

ONTARIO COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Wednesday, May 13, 2026, Time: 7:00 PM

Join from the meeting link

<https://ontariocountyny.webex.com/ontariocountyny/j.php?MTID=m932c7ca998a16e7be4a8ef8f87938b1b>

Join by meeting number

Meeting number (access code): 2343 871 0760

Meeting password: naMT52j8ZHe

Join by phone

[+1-408-418-9388,,23438710760##](tel:+1-408-418-9388,,23438710760##)

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, May 13, 2026, Ontario County Planning Board meeting to order at 7:12 PM.

2. Roll Call

Upon roll call, the following members were:

Present:

Ruth Cahn
Burch Craig
Dan Crowley
Stephen High
Ed Kaiser
Thomas Kugris
Ted Liddell
A.J. Magnan
Chris Mergler
Paul Passavant
Jamie Purdy
Ryan Wilmer
Tammy Worden
Ben Wickham

Absent:

Jack Dailey

Excused:

Lisa Grefrath, Paul Lambiase, Leonard Wildman

Present (Voting): 14, Present (Not Voting): 0, Absent: 1, Excused: 3

Guests:

Ted Mayhood (T. Canadice) - 64-2026; Brian Grose (Fagan Engineers) - 71-2026; Andrew V. (Sherman Solar) - 79.0-2026 & 79.1-2026; Victor Ciaccia (Norbut Solar) and Megan Serini (BME

3. Approval of Minutes:

Ruth Cahn motioned to approve the minutes of the April 8, 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. City of Canandaigua

63-2026 (Class 1) Lot line adjustment involving three lots, for the proposed FLCC Culinary Arts Center — at 100, 130, and 158 Lakeshore Drive.

Municipality:	City of Canandaigua
Referring Board:	Planning Commission
Application Type:	Subdivision
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	84.18-1-46.1; 84.18-1-46.2; 84.18-1-10.1

Description & Review Comments:

The project has been referred as a subdivision application for the reconfiguration of three existing lots.

The proposed project is located along Lakeshore Drive and the right of way along the north shore of Canandaigua Lake in the City of Canandaigua. The Speedway gas station is directly east of the project, Kershaw Park is to the south across Lakeshore Drive, Pinnacle North Apartments are across Ellen Polimeni Blvd. to the west, and Parkway Plaza is to the north. In total, the project consists of three (3) parcels totaling approximately 11.2 acres. Once combined, Lot 1 is to be 8.9-acres, while Lot 2 is to be 2.3-acres. The larger lot is to be developed into a public park with approximately ±93,000 SF of impervious area. The smaller lot is to contain a 19,460 SF culinary school. Parking lots and an extensive sidewalk/patio system are to service the lots. The plan proposes a reduction of existing impervious cover by 39.8% of the total disturbed, impervious area. The final grading of the site is planned to

minimize runoff contribution from new pervious area onto the impervious cover.

Operationally, the Culinary Art's Center of Excellence (CACE) will serve as the home for FLCC's Culinary Program, and house the New York State Wine and Culinary Center (doing business as New York Kitchen, or 'NYK') offices, an office for Cornell Cooperative Extension of Ontario County, and shared demonstration space and kitchen teaching space. NYK will operate a retail and tasting space for New York State sourced food and beverages but will not operate a restaurant. The site is a known brownfield area for which a remediation and management plan has been developed and approved by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and has been implemented.

Access is to be provided to the site via Lakeshore Drive to the south, and a proposed paved road to the north. There are 94 parking spaces proposed, and 8 of which are proposed as ADA accessible. An existing 82 parking spaces are located on the adjacent parcel to the east.

Stormwater generally drains via sheet flow, shallow concentrated flow, and channelized pipe flow from the open ground on site into the surrounding existing storm system, ultimately discharging into Canandaigua Lake Outlet. Under developed conditions, runoff will generally flow to one of four stormwater management areas located throughout the site. On the Culinary Center parcel, a 3 ft. stormwater management area is proposed. The stormwater management areas will discharge into the existing storm system under Muar Street before ultimately discharging into Canandaigua Lake Outlet. With stormwater storage, controlled outflow, and a 39.8% reduction in impervious area from the project, there is a 34.4% decrease in peak discharge on average. Additionally, the site uses green infrastructure practices to meet NYSDEC stormwater quality minimum requirements, which include water quality volume, runoff reduction volume, and channel protection volume.

The CACE will have public sewer/water with anticipated usage of 1,000 gallons/day for each. Local utilities will be used (RG & E). A geothermal system is proposed. 59 trees (red maple, river birch, red oak, white spruce, green giant) and 189 shrubs are proposed to surround the building and parking areas. The lighting proposed will be dark sky compliant and will be for security illumination and seasonal patio lighting. Lighting for the parcel will include 9 streetlamps, 20 bollard lights, 8 wall-mounted lights, 19 in-pavement lights, and 35 landscape accent lights (91 total).

According to Oncor:

- The subject parcels are commercial vacant land use.
- Surrounding land use is commercial with open space / recreation to the south (Kershaw Park).
- Canandaigua Lake is just over 200 ft. south of the subject parcels.
- The subject parcels lie within the FEMA Q3 Floodplain and 100- and 500-Year Flood Zones.
- Wetlands (NYSDEC and Federal) exist at the Canandaigua Outlet and Canandaigua Federal Canal to the east and west, respectively.
- Soil disturbed is Wayland Silt Loam (hydric, high permeability, very high erodibility, is not prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group B/D).
- Slope disturbed is little to none (0-3% gradient).
- The land disturbed is the mowed lawn and parking lot.

Comments

1. Protection of water quality and community character are stated goals of the Ontario County Planning Board, and should be ensured due to the environmental significance of Canandaigua Lake — which serves as an important recreational and drinking water resource for surrounding communities. Lakeshore Drive has also been designated by the Ontario County Planning Board as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Where possible, the project should be designed to maintain the scenic quality of the lake corridor, minimizing light pollution and impervious surface.
3. It should be ensured that there is enough space for emergency vehicle turnaround.
4. The applicant and referring agency are strongly encouraged to involve Ontario County Soil and Water Conservation and NYSDEC as early in the review process as possible to ensure proper design and implementation of storm water and erosion control measures.

CRC Comments

1. The Board requests clarification regarding whether the proposed Lakeshore Drive access will operate as a right-in/right-out intersection. Given the proximity of the Muar Street/Lakeshore Drive intersection and the adjacent gas station to the east, the Board is concerned about the potential for traffic issues. The applicant and referring agency should consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances for the proposed driveway comply with standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).
2. The Board requests additional information regarding interim access to the northern parking area located north of the proposed Culinary Center. Specifically, it is unclear whether access will be provided via the existing gravel drive. The site plan notes a “DO NOT ENTER” sign at the eastern access point and indicates that the gravel drive is to be raised to the proposed grade and paved during the future Lakeshore Park phase.
3. The Board recommends that the applicant establish appropriate cross-access and shared access easement agreements among the newly re-subdivided parcels to ensure coordinated vehicular circulation and long-term site functionality.
4. The Board recommends submission of a phasing plan that clearly illustrates how vehicular access and parking will be maintained throughout each stage of development.
5. The Board encourages the applicant to consider incorporating electric vehicle charging stations as part of the proposed parking facilities. If EV charging infrastructure is proposed, the location and number of charging spaces should be identified on the site plan.
6. The applicant and referring Board should consider development-wide energy generation and energy use reduction strategies, such as rooftop solar. The referring Board/municipality is encouraged to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating such measures and to consider requiring their use where appropriate.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Site Plan
3. Subdiv Plat
4. Grading & Erosion Plan
5. Landscaping Plan
6. Lighting Plan
7. Planning Commission App

8. FEAF
9. SWPPP (439 Pages)

CPB Comment

1. The County Planning Board recommends that the applicant confirm that adequate on-site parking will be available to accommodate staff and students during class periods. The applicant should consider implementing a parking permit or badge system to prioritize parking for authorized staff and enrolled students

Board Motion: To retain referral 63-2026 as a class 1 and return to the local board with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Ryan Wilmer. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion: Passed.

7. Town of Bristol

86-2026 (Exempt / LATE REFERRAL) Subdivision of a 6.4-acre parcel into 2 parcels (Parcel 1: 3.25-acres; Parcel 2: 3.10-acres) — at 0000 Gulick Road.

Municipality: Town of Bristol
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Subdivision
Class: Exempt / LATE REFERRAL
Property 150.00-3-18.000
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

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

Attachments:

1. Survey Plat
2. SEAF

Board Motion: To accept late referral 86-2026 as a late referral.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Dan Crowley. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion:** Passed.

8. Town of Canadice

64-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit for a one-day music festival at 5672-5676 County Road 6.

Municipality: Town of Canadice
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Special Use Permit
Class: Class 1
Property 164.00-2-21.100
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

The document is a proposal for the Full Moon Music Festival planned for August 29, 2026, in the Honeoye/Canadice area. The event is described as a small, affordable, family-friendly community festival featuring live music, local vendors, and cultural activities from 12 PM to 3 AM. The proposal outlines plans for controlled attendance, organized parking and stage layout, monitored entry, waste management, sound control, and portable restroom facilities. It also states that nearby residents will be informed in advance and provided a direct contact person during the event. The festival will be located on the southern half of the parcel (south of the stream), in the open field.

