

ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Wednesday, February 11, 2026, Time: 7:00 PM

74 Ontario St., Canandaigua, NY, Second Floor, Board of Supervisors Meeting Room
or

<https://ontariocountyny.webex.com>

Meeting number: 2335 531 3061

Meeting password:

7uVPhCTe3p6

Join by phone

+1-408-418-9388 Toll

Access code: 23355313061

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 www.ontariocountyny.gov/97/Planning.

1. Call to Order

Chair Passavant called the Wednesday, February 11, 2026, Ontario County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

2. Roll Call

Upon roll call, the following members were:

Present:

Ruth Cahn

Burch Craig

Dan Crowley

Lisa Grefrath

Stephen High

Thomas Kugris

A.J. Magnan

Chris Mergler

Paul Passavant

Jamie Purdy

Leonard Wildman

Tammy Worden

Present Not Voting:

None

Absent:

Jack Dailey

Excused:

Ed Kaiser, Paul Lambiase, Edward (Ted) Liddell, Ryan Wilmer

Present (Voting): 12, Present (Not Voting): 0, Absent: 1, Excused 4

Guests:
Ben Wickham (OCPB Town of Seneca Representative - effective 2/19/2026)
Nicholas Snyder - Passero Associates (Farmington Meadows; 21.0-2026 & 21.1-2026)

3. **Approval of Minutes:**

Burch Craig motioned to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2026 . The motion was seconded by Stephen High. The motion passed.

4. **Old Business:**

PLEASE BE AWARE OF A RECENT SCAM THAT IS GOING AROUND. THERE ARE NO FEES FOR COUNTY PLANNING BOARD REVIEW. YOU SHOULD NEVER RECEIVE AN INVOICE FROM THE ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD.

5. **New Business:**

6. **Town of Canandaigua**

17.0-2026 (AR2) Area Variance and Site Plan to increase pre-existing non-conforming lot coverage from 30.59% to 31.70% (when no greater than 25% is permitted) — at 3407 West Lake Boulevard. Proposed work is for shoreline stabilization (rip-rap and retaining wall installation), patio/deck and walkway updates, and construction of a new permanent dock and boat station. 17.0-2026 is associated with the area variance and 17.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: AR2
Property 98.13-1-6.000
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

The subject parcel had a project referred at the September 2024 Ontario County Planning Board meeting as a Special Use Permit (to re-apply for a Short-Term Rental under newly adopted Town of Canandaigua Code Chapter 201) to increase the allowed maximum occupancy of an existing Short-Term Rental from 12 people to 18 – at 3407 West Lake Blvd. in the Town of Canandaigua. The special use permit was granted by the Town. The Town of Canandaigua Zoning Officer has confirmed that the current referral (area variance) will not affect the special use permit that is in

effect.

Policy AR 5 Applications involving one single family residential site, including home occupations.

Part B Development of Lakefront Parcels.

B. The following applies to all development on parcels with lake frontage that require;

- variances pertaining to lot coverage or,
- variances pertaining to side yard setbacks or,
- variances pertaining to lake shore setbacks

The CPB's role of reviewing and making recommendations on countywide development has provided a unique perspective on the trend of more intensive development and use of lakefront lots. Of particular concern are the incremental negative impacts on water quality and the character of our lakefront neighborhoods. The following policy is a result of discussion and debate spanning 18 months as well as consultation with outside agencies directly involved with water quality issues in Ontario County. The intent is to address the over development of lakefront lots and support the clearly stated interests and for the local decision makers to do the same.

Final Classification: 2

Findings:

1. Protection of water features is a stated goal of the CPB.
2. The Finger Lakes are an indispensable part of the quality of life in Ontario County.
3. Increases in impervious surfaces lead to increased runoff and pollution.
4. Runoff from lakefront development is more likely to impact water quality.
5. It is the position of this Board that the legislative bodies of lakefront communities have enacted setbacks and limits on lot coverage that allow reasonable use of lakefront properties.
6. Protection of community character, as it relates to tourism, is a goal of the CPB.
7. It is the position of this Board that numerous variances can allow over development of properties in a way that negatively affects public enjoyment of the Finger Lakes and overall community character.
8. It is the position of this Board that such incremental impacts have a cumulative impact that is of countywide and intermunicipal significance.

Final Recommendation: Denial

Comments:

1. The referring body is encouraged to grant only the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the lot.
2. The applicant and referring agency are strongly encouraged to involve Canandaigua Lake Watershed Manager as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and implementation of storm water and erosion control measures.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Test Questions
3. Preliminary Plans
4. Rendering
5. Project Summary
6. Supplemental Project Package
7. Existing Conditions Plan
8. Existing Photos
9. ZBA App
10. PB App
11. SEAF
12. Shoreline Development Statement
13. NYSDEC Determination
14. ZLD

17.1-2026 (Exempt) Area Variance and Site Plan to increase pre-existing non-conforming lot coverage from 30.59% to 31.70% (when no greater than 25% is permitted) — at 3407 West Lake Boulevard. Proposed work is for shoreline stabilization (rip-rap and retaining wall installation), patio/deck and walkway updates, and construction of a new permanent dock and boat station. 17.0-2026 is associated with the area variance and 17.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Exempt
Property 98.13-1-6.000
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

Exempt (See Exemption #9 of Appendix B of the OCPB Bylaws).

Attachments:

None

18-2026 (Exempt) Area Variance for a second accessory structure (generator) when no greater than one is permitted — at 4351 Tichenor Point Drive.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance

Class:	Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID):	126.16-1-1.100

Description & Review Comments:

Exempt (See Exemption #1 of Appendix B of the OCPB Bylaws).

Attachments:

1. Plat
2. Drawing
3. Test Questions
4. ZBA App
5. Spec Sheet
6. ZLD

19-2026 (Exempt) Subdivision of a 2.24-acre parent parcel into two (Lot 1: 1.12-acres and Lot 2: 1.12-acres) — at 2600 Brickyard Road.

Municipality:	Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Subdivision
Class:	Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID):	70.00-1-43.100

Description & Review Comments:

Exempt (See Exemption #11 of Appendix B of the OCPB Bylaws).

