

Town of Canandaigua

5440 Routes 5 & 20 West
Canandaigua, NY 14424

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 13, 2022, at 6:00 PM

Rev. 1/24/2022

MEETING REPORT

MEETING CALLED BY: BOB DICARLO, CHAIR

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: BOB DICARLO FERNANDO SOBERON TIM RILEY
RAY HENRY

SECRETARY: KIMBERLY BURKARD

TOWN STAFF: SARAH REYNOLDS

GUESTS:

CALL TO ORDER

- Mr. DiCarlo opened the Zoom meeting at 6:05pm.

REFERRALS

- Planning Review Committee Referrals:
 - CPN-21-094
CPN-21-094 Greene Land Surveying PLLC, 403 East Miller Street, Newark, N.Y. 14513; representing Martin E. and Lori J. Gilmore, 2701 Short Road, Newark, N.Y. 14513; owners of property at 5039 Seneca Point Road. TM #153.00-1-15.220
Requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan approval for construction of a single-family home with private wastewater treatment system and a private well.
 - CPN-21-096
CPN-21-096 Marks Engineering, c/o Brennan Marks, P.E., 42 Beeman Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; representing Jeffrey and Kate Ingraham, 164 Trevor Court Road, Rochester, N.Y. 14610; owner of property at 5015 Seneca Point Road. TM #153.00-1-15.300
Requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan for construction of a single-family residence with accessory building and other site amenities including a new on-site wastewater treatment system, a new driveway and a well.
 - CPN-21-098
CPN-21-098 Venezia & Associates, 5120 Laura Lane, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; representing Timber Wind LLC, 1950 Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road, Rochester, N.Y. 14623; owner of property at 6170 Dugway Road. TM #153.00-0-63.200
Requesting an Area Variance and a Single-Stage Subdivision approval to create Lot #1 at 18.644 acres (with frontage of 30 feet when 225 is required) and Lot #2 at 3.571 acres.

See prepared comment sheets that follow.

Town of Canandaigua

5440 Routes 5 & 20 West

Canandaigua, NY 14424

(585) 394-1120 * Fax: (585) 394-9476

townofcanandaigua.org

DATE: January 13, 2022

TO: Chairman Chuck Oyler & members of the Planning Board

FROM: Chairman Bob DiCarlo & members of the Agricultural Advisory Committee

RE: Referrals from the Project Review Committee (PRC)

In accordance with Town of Canandaigua Town Code §17-5 the Town of Canandaigua Agricultural Advisory Committee (Ag Committee) met on January 13, 2022 to review and provide comment relative to the application(s) listed below and referred to the Ag Committee by the PRC. The applications and the Ag Committee's findings are as follows.

CPN-21-094	5039 Seneca Point Road	TM# 153.00-1-15.220	13.3 acres
-------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Greene Land Surveying PLLC, 403 East Miller Street, Newark, N.Y. 14513; representing Martin E. and Lori J. Gilmore, 2701 Short Road, Newark, N.Y. 14513; owners of property at 5039 Seneca Point Road.

Requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan approval for construction of a single-family home with private wastewater treatment system and a private well.

Review based on:

- Application materials on file as of 01/11/2022
- Ontario County On-Cor maps
- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2016 Agricultural Enhancement Plan
- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2018 Open Space, Conservation, and Scenic Views Master Plan
- Town policies and maps incorporated in Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Planning documents adopted by Town Board.

Project Findings:

- Property **IS** located in Ontario County Ag District 1.
- Property **IS** currently farmed according to property owner.
- Ag Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID NOT** receive a rating from Ag Enhancement Plan.
- Open Space Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID** receive a rating from the Open Space Master Plan. The parcel rated low: 1073 out of a possible 16,000. However there is a gully with a stream running along the northern side of the property that is noteworthy because it is a tributary to Canandaigua Lake.
- Property **IS NOT** in the Padelford Brook Greenway
- Property **IS NOT** in the Strategic Farmland Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Strategic Forest Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Canandaigua Lake watershed
- Soils/land cover for parcel is as follows:

Type	Description	% Coverage	Acres
Agricultural District	ONT01	995.5%	13.4
Ecological Community	Successional Northern Hardwoods	20.631%	2.8
Ecological Community	Successional Old Field	79.369%	10.7
NRCS Soils	Danley-Lansing complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	1.9%	0.3
NRCS Soils	Darien silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	15.4%	2.1
NRCS Soils	Lansing silt loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	2.2%	0.3
NRCS Soils	Lansing silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	60.0%	8.1
NRCS Soils	Ontario, Honeoye and Lansing soils, 35 to 55 percent slopes	0.7%	0.1
NRCS Soils	Rock outcrop-Arnot complex, 35 to 80 percent slopes, extremely stony	19.9%	2.7
Utilities - Electric	ROCHESTER GAS & ELECTRIC	100.0%	13.5
Utilities - Gas	NEW YORK STATE ELCTRIC & GAS	100.0%	13.5
Utilities - Telephone	Finger Lakes Technology Group	100.0%	13.5
Utilities - Telephone	Frontier Telephone of Rochester	100.0%	13.5
Watershed	Canandaigua Lake	100.0%	13.5

Comments:

- The Committee feels that although this project technically constitutes a loss of farmland it is not significant. The property is also not in the Town's designated farmland protection area and so is not prioritized for protection.

MOTION: *"The Agriculture Advisory Committee recommends the Town of Canandaigua Planning Board find the proposed project DOES NOT cause a loss of valuable agricultural lands for the Town of Canandaigua."*

CPN-21-096 5015 Seneca Point Road TM# 153.00-1-15.300 10 acres

Marks Engineering, c/o Brennan Marks, P.E., 42 Beeman Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; representing Jeffrey and Kate Ingraham, 164 Trevor Court Road, Rochester, N.Y. 14610; owner of property at 5015 Seneca Point Road.

Requesting a Single-Stage Site Plan for construction of a single-family residence with accessory building and other site amenities including a new on-site wastewater treatment system, a new driveway and a well.

Review based on:

- Application materials on file as of 01/11/2022
- Ontario County On-Cor maps
- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2016 Agricultural Enhancement Plan
- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2018 Open Space, Conservation, and Scenic Views Master Plan
- Town policies and maps incorporated in Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Planning documents adopted by Town Board.

Project Findings:

- Property **IS** located in Ontario County Ag District 1.
- Property is currently farmed.

- Ag Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID NOT** receive a rating from Ag Enhancement Plan.
- Open Space Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID** receive a rating from the Open Space Master Plan. The parcel rated low: 699 out of a possible 16,000. However there is a gully with a stream running along the south side of the property that is noteworthy because it is a tributary to Canandaigua Lake.
- Property **IS NOT** in the Padelford Brook Greenway
- Property **IS NOT** in the Strategic Farmland Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Strategic Forest Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Canandaigua Lake watershed
- Soils/land cover for parcels are as follows:

Type	Description	% Coverage	Acres
Agricultural District	ONT01	6.5%	0.1
Ecological Community	Successional Northern Hardwoods	35.831%	3.6
Ecological Community	Successional Old Field	64.169%	6.5
NRCS Soils	Darien silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	49.8%	5.0
NRCS Soils	Darien silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	16.3%	1.6
NRCS Soils	Lansing silt loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	1.3%	0.1
NRCS Soils	Ontario, Honeoye and Lansing soils, 35 to 55 percent slopes	9.7%	1.0
NRCS Soils	Rock outcrop-Arnot complex, 35 to 80 percent slopes, extremely stony	22.9%	2.3
Utilities - Electric	ROCHESTER GAS & ELECTRIC	100.0%	10.1
Utilities - Gas	NEW YORK STATE ELCTRIC & GAS	100.0%	10.1
Utilities - Telephone	Finger Lakes Technology Group	100.0%	10.1
Utilities - Telephone	Frontier Telephone of Rochester	100.0%	10.1
Watershed	Canandaigua Lake	100.0%	10.1

Comments:

- The Committee agrees that although this project technically constitutes a loss of farmland it is not significant. The property is not in the Town's designated farmland protection area and so is not prioritized for protection.

MOTION: "The Agriculture Advisory Committee recommends the Town of Canandaigua Planning Board find the proposed project DOES NOT cause a loss of valuable agricultural lands for the Town of Canandaigua."