The Town of Canadice Code Enforcement Officer submitted that in the past two years, the festival drew under 400 attendees and there were no complaints regarding noise, traffic, parking, litter, or sanitation. The event is proposed to have eight bands, and for the first time: vendor tents, a food truck, and a liquor truck. Given the increased commercial nature of the festival, the CEO requested the applicant submit for site plan approval to the Town of Canadice Planning Board so they may fully evaluate the proposal and impose appropriate conditions.

The Site Plan indicates:

- (136) 10' x 20' parking spaces in two main lots, including 6 VIP parking and 3 ADA accessible spaces.
- An area for art and food/beverage vendors.
- First Aid and Fire Extinguisher tent.
- Vendor tent.
- One 10' x 12' stage with a gathering area.
- 3 standard and 1 ADA-compliant portable restrooms.
- Access will come off of County Road 36 to the east via separate enter-only and exit-only access points.

According to Oncor:

- A National Wetland buffers the stream that runs through the center of the parcel.
- The concert area has a predominately gentle slope (4–9% gradient), except for the

stream, which has areas of steep to extremely steep slopes (16–60% gradient; 30+ ft. elevation drop).

- The subject parcel has rural residential land use.
- Surrounding land use is primarily residential. The adjacent parcel to the south is rural vacant.

Comments

1. A clearly identified fence and signage should be placed between the concert area and the gully to the north in order to ensure attendee safety.
2. The applicant and referring agency should consult with the Ontario County Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances for the proposed driveway comply with standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).
3. Will there be employees / parking attendants to help guide traffic? Will the lot be attended during events?
4. Protection of water quality is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. Accordingly, the applicant should ensure that trash/waste generated onsite is handled and disposed of in a manner that prevents contamination of surface water and groundwater, and is consistent with applicable environmental regulations and best management practices.

OCDPW Comment

1. Parking is not permitted on the shoulders of County Road 36, otherwise we have no concerns with the proposed plan.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Sketch
3. PB App
4. SEAF
5. Event Details
6. CEO Letter

Board Motion: To retain referral 64-2026 as a class 1 and return to the local board with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Ed Kaiser. **Vote:** Yes 13, No 0, Abstained 1 (Burch Craig). **The motion:** Passed.

9. Town of Canandaigua

65-2026 (Class 1) Subdivision of a 25.5-acre parcel into two equally sized parcels

(12.75-acres each) — at 5445 Wells Curtice Road.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Subdivision
Class: Class 1
Property 140.00-1-1.200
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

This project was previously referred to the County Planning Board in April 2026 as referral 49-2026 for the same exact project. Last month, referral 49-2026 was considered exempt under Exemption 11 (in Appendix B of the Ontario County Planning Board Bylaws) – “*Subdivision of land into two lots that meet all applicable local municipal code requirements.*”

It was later indicated that the subdivision no longer meets all applicable code requirements and is no longer exempt from County Planning Board review (and is Class 1). The applicant is now requesting a waiver from the requirement of the proposed lots to have a property lot depth greater than 2.5x's the lot width.

Both proposed parcels would have a property lot depth of over 2,000 ft. and property lot width of 318 ft. and 320 ft. (lot depth at least 6x lot width). The required minimum lot width for this parcel (zoned RR-3) is 225 ft.

According to Oncor:

- The adjacent parcel to the west is in the Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- The subject parcel is rural vacant. Surrounding land uses are predominately residential or vacant.
- NYS DEC Informational Wetland is located along the rear (western) portion of the parcel. A National Wetland also buffers the stream along the back of the parcel.
- The rear (western) half of the proposed parcels are forested (successional northern hardwoods).
- The slope of the front (east) half of the parcel is a gentle slope to no slope (0-9% gradient). The rear of the parcel has areas of steep to excessively steep slope (16–60+% gradient) near the stream, with a 150+ ft. decline.

Comment

1. Within/along the parcel are DEC Informational Wetlands and will require a Jurisdictional Determination request from the NYSDEC.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Subdiv Map
3. Waiver
4. PB App
5. SEAF
6. Memo

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

66-2026 (Class 2 / A) Repeal and adoption of an updated Chapter 170 “Stormwater Management”.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Town Board
Application Type: Text Amendment
Class: Class 2 / A
Property Information (Address & ID): N/A

Description & Review Comments:

The proposed revisions to Chapter 170 modernize and reorganize the Town’s stormwater regulations. The prior code was a single 11-section chapter focused generally on stormwater management, while the new code restructures the chapter into two distinct articles separating (1) construction-phase erosion/sediment control and pollution prevention from (2) post-construction stormwater management requirements. This creates a clearer regulatory framework and better aligns the code with current NYSDEC and MS4 permit requirements.

Key updates include:

- Expanded applicability threshold:
 - The old code applied to all “land development activities,” generally tied to state thresholds of one acre or more. The new code instead establishes a local threshold of 25,000 square feet of disturbance which captures smaller development activities and increases local review authority.
- Updated permit references and regulatory consistency:
 - The revised code updates outdated SPDES/MS4 permit references (GP-0-15 series) to current permits, including GP-0-24-001 / GP-0-25-001, ensuring consistency with current NYSDEC regulations and standards.

- More detailed application and SWPPP requirements:
 - The new code significantly expands Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements, including:
 - more detailed site mapping and phasing requirements,
 - contractor certifications,
 - pollution prevention measures,
 - post-construction design calculations,
 - natural resource inventories,
 - vegetation management plans, and
 - documentation of maintenance responsibilities and easements.
 - This results in more comprehensive review materials and stronger project accountability.
- Creation of formal approval and inspection process:
 - The revised chapter formalizes a clearer approval workflow through the Stormwater Management Officer (SMO), including mandatory review/approval prior to permits, inspection milestones, inspection reporting, and closeout procedures.
- Financial security provisions added:
 - A new section authorizes the Town to require financial guarantees/performance security to ensure installation and maintenance of erosion and stormwater controls.
- Expanded long-term maintenance and access requirements:
 - The new code strengthens post-construction obligations by requiring:
 - maintenance easements,
 - inspection and maintenance agreements binding future owners,
 - as-built plans/project closeout documentation,
 - long-term facility maintenance provisions.
 - This improves enforceability of permanent stormwater infrastructure maintenance.
- Refined enforcement provisions:
 - The updated code clarifies stop-work authority, notice of violation procedures, project closeout standards, and withholding of certificates of occupancy.
 - The revised chapter reduces maximum criminal fine amounts and imprisonment durations compared to the prior code.

Comments

1. The proposed reduction in disturbance thresholds represents a significant expansion of permit applicability. The referring board should confirm that the Town has adequate administrative capacity to implement and enforce this increased workload.
2. Given the lowered disturbance thresholds, the Town may wish to consider a simplified or expedited review process for minor projects to reduce administrative burden while maintaining environmental protections.
3. The Town may wish to establish more detailed standards for calculating contingencies, release procedures, and acceptable financial guarantees– in order to improve consistency and reduce possible disputes.
4. The Town may wish to clarify whether appeals procedures exist for administrative determinations made by the Stormwater Management Officer (SMO).
5. The Town may wish to define a “major amendment” in terms of approvals needed for

plans modified after initial approval.

6. The Town may wish to confirm that the revised penalty structure is adequate to deter noncompliance, particularly for larger commercial projects.

CRC Comment

1. The Town is commended for its timely review and refinement of its' stormwater management code, in conformance with the NYSDEC regulations and standards.

Attachments:

1. Ch. 170 New Code Section
2. Memo

Board Motion: To retain referral 66-2026 as a class 2 and return to the local board with recommendation for approval with comments.

Motion made by: Ryan Wilmer, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion:** Passed.

67-2026 (Exempt) Area Variance for the installation of an accessory structure (generator) with a proposed 4.9 ft. setback when a minimum of 6 ft. is required — at 8000 Arbour Hill Trail.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Exempt
Property 112.19-1-44.000
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

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

Attachments:

1. Sketch
2. Location
3. Photo
4. Test Questions
5. ZBA App
6. Letter
7. Neighbor Consent
8. Map of Site

9. App Materials
10. SPECs

68-2026 (Class 1) Area Variances (2) to construct a 200 SF accessory structure (shed) at 5245 State Route 21 South. The area variances are for (1) a (south) side setback of 11.2 ft. when a minimum of 20 ft. is required, and (2) a stream setback of 26 ft. when a minimum of 100 ft. is required.

Municipality: Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Class 1
Property 153.00-1-75.110
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

The 20' x 10' accessory storage shed will be wood-framed with wood siding, metal gable roof, and a gravel pad foundation. The structure is to be used for storage only – no plumbing is proposed.

According to Oncor:

- A stream runs through the center (north/south) of the parcel and is buffered by a National Wetland.
- The land disturbed is mowed lawn. Soil disturbed is the Fluvaquents-Udifluvents complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes, frequently flooded (hydric, high permeability, low erodibility, is not prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group A/D). Slope disturbed is gentle to none (0-3% gradient).
- Subject parcel is vacant. Surrounding land use is predominately residential, with the adjacent eastern parcel being vacant.

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 ZBA application for the applicants' response to the test questions.

Comments

1. The Town is encouraged to grant only the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the lot.
2. Protection of water quality/quantity is a stated goal of the CPB. It should be ensured that steep slope areas surrounding the stream are not impacted by development.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Shed Details
3. Test Questions
4. ZBA App

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

69-2026 (Class 1) Site Plan to construct a building for a landscaping and hardscaping business with associated improvements — at 2451 Brickyard Road.