Attachments:

1. Subdiv Plat
2. Current Tax Map
3. PB App
4. SEAF
5. Ag Data Statement
6. ZLD

20.0-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site plan to construct and operate a 120 ft. (+ 4 ft. lightning rod) monopole telecommunications tower and associated improvements — at 0000 County Road 8. 20.0-2026 is associated with the special use permit and 20.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality:	Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Special Use Permit
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	56.00-2-32.113

Description & Review Comments:

According to Town Code Section §220-60(A)(6) – “No tower shall be erected on top of any drumlin area, on actively farmed land, within a federal or state wetland, or on a slope greater than 15%. The applicant has requested a waiver of the requirement for the tower to be located on a drumlin. The Town Zoning Official has indicated that the applicant has not done so yet, but will need to apply for an area variance for the tower to be erected on actively farmed land.

The subject 90.7-acre parcel currently has an agricultural use. Disturbance is estimated at 0.93 acres. It is estimated 0.4-acres of agricultural land (for the access road) and 0.2-acres of forested land (for the telecommunication tower; 26 trees; 9-19 in. diameter) are to be removed, and 0.4-acres of impervious surface and 0.2-acres of meadows/grassland are to be added (seeded) as a result of construction. The facility will consist of a 120 ft. monopole tower (with a proposed 4 ft. lightning rod and FAA obstruction lighting) that will support a Verizon Wireless antenna array at 115 ft. above ground level, and space for two future carriers below. Ground-based improvements include outdoor equipment cabinets on a 11 ft. x 12.5 ft. concrete slab with an ice canopy over it, a cable bridge, 10 ft. H-frame, a 50-kW diesel generator on a 4 ft. x 8 ft. concrete slab – all enclosed by a 34 ft. x 77 ft. (8 ft. tall) chain link fence with a 1 ft. barbed wire top. The compound, generator, proposed tower, wireless telecommunications equipment, transformer, and meter board are all to be located within an 80 ft. x 125 ft. lease area. Access to the site will utilize a proposed 12 ft. wide gravel driveway off of County Road 8 (to the west) to the proposed tower location.

Verizon agrees to remove the proposed wireless telecommunications facility and related improvements installed within 90 days of the expiration or earlier termination of the lease agreement. They have also indicated that they will comply with any reasonable FAA or Mercy Flight Requirements. Communication with Mercy Flight has occurred, with the Director of Operations highly recommending a light be installed on the proposed tower for helicopter identification/avoidance.

According to the submitted photo simulation, the tower will be visible from the homes along County Road 9 (to the north and south), from State Route 332 (west), from Risser Road to the east, and as far north as Canandaigua Farmington Town Line Road (5,568 ft.). The proposed tower is 235 ft. from the nearest parcel boundary to the north, and over 400 ft. from the nearest structure (also to the north).

According to Oncor:

- The proposed tower is roughly 1.42 miles (7,500 ft.) from Canandaigua Airport / Mercy Flight.
- The subject and surrounding parcels to the north are in Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- Surrounding land use varies: agricultural and residential to the north, recreational to the

south (Canandaigua Sportsmen's Club) and residential, and residential to the west (across CR8).

- A historic barn (1940) lies on the adjacent parcel to the south (2191 CR8).
- A tributary to Padelford Brook lies along the southwest boundary of the parcel. National wetlands, NYSDEC informational wetlands, and Draft 100-Year Flood Zones border portions of the tributary.
- Wetlands (National and NYSDEC jurisdictional), FEMA Q3 Floodplains, and Draft 2023 100-Year Flood Zones lie just west of the subject parcel, across County Road 8.
- Slope disturbed is gentle to none (0–9% gradient).
- Soil disturbed is primarily:
 - Ovid Silt Loam — hydric, moderately high permeability, high erodibility, is prime farmland if drained, and is in hydrologic soil group C/D
 - Colllamer Silt Loam — not hydric, moderately high permeability, very high erodibility, is prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group C/D.

Comments

1. The referring Board should ensure a decommissioning estimate/agreement is provided, and that it is reviewed as needed for inflation.
2. Will the FAA obstruction lighting be rotating? What color will it be?
3. Protection of community character is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. The referring board should consider landscaping between the access drive and the adjacent residence to the north.
4. The Board has an interest in protecting Ontario County's farmland and farms. Disturbance/removal of farmland should be mitigated as much as possible.

OCDPW Comment

1. A driveway permit will be required for access to County Road 8. Please visit <https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/1260/Highway-Work-Permits> for more information. Insurance certificates from the contractor will be required prior to permit issuance.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Overall Plan
3. Compound Plan
4. Grading & Erosion Plans
5. Tree Survey
6. Plan Set
7. Photo Simulation
8. PB App
9. PB App 2
10. Soil & Erosion App
11. FEAF
12. Project Description
13. Applicant Response
14. Site Analysis
15. Mercy Flight Letter

- 16. Ag Data Statement
- 17. Lease Agreement
- 18. Full Application - 256 pages
- 19. ZLD

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

20.1-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site plan to construct and operate a 120 ft. (+ 4 ft. lightning rod) monopole telecommunications tower and associated improvements — at 0000 County Road 8. 20.0-2026 is associated with the special use permit and 20.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Class 1
Property 56.00-2-32.113
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

See 20.0-2026.

Attachments:

None

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

7. Town of Farmington

21.0-2026 (Class 1) Subdivision and Site Plan for the Farmington Meadows subdivision — at 0000 County Road 41. Development includes one (1) four-story senior apartment building (150 units), 29 two-story townhome style apartment buildings (230 units) with a central clubhouse and pool, 50 single-family home lots, an estimated five (5) commercial

pad sites, and a self-storage facility. Referral 21.0-2026 is in regard to the subdivision and 21.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Farmington
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Subdivision
Class: Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID): 41.07-1-28.210 and 41.07-1-28.300

Description & Review Comments:

The project was referred to the County Planning Board (CPB) in December 2025 (referrals 209.0-2025 and 209.1-2025) for a local Law amending Chapter 165, Article III (Establishment and Designation of Districts) and Section 165-12 (Zoning Map) for the rezoning of land for the Farmington Meadows Incentive Zoning Project. 209.0-2025 is related to the text amendment portion, 209.1-2025 is for the map amendment. The CPB recommended approval (with comments) for both referrals.

