

CPB COMMENTS:

- The Board requests the referring agency have the applicant and engineers provide a full build out of the entire 51 acre parcel.
- As currently designed the proposed development only shows one point of egress to service 84 units. It is recommended that when considering the build out of the entire parcel, additional points of entry and exit are considered/incorporated.

FINDINGS:

The County Planning Board Bylaws include the importance of protecting natural features. Segmented projects, or projects reviewed in increments without consideration of the potential for development on the entire parcel can create issues with stormwater quality and overall quality of the watershed.

Whole parcel planning is essential when considering the impacts associated with a project in its entirety. Requiring a full parcel build out will prevent segmentation of potential environmental impacts, allowing the Board to consider the appropriateness of design factors like stormwater infrastructure to ensure there is not any adverse impact to stormwater/ water quality.

Board Motion: Referral #56-2016 be retained as a Class 2 and returned to the local board with the recommendation of approval with the following modification.

Modification #1: The referring Board should not take action on granting the PUD until a full parcel build out is developed by the applicant.

Motion made by: Glen Wilkes

Seconded by: Tim Marks

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion carried.

57 - 2016	Town of Geneva Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: Exempt
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Hanna, Mike & Mary	
Property Owner:	Hanna, Mike & Mary	
Tax Map No(s):	119.00-1-17.120	
Brief Description:	Area Variance request for a proposed second bay for an existing garage. The proposed will only be 8.1 ft from the side parcel line, which does not meet the 15 ft side setback requirement. The project is located at 200 Slosson Ln. in the Town of Geneva.	

Appendix B List of Referrals Eliminated from the County Planning board Review Process

1. All area variances that are single item and unrelated to a site plan, subdivision or multiple variance requests (i.e., the one and only application for the entire project is for an area variance), except for signs within 500 feet of a state or federal highway.

Final Recommendation: EXEMPT

58 - 2016	Town of Canandaigua Zoning Board of Appeals	Class: Exempt
Referral Type:	Area Variance	
Applicant:	Hribar, Gale	
Property Owner:	Hribar, Gale	
Tax Map No(s):	125.16-1-7.000	
Brief Description:	Area Variance request for a proposed 400 sq ft deck to be added to a single-family home. The proposed deck meets all setback requirements except the required 100 ft setback from the creek that runs through the property. The proposed deck will only be 76.7 ft from the creek. The project is located at 4332 Labrador Lane in the Town of Canandaigua	

Appendix B List of Referrals Eliminated from the County Planning board Review Process

1. All area variances that are single item and unrelated to a site plan, subdivision or multiple variance requests (i.e., the one and only

Class Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn

application for the entire project is for an area variance), except for signs within 500 feet of a state or federal highway.

Final Recommendation: EXEMPT

59 - 2016	Village of Rushville Planning Board	Class: 1
Referral Type:	Subdivision	
Applicant:	Rushco Inc.	
Property Owner:	Catlin, Phil	
Tax Map No(s):	171.05-1-6.110 & 171.05-1-23.221	
Brief Description:	Subdivision request to consolidate two adjacent parcels into one parcel approximately 3 acres. The proposed consolidation is necessary to build an addition to an existing storage building. The parcels are located at 1 Warehouse St. in the Village of Rushville.	

March 2016 Comments:

Area Variance request for an addition to existing storage building, to provide inside storage for material that is currently stored outside. Property is currently a gas station and fuel storage facility. The new addition does not meet the required setback of 75 ft, put in place to provide adequate buffering to residential districts, thus applicant is seeking a 37.5 ft variance.

- The consolidation of the two parcels has not been set in motion. Therefore currently the proposed addition would need two additional variances for side setbacks, per local law Article XI – Dimensional Requirements.
- The FEMA floodplain on the property due to the West River that runs through the property has not been delineated on the site plan.
- Since proposed building would fall into portion of the FEMA floodplain present on the property, we recommend the applicant reconsider the layout of the addition to extend towards the road away from the floodplain and residential district. Thus avoiding any complications with building in a floodplain and building a sufficient buffer. Only one variance would still be needed for the front setback.

According to ONCOR data:

- No State or Federal wetlands are present on the property.
- The property is located within a FEMA floodplain.
- The property is not located within 500 ft. of an Agricultural District.

SWCD COMMENTS: Stormwater Management

- When/if downspouts are installed on the new proposed building, that they be routed to a grass/lawn area.

NOTE: The applicant has been asked to provide additional information regarding delineation of the floodplain which is not available at this time. Consolidation of the two parcels was requested. An updated subdivision map has not been submitted as of March 7th.

April 2016 COMMENTS:

Subdivision map and application has been submitted showing the consolidation of the two parcels. Per subdivision map, the floodplain has been delineated, but is inconsistent with what is shown in ONCOR. As represented on the submitted plan, the proposed building is not within the delineated floodplain. Per the approval of the subdivision, the applicant is still seeking Site Plan approval and a 37.5 ft variance for residential setback, which requires 75ft.

CPB COMMENTS:

The referring Board is *strongly encouraged to grant the minimum variance necessary.*

Board Motion: Referrals #59-2016, #59.1-2016 and #59.2-2016 be retained as Class 1s and returned to the local board with comments.

Motion made by: Tim Marks

Seconded by: Glen Wilkes

Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion carried.

Class Abbreviations

AR 1: Administrative Review Class 1

AR 2: Administrative Review Class 2

EX: Exempt

W: Withdrawn