Municipality:	Town of Canandaigua
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Site Plan
Class:	Class 1
Property	70.00-1-78.400

**Information
(Address & ID):****Description & Review Comments:**

The proposed project consists of a site plan application for the construction of a building and associated site improvements to support a landscaping and hardscaping business at 2451 Brickyard Road. The subject parcel is approximately 3.0-acres in size, with an estimated land disturbance of 0.89 acres as part of the proposed development.

The project includes utility connections to a proposed 2,000-gallon wastewater holding tank, municipal water service provided by the City of Canandaigua, and overhead electrical service. All proposed site disturbance will occur outside the 100-foot buffer associated with the existing wetland area on the property.

Stormwater management measures have been incorporated into the site design. Roof and footer drains will discharge to a rip-rap splash pad, while a proposed culvert located at the southwest corner of the parcel will convey runoff to an existing culvert along Brickyard Road. Surface water will generally sheet flow around the building and into the roadside drainage ditch.

Site improvements also include the installation of an 8-foot-tall privacy fence surrounding the front and sides of the building. Outdoor storage of landscaping equipment and materials is proposed within the parking lot area. Upon completion of construction, all disturbed areas will be stabilized and restored as mowed lawn. In addition, all exterior lighting associated with the project will be designed to comply with dark sky standards. There are no proposed signs for the project.

According to Oncor:

- The adjacent parcels to the north and to the west are in Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- The subject and surrounding parcels to the north, south and east are all vacant. The parcels across Brickyard Rd. (to the west) contain the Canandaigua Airport.
- NYS DEC Informational Wetland is located along the rear (eastern) portion of the parcel.
- The land disturbed is a mix of silver maple - ash swamp and a successional old field.
- Soil disturbed is Collamer Silt Loam (not hydric, moderately high permeability, very high erodibility, is an area of prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group C/D).
- Slope disturbed is little to none (0-3% gradient).

Comment

1. Within/along the parcel are DEC Informational Wetlands and will require a Jurisdictional Determination request from the NYSDEC.
2. Protection of water quality is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. Accordingly, the applicant should ensure that any oil, fuels, or other fluids associated with outdoor equipment display or any equipment maintenance / servicing are properly handled, stored, and disposed of in a manner that prevents contamination of surface

water and groundwater, and is consistent with applicable environmental regulations and best management practices.

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Site Plan
3. PB App
4. SEAF
5. Ag Data Map

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

10. Town of Geneva

70-2026 (Class 1) Site Plan Amendment for a proposed project consisting of: 3 manufactured homes, 14 yurts, a pavilion, restroom facility, 4 storage buildings, and associated improvements — at 0000 and 4188 State Route 14.

Municipality:	Town of Geneva
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Site Plan
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	133.00-1-18.112 and 133.00-1-17.110

Description & Review Comments:

The project was referred to in February 2022 as 19-2022 (Class 2) for a “*Map amendment to create a PUD at 4182 Route 14 in the Town of Geneva. Planned uses for the 59-acre property include 3 homes, a silvo-pasture farm, a farmstand near Big aLICe Brewery, and a glamping area.*” The Ontario County Planning Board recommended approval, and the Town Board granted approval of the project. The project is now back for a site plan amendment to the previously approved PUD. The Code Enforcement Officer mentioned that the Yurts will require NYSDOH approval as well.

Additional improvements include:

- Two ponds
- Individual parking for manufactured homes, and a 23-space (2 ADA Accessible) parking area
- Pavilion

The primary change was to the location of the farming relative to the lodging areas – the farming has been moved to the rear of the larger parcel, and the lodging areas have been moved closer to the front of the parcel in order to more easily connect to the sewer and line. Two proposed stormwater infiltration trenches and a swale will be constructed to direct water to the existing roadside water swale to the east (along State Route 14).

The subject parcel is currently all farmed. 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 subject PUD parcels are north of Big aLICE Brewing along State Route 14.

According to Oncor, the parcel addressed 4188 State Route 14 is in OC Agricultural District #1, as well as the adjacent parcel to the west across White Springs Brook. The NWI indicates a potential federal wetland and NYSDEC informational wetland along White Springs Brook along the west property boundary. There is also an area of 16–30 percent steep slope in the south-west corner of the site. The majority of the site has a gentle slope (4–9% gradient) down towards Seneca Lake to the east.

Relevant February 2022 Staff/Board 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. Does the applicant anticipate wholesale or retail sale of mushrooms and milk or meat livestock products produced on the farm? What number of vehicle trips and parking will the farm business entail?
4. The referring body should consider requiring retention of vegetative buffers along the property perimeter to protect the agricultural activities from adjacent residential uses.
5. What standards will apply to the guest accommodations?
6. What are the sizes of the proposed structures?
7. What is the size, use, water source, and outflow location of the farm ponds?
8. This segment of SR 14 appears to be developing the mix of residential and commercial uses anticipated in the Town Center Mixed Use district. The referring body should consider how to safely accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel between residential uses along the lake and in Bayview Heights, and commercial uses such as restaurants/breweries/wineries, potential farm stand, etc. from the City line to Turk Road.
9. Will this project be phased out?
10. How will the new trees be protected from grazing livestock or how long after trees are planted will livestock be introduced?

11. The 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.

Comments

1. According to Oncon, there may be DEC Informational Wetlands which would require a Jurisdictional Determination request from the DEC.
2. Protection of water features (water quality and quantity) is a stated goal of the CPB. Proper containment and disposal of animal waste needs to be ensured in order to protect the water quality of the nearby water features (pond, stream, groundwater).

OCSWCD Comment

1. Due to the poor soils, expense, hydraulic loading, and location/proximity to Seneca Lake, hooking to an existing sewer is highly recommended.

NYS DOT Comments

1. The existing driveway is recommended to be upgraded to meet minor commercial standards via a highway work permit. It is ultimately the Town's responsibility to require this upgrade since there's already an established driveway at this location. DOT won't get involved unless the development begins causing traffic safety issues in the ROW.
2. The proposed swale connections appear to be on private property. I highly recommend keeping it that way, because any direct drainage connections in the ROW will require a drainage study, highway work permit, and an annual use & occupancy permit which carries a fee.
3. Any utility connections in the ROW will require a highway work permit.

CRC Comments

1. The site plan should identify the distance between the proposed driveway and the nearest existing driveways to the north (Big aLICE Brewing property) and to the south (the adjacent residential parcel). This information is needed to determine whether the proposed access complies with applicable New York State Department of Transportation driveway spacing standards, which generally require a separation distance of approximately 300 to 500 feet, depending on roadway classification and operating conditions.
2. Based on the submitted site plan, the proposed driveway appears to encroach upon or be located directly adjacent to the northern property line with the Big aLICE Brewing parcel (Tax Map No. 133.00-1-18.111). The applicant should clarify whether any portion of the driveway is proposed outside the subject parcel boundaries and, if so, whether an area variance, easement, or lot line adjustment will be required.
3. The Board strongly recommends that, prior to the commencement of any site work, the applicant obtains confirmation from the Town of Geneva Water and Sewer Department

and New York State Electric & Gas that adequate utility service can be provided to the site.

4. The application should clarify the proposed fire protection measures for the development. Specifically, the applicant should indicate whether a fire hydrant is proposed and whether the onsite ponds will provide an adequate and acceptable water source for fire suppression purposes, subject to review by the applicable fire authorities.
5. Additional information should be provided regarding the proposed restroom facilities, including whether showers are proposed, the number of toilets to be installed, and whether the structure will be connected to public water supply and sanitary sewer systems. The Board recommends that these details be confirmed prior to any project approvals.
6. The nature and scope of the proposed animal and agricultural activities are not clearly described in the application materials. The applicant should provide additional detail regarding these operations so that their consistency with local zoning and operational standards can be fully evaluated before approvals are granted.
7. Any yurt units intended for transient occupancy should comply with all applicable provisions of the Town of Geneva Short-Term Rental regulations, including permitting, safety, and operational requirements.
8. The Board recommends that the applicant provide a general project timeline, including anticipated phases of construction and estimated completion dates.
9. Community character is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. The referring board should consider requiring a landscaping buffer between the proposed uses, and the adjacent residential parcel to the south and brewery to the north.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Site Plan
3. PB App
4. Old 2022 Site Plan

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

71-2026 (Class 2 / A) Site Plan to remove existing buildings to construct a 4,600 square foot convenience store with an integrated fast-food service component, along with fueling facilities and associated site improvements — at parcels 0000 County Road 4, 803 County Road 4, and 510 County Road 6.

Municipality: Town of Geneva
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Class 2 / A

Property Information (Address & ID):	90.03-1-17.000, 90.03-1-14.000, and 90.03-1-15.000
---	--

Description & Review Comments:

The project was previously referred to in May 2024 (as referral # 103-2024) for a site plan for the construction of a 4,500 SF convenience store with fueling island. The County Planning Board returned the referral to the Town of Geneva Planning Board as incomplete due to the lack of clarity/consistency of referral materials regarding the lack of a site plan and stormwater management plan. The project was then re-referred to in November 2024 with additional materials. The project was elevated from a Class 1 to a Class 2 and recommended for approval with modification by the Ontario County Planning Board. Recommended modifications included:

1. The area surrounding / near Castle Creek is known to have significant flooding issues. The referring Board should require the applicant to follow the most current NYS Stormwater Design Manual guidelines and ensure the applicant has adequately minimized the potential for downstream flooding in accordance with SEQR. Evidence of an access easement for maintenance of the stormwater facility should be provided.
2. This proposed project is located at a busy, multi-modal, intersection of two county roads; this 4-leg intersection has an accident rate higher than the NYS average for similar rural signalized intersections. The referring Board should require the applicant to adjust the design in accordance with the recommendation of Ontario County Department of Public Works (OCDPW).