Incentives requested were:

1. Allowing the development of single-family and multifamily housing.
2. Allowing all the uses typically allowed General Business (GB) zoning for the commercial properties along SR-332 and CR-41. Most of these uses are currently allowed in the existing PD zoning.
3. A reduction of driveway spacing from 400' to 130'. This is applied to the internal roads on the site and not on SR-332 or CR-41.

Amenities provided are:

1. Construction of 3,360± LF of offsite sidewalk.
 - a. 1685± LF of sidewalk along SR-332 from the site to Farmbrook Drive.
 - b. 570± LF of sidewalk along SR-332 from the site to CR-41.
 - c. 1,100± LF of sidewalk along CR41 from the site to SR-332.
2. Upgrading the future 3-way signalized intersection on SR-331 and Savalla Blvd. to a 4-way signalized intersection.
3. A new public road with sidewalks (Road A) connecting SR-332 at the intersection of Savalla Blvd. to CR-41.
 - a. Without a public road, NYSDOT would not allow a connection at a signalized intersection on a state road.
 - b. NYSDOT does not allow new driveways on SR-332 between Savalla Blvd and CR-41, so without this public road, the frontage on SR-332 would not be able to be developed.
4. A new public road with sidewalks (Road B) connecting Road A to Quentenshire Dr.
 - a. This road was originally intended to be a private road, but at the request of the Highway Superintendent, it was upgraded to a public road with a fully dedicated ROW.
5. A new public road with sidewalks (Road E) connecting Road A to Road B.
 - a. New 6-foot wide asphalt bike path connecting SR-332 to Quentenshire Dr.
6. Provides better connectivity for the community and to the Auburn Trail system.
7. Approximately 3,300 LF of new water main that will be oversized to allow better flow,

- more redundancy, and future capacity in the water system.
- a. This new water main will likely include a PRV to help regulate and separate the different pressure zones in the system.
 8. Oversized stormwater ponds/BMPs to help alleviate current drainage issues and provide for future capacity.
 9. Longer, double wide driveways for single-family homes.
 - a. This was done at the request of the PRC and the Planning Board Chair to provide more parking and reduce the likelihood of cars being parked on the public roads and across the sidewalks.
 10. \$100,000 dollars contributed to the offsite Beaver Creek Interceptor Force Main project.

The project is now before the CPB for the subdivision and site plan for the development.

The subject parcel totals 65.1 acres and is located at the southeast corner of State Route 332 and County Road 41. Development is estimated to disturb roughly 63.0 acres. It is estimated that the project will: create 22.7-acres of impervious surface and 4.3-acres of water features (ponds), and will remove roughly 43.0-acres of forested land and 20.4-acres of meadows/grasslands/brushland. The project site is bounded by CR-41 and existing buildings to the north, Quentenshire Dr. to the east, single family homes to the south, and NY-332 to the west. The project site currently consists of undeveloped land. Land uses in the vicinity of the project site include residential, retail, and service uses. The current zoning of the parcels is IZ and MTOD.

According to Oncon, the slope is predominately gentle to none (0–9%), and soils are predominately Odessa silty clay loam (prime farmland if drained), Odesa silt loam (prime farmland if drained), and Farmington loam (farmland of statewide importance).

The project is intended to be constructed in two phases, with the majority of the residential and core infrastructure and half of the commercial development being completed during Phase I. The development includes the following primary components:

- *Senior Living*: One (1) four-story senior apartment building featuring 150 units.
- *Multi-Family Residential*: Twenty-nine (29) two-story townhome style apartment buildings totaling 230 units, supported by a central clubhouse and pool.
- *Single-Family Residential*: Fifty (50) single-family home lots.
- *Commercial Development*: An estimated five (5) commercial pad sites situated along SR-332 (specific tenants TBD).
- *Self-Storage*: A self-storage facility on CR-41 to serve the community and local residents.
- *Connectivity*: Construction of new public and private roadways, integrated sidewalks, and dedicated bike paths to promote walkability.
- *Utilities*: Comprehensive water and sewer expansion to serve the Farmington Meadows development.
- *Site Management*: Advanced stormwater management systems (SWPPP) and extensive flatwork/parking facilities.
- There are 909 proposed parking spaces for the entire development.

The Site Plan indicates there are 16 proposed ADA accessible spaces combined with the commercial spaces, clubhouse, and apartment building. According to NYS Building Code Section 1106, a development with 501-1,000 spaces requires a minimum of 2% of the spaces to be ADA accessible. With there being 909 total spaces proposed, that means the entire development would

be below the 2% requirement (1.76%). If just consider the apartment area, it contains 12 (of the 16) total ADA accessible spaces, and has a total of 218 spaces (5.5%). This would meet the requirement of 7 spaces for a lot containing 201–300 spaces. There are no EV charging stations indicated on the plans.

As proposed, there will be a home density ratio of 6.60 units/acre ($430 \text{ units} / 65.1\text{-acres} = 6.60 \text{ units/acre}$).

Associated improvements include: a clubhouse, dog park, sidewalks and bike paths, a village green, two (2) pavilions and pedestrian connections to the Auburn Trail. The site is intended to be set up with a HOA that will cover the single-family homes and the multifamily homes. A public sidewalk is proposed along SR332, spanning from CR41 as far south as Farmbrook Drive (past the State Trooper building). The proposed sidewalk connects as far north as the SR332 / CR41 intersection, and will go to Quentenshire Drive to the east. Sidewalks are also proposed on the internal roadway, as well as bike paths and a stone dust walking path in the village green.

The site will have direct access to State Route 332 through a new intersection to the west. The new intersection will eventually be a four-way, signalized intersection. The site will also have indirect access to State Route 332 via County Road 41 (to the north) and the new intersection with County Road 41. In addition, the site will also have a connection off of Quentenshire Rd. to the east. A traffic study was conducted and determined that the existing transportation network can adequately accommodate the projected traffic volumes and will result in minor impacts on the area. The proposed project is expected to generate approximately 192 entering/227 exiting vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 297 entering/292 exiting vehicle trips during the PM peak hour. The internal roads starting at SR332, going north to CR41 and Quentenshire Rd. (roads serving single-family homes) are to be dedicated to the Town. The parcels are located in the Victor Central School District.

