# Ontario County Planning Board

Len Wildman, Chair David Wink, Vice Chair

### ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW REFERRAL

The application described herein has been reviewed using an administrative review process established by the Ontario County Board of Supervisors (Resolution 540-2006). The subsequent official recommendation is derived from policies established by the Ontario County Planning Board. Recommendations for referrals not subject to administrative review can be found in the draft minutes from the respective CPB full board meeting.

Referral No:	Referring Municipality & Agency:	ng Municipality & Agency:		CPB Meeting Date:
26 – 2019 &	Town of Canandaigua - Planning Board	of Canandaigua - Planning Board		02/13/2019
26.1-2019				
Type of Application:		Administrative Review:		
Site Plan		Class: AR 1		
2. Applicant:				
Eldon Payne				
3. Property Owner (if different from the applicant):				
Susan Cooney				
	Project Description:	<b>Project Description:</b> Site plan and road side area variance for 2 additions to house at 4941 Island Beach Drive off CR 16 near Ferris Hills Drive in the Town of Canandaigua.		
4. Tax Map #:	Site plan and road side area variand			
98.09-1-10.000				
50.05-1-10.000				
Referral Recommendation: CPB will make no formal recommendation.				

The existing home has a setback of 9' to 11' from Island Beach Drive when a 55' setback is required. One of the proposed additions reduces this setback to 1/8'' to 1'3'' along most of the house frontage. The subject property is located at the end of Island Beach Drive. The  $2^{nd}$  addition maintains the required 10'side setback.

According to OnCOR there are not mapped wetlands, floodplains, or steep slopes in the areas of the proposed additions. The area from the house to the lake is in a floodplain. The lake frontage has slopes of 16 to 30%. The area variance documentation does not include information on the size of the proposed additions or plans for accommodating additional stormwater.

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

The intent of this policy is to:

- Address residential development that may infringe on County ROW's or easements for roads and other infrastructure.
- Address traffic safety along intermunicipal corridors by encouraging proper placement of residential driveways along County roads.
- Address impacts to ground and surface waters
- C. Applications subject to policy AR-5 and not involving lakefront lots with coverage, or side or lakefront setback variances or with encroachments on County right-of-ways.

#### Final Classification: Class 1

#### Findings:

- One-and two-family residential uses represent 63% of the 49,354 parcels on the 2017 Ontario County assessment roll. Between 2012 and 2017 1,067 single family residential parcels were added and 13 two-family were removed. These parcels represent 89% of all parcels added county-wide.
- 2. Collectively individual residential developments have significant impacts on surface and ground water.

- 3. Proper design off on site sewage disposal is needed to protect ground and surface waters.
- 4. Proper storm water and erosion control is also needed to achieve that same end.
- 5. Proper sight distance at access points along County roads is an important public safety issue of county wide significance.
- 6. Standards related to protecting water quality and traffic safety have been established by agencies such as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and NYSEDC.
- 7. These issues can be addressed by consulting appropriate agencies during local review and ensuring that those standards are met

**Final Recommendation** – With the exception of applications involving lakefront properties involving side, lake, or lot coverage variances or encroachments to County owned right-of-ways described in AR Policy 5 Parts A and B, the CPB will make no formal recommendation to deny or approve applications involving one single family residential site, including home occupations.

#### Comments

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

**OCDPW Comment** The site plan should show title block, date, preparer, and utilities including 1<sup>st</sup> sanitary sewer manhole north of the property and force main that crosses the property.

Thomas Harvey, Director Ontario County Planning Department Date

## **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 AR2 is a review as a Class 2 and require local board action if disapproved. The following table summarizes the administrative review policies specified in the bylaws.

Administrative Review Policies:– Ontario County Planning Board By-Laws Appendix D			
AR-1	Any submitted application clearly exempted from CPB review requirements by intermunicipal agreement		
AR-2	Applications that are withdrawn by the referring agency		
AR-3	Permit renewals with no proposed changes		
AR-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-5 A. Class 2 Denial	Applications involving one single-family residential site infringing on County owned property, easement or right-of-way.		
AR-5 B.	Applications involving one single-family residential site adjoining a lake that requires an area variance		
AR-5 C.	All other applications involving a site plan for one single-family residence.		
AR-6	Single-family residential subdivisions under five lots.		
AR-7 A. Class 2 Denial	Variances for signs along major designated travel corridors.		
AR-7 B.	Applications involving conforming signs along major travel corridors.		
AR-8	Co-location of telecommunications equipment and accessory structures on existing tower and sites (Applications for new towers or increasing the height of an existing tower will require full Board review)		