The project has now been re-referred to the Ontario County Planning Board as 71-2026, as a Class 2.

The subject parcels to be combined are 1.60-acres total, and disturbance is estimated at 0.96-acres. The project increases impervious coverage from 0.72-acres to 0.79-acres. Plans indicate parcels (TM#: 90.03-1-17.000; 90.03-1-14.000; 90.03-1-15.000) are to be combined as one lot. Features to be removed from the parcel(s) include: an existing convenience store, fuel island (8 pumps), office building, surrounding pavement and the old sign at the CR4/CR6 intersection. Plans show that the historic sign along CR4 is to remain, and a Phase IA study/report has been completed and submitted to SHPO for their review and coordination with the Seneca Indians regarding the burial mound.

Impervious surfaces will be conveyed via a closed storm sewer collection system. As the total land disturbance associated with the project is less than one acre, the project is not subject to full post-construction stormwater quantity control requirements; however, runoff from impervious areas will be captured by a network of catch basins and conveyed to the County's existing storm sewer system located along Pre Emption Road. Due to the presence of potential pollutant-generating activities, the project will incorporate a water quality treatment system upstream of the point of discharge. The treatment system will be designed to provide removal of total suspended solids (TSS) and associated pollutants in accordance with applicable regulatory guidance. A sanitary sewer connection is proposed at the existing manhole located on Castle Street. Coordination with the City of Geneva is ongoing. Connection to public water is

proposed. Overhead electricity will serve the site.

Site access will be provided via two entrance/exit driveways. The site plan indicates that the northern access along CR4 is striped with an entrance/exit option. The eastern access along CR6 is not striped, allowing for entrance and exit as well. Review and approval of the driveways will be completed by the Ontario County Highway Department. Parking areas (25 spaces; including 2 ADA Accessible and 3 eV charging stations) are proposed. A refuse area is proposed along the western edge of the parking area. 39 lights are proposed – consisting of 16 building-mounted lights, 17 canopy lights, and 6 freestanding light poles. The plans indicate a monument sign is proposed at the corner of CR4 / CR6. There is no longer a sidewalk along CR4 proposed, or a parking area on the adjacent parcel to the south (TM# 103.00-3-10.200).

The largest difference in elevation (land slopes downhill towards the south) occurs along the southern edge of the parking area — where there is an 8 ft. difference/ retaining wall. A 3 ft. high guardrail is proposed to be installed along the retaining wall. Five (5) Red Maple trees (mature height of 40 ft. to 60 ft.) and 8 Wintergreen Boxwood are to be planted between the subject parcel and the adjacent residential parcel to the west.

There are five employees proposed.

According to OnCor:

- Subject Parcel land use is commercial. Surrounding parcels are predominately community services (Cornell Agritech) and commercial (self-storage buildings) on the adjacent parcel to the west.
- The parcel directly to the north and across CR4 is in the Ontario County Agricultural District #1 (Cornell Agritech).
- Land disturbed is located on an existing asphalt parking/fueling area.
- Soil disturbed are Ontario Loam and Lima Loam.
 - Ontario Loam: not hydric, moderately high permeability, medium erodibility, is an area of prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group B.
 - Lima Loam: partially hydric, moderately high permeability, high erodibility, is an area of prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group B/D.

The applicant representative was present for the 5/14/2026 CPB Meeting and provided additional information on the project:

- The plan is to avoid the burial mound. The applicant is actively trying to communicate with SHPO and the Seneca Native Americans. They are doing everything they can but have not heard from them. The site plan was adjusted to avoid this area.
- The catch basins will collect the water into a primary holding/treatment tank before discharged. The lot will be graded to direct water towards the catch basins.
- The applicants are looking into a couple different options for sewer. Option 1 is to work with Cornell and tap into their private system. Option 2 is to work with the Town and connect sewer at Castle Street. For option 2, a underground pump station would be required to be installed on the parcel.
- Stormwater plans are designed to meet the 100-year flood zone requirement.

Relevant May and November 2024 Staff/CPB Comments

1. Stormwater currently flows into Castle Creek. With the proposed increase in impervious surface (and given existing Castle Creek concerns), the CPB encourages the local Board to require the installation of a stormwater management facility if they are not applying undeveloped standards, or as recommended in the 2024 NYS Stormwater Design Manual.
2. Demolition debris should be recycled if feasible or disposed of properly.
3. Will this new convenience store/fueling station significantly increase traffic on the parcel?
4. Are there onsite monitoring wells due to previous underground fuel tank leakage? Will they be retained? Will there be soil tests / monitoring associated with removing existing fuel tanks?
5. Will the 3 proposed EV charging stations be level 3 chargers?
6. Is Cornell AgriTech (New York State Agricultural Experiment Station) aware of the project? The applicant needs to contact Cornell AgriTech about this parking area/walkway, as well as to get their opinion on the proposed project and its effect on their surrounding parcels (campus, crop fields, vacant land).
7. The referring board should make sure the project engineer is using the most recent 2024 NYS Stormwater Design Manual.
8. A left-in option at the CR6 entrance should be considered as well (not just a right-in/right-out). CR6 does have a left turn lane at the project site's CR6 entrance before/at the CR4/CR6 intersection.

Relevant May and November 2024 OCDPW Comments

1. We would like to see the entrance along County Road 6 moved another 10'+ to the south, as it does not currently meet the minimum NYSDOT requirements for the intersection.
2. Curbing will need to be placed in the areas where access is being closed off. See NYSDOT standard sheet 609-01, Sheet 1 "Near Vertical Face"
3. The drainage structures in the area may have to be relocated or modified. The drainage structure at the existing gas station parking lot and the ones at the southern parcel parking lot all tie into the County drainage system. When the site plans become more detailed, please provide details on the plans for either new drainage or removing the existing drainage and the existing drainage system connections.
4. Please provide curb details for the curb being modified from the entrance to County Road 6, down to the entrance of the proposed parking area south of the gas station.
5. Please also provide a plan to remove existing catch basins. How are the pipes that go between the drainage system in the road and the ones in the parking lot going to be removed?

Relevant November 2024 OCSWCD Comments

1. Concrete truck washout should be located a minimum of 100 feet from all stormwater inlets.
2. Will existing stormwater infrastructure, including drop inlets, be removed entirely?
3. Consider the use of 0 P fertilizer unless otherwise indicated through soil testing.

4. Ends of silt fence should curve upslope to capture sediment-laden runoff (see north-western edge).

Comment

1. Has the eastern (County Road 6) entrance been moved away from the intersection (south) per OCDPW's request? What is the distance from the intersection? The applicant should consult with the Highway Department and ensure that the sight distances for the proposed driveway comply with standards established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

OCDPW Comments

1. Please include sight distances for the access points to County Road 4 and County Road 6.
2. We appreciate the effort to create well-defined entrances at this intersection. However, the engineer should make County Road 6 access a right-in/right-out access due to the entrance's proximity to the intersection and the lack of distance to the stop bar at the intersection.
3. A gas station at the intersection of CR41 and Route 332 has experienced numerous accidents over the past five years involving left turns into and out of the site, which is also located near a heavily trafficked intersection.
4. Please prepare a drainage report showing pre-and post-development flows. Please ensure that the post-development amount does not exceed the pre-development amount.
5. Are there any filtration devices or methods proposed to treat the water leaving the site prior to making it into the County System and later to Castle Creek?

CRC Comments

1. Protection of water quality and water quantity is a stated objective of the Ontario County Planning Board. The Board recommends additional information be provided regarding the potential for stormwater runoff to overtop the proposed retaining wall during significant storm events. Appropriate stormwater management measures should be incorporated to address runoff generated by the increase in impervious surface area.
2. It should be clarified whether all proposed catch basins will be connected to the site's stormwater quality treatment system. All stormwater collection structures should be integrated into the treatment system to ensure comprehensive water quality protection.
3. The site plan depicts a freestanding commercial sign at the intersection of County Road 6 and County Road 4. The referring board should confirm whether a sign permit will be required and submitted as part of the approval process.
4. Plans should identify the proposed location(s) for snow storage and describe how snow removal operations will be accommodated on site.
5. The site plan indicates a proposed rear yard setback of 26 feet, whereas the zoning ordinance requires a minimum setback of 35 feet. The referring board should confirm whether the applicant intends to seek an area variance from the appropriate municipal review board.
6. Additional information regarding the anticipated fuel delivery operations, including the

routing and maneuvering of delivery vehicles is needed. Given the location and expected traffic associated with the proposed use, the Board recommends that a traffic impact study be prepared to evaluate potential effects on the surrounding roadway network.