Water is to be provided by the Canandaigua/Farmington Consolidated Water District, to be connected from the existing mains on SR 332 and Quentenshire Drive. Sanitary sewer connection to an existing main (along CR 41) is to be provided by the Farmington Sanitary Sewer District. Estimated volume/usage for both is 130,350 gallons/day, each. On-site stormwater management will be directed to the four stormwater ponds (up to 10 ft. deep) that are placed throughout the subdivision in order to mitigate stormwater from increased impervious surface. Roadside Swales also help collect stormwater. For energy needs, in December 2025, the applicant stated, *“Recent improvements to the RG&E substations at 127 Hook Road and 168 State Street have been completed, and the utilities (RG&E and NYSEG) have announced that these facilities are being brought online. We anticipate that they will meet additional demand generated by the proposed project. We will coordinate with RG&E”*. Overhead electric is proposed. Contractors are to relocate poles as necessary. There are 676 trees and 36 shrubs that are proposed throughout the property. All areas disturbed are to be seeded with grass seed mix. All proposed lighting will be cast down and dark-sky compliant.

The applicant's representative was present for the 12/9 Coordinated Review Committee (CRC) meeting (via webex) and provided the following additional details:

- The applicant representative mentioned that the developer has had conversations with the utility providers (RG&E and NYSEG), and it is believed there is adequate electrical capacity for the project due to recent improvements to the RG&E substations at 127 Hook Road and 168 State Street being completed.

- At this time, there have been no conversations about implementing solar or geothermal.

Relevant December 2025 Comments

1. The referring Board should consider requiring that the developer provide a portion of units at costs affordable to average-sized households (families) at or below 100% of the annual median income.
2. How many of the units will be ADA compliant or visitable by providing a zero-step entry, 36' doorways, and access to a bathroom?
3. At the start of each phase, the referring board is encouraged to require the applicant to adhere to the code/design standards in place at that time – not what was in place at the time at the start of the project.
4. Protection of community character is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. Development patterns such as preserving existing vegetation and adding landscaping with diverse species and spacing as found in nature, rounded landforms (5:1 slopes), and curving driveways that follow the landform, vegetated buffers between commercial/residential land.
5. Is there sufficient water capacity available for this major subdivision?
6. Is there adequate space for emergency vehicle turnaround if needed?

Relevant December 2025 CRC Comments

1. The Board requests clarification regarding school transportation logistics. Specifically, will Victor Central Schools provide bus service to the development, and if so, where will designated pickup locations be situated? The Board further asks whether any sheltered pickup areas are proposed, and whether sufficient space exists on-site to safely accommodate school bus traffic, including pick-up and turnaround movements.
2. The Board asks whether the applicant has considered any development-wide energy-reduction strategies, such as solar, geothermal, or high-efficiency materials and equipment? The referring Board/municipality is encouraged to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating such measures and to consider requiring their use where appropriate.

Relevant December 2025 CPB Comment

1. Has the applicant received confirmation from NYSEG that capacity will be available for full build out? In 2024, utility providers began notifying developers of electric and gas delivery capacity limitations. Local municipal building and zoning staff are requested to encourage those planning developments with significant new energy use to notify RG&E or NYSEG as appropriate. See utility provider (RG&E and NYSEG) intake form below.

https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47728/NYSEG-RGE-Housing-Intake-Form_2024

Comment

1. The applicant is encouraged to install a fence surrounding the stormwater management facility.

OCSWCD Comment

1. Due to the invasive potential, crown vetch should not be used for stabilization.
2. Consider zero phosphorus fertilizer.

OCDPW Comments

1. Site Plan comments were sent to both Passero Associates and the Town of Farmington on 1/28/26.
2. Provide a detail of the intersection between the proposed roadway and County Road 41. The curb shall not come out directly onto County Road 41 as it poses a potential hazard to motorists. Please confirm the limits of the curbing.
3. The sidewalk around County Road 41 is not clearly shown. Will the proposed sidewalks tie into the new crosswalk at County Road 41/RT 332 that was placed as part of the NYSDOT Signal Upgrade project?
4. Additional comments in regard to stormwater and SWPPP will be sent at a later date. Our only initial observation was that the SWPPP shows a 30" "outlet pipe" between ponds 1C and 1A, while the plans show a 24" culvert pipe between the ponds.

NYSDOT Comments

1. Crosswalks should be installed as type S if the intersection is controlled by a stop sign and be converted to type L upon traffic signal installation. This should be noted on the plans.
2. Additional set of left/straight and right arrows near the start of lane split (see Standard Sheet 685-01).
3. A bike path may be requested to connect to the edge of the pavement at/near an intersection.
4. In general, we concur with the conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study.
5. The proposed site access at NYS Route 332 shall be right-in / right-out until the full access intersection with Savalla Blvd is established, and a traffic signal is constructed and operational. We note that additional work along NYS Route 332, including removal of existing U-turns north and south of Savalla Blvd, will be required.
6. We note that a traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of NYS Route 332 and Savalla Blvd for both the proposed Farmington Meadows project and the Hathaways Corners project that is under construction. If available, please provide clarification on when and by which project / developer the signal is anticipated to be constructed.
7. All work within the NYS right-of-way, including driveway and utility work, will require a Highway Work Permit.

