOS to continue dialogue regarding a planning process to convene local planning, zoning, and municipal officials and community stakeholders and possible creation of a Vision Plan. A visioning process and plan would allow discussion of conditions, trends, and desired outcomes across departments, level of governments, and community partners.

- June 10, 2022 is deadline for written comments on NYS draft Climate Action Scoping Plan. The Plan outlines how NYS plans to reach Green House Gas reduction and renewable energy production targets in the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act passed in 2019. The 300 page plan, 18 page overview, and info on virtual and in-person public hearings are available here <https://climate.ny.gov/Our-Climate-Act/Draft-Scoping-Plan>
- Brainstorm about reducing Green House Gas emissions of Ontario County Transportation system (if time allows)
- Upcoming Training

**Thursday June 9, 2022 7:30 to 4:00** Southern Tier West: Adopting & Amending Zoning, Vacancy: Tools and Strategies for Local Governments, Accounting 101 for Cemeteries <https://www.southerntierwest.org/local-government-conference.html>

**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/>

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

**Adjournment:** Being no further business for discussion, Vice chair Passavant requested a motion to adjourn the 5/11/22 County Planning Board meeting. ***Motion to adjourn made by Glen Wilkes seconded by Roslyn Grammer Motion carried.*** 5/11/22 CPB meeting adjourned at 9:15.

Respectfully submitted by Linda Phillips, Senior Planner