7. In addition to the proposed guardrail, the Board recommends consideration of supplemental safety measures, such as fencing and/or landscaping, to discourage pedestrians, particularly children, from accessing the edge of the retaining wall.
8. Additional detail is needed regarding the collection, treatment, and discharge of stormwater runoff. The Board recommends that the applicant provide a comprehensive stormwater management plan demonstrating how runoff will be captured and treated in accordance with applicable standards.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Site Plan
3. Grading Plan
4. Utility Plan
5. Landscaping Plan
6. Lighting Plan
7. Area Map
8. Plan Set
9. PB App
10. SEAF
11. Project Description
12. Old (2024) Plan Set

CPB Comments

1. Prior to the commencement of any site work, the applicant should obtain written confirmation from the Town Department of Public Works indicating that the proposed connections to the municipal sanitary sewer and stormwater management systems are acceptable and that adequate capacity is available to serve the project.
2. The applicant should identify the procedures and protocols that will be implemented to address potential fuel spills, including spill prevention, containment, and response measures. The County Planning Board further recommends that an appropriate monitoring and containment system be incorporated to detect and manage any releases in a timely manner.
3. If an sewer extension is planned, disturbance will be over one acre. If this were the case, the project will need a SWPPP and be subject to full post-construction stormwater quantity control requirements.
4. Distances from the proposed access points to the CR 4/6 intersection should be indicated on the site plan.
5. Where will the proposed underground storage tank be located? This should be indicated on the site plan.

Board Motion: To retain referral 71-2026 as a class 2 and return to the local board with recommendation for approval with comments.

Motion made by: Chris Mergler, **seconded by:** Tammy Worden. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0,

Abstained 0. **The motion:** Passed.

11. Town of Gorham

72-2026 (Exempt) Site plan approval for drainage improvements to the existing bisecting channel to reduce flooding occurrences on the applicant's property and to prevent future flooding of the residential properties in the area at 3800 & 3810 State Route 364.

Municipality: Town of Gorham
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID): 113.11-1-12.000; 113.11-1-13.100

Description & Review Comments:

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

Attachments:

1. Plan Set
2. PB App
3. SEAF
4. LOI
5. Engineer's Report
6. Army Corp Of Engineers Correspondence

12. Town of Hopewell

73-2026 (Class 1) Site Plan for the construction of a new 3,680 SF storage addition to an existing commercial building at 2474 State Route 21.

Municipality: Town of Hopewell
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID): 72.00-1-1.100

Description & Review Comments:

The subject parcel is 0.8-acres and has an estimated disturbance of 0.41-acres. The parcel currently contains Potter Heating, Cooling & Plumbing, and its associated asphalt parking lot with 7 spaces. The proposed building addition will include the replacement of the existing park area to the north and the addition of 21 new lined parking spaces (including 2 ADA Accessible spaces). A dumpster enclosure is proposed just east of the parking area. A light pole is to be relocated. Lot coverage is currently 70.4% and proposed to be 74.8% when there is a maximum of no greater than 75% permitted.

According to Oncor:

- The adjacent agricultural parcels to the northwest are in Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- The subject parcel has a commercial land use. Surrounding parcels are primarily commercial. Two residential parcels lie to the south.
- The land disturbed is a paved/parking area.
- Slope disturbed is little to none (0-3% gradient).

Comment

1. Protection of water quality/quantity is a stated goal of the Ontario County Planning Board. The applicant is encouraged to minimize impervious surface coverage where feasible and incorporate effective stormwater management practices, including consideration of low-impact development and green infrastructure measures to reduce runoff and promote groundwater recharge.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Site Plan
3. Plan Set
4. SEAF

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

74-2026 (AR2) Area Variances (2) involving the renovation of three existing ground-mounted signs (maximum of one permitted) and installation of two building-mounted commercial speech signs (maximum of one permitted) — at 4350 County Road 50.

Municipality: Town of Hopewell

Referring Board:	Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type:	Area Variance
Class:	AR2
Property Information (Address & ID):	85.03-1-7.100

Description & Review Comments:

Policy AR-7: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified Route 5&20 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County. The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible. A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation — Denial

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Ground Signs
3. Building Signs
4. Sign Locations

75-2026 (AR2) Area Variances (2) for the renovation of an existing ground-mounted commercial speech sign at 3259 County Road 10. Area Variances are for: (1) a sign height of 20 ft. when no greater than 6 ft. is permitted, and (2) a sign area of 48 SF when no greater than 20 SF is permitted.

Municipality:	Town of Hopewell
Referring Board:	Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type:	Area Variance
Class:	AR2

Property Information (Address & ID):	85.03-1-4.100
---	---------------

Description & Review Comments:**Policy AR-7: Signs**

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified Route 5&20 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County. The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible. A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2**Findings:**

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation — Denial**Attachments:**

1. Aerial
2. Sign Image

76-2026 (Class 1) Area Variance for a proposed ground-mounted commercial speech sign with an area of approximately 31 SF when no greater than 20 SF is permitted — at 4341 County Road 50.

Municipality:	Town of Hopewell
Referring Board:	Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type:	Area Variance
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	99.00-1-5.000

Description & Review Comments:

This project is not considered AR-2 because it is not located on property along a primary travel corridor (Route 5 & 20).

The proposed 92'' x 48'' double-sided (Cedar Lodge) sign is proposed to be replaced by a new LED-illuminated double-sided (Lakeshore Landing Studio Apartments) sign of the same dimensions. The sign is located on the corner of the SR 50 / Marvin Sands Dr. (FLCC) entrance – near the northwest corner of the parcel. The subject parcel and surrounding land uses are all commercial, except for FLCC to the south and west (community services).

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 ZBA application for the applicants' response to the test questions.

Comments

1. According to Oncor, the sign looks to be in the right-of-way. Does this need an additional area variance and/or permissions from the OCDPW?
2. The applicant should consult with the Ontario County Highway Dept., as the sign appears to be in (or very near) the right-of-way.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Sign Image

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-

2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion Passed.**

13. Town of Richmond

77-2026 (Exempt) Area Variance to install a 6 ft. tall fence in the front yard when no greater than 3 ft. is permitted — at 5752 Willow Beach.

Municipality: Town of Richmond
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID): 165.17-1-8.110

Description & Review Comments:

Exempt (See Exemption #3 of Appendix B of the OCPB Bylaws).

Attachments:

1. Application Materials

78-2026 (AR2) Area Variance to install an approximately 55 SF ground-mounted sign when no greater than 32 SF is permitted — at 8690 Main Street (Richmond Town Hall).

Municipality: Town of Richmond
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: AR2
Property Information (Address & ID): 135.00-2-9.110

Description & Review Comments:

Policy AR-7: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified US Route 20A as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County. The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible.

A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation — Denial

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Sign Image

79.0-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site Plan for a proposed large-scale solar energy system – at 0000 US Route 20 A . 79.0-2026 is regarding the Special Use Permit, and 79.1-2026 is for the Site Plan.

Municipality: Town of Richmond
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Special Use Permit
Class: Class 1
Property Information
(Address & ID): 135.00-2-57.100

Description & Review Comments:

The project was previously referred to in September 2024 as 168-2024 (Class 1 – no recommendation) for an area variance for a proposed setback of 40 ft. when a minimum of 200 ft. is required. No site plan was provided at the time. Phase I was constructed. The project was then re-referred to in November 2025 as 200.0-2025, 200.1-2025, and 200.2-2025 (class 1's) for an “*Area Variance, Special Use Permit, and Site Plan for a proposed large-scale solar energy system with setback(s) of 40 ft. when a minimum of 200 ft. is required*”. This was for Phase II – the adjacent parcel to the west. The area variance was granted. The referral is now back for special use permit and revised site plan approval for Phase II. The primary edit was removing the triangular (north-most) portion of the solar array.

The proposed 4.0 MW AC solar array is located along County Road 37 and US Route 20A in the Town of Richmond. The current referral is associated with the parcel located to the west of the existing 4.0 MW AC solar array. The project site will be leased to the owners of the solar array, Sherman Solar I, LLC and Sherman Solar II, LLC.

The Application maintains a 200' setback to Residential/Agricultural and Business zoning districts.

The subject parcel is 32.1 acres and disturbance is estimated at 26.5 acres. There is no proposed grading. In 2025, it was mentioned that the proposed development will create approximately 0.01 acres of impervious surface. The development will include the installation of approximately 14.3 acres of solar panels.

The improvements to the site will also include a pervious gravel access road, woven-wire perimeter fence, vegetative screening, electrical equipment pads and electric utility connection. The proposed project does not require water or sewer connections. 48 Thuja x Green Giant and 48 Colorado Blue Spruce are proposed to be located along the western side of the parcel, providing a visual buffer between the solar array and the homes/businesses along CR37. A 7 ft. high fence will be installed surrounding the array.

A connection to the existing National Grid substation will be provided to facilitate the distribution of the solar-generated electricity. This will be accomplished by providing underground and overhead electric lines from the solar array to the existing utility service. A substation exists just west of the parcel at the CR37/SR20A intersection. The proposed project will provide a pervious gravel access off of County Road 37 to the west.

The majority of the project site is currently inactive agricultural fields previously mowed for hay. The site can be broken into four (4) separate drainage areas. Drainage Area 1 flows to the north-west towards neighboring properties and eventually draining into the roadside swale along County Road 37 towards a pond at the corner of CR-37 and Dugan Road. Drainage Area 2 flows to the south and enters a delineated wetland area. Any portion of property south of the wetlands will have no proposed development. Drainage Area 3 flows easterly and enters a swale in the existing solar array which drains to the north towards a ditch lined with cattails and east towards a delineated wetland area. Drainage Area 4 consists of the remaining portion of the existing solar field which all flows to the east towards wooded area and delineated wetlands. The entire site drains into Honeoye Creek, which is approximately 4,000 feet to the east of the site. It is anticipated that the hydrology of the site will not be significantly altered by the proposed development.