CRC Comments

1. What is the applicant's definition of senior living? Will the proposed senior housing have different/elevated levels of care? Will there be assisted living or skilled nursing?
2. Is the project meeting the requirement for number of ADA accessible parking spaces? Given the proposed senior-living apartments, the referring board should consider having the number of ADA spaces increased as a condition of approval.
3. The Board reiterates December 2025 comment 6 regarding emergency vehicle access. The applicant should ensure they speak with the Farmington Fire Dept. to confirm there is enough space for emergency vehicle turnaround, as well as readily available access to all

- four floors of the apartment building.
4. This development is an opportunity for developers to implement development-wide energy generation / saving systems that would benefit the entire community (ex: geothermal, high efficiency appliances, rooftop solar, in-home battery energy storage, in-home eV charging, etc.).
 5. Given the energy infrastructure challenges in the County, the referring board should consider the adoption of code changes to preference development with energy generation/storage/efficiency measures such as zero-e homes, home battery energy storage, etc.
 6. The Ontario County Planning Board has an interest in preserving its natural resources. Removal of trees and natural habitat should be mitigated where possible.
 7. At the 12/9/2025 CRC Meeting, the applicant representative indicated that they have had conversations with utility providers (RG&E and NYSEG), and that “they believe there is adequate electrical capacity for the project due to recent improvements to the RG&E substations at 127 Hook Road and 168 State Street”. Has the applicant received confirmation (a letter of commitment) confirming adequate capacity?

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Overall Site Plan
3. Site Plans
4. Utility Plans
5. Storm Plans
6. Grading Plans
7. Landscaping & Lighting Plans
8. Plan Set Part I (23 pages)
9. Plan Set Part II (16 pages)
10. Plan Set Part III
11. Road Dedications and Sidewalks
12. Existing Condition
13. Single-Family Layout & Elevations
14. Townhome Layout & Elevations
15. Multi-Family Home Examples
16. Maps
17. Town Board Resolution
18. PB Application
19. LOI
20. FEAF
21. SWPPP (464 pages)
22. Traffic Impact Report (409 pages)
23. Estimated Project Schedule
24. Fish and Wildlife Determination
25. TB Resolution

CPB Comment

1. The County Planning Board recommends that the Town Board (and other municipal City/Town/Village Boards) consider adopting a definition and associated standards for the term “senior-living” within their zoning regulations. Establishing a clear definition would help distinguish the level of care and services provided and promote consistent

interpretation in future land use and development applications.

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

21.1-2026 (Class 1) Subdivision and Site Plan for the Farmington Meadows subdivision – at 0000 County Road 41. Development includes one (1) four-story senior apartment building (150 units), 29 two-story townhome style apartment buildings (230 units) with a central clubhouse and pool, 50 single-family home lots, an estimated five (5) commercial pad sites, and a self-storage facility. Referral 21.0-2026 is in regard to the subdivision and 21.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Farmington
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID): 41.07-1-28.210 and 41.07-1-28.300

Description & Review Comments:

See 21.0-2026.

Attachments:

None

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

22-2026 (Class 1) Area Variance for the absence of sidewalks when "sidewalks are to be provided along all sites fronting along any state and county highways" in the MTOD (Major Thoroughfare Overlay District) — at 6228 Collett Road West.

Municipality: Town of Farmington
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Class 1
Property 29.00-1-4.000

**Information
(Address & ID):**

Description & Review Comments:

The subject parcel is 6.6 acres. The applicant is requesting an area variance. If approved, they will then apply for site plan approval for the future expansion of their yard, shop, and office space. The future plan is to expand the yard by approximately 60 ft. to the east (adding 15,000 SF of fenced equipment storage), add 3,000 SF of matching pole-barn construction mechanic's space, and to expand the office by approximately 1,000 SF into what is currently the shop space.

Town Code §165-34J(3)g[6] states, "Sidewalks are to be provided along all sites fronting on State and County highways and other Town highways within the mapped MTOD district that connect to, or contribute to, the completion of a pedestrian network in the area".

The property fronts along State Route 332, where no pedestrian network currently exists. The applicant mentions that "construction of a sidewalk at this location would not connect to, nor contribute to, the completion of a pedestrian network. Additionally, due to the slope and physical constraints of the roadway embankment, there is no feasible space to safely construct a sidewalk along this portion of State Route 332".

According to Oncor:

- The closest sidewalk network along/adjacent to State Route 332 appears to be 500+ ft. to the south @ the SR332 Collett Rd. W intersection.
- Subject parcel has commercial use. Surrounding land use is predominantly commercial, except for the residential developments to the north (Saratoga Crossing) and south (Collett Woods).

What must be proven in order to be granted an area variance? If requesting an area variance, that is, permission to build in an otherwise restricted portion of the property (such as in the required front, side or rear yards, or above the required building height, or in excess of the lot coverage regulations), then state law requires the applicant to show that the benefit the applicant stands to receive from the variance will outweigh any burden to health, safety and welfare that may be suffered by the community. State law requires the ZBA to take the following factors into consideration in making its determination:

1. whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance;
2. whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method which will be feasible for the applicant to pursue but would not require a variance;
3. whether the requested area variance is substantial;
4. whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; and
5. whether an alleged difficulty is self-created.

Unlike the use variance test, the ZBA need not find in favor of the applicant on every one of the above questions. Rather, the ZBA must merely take each one of the factors into account. The ZBA may also decide that a lesser variance than the one requested would be appropriate, or may decide

that there are alternatives available to the applicant which would not require a variance. See the submitted documents for the applicants' response to the test questions.

Attachments:

- 1. Aerial
- 2. Test Questions
- 3. ZBA App
- 4. FEAF
- 5. LOI
- 6. Street View

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

8. Town of Hopewell

23-2026 (Class 1) Area Variance to subdivide an 8.1-acre parent parcel into three parcels (Lot 1: 6.4-acres; Lot 2: 1.3-acres; Lot 3: 0.4-acres) — at 1875 County Road 19. The area variance is for Lot 3 to have an area of 0.4-acres (or 17,412 SF) when a minimum of 30,000 SF is required.	
Municipality:	Town of Hopewell
Referring Board:	Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type:	Area Variance
Class:	Class 1
Property	58.00-1-13.121
Information	
(Address & ID):	

Description & Review Comments:

The area variance request is for the lot area of 0.4 acres (or 17,412 SF) — which is a 42% relief of the required 30,000 SF.

Proposed Parcel 1 is a current brush lot. It is currently under contract to be sold to a family looking to build their primary residence on it. Proposed Parcel 2 has an abandoned colonial home on it with a cement septic tank and leach field. A water well could not be located. Initial conversations with the Hopewell Code Enforcement Officer indicate that a new approved septic system will be required, and the home itself will need a structural review and approval by an engineer prior to any rehab permits. Proposed Parcel 3 currently contains an inhabited double-wide trailer with a working septic, leach field, and well.