CPN-21-098 6170 Dugway Road TM# 153.00-1-63.200 22 acres

Venezia & Associates, 5120 Laura Lane, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424; representing Timber Wind LLC, 1950 Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road, Rochester, N.Y. 14623; owner of property at 6170 Dugway Road.

Requesting an Area Variance and a Single-Stage Subdivision approval to create Lot #1 at 18.644 acres (with frontage of 30 feet when 225 is required) and Lot #2 at 3.571 acres.

Review based on:

- Application materials on file as of 01/11/2022
- Ontario County On-Cor maps
- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2016 Agricultural Enhancement Plan

- Maps and Parcel Ranking data in the 2018 Open Space, Conservation, and Scenic Views Master Plan
- Town policies and maps incorporated in Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Planning documents adopted by Town Board.

Project Findings:

- Property **IS** located in Ontario County Ag District 1.
- Property **IS** currently farmed.
- Ag Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID** receive a rating from Ag Enhancement Plan. Parcel rated low overall but did receive 400 points for its proximity to a protected farm: the Hicks farm is nearby and is protected by a PDR.
- Open Space Plan Ratings. Parcel **DID** receive a rating from the Open Space Master Plan. The parcel rated low: 871 out of a possible 16,000. However there is a small stream on the property that drains into Canandaigua Lake.
- Property **IS NOT** in the Padelford Brook Greenway
- Property **IS NOT** in the Strategic Farmland Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Strategic Forest Protection Area
- Property **IS** in the Canandaigua Lake watershed
- Soils/land cover for parcels are as follows:

Type	Description	% Coverage	Acres
Ecological Community	Cropland	51.428%	11.3
Ecological Community	Mowed Lawn	10.036%	2.2
Ecological Community	Successional Northern Hardwoods	38.536%	8.5
NRCS Soils	Chenango gravelly loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	0.1%	0.0
NRCS Soils	Chenango gravelly loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	6.2%	1.4
NRCS Soils	Langford channery silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	49.5%	10.9
NRCS Soils	Langford-Erie channery silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	1.5%	0.3
NRCS Soils	Lordstown-Manlius-Towerville complex, 15 to 25 percent slopes, very stony	1.8%	0.4
NRCS Soils	Lordstown-Manlius-Towerville complex, 25 to 35 percent slopes, extremely st*	21.2%	4.7
NRCS Soils	Mardin channery silt loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	8.7%	1.9
NRCS Soils	Valois gravelly loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	7.2%	1.6
NRCS Soils	Valois gravelly loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	1.3%	0.3
NRCS Soils	Volusia channery silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	2.5%	0.6
Utilities - Electric	ROCHESTER GAS & ELECTRIC	100.0%	22.0
Utilities - Gas	NEW YORK STATE ELCTRIC & GAS	100.0%	22.0
Utilities - Telephone	Finger Lakes Technology Group	100.0%	22.0
Utilities - Telephone	Frontier Telephone of Rochester	100.0%	22.0
Watershed	Canandaigua Lake	100.0%	22.0

Comments:

- The Committee...

MOTION: *"The Agriculture Advisory Committee recommends the Town of Canandaigua Planning Board find the proposed project DOES NOT cause a loss of valuable agricultural lands for the Town of Canandaigua."*