The site mainly consists of silt loam soil types having a hydraulic soil group classification of Type D. These soils are typically made up of fine-grained material that has a low infiltration rate. A copy of the soil map is included in Appendix A and a full soil report can be found in Appendix H.

According to Oncor:

- Subject Parcel is 32.1 acres. The adjacent parcel (to the east – 8894 Main St.) with an existing solar energy system is 45.7 acres.
- The parcel has gentle to no slope (0–9%).
- A national wetland lies on the southernmost tip of the subject parcel (along Main St.). This area is to remain undisturbed.
- Surrounding land uses include: an existing solar energy system on the adjacent parcel to

the east, predominately commercial uses to the south (SR 20A), vacant and residential to the west (along CR37), and a mix of commercial and community service (church) to the north.

A Decommissioning Bond was not provided this month, but was provided in November 2025. It stated –

“Decommissioning may be triggered as a result of the following conditions:

- *The land lease expires or is terminated;*
- *Town Special Use Permit or Site Plan approval is revoked; or*
- *The Project does not produce energy for sale for a period of greater than 365 days;*
- *The project is damaged and will not be repaired or replaced.*

The Project will provide written notice to the Town code enforcement officer within 30 days of the above decommissioning triggers. All such removal and decommissioning shall occur within 12 months of the aforementioned Project decommissioning triggers. If the Project or landowner does not decommission the Project as required by the Town’s zoning ordinance, local laws or rules and regulations, the Town is permitted to utilize the decommissioning financial security to decommission the Project. The decommissioning funds will be an irrevocable financial security bond or other form acceptable to the Town. The Town will be designated as the financial security beneficiary and the amount of security will be 110% of the estimated decommissioning costs unless otherwise approved by the Town Board. Decommissioning cost starting at year 1 after construction is \$146,346. The financial security shall provide for a 2% annual increase to compensate for the cost of inflation or any other anticipated increase in decommissioning costs.”

The applicant representative was present for the 5/13/2026 CPB Meeting and provided additional details on the project:

- There is an existing hedgerow / line of trees that provides screening of solar array from residential parcels / church to the west. Trees are proposed to be planted for additional screening. The solar panels maintain a 200 ft. boundary from the church.
- The road was designed to be placed as far away from adjacent parcels as possible, to limit visibility.
- There are no plans for battery energy storage.
- The existing and proposed solar arrays will be two separate systems (arrays).

Relevant September 2024 and November 2025 Comments

1. Will the project use access to an existing solar facility for construction and maintenance activities?
2. How frequently will grass cover be maintained? Will it be mowed or will animal grazing (sheep) be utilized?
3. The applicant should consider the use of agro-voltaics.
4. Will there be any additional battery energy storage onsite?

5. Has a glare study been completed? How visible is the array from nearby properties and the road (CR37 and SR 20A)?
6. The referring board should consider requiring a landscaping agreement as a condition of approval in order to ensure vegetation and landscaping continues to be maintained after development.
7. Has any investigation been done to determine if an underground tile is pre-existing on site?

OCDPW Comment

1. Any work within the Ontario County ROW along County Road 37 will require a highway work permit. Please provide contractor insurance certificates at the time of permit application.

CRC Comments

1. The County Planning Board recommends that the County develop a comprehensive inventory of existing energy infrastructure, including available generation and transmission capacity, as well as the location of existing large-scale solar energy facilities throughout the County. Such an inventory would provide a valuable foundation for informed planning and zoning decisions at both the municipal and county levels.
2. Are there any plans for onsite battery energy storage? Is there space for it in the future?

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Site Plan
3. Grading & Utility Plan
4. Landscape Plan
5. Plan Set
6. ZBA App
7. PB App
8. Old Plan Set

Board Motion: To retain referrals 79.0-2026 and 79.1-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: Dan Crowley, **seconded by:** Chris Mergler. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

79.1-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site Plan for a proposed large-scale solar energy system – at 0000 US Route 20 A . 79.0-2026 is regarding the Special Use Permit, and 79.1-2026 is for the Site Plan.

Municipality: Town of Richmond

Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Site Plan
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	135.00-2-57.100

Description & Review Comments:

See 79.0-2026.

Attachments:

None

Board Motion: To retain referrals 79.0-2026 and 79.1-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: Dan Crowley, **seconded by:** Chris Mergler. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion Passed.**

80-2026 (Class 1) Re-subdivision, reconfiguring three lots at 0000 Main Street.

Municipality:	Town of Richmond
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Subdivision
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	135.00-2-8.110, 135.00-2-9.110, and 135.00-2-9.211

Description & Review Comments:

The re-subdivision involves three parcels. The proposal consists of roughly 2,500 SF taken from TM# 135.00-2-8.110 and 30,000 SF taken from TM# 135.00-2-9.110, to be added to TM# 135.00-2-9.211. 8690 Main St.

The project was previously referred to in 2025 as referral #220-2025 for the exact same project. The referral was incorrectly labeled exempt and is now referred to as a Class 1 (no intermunicipal or countywide impact, no recommendation made); as exemption 11 of Appendix B of the OCPB bylaws does not apply.

According to Oncor:

- Subject Parcels have a land use of:
 - TM# 135.00-2-9.110 (8690 Main St.) — Community Services; Town Hall
 - TM# 135.00-2-9.2111 (8696 Main St.) — Public Services; Sewage Treatment Facility
 - TM# 135.00-2-8.110 (0000 Main St.) — Vacant
- Surrounding parcels have mixed land use. Parcels to the north are open space / conservation, parcels to the east are industrial, and to the south and west are primarily commercial.
- Subject parcels contain:
 - TM# 135.00-2-8.11 (0000 Main St.) is owned by the Town of Richmond and contains a portion of the Honeoye Creek outlet.
 - FEMA Q3 Floodplains
 - Draft 2023 100-Year Flood Zones
 - National Wetlands and NYSDEC Jurisdictional/Informational Wetlands

Comment

1. Within/along the parcel are DEC Informational Wetlands and will require a Jurisdictional Determination request from the NYSDEC.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Plat
3. PB App
4. SEAF

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

14. Town of Victor

81-2026 (WITHDRAWN) Area Variance for a wall-mounted commercial business sign to be allowed in a location not connected to a parking area of public right-of-way — at 401 Commerce Drive.

Municipality:	Town of Victor
Referring Board:	Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type:	Area Variance
Class:	WITHDRAWN
Property Information	6.04-1-78.000

| (Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

The application has been withdrawn.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Sign Images
3. Test Questions
4. ZBA App
5. Coversheet

82.0-2026 (Class 1) Area Variances (6 total) related to 19 proposed commercial business signs for the Bass Pro Shop at 700 Eastview Mall Drive. 82.0-2026 is for the area variance of having two signs placed on a separate parcel, 82.1-2026 is for the variance requests related to sign size and number (AR2), and 82.2 is for the multiple typeface area variance request (exempt).

Municipality: Town of Victor
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Class 1
Property 6.00-1-12.600
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

The Bass Pro Shop project was first seen in March 2026 as 39.0-2026 and 39.1-2026 for “*Special Use Permit and Site Plan to redevelop the former Lord & Taylor building into a Bass Pro Shop — at 700 Eastview Mall Drive.*”

The area variance in 82.0-2026 (Class 1’s) are for signs 16 and 20 being on a lot separate from the lot where the business is located. Town Code Section 165-6D Prohibited Signs – “*Unrelated signs. Business use signs must advertise a bona fide business conducted on the premise where the sign is located.*” The remaining sign area variance requests are either Administrative Review - Class 2 (AR2) or Exempt - 82.1-2026 and 82.2-2026.

Sign 16 and 20 are both wayfinding monument signs, roughly 50 SF in size. Sign 16 is proposed to be located on the parcel just north of the Bass Pro Shop parcel, at 100-1020 Eastview Mall Drive (TM# 6.00-1-12.100), at the northwest corner of the Eastview Mall Drive / Commons Boulevard (4-way) intersection. Sign 20 is located on the same parcel as sign 16, but at the second Eastview Mall Drive / Commons Boulevard (3-way) intersection to the west.

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 ZBA application for the applicants' response to the test questions.

Comment

1. The referring board should grant the minimum variance necessary to allow identification of the business and its products.

Attachments:

1. Aerial
2. Sign Images
3. Street View
4. Free Standing Sign View
5. Monument Sign Plan
6. Sight Distances
7. ZBA App
8. SEAF
9. LOI

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion Passed.**

82.1-2026 (AR2) Area Variances (6 total) related to 19 proposed commercial business signs for the Bass Pro Shop at 700 Eastview Mall Drive. 82.0-2026 is for the area variance of having two signs placed on a separate parcel, 82.1-2026 is for the variance requests related to sign size and number (AR2), and 82.2 is for the multiple typeface area variance request (exempt).