According to Oncor:

- An active rail line (Finger Lake Railway) abuts the subject parcel(s) to the east. The

Canandaigua Outlet lies just east of the rail line.

- The subject and surrounding parcels are primarily residential except for agricultural use to the east (east of Canandaigua Outlet).
- NYSDEC Informational Wetlands and National wetlands lie on the eastern parcel edge and to the east. FEMA 100- and 500-Year Flood Zones, and FEMA Q3 Floodplains lie just east of the parcel.
- Parcels to the east and south are within Ontario County Agricultural District #1.

What must be proven in order to be granted an area variance? If requesting an area variance, that is, permission to build in an otherwise restricted portion of the property (such as in the required front, side or rear yards, or above the required building height, or in excess of the lot coverage regulations), then state law requires the applicant to show that the benefit the applicant stands to receive from the variance will outweigh any burden to health, safety and welfare that may be suffered by the community. State law requires the ZBA to take the following factors into consideration in making its determination:

1. whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance;
2. whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method which will be feasible for the applicant to pursue but would not require a variance;
3. whether the requested area variance is substantial;
4. whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; and
5. whether an alleged difficulty is self-created.

Unlike the use variance test, the ZBA need not find in favor of the applicant on every one of the above questions. Rather, the ZBA must merely take each one of the factors into account. The ZBA may also decide that a lesser variance than the one requested would be appropriate, or may decide that there are alternatives available to the applicant which would not require a variance. See the submitted documents for the applicants' response to the test questions.

Comments

1. Within/along the parcel are DEC Informational Wetlands and will require a Jurisdictional Determination request from the NYSDEC.
2. The Town is encouraged to grant only the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the lot.
3. The referring agency and applicant are encouraged to ensure that any required soil percolation tests are completed and considered during subdivision review.
4. The referring agency and applicant are encouraged to involve all appropriate agencies as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and placement of on-site septic and/or curb cuts.
5. The referring agency and applicant are encouraged to consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances for any proposed driveways comply with applicable design standards.

OCDPW Comments

1. Ontario County DPW would prefer the existing “entrance” for the lot 2 residence continue

- to be used. Shall a new culvert pipe be needed (if there is one there), then a Highway Work Permit would be required. If simply placing a new crusher on the driveway of lot 2, a permit would NOT be required.
2. Shall a driveway ever be placed on lot 1, it is important to note that a location be picked with adequate sight distance. Contact DPW if there are any questions.

CRC Comments

1. Any existing/proposed curb-cuts should be shown on the site plan when the applicant applies for site plan approval. Especially Lot 2 due to its proximity to Lot 3.
2. The referring Board is encouraged to add conditions for single & shared driveway access from CR19 to any approved variance.

Attachments:

1. Subdiv Plat
2. Test Questions
3. LOI
4. SEAF

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

9. Town of Victor

24-2026 (Class 1) Preliminary Subdivision Approval for Section 2-4 of the Woods at Valentown (High Point Business Park) subdivision consisting of 71 for-sale townhouse units and one 4-story apartment building with 100 units at 0000 High Point Drive.

Municipality:	Town of Victor
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Subdivision
Class:	Class 1
Property	1.07-1-4.100
Information	
(Address & ID):	

Description & Review Comments:

The subject parcel is 56.9 acres and disturbance is estimated at 18.8 acres. The total number of units proposed in the subdivision is 255 units (and a clubhouse), which the Town Board modified the PDD on December 22, 2025. The referral was reviewed at the September 2025 County Planning Board (CPB) meeting as 154-2025 (Class 2); "High Point Business Park PDD Amendment to reduce the number of residential units by 39 units from 294 to 255 while shifting

the mix from all 3-story apartment buildings to include 71 townhouses and 100 units in a 4-story apartment building in High Point Drive sections 1 and 2". The referral was recommended for approval by the CPB.

On January 27, 2026, Section 1 was granted re-approval by the Town Planning Board, consisting of two (2) three-story apartment buildings consisting of 42 units in each.

The referral was also reviewed by the County Planning Board in July 2017 (rezone and map amendment), June 2018 (PDD amendment), January 2019 (final site plan), and July 2022. An updated traffic study was completed with the previous PDD amendment. The applicant states, "No further traffic analysis or updated traffic study has been completed as the proposed uses will result in consistent traffic levels as originally accepted as part of the 2017 PDD amendment." In 2017, NYSDOT commented on the project and stated, "I don't see where it [the PDD] would have an impact on the State highway system, unless their traffic study shows such an increase in traffic that the signal system needs to be adjusted".

Section 2 and 4 include the 71 townhouse lots, and two homeowners Association (HOA) lots will be created to serve these areas of the project. Section 1 and 3 (containing the apartment buildings) and the other remaining land will remain as a singular property. The apartment buildings have a proposed height of 60 ft. (at the base of the roof).

Access to Sections 2–4 will be provided by existing road stubs currently installed at the northeast and northwest corners of High Point Drive. The roads extending from the existing stubs will be private drives, with access and utility easements provided to the Town, consistent with previous approvals. Each residential unit will have a minimum of 2 parking spaces available. For the townhomes, one with an enclosed garage in each unit as well as a driveway space. 16 visitor parking spaces are proposed as well for the townhomes (Section 2). The apartment building includes underground parking (109 spaces) as well as (100: 5 ADA accessible) surface spaces for residents, visitors and overflow parking. The site plan does not indicate any proposed eV charging stations. A natural surface trail is proposed to connect Sections 2–4. According to aerial imagery, there does not appear to be sidewalks/trails connecting Sections 2–4 to Section 1 or to High Point Business Park.

All areas of the project are within existing water and sewer districts and will connect to the existing public facilities originally constructed along High Point Drive to serve the property. The design of these utilities will be consistent with the previously approved application for the property and offered in dedication to the Town of Victor and Monroe County Water Authority as applicable.

