

CPN-20-010 **Venezia & Associates, 5120 Laura Lane, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; representing Terry Dekouski (239 Kennedy Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424) and Wally Jones (70 S. Main Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424); owners of property on Thomas Road at Brickyard Road**
TM #70.00-1-2.111
TM #70.06-1-68.10
Requesting Subdivision Sketch Plan Review to subdivide 28.9 acres for proposed 72 lots for residential town homes. Constrained lands: 5.81 acres. Current zoning: R-1-30. Base density: 70 lots
Acres being conserved: 19.790 (42%).

This application was reviewed by the Planning Review Committee on October 15, 2019; November 26, 2019; and February 18, 2020.

This application previously was reviewed by the Environmental Conservation Board on November 7, 2019.

Mr. Ritts presented this application and provided the following information:

This application remains as a Sketch Plan Review at this time. No decision will be made by the Planning Board when this application is presented on March 24, 2020.

The applicant proposes to subdivide 28.9 acres into 72 building lots with 20.3 acres to remain as undeveloped open space and for stormwater management facilities.

Since the previous presentation to the ECB in November 2019, the plans have been revised to include a parcel to the east and to avoid the land to the southwest which is not considered to be a formal wetland but that nonetheless is a wet area of the property.

The entire parcel of approximately 53 acres is primarily vacant land. Areas in the north and east of the property are partially farmed, there are no steep slopes, there are no recorded rare plants or animals, and there are two natural gas lines and easements that run through the property.

The proposed lots range in size from approximately 8,800 square feet to approximately 47,500 square feet. The average proposed lot size is 11,000 square feet. Some lots are below the Town Code minimum lot size requirements in the R-1-30 Zoning District but the Planning Board has the ability to waive this minimum lot size requirement (§ 174-70).

Ms. Hooker provided the following comments:

This was reviewed a few months ago as 30 lots on 29 acres. Now they have added a new parcel to the project and it is 72 homes on 53 acres. Last

time, ECB suggested that they consolidate the conservation area and concentrate it along the southern edge, which they have done.

There is still some fragmentation of the conservation lands, because they are treating two gas easements as conservation land.

Other than the strip with trees along the south edge, the rest of the land is former farmland and does not have particular conservation value. It is rated lowest of five in the Open Space Plan. What measures are proposed to increase the usefulness of these areas as conservation land and to prevent encroachment by adjacent owners?

Lot sizes are well below that envisioned with Conservation Subdivision law (average around $\frac{1}{4}$ acre, some as small as one-fifth of an acre) but apparently permissible and consistent with what the Town has allowed at other developments.

Last time, we recommended attention to linking to neighborhood trail system. This is not addressed yet.

Ms. Hooker said that the intent of the Town's Conservation Subdivision regulations is the identification and preservation of outstanding natural resources such as wetlands, forests, etc., but that now it seems as though a number of developers seek to use these regulations as a mechanism for maximizing the number of units on a parcel to make the development more profitable by the building of more housing units with reduced infrastructure. Ms. Hooker said that this is not a bad thing if it translates into more affordable housing units but she questioned whether the Conservation Subdivision regulations are working the way in which they were intended.

Ms. Marthaller said that the Town's consultant (LaBella Associates) has been requested to review the Conservation Subdivision regulations. She said that in all cases these regulations may not be working as intended to identify and protect lands of natural resource value and importance.

Mr. Damann asked about the use of the Conservation Subdivision regulations in this application and whether the use of the regulations encourage and enhance valuable natural resources and maintain the integrity of the natural resources on the property.

Ms. Marthaller discussed the proposed route of the Auburn Trail, a portion of which has been installed along the east side of Brickyard Road and a spur line of which has been proposed for Thomas Road leading to State Route 332 and Blue Heron Park.

The ECB also discussed the road stub that is shown on the Sketch Plan which extends from the southern boundary of the property into an adjacent property. The ECB asked about the purpose of this road stub and possible future connections.

ECB Comments: The ECB questions whether the use of the Conservation Subdivision regulations is appropriate in this application. The ECB also suggests that the Planning Board consider the proposed spur line of the Auburn Trail across the Thomas Road frontage of this property and the purpose of the road stub that is shown leading from the southern boundary of the property.

CPN-20-011 **Marks Engineering, c/o Brennan Marks, P.E., 42 Beeman Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424, representing BTY Holdings LLC, dba “Must Stash It,” 3568 County Road 16, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; owner of property at 2970 County Road 10**
TM #84.00-1-17.100
Requesting an Area Variance for the front setback; and requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan approval for “Must Stash It” 12 new self-storage warehouse facilities.

Mr. Ritts presented this application and provided the following information:

The applicant is requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan approval to construct 12 new 4,500-square-foot 12½-foot high storage buildings on a newly subdivided parcel at 2970 County Road 10 adjacent to an existing solar farm.

The applicant also requests an Area Variance for a front setback of 61.43 feet from County Road 10 when 75 is required (a 13.57-foot Area Variance).

The applicant also requests a Special Use Permit to allow the outdoor storage of boats on a proposed gravel area of the site. The outdoor boat storage will be gradually phased out as new storage warehouse structures are built.

Existing conditions include two isolated non-navigable unregulated (under the Clean Water Act) wetland areas that do not require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The parcel is relatively flat and is currently vacant land with overgrown brush and grasses. The land drains from east to west.

Three drainage swales will connect to a diversion basin and then to a retention pond. A diversion culvert will be installed to divert stormwater runoff into the retention pond.

Ms. Marthaller expressed concern about the disturbance of the wetlands, especially when it appears from the aerial photograph that the drainage channels may be connected to existing drainage channels on the east side of County Road 10.

The landscape plan includes the planting of six new shade trees along the County Road 10 frontage and four landscape beds to buffer the front of the facility as viewed from