Municipality: Town of Victor
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: AR2
Property Information (Address & ID): 6.00-1-12.600

Description & Review Comments:

A list of all signs / area variances that are AR2's (82.1-2026) include:

- Sign 1 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 2 (Business Sign) — sign SF/#
- Sign 3 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 4 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 5 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 6 (Brand Sign) — brand signs (1 of 5); sign SF/#
- Sign 7 (Brand Sign) – brand signs (2 of 5); sign SF/#
- Sign 8 (Brand Sign) – brand signs (3 of 5); sign SF/#
- Sign 9 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 10 (Directional Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 11 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#
- Sign 12 (Brand Sign) – brand signs (4 of 5); sign SF/#
- Sign 13 (Brand Sign) – brand signs (5 of 5); sign SF/#
- Sign 16 (Wayfinding Monument Sign) – multiple wayfinding signs (1 of 3)
- Sign 18 (Wayfinding Monument Sign) – multiple wayfinding signs (2 of 3)
- Sign 20 (Wayfinding Monument Sign) – multiple wayfinding signs (3 of 3)
- Sign 21 (Business Sign) – sign SF/#

Relevant Code sections include:

- 165-6(N) No (0) brand signs permitted
- 165-5(B)(3) Sign SF (over 20 SF) and number
- 211-22(D)(3)(a) Multiple wayfinding signs
- 165-5(B)(6) No (0) monument signs permitted

Policy AR-7: Signs

The County Planning Board has long taken an interest in supporting local efforts to limit excessive signage. The Board has identified State Route 96 as a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County. The intent is to protect the character of development along these corridors by encouraging local boards to adhere to their adopted laws as much as possible. A. All applications for signs located on property adjoining primary travel corridors that do not comply with local limits on size and/or number.

Final classification: Class 2

Findings:

1. The proposed sign is on land along a corridor identified by the Board as being a primary travel corridor for tourists visiting Ontario County.
2. Protection of the community character along these corridors is an issue of countywide importance.
3. Local legislators have standards for signage that allows for business identification sufficient to safely direct customers onto the specified site.
4. It is the position of this Board that the proposed signage is excessive.
5. Excessive signage has a negative impact on community character.

Final Recommendation — Denial

Attachments:

None

82.2-2026 (Exempt) Area Variances (6 total) related to 19 proposed commercial business signs for the Bass Pro Shop at 700 Eastview Mall Drive. 82.0-2026 is for the area variance of having two signs placed on a separate parcel, 82.1-2026 is for the variance requests related to sign size and number (AR2), and 82.2 is for the multiple typeface area variance request (exempt).

Municipality: Town of Victor
Referring Board: Zoning Board of Appeals
Application Type: Area Variance
Class: Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID): 6.00-1-12.600

Description & Review Comments:

Exempt - design and appearance of proposed signs are outside the scope of County Planning Board review. The related area variances are for signs 1, 2, and 3.

Town Code Section 165-4A(4) Design and Appearance — *"No more than two typeface fonts may be used on any one sign or group of signs indicating one message."*

Attachments:

None

83.0-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site Plan Amendment to develop a 4.43 MWAC solar energy facility on a 34.93-acre parcel located at 0000 Main St. Fishers, adjacent (east) of the Monroe County / Town of Victor Municipal Boundary (TM# 5.00-1-70.000), in the Town of Victor. 83.0-2026 is regarding the special use permit, and 83.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality: Town of Victor
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Special Use Permit
Class: Class 1
Property 5.00-1-70.000
Information
(Address & ID):

Description & Review Comments:

This project originally presented its application to the Ontario County Planning Board for a site plan to develop a solar facility in March 2024 (51-2024). Shortly thereafter, the Town declared a moratorium for the purpose of evaluating its then-current law regarding solar energy facilities. The amended solar law was adopted (Local Law No. 2 – 2025, “Solar Photovoltaic Systems of the Town of Victor,” the “Solar Law”), and the applicant re-submitted their proposal in June 2025 as 102.0-2025 and 102.1-2026 for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan to develop a solar energy facility. The applicant received site plan and special use permit approval by the Town of Victor Planning Board.

The applicant is now submitting a revised site plan. Recently, Norbut Solar determined to update the Project design to utilize a Single Axis Tracker racking system, which runs North-South and is able to track the sun throughout the day. The Fixed Tilt racking project was previously designed to remain stationary and runs East-West. The project’s buildable area and overall impact have not been increased. As such, Norbut Solar is resubmitting what amounts to substantially the same proposal for the Board’s review and consideration.

Proposed solar panels with associated equipment, wiring, fencing, extension of a 20’ wide gravel access drive, and a bioretention facility. The facility is to be connected to the New York State electrical grid via underground electrical lines. The property consists of 34.93-acres of undeveloped (rural vacant) forested area and meadowland located to the north of Main St. Fishers and is within the Town’s R-2 Residential Zoning District and the Route 96/251 Corridor Overlay District. The total disturbance of the project is 28.0 acres. There is a proposed maximum lot coverage of 19.9%. Surrounding land uses are residential (homes to the west/Monroe County and to the south) and vacant to the west. I-90 borders the northern edge of the project parcel. Parcel is not in Ontario County Agricultural District 1, but parcels across the road (to the north – I-90, and to the south – Main St. Fishers) are in Ontario County Agricultural District 1. Project site is within the West Erie Canal Corridor NYS Heritage Area. According to OnCor, there is a historic barn located across the street at 8026 Main St. Fishers.

There are a total of 8,932 panels proposed. Panels will have a maximum height of 12 ft. Proposed 8' high agricultural fence to surround the perimeter of the solar facility area. Front/Rear/Side setbacks are to be 100' from the property line. Setbacks from non-participating landowners to be 300 ft. from the parcel line.

Entrance along Main St. Fishers is within FEMA Q3 Floodplain, along with the Draft 2023 500 Flood zone. A portion of parcel (near entrance) along Irondequoit Creek to the south may be within the Draft 2023 100-year flood zone. A stream feeding into Irondequoit Creek cuts across the north-west corner of the subject parcel, and is within the National Wetland Inventory and the NYSDEC Informational Wetland. National wetlands also lie along the southern portion of the parcel, just south of the proposed solar field. For panels installed in the wetland area – no excavation or removal of soil is allowed, trees may be cut, but stumps must remain, and upon completion of the work a wetland seed mix will be applied. Soil type is Schoharie Silty Clay Loam (0–9% Slope): not hydric, moderately high permeability, very high erodibility, is an area of prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group C/D. The subject parcel is predominately flat, but has steep downward slopes (16-30% gradient) at the entrance of the parcel along Main St. Fisher, as well as in the north-west corner of the parcel (sloping down towards stream).

A view shed analysis was conducted for this project with consideration of existing trees. Based on the solar array parameters provided and the current site design, glare is not predicted for pilots approaching 24 runways at 10 airports located within a 25-mile radius of the project. These airports include: Canandaigua Airport, Harvs Airport, Creekside Airport, Fort Hill Airport, Smiths Land Base, Ledgeale, LeRody, and the Skyview Airport. Nor does glare effect helicopter pilots hovering 500 ft AGL over the helipad at the Strong Memorial Hospital helipad in Rochester, or air traffic control tower viewers at the Greater Rochester International Airport.

The results of the ForgeSolar analysis determined no glare from the Project is predicted to occur for drivers of vehicles on any of the 15 road segments adjacent to the Project. Roads included in the analysis are Canning Parkway, Chillington Lane, Cole Road, Kingsbridge Lane, Log Cabin Road, Main Street Fishers, Mile Square Road, Mile Square Road south, Old Dutch Road, Rae Boulevard, Royal Hunt Lane, Smith Road, Tennyson Way, Windham Circle, and Windham Hill Road. Glare is not predicted for any of the 46 structures, primarily houses, that were analyzed with proximity to the Project area.

Existing vegetation (consisting mostly of brush in the center of the parcel) is to be cleared and grubbed (stumps removed) for installation of the panels. Remaining vegetation (primarily woods, brush, and open meadow) will remain where possible. Stumps are to remain with trees that are cleared in wetland areas. There are 32 proposed tree plantings (14 White Fir, 12 White Spruce, and 6 White Pine) located along the southeastern corner of the parcel by the neighboring residences, and 30 proposed shrub plantings surrounding the proposed bioretention area. Trees within the residential 300 ft. buffer are to remain. Lawn seed is to be planted in any disturbed area not occupied by impervious surface or plantings. According to the Site Plan, a minimum 1-year guarantee shall be provided on all plant materials from the date of final acceptance. Permanent equipment (specifically the inverters) will generate noise below the NYSDEC guidelines for quiet rural areas. The inverters are operational only during daylight hours.

According to the previously submitted Engineers Report, there are some grading activities for the access drive and stormwater management facility (SWMF). However, the design maintains the general drainage patterns from the existing conditions. The only impervious area creation (1.0-acres of impervious area total) is from the compacted gravel access drive and concrete pads used to support the associated solar panel electrical equipment. On the northern portion of the

parcel (the majority of the solar facility area), stormwater drains north into an existing culvert under I90. The southern portion of the parcel is to drain to the proposed bioretention area to the south in addition to an existing off-site pond to the east. The western portion of the parcel water generally remains on site, eventually draining to Irondequoit Creek to the south-west.

Proposed temporary silt fence to surround the area of disturbance (and soil stockpile). A topsoil stockpile, concrete washout area and proposed stabilized construction staging area are to be located in the front / center of the parcel. Permanent stone check dams are to line the access drive. Also, a permanent proposed stone check dam is to be located at the north-west corner of the property.