** END OF REFERRALS **

NEW BUSINESS

- **Scenic Viewshed Overlay**

- Mr. DiCarlo expressed interest in reviewing the Scenic Viewshed Overlay (SVO) in order to maybe learn some ideas/techniques that could be applied to an agricultural overlay.
- Mr. Soberon liked the SVO text that noted the strictest code would apply in situations to resolve between the SVO and the underlying base code.
- Both Mr. DiCarlo and Mr. Soberon like the clarity and shortness of the SVO.
- Mr. DiCarlo added that most of the SVO does not apply to what the Agricultural Committee would like to implement.
- Mr. Reily and Mr. DiCarlo noted that they found that the SVO was not very restrictive.
- Ms. Burkard added her viewpoints on the Ordinance Committee discussions for the SVO. She said that the SVO was intended to promote single-family homes by setting lot size minimums in order to prevent larger developments from happening in the viewshed. She also noted that the current SVO was intended to be a starting point and that further revisions are intended. She added that vegetation and trees, one of the key elements in protecting the viewshed, are not currently in the SVO. She also noted that Conservation Subdivisions are not allowed in the SVO.
- Mr. DiCarlo said that focusing on single-family space as opposed to denser developments is not something that would be useful in an Ag overlay. Mr. Reily agreed and noted that in previous Ag Committee conversations, they had agreed that greater development density would be advantageous for agriculture purposes. Mr. Soberon said that they were looking for something different with the SVO but it overlays a different areas than agriculture does.
- Ms. Reynolds shared the Scenic Viewshed map (part of the Open Space Plan). Purple areas noted on the map are the locations that the SVO law applies to.
- Ms. Reynolds said that the Conservation Subdivision would be preferable, from an agricultural viewpoint, especially if they leave farmland.
- Mr. DiCarlo said the TDR would be useful for what the Ag Committee is trying to accomplish.
- Ms. Reynolds explained that a Conservation Subdivision can allow a developer to build more densely than zoning allows by letting them conserve a portion of the land. She said that the Natural Resources Inventory helps to identify what land cover types are key to conserve. The developer sets aside a certain percentage of those land types and is able to build more densely in the balance of the property remaining with smaller lots and houses closer together. She said Pierce Brook is a good example of a Conservation Subdivision which has large areas of conserved land. She added that no farm fields were conserved for farming and that the Conservation Subdivision is not related to the TDR.
- Mr. Soberon expressed his opinion that an overlay would be a good thing for the Ag. Committee to pursue. He continued that the Ag Committee should define how they would like to see land conserved. Examples: minimum size left for farming, layout of the farm field, etc. These items should be defined for things like Conservation Subdivisions. Mr. DiCarlo added that this should include guidelines for field access and field shape. Mr. Soberon said that if the parcel that is being

- developed has slopes that those are not appropriate for farming. Ms. Reynolds said that guidelines can be drafted for use in future conservation subdivisions that have active farmland on them. The developer would get a copy of those guidelines. Ms. Reynolds noted that to make guidelines part of the Conservation Subdivision that it would require another review by the Ordinance Committee but the guidelines can be available and used while that process is happening. Mr. Soberon saw this working well with an Agricultural Overlay.
- Mr. Reily said that he feels that the Ag Committee is getting these reviews at the end of a process and that decisions have already been made that can't be undone. He feels this minimizes the value of the Ag. Committee reviews.
 - Discussion about agricultural guidelines included:
 - Minimum percentage or acreage—this may be difficult to define. Under 15 acres is small but 7 acres is used by some sources.
 - Easy access to the road
 - Slopes no more than x degrees
 - Continuous piece of land that is easy to work with machinery
 - If it is being currently actively farmed, that there is an opportunity to lease/rent at a fair market rate and continue the farming operations
 - Ms. Reynolds said that there is a calculation for Conservation Subdivisions. She will send the Conservation Subdivisions law to the Committee to read before the next meeting. Mr. DiCarlo asked if Mr. Finch can attend the next meeting.
 - Ms. Reynolds asked if there is land conserved for farming, would it be farmed again? Mr. Reily added that farmers will only travel so far from their base farm. This could only apply to land that is already being actively farmed otherwise you are only creating open space.
 - Ms. Reynolds said that open space in Conservation Subdivisions are owned by an HOA. Mr. DiCarlo said that because of the housing, it becomes less desirable to farm in such areas and the residents living there may not like the farming activities.
 - Ms. Reynolds said that the Town of Canandaigua does not currently have a TDR program. There is a report that has ideas that could be used in creating one but there was some push back to those ideas—specifically about the incentives/fees used in the Uptown area. The existing TDR report would not work as written because of the new Form Based Code.
 - Ms. Reynolds explained that money paid by developers into a TDR fund could be used to put a conservation easement at some future time on an unrelated piece of land. Mr. DiCarlo wants Mr. Finch's input on the TDR program as well. Ms. Reynolds will forward the TDR report to the Ag Committee.

ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

Adjournment @ 7pm

Next Meeting, February 10, 2022, 6pm