The estimated average daily demand for the entire project is approximately 65,680 gpd, and adequate capacity exists within the existing system to serve the proposed development. For Sections 2 and 3, new water mains will be extended from the existing water main along High Point Drive near the northeast road stub and routed along the private road, where the line will split to serve the townhouses and public fire hydrants in Section 2 and the four-story apartment building in Section 3. A new meter and backflow equipment will be provided within the apartment building, with a private fire service downstream of the backflow equipment serving private hydrants in its vicinity. Hydrants will also be installed along the dedicated main in Section 2. For Section 4, a new water main will be extended from the existing water main along High Point Drive near the northwest road stub and routed along the private road to serve the townhouses and fire hydrants in that section.

For sanitary utilities, the estimated average daily demand (for the entire project) is approximately

65,680 gpd. Adequate capacity exists within the existing system for the development of the property as proposed. Section 2 & 3 will connect to the existing sanitary sewer stub located at the northeast road stub, and Section 4 will connect to the existing sanitary sewer stub located at the northwest road stub.

The applicant mentions that existing stormwater management facilities for the Woods at Valentown Parcel were built with the construction of High Point Drive and have been in operation for several years without issue. Sections 2-4 have proposed concrete gutters that will line both sides of the internal roadway to collect stormwater and divert to the bioretention areas – consisting of an existing 16 ft.-deep infiltration basin (pond), as well as three proposed bioretention areas. There are additional pond/bio-retention areas as a part of Section I as well.

No wetlands on the site are to be disturbed by the proposed development modifications and no portion of the site is located within a recognized 100-year floodplain. All wetland mitigation and stream relocation measures have been completed with previous construction phases at High Point Business Park. Steep slopes disturbed are to be seeded with steep slope seed mix.

Trees are to be removed for development of the apartments/homes, but forested area is to remain between the sections. 21 new trees (and 163 shrubs) are proposed to be planted. Streetlights (38 pole-mounted) are proposed on one side of the internal roadways, with denser lighting between townhomes and in the apartment parking area. All lights are to be dark-sky compliant.

According to Oncon:

- The Monroe/Ontario County municipal boundary runs along the northern boundary of the subject parcel.
- The adjacent parcel to the south is in Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- The subject parcel has residential vacant land use. Parcels to the west are commercial, parcels to the east are residential, and to the south agricultural.
- A regulated stream runs through the center of the parcel. A federal wetland buffers the stream.
- NYSDEC Jurisdictional wetlands exist on the subject parcel.
- Slope disturbed ranges from gentle to extremely steep (9–60% gradient).
- Soil disturbed is primarily Palmyra and Howard Soils (not hydric, high permeability, medium erodibility, is prime farmland on moderate slopes, and is in hydrologic soil group B).
- Land disturbed is Appalachian Oak Hickory Forest and a successional old field.

Relevant September 2025 Comments

1. What are slopes in areas of additional tree clearing? Tree removal on a steep slope can create cascading changes in tree cover and slope stability. Are there additional areas of the site with a proposed grade steeper than 1:4?
2. Is the existing stormwater management facility able to meet revised NYSDEC guidelines and expected peak rainfall events?
3. Do proposed trails connect all residential areas to the clubhouse? To High Point Business Park? Are there plans to do so?
4. How much of the provided open space/undisturbed area is under the overhead wires?
5. Within the parcel are DEC Informational Wetlands and will require a Jurisdictional

Determination request from the NYSDEC (if not already completed).

Relevant September 2025 CRC Comments

1. There are concerns over the high level of disturbance in steep slope areas and the proximity to the Federal wetland (and NYSDEC informational wetlands). Protection of water and natural features is a stated goal of the County Planning Board. Proper soil erosion controls and stormwater protection need to be ensured. The appropriate agencies should be consulted during the planning and construction process (Army Corps of Engineers, NYSDEC, OCSWCD).
2. Setbacks from wetlands and streams should be provided on the plans. The building just east of the Federal Wetland looks as if it may have moved closer to the wetland. Is it still outside the required 100 ft. minimum buffer as required in Town Code 211-30A?
3. The applicant is encouraged to investigate additional means of emergency access. As currently configured, the site plan shows a long access road to multiple units with no additional point of egress. In 2019, the applicant mentioned they intend to add turning lanes at Winwood Hollow, Cedar Glen, and Embury Ridge intersections. Is this still planned?
4. Fencing around the stormwater management/retention ponds should be considered for pedestrian/child safety.
5. The project lies right on the Monroe / Ontario County line. Has Monroe County or the Town of Perinton been notified?

Comments

1. Has the applicant received confirmation from NYSEG that capacity will be available for full build out? In 2024, utility providers began notifying developers of electric and gas delivery capacity limitations. Local municipal building and zoning staff are requested to encourage those planning developments with significant new energy use to notify RG&E or NYSEG as appropriate. See utility provider (RG&E and NYSEG) intake form below.
<https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47729/NYSEG-RGE-Eco-Dev-Intake-Form2020-rev1>
https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/DocumentCenter/View/47728/NYSEG-RGE-Housing-Intake-Form_2024
2. How many of the units will be ADA compliant or visitable by providing a zero-step entry, 36" doorways, and access to a bathroom?
3. The referring Board should consider requiring that the developer provide a portion of units at costs affordable to average-sized households (families) at or below 100% of the annual median income.
4. Will the indoor parking spaces be ADA accessible / have elevators?
5. The Board requests clarification regarding school transportation logistics. Specifically, will Victor Central Schools provide bus service to the development, and if so, where will designated pickup locations be situated? The Board further asks whether any sheltered pickup areas are proposed, and whether sufficient space exists on-site to safely accommodate school bus traffic, including pick-up and turnaround movements.
6. The Board asks whether the applicant has considered any development-wide energy-reduction strategies, such as solar, geothermal, or high-efficiency materials and equipment? The referring Board/municipality is encouraged to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating such measures and to consider requiring their use where appropriate.
7. At the start of each phase, the referring board is encouraged to require the applicant to

adhere to the code/design standards in place at that time – not what was in place at the time at the start of the project.

NYS DOT Comment

1. We have reviewed the Preliminary Subdivision Plans for the Woods at Valentown project and expect that impacts on the State highway system will be minor. We acknowledge that site-generated traffic may result in minor increases in delays at intersections along NYS Route 96 during peak travel periods.