The previously submitted (March 2024) decommissioning plan mentions:

- The solar facility is designed for a minimum expected operational life of 25 years, but may operate for 40 years or more.
- Decommissioning activities will begin within twelve (12) months of the facility permanently ceasing operation or another triggering event as defined by the authority having jurisdiction.
- Following the issuance of a building permit from the Town, funds will be reserved by the project owner for decommissioning and site restoration in the form of a decommissioning bond, which will stay in effect for as long as the project remains in commercial operation.
- Decommissioning and restoration is estimated to take 6 months.
- Decommissioning includes: removal of electrical components/racks/rack wiring, PV module dismantling and panel removal, breakup/removal of concrete pads or ballast, electrical cable removal, fencing/racking removal, grading and road removal, and seeding the disturbed area.

At the March 2024 CRC Meeting, the applicant's representative provided some additional information on the project:

- There are no plans at this time for sheep (agricultural) grazing at this solar facility area. Seed/grass mix allows for minimal maintenance (will mow 2–3 times a year).
- If needed, there is a 20'-wide perimeter between panels and fence to allow for access anywhere on the property.
- There is no onsite energy (battery) storage on this parcel.
- The decommissioning plan takes into account a 2% yearly escalator for decommissioning costs.

The applicant representative was present for the 5/13/2026 CPB Meeting and provided additional information on the project:

- There are no plans for Battery Energy Storage. There is space for it but no plans.
- There are no plans for animal grazing at this time. The solar company does own a flock of sheep for grazing on other sites, so agrovoltiacs is a possibility.
- The maintenance agreement requires the applicant to maintain plantings for the life of the solar facility.
- The decommissioning plan remains the same.

Comment

1. Are the details still the same for the previously submitted decommissioning plan? Are there any changes to plans in terms of sheep/animal grazing or onsite battery energy storage?

CRC Comments

1. The County Planning Board recommends that the County develop a comprehensive inventory of existing energy infrastructure, including available generation and transmission capacity, as well as the location of existing large-scale solar energy facilities throughout the County. Such an inventory would provide a valuable foundation for informed planning and zoning decisions at both the municipal and county levels.
2. Are there any plans for onsite battery energy storage? Is there space for it in the future?

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Site Plan
3. Utility & Grading Plan
4. Landscape Plan
5. Overall Site Plan
6. Overall Phasing Plan
7. Site Plan Overlay
8. Plan Set
9. Site Plan App
10. SUP App
11. FEAF
12. LOI
13. Decommissioning Estimate
14. Glint and Glare Study
15. Noise Study
16. SWPPP
17. Old 2025 Plan Set

Board Motion: To retain referrals 83.0-2026 and 83.1-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: Dan Crowley, **seconded by:** Chris Mergler. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0.
The motion Passed.

83.1-2026 (Class 1) Special Use Permit and Site Plan Amendment to develop a 4.43 MWAC solar energy facility on a 34.93-acre parcel located at 0000 Main St. Fishers, adjacent (east) of the Monroe County / Town of Victor Municipal Boundary (TM# 5.00-1-70.000), in the Town of Victor. 83.0-2026 is regarding the special use permit, and 83.1-2026 is for the site plan.

Municipality:	Town of Victor
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Site Plan
Class:	Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID):	5.00-1-70.000

Description & Review Comments:

See 83.0-2026.

Attachments:

None

Board Motion: To retain referrals 83.0-2026 and 83.1-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: Dan Crowley, **seconded by:** Chris Mergler. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

84-2026 (Exempt) Site Plan to construct a single-family dwelling on a currently vacant parcel at 0000 County Road 41.

Municipality:	Town of Victor
Referring Board:	Planning Board
Application Type:	Site Plan
Class:	Exempt
Property Information (Address & ID):	40.00-1-27.120

Description & Review Comments:

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

OCSWCD Comment

1. It appears no soil investigation work had been conducted prior to the release of this site plan. It also appears a raised fill leach system was anticipated. If an alternative leach system is proposed following a proper soil investigation, a full review by the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) will be required.

Attachments:

1. Home Site Plan
2. Plan Set

3. LOI
4. SEAF
5. PB App

85-2026 (Class 1) Site Plan to install a 240 SF prefabricated storage shed for additional dry storage at 330 and 100-410 Phoenix Mills Plaza.

Municipality: Town of Victor
Referring Board: Planning Board
Application Type: Site Plan
Class: Class 1
Property Information (Address & ID): 28.12-1-19.120 & 28.12-1-19.111

Description & Review Comments:

The proposed project includes the installation of a 12-foot by 20-foot prefabricated storage shed to be located at the rear (south) of the existing building, behind Otto Tomotto's Restaurant. Disturbance is estimated at 0.01-acres. The shed will be used solely for additional dry storage in support of the property's ongoing operations. No change to the existing use, tenancy, or occupancy of the building is proposed.

The shed will be prefabricated and placed on a gravel base. It will include LED (downlit) lighting (lighting specs, cut sheet and layout attached to the Site Plan Application). The proposed location is intended to minimize visibility from public rights-of-way and adjacent properties, and the structure will function solely as an accessory use.

This submission also acknowledges the previously approved variance for pergola lighting located at the front of the building. No changes to the approved pergola lighting are proposed as part of this application, and all lighting will remain consistent with the terms and conditions of the approved variance. No expansion of the principal building footprint is proposed, and no increase in parking demand, traffic generation, or utility usage is anticipated as a result of this improvement.

According to Oncor:

- The subject parcel and adjacent parcels to the east and west are for commercial use. Parcels to the north (across SR 96) are vacant. Parcels to the south (across Mud Creek) are residential.
- The adjacent parcel to the south is in Ontario County Agricultural District #1.
- Mud Creek runs along the southern parcel boundary and is buffered by a National Wetland.
- The subject parcel contains FEMA Floodways, Q3 Floodplains, and Draft 2023 500 – and 100-Year Flood Zones.
- Soil disturbed is Geneseo Silty Clay Loam (not hydric, very high erodibility, is an area of prime farmland, and is in hydrologic soil group C).

- Slope disturbed is little to none (0-3% gradient).

Attachments:

1. Aerials
2. Site Plan
3. LOI
4. PB App
5. SEAF
6. Plat Map
7. Topo Map
8. Shed Lighting Specs
9. ZBA RESO Phoenix Mills Sprinkler Waiver
10. Pergola Lighting Details and Specs

Board Motion: To retain referrals 65-2026, 68-2026, 69-2026, 70-2026, 73-2026, 76-2026, 80-2026, 82.0-2026, and 85-2026 as class 1s and return them to the local boards with comments.

Motion made by: A.J. Magnan, **seconded by:** Burch Craig. **Vote:** Yes 14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed.

15. Privilege of the Floor

Ryan Davis (Executive Director of Economic Development) gave a presentation at 6:00 PM on the 2026 Economic Development Strategic Plan. Discussions included:

- The 2026 Economic Development Strategic Plan can be viewed on the County website at <https://www.ontariocountyny.gov/2416/Ontario-County-2026-Economic-Development>
- A five-year, flexible roadmap to leverage Ontario County's strengths and address housing, infrastructure, workforce, and business growth through coordinated actions with regional partners. Steps include:
 1. Infrastructure for Growth
 2. Business Retention & Attraction
 3. Housing & Quality of Life
 4. Land & Sites
 5. Workforce
 6. Agriculture & Agribusiness
 7. Tourism
- Empire State Development Grants awarded
- IDA Projects
- EDC & Eagle Loans
- Community Partnership
- An update on energy concerns and grid capacity was discussed. Ryan Davis recently (December 2025) spoke at a grid capacity summit at Hobart & William Smith College.
- The Economic Development Dept is growing – recently a Community Manager and Manager of Housing & Development strategy has been hired.

Planning Department Updates:

- Updates on March 2026 Denial Recommendations & Municipal Actions.
 - 40-2026 & 42-2026
- Training Info. / Updates.
- Supreme Court / NYSDEC decision update regarding NYSDEC's Part 664 Freshwater Wetlands regulations.

16. Upcoming Trainings:

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

Genesee / Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council Spring local government workshop

- [See link to register](#)
- May 28, 2026: 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM; Genesee Community College, 1 College Road, Batavia, NY

Estabrook Municipal Bootcamp

- [See link to register](#)
- 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 onsite & Online interactive courses

- [See link](#)
- Includes a statewide schedule of NYS DOS onsite local government trainings.
- Includes links to online interactive courses and previously recorded webinars. Recorded webinars include:
 - Essentials for Planning and Zoning Board Staff
 - Zoning Board of Appeals Overview
 - Planning Board Overview
 - Zoning Basics for Enforcement Officials and Board Members
 - State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) Basics
 - Floodplain Regulation for Local Review Boards
 - Farmland Protection & Agricultural Viability

NYS DOS Recorded Webinars

- [See 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 training is free (If your municipality is a member)

- [See 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 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

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

17. Upcoming Meetings and Important Dates

The next Coordinated Review Committee meeting will be on June 9, 2026, at 20 Ontario St (2nd Floor, Room 229) at 3:30 PM. The next associated Ontario County Planning Board meeting will be on June 10, 2026, at 74 Ontario St. (Room 218; Sessions Room), Canandaigua, NY at 7:00 PM.

18. Adjournment:

Board motion to: Adjourn. **Motion made by:** Dan Crowley, **seconded by** Ed Kaiser, **Vote:** Yes

DRAFT

14, No 0, Abstained 0. **The motion** Passed. The Ontario County Planning Board meeting was adjourned at 8:33 PM.

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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)