CRC Comments

1. The Board reiterates September 2025 CRC Comment 2. Setbacks from wetlands and streams should be provided on the plans. Is the proposed apartment building/parking lot outside the required 100 ft. minimum buffer as required in Town Code section 211-30A?
2. Are any public EV charging stations envisioned for multifamily homes or townhome parking lots?
3. This development is an opportunity for developers to implement development-wide energy generation / saving systems that would benefit the entire community (ex: geothermal, high efficiency appliances, rooftop solar, in-home battery energy storage, in-home eV charging, etc.).
4. Given the energy infrastructure challenges in the County, the referring board should consider the adoption of code changes to preference development with energy generation/storage/efficiency measures such as zero-e homes, home battery energy storage, etc.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Overall Site Plan
3. Site Plans
4. Utility Plans
5. Grading Plans
6. Landscaping & Lighting Plans
7. Plan Set
8. Layout & Elevations
9. Photo Simulation
10. Old 9-2025 Plan Set
11. LOI
12. PB App
13. Supplement to Engineer's Report

Board Motion: To retain referral 20.0-2026, 20.1-2026, 21.0-2026, 21.1-2026, 22-2026, 23-2026, and 24-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

10. Privilege of the Floor

-Planning Department Staff provided the following updates/information:

- Timeline for the Ontario County Access Management Plan - which the OCPB (Ontario County Planning Board) will have an official role in.
- Review of possible 6:00 trainings before the CPB meetings (official list of dates/topics forthcoming). Possible topics/presentations include:
 - Presentation(s) on Ontario County Access Management Plan Updates
 - Agricultural Enhancement Board Updates
 - Economic Development Plan Update
 - Electrical Energy Utility Capacity/Transmission Updates
 - Office of Aging
 - Planning Director Updates
- Reminder to anyone who is behind on their training to start getting some hours.
- Class 2 denial follow-ups with referring municipalities are to start next month (March 2026).
- The 2026 OCPB Annual Report presentation to the PEQ and BOS committees will be presented at the upcoming (March 2026) meeting(s).

-Ruth Cahn (OCPB representative to the Ad Hoc Housing Committee) provided updates on housing in the County. Mrs. Cahn reiterated that there is a great need for affordable housing in our County, especially for seniors. The Board should continue to provide comment in the minutes urging developers to consider affordable housing when proposing a project.

11. Upcoming Trainings:

An updated list of training opportunities can be found at: <https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/192/Training>

NYS DOS Local Government Training - Winter Webinar Series

- [See link to register](#). Click on / reference individual meeting dates within the link to register.
- **February 15–17, 2026; 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM; Marriot Marquis, 535 Broadway, New York, NY (NYS Association of Towns)**
 - Annual Conference
- **February 23, 2026; 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM; Location TBD (Rockland County)**
 - State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) Basics
- **March 10, 2026; 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM; Murray Hill Campus, Building 1 Auditorium, 1 Murray Hill Drive, Mount Morris, NY (Livingston County)**
 - Hot Button Land Uses

LOCATE Finger Lakes Energy Infrastructure Summit

- [Click here for link](#)
- Topics include: Challenges to job development in the Finger Lakes because of the electric grid, the status of the electric grid serving the Finger Lakes region, what steps are necessary to modernize and upgrade the energy grid throughout the Finger Lakes region, and New York State policy action items needed to upgrade energy distribution in the Finger Lakes region.

MRB Group / Hancock Estabrook Municipal Bootcamp

- [Click here for link](#).
- SESSION 2: From Big to Small — The Big Picture — Developing and Implementing

Comprehensive Plans

- **Thursday, February 26, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 3: Getting it Together — The Basics of Running a Meeting and the Open Meetings Law
 - **Thursday, March 26, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 4: Soaking Up The Sun — Solar and Battery Storage and the Local Review Process
 - **Thursday, April 23, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 5: Water, Water Everywhere — The Impact of Wetlands on Development
 - **Thursday, May 28, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 6: Zoning Board Basics — Roles of the Zoning Board in Community Development
 - **Thursday, June 25, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 7: Growing Intentionally — The Role of Local Leadership in Attracting Investment and Economic Development
 - **Thursday, July 23, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 8: A Storm is Brewing — How Development Review Addresses Stormwater Management and Water Quality
 - **Thursday, September 24, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 9: Funding Your Priorities — Developing and Managing Competitive Grant Applications
 - **Thursday, October 22, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**
- SESSION 10: Santa's Naughty and Nice List — The Best and Worst of 2023
 - **Thursday, December 17, 2026–6:00 PM - 7:00 PM; (Remote)**

Deploying Safe Lithium-ion Energy Storage in your community — hosted by the New York State Interagency Fire Safety Working Group (from May 7, 2025)

- Topics include: critical safety considerations, regulatory updates, best practices in the field, and recommendations for local actions. [See presentation slides](#)

NYS DOS Regional On-Site Trainings

- [Click here for link](#)
- Statewide schedule of NYS DOS on-site local government trainings. Typically, updated in August and November/December.

NYS DOS On-Line Interactive Courses

- [Click here for link](#)
- Includes links to online interactive courses.

NYS DOS Recorded Webinars

- [Click here for link](#)
- Use this link to access recorded webinars, including Introductory courses on Planning and Zoning Boards. The courses are 1–2 hours each. You may choose to complete a final quiz on each topic.

Print the quiz to provide documentation of course completion. You may need to disable your browser's pop-up blocker to access links in the training.

New York Conference of Mayors trainings are free (if your municipality is a member).

- [Click here for link](#)
- The NY Conference of Mayors also offers virtual and recorded webinars for member villages and cities.
- Recorded webinars include:
 - 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 ZBA'S 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

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
- Recorded Webinars Include:
 - 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 and 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 II
 - Working with Developers to Foster Investment in the Community
 - Communication, the Media and Social Media
 - Open Government and Planning and Zoning Decision-Making

12. Adjournment:

Board motion to: Adjourn. **Motion made by:** Tammy Worden, **seconded by** Burch Craig, **Vote:** Yes 12, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed. The Ontario County Planning Board meeting was adjourned at 7:21 PM.

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	Variances 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)