

## **VILLAGE OF HONEOYE FALLS PLANNING BOARD**

**July 12, 1999**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Denise Heischman, Betsy Taylor, John Hoffman, Earll Fontaine, Tom Judd

**ALSO PRESENT:** Michael Tobin, Village Attorney; James Turner, Village Code Enforcement Officer; George Gotscik; Richard Rosen, Mark IV Construction; Robert and James Hall, American Technologies; John Hinman.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Heischman at 7:30 p.m.

### **SITE PLAN REVIEW : 44 BRIGHAM CIRCLE : RICHARD ROSEN**

The Board reviewed plans submitted by Richard Rosen of Mark IV Construction for a new home at 44 Brigham Circle. The proposed home is the "Crawford" model, which has been approved at different sites within the Clover Meadows development. The Board reviewed various features of the proposed home, such as the garage, porch and gables. The setbacks were reviewed by the Board. Chairman Heischman noted that the proposed home was near to the conservation easement, and reminded Mr. Rosen that the conservation easement should not be crossed during the construction of the home. Chairman Heischman asked if there were any further comments or concerns from the Board: none were noted.

Motion by Betsy Taylor, seconded by John Hoffman to grant site plan approval to Richard Rosen for a new home at 44 Brigham Circle according to plans submitted June 21, 1999, with the condition that no construction takes place within the conservation easement or any other easement.

Motion carried.

### **SUBDIVISION APPROVAL : GEORGE GOTSCIK: STELLAR PROJECTS**

The Board discussed with Mr. Gotscik progress on the Stellar Projects donation of land to the Honeoye Falls- Lima Central School District. Mr. Gotscik stated that he wished to continue communication with the Village regarding this project, and provided updates to the Board regarding environmental study. Mr.

Gotscik stated that Becky Lund, a student at HF-L had completed all the work on the SEQR long form. but was unavailable to attend the Planning Board meeting to present her findings. Mr. Gotscik stated that no pollution was found at the base of the chimney located on the property. and that it had not been used since approximately 1932. Mr. Gotscik also stated that there would be approximately \$6,000 granted for the repair of the chimney, and there would be research done by students beginning next fall into the historical significance of the chimney. and whether it would be kept as an historic artifact; however, this would have to be determined by the School Board.

Board member Tom Judd pointed out that according to the easement, no new structures could be erected at the site unless written consent was granted by the Village. Mr. Judd referred to a clause that stated there would be no exemption from the Village Code, because the site was in an overlay district. Mr. Gotscik stated that there was a possibility of a foot bridge to be constructed to the Oxbow of the creek, but that students would be used to assist in developing the land.

Chairman Heischman stated that since the easement had not been approved by the School Board. that it might be prudent to delay any further action until they had done so. Village Attorney Michael Tobin stated that it was important for the Planning Board to act in a timely manner due to time recording of the map. Mr. Gotscik stated that if it were acceptable to the Planning Board, he would proceed to the School Board with the presentation for the subdivision. Chairman Heischman stated that a copy of the review should be made and sent to the School Board for their review. She suggested that the School Board notify the Planning Board if they had any concerns, that she might sign off on the subdivisions and easements. Board member Toni Judd suggested that if any concerns were expressed by the School Board, that they be discussed amongst the Planning Board as well. Mr. Gotscik stated he did not foresee any problems with the School Board review, but he would return to the Planning Board after the School Board Review to report their findings.

Chairman Heischman decided that the Planning Board would review the Assessment form at their August 2, 1999 meeting. Mr. Gotschik stated he would request notification as to the time of the meeting, as well as provide the Board with follow-up to the School Board review.

#### **INFORMAL DISCUSSION :58 NORTH MAIN STREET: JAMES HALL/AMERICAN TECHNOLOGIES**

An informal discussion ensued between Mr. James Hall of American Technologies and the Planning Board regarding change of use of a building located at 58 North Main Street. Applications were not filed, nor motions made.

#### **SITE PLAN REVIEW : ADDITION : 31 ½ YORK STREET : HINMAN**

The Board reviewed an application from Mr. John Hinman for a library addition at his home at 31 ½ York Street. The Board reviewed the plans and commented favorably on the various design features included therein. Mr. Hinman stated that the goal of the design was to incorporate the addition in to the existing design of the house as much as possible, to gain continuity with the existing structure. Chairman Heischman remarked that his efforts seemed to be successful, as the proposed addition blended in well with the character of the house.

The Board raised the question of drainage. Code Enforcement Officer Jim Turner stated that there would be no significant impact to the neighboring homes from the addition. Mr. Hinman stated that there would be downspouts and splash blocks installed on the addition, with possible 4" pipe. Mr. Hinman stated that he presently experiences some flooding in his basement, and that future plans for this area might include grading to avert water from his home. Mr. Turner stated that drainage problems were not due to any feature of Mr. Hinman's house.

Board member John Hoffman inquired if there were to be a crawlspace or basement under the proposed addition: Mr. Hinman answered that there would be a crawlspace. Chairman Heischman inquired if there were any drainage swales located near the house: Mr. Hinman replied that swales were present near the driveway.

Chairman Heischman noted there were no setback issues in regards to the proposed addition. She asked for other considerations or concerns from the Board: none were noted. She remarked that the plans provided a nice match to the existing house.

Motion by Tom Judd, seconded by John Hoffman, to grant site plan approval to John and Lisa Hinman for an addition to their home located at 31 ½ York Street, according to plans submitted June 25, 1999.

Motion Carried.

#### **DISCUSSION : VILLAGE CODE UPDATE PROCESS**

Village Code Enforcement Officer Jim Turner stated that as per the Mayor's request, the Village Code was to be updated every five years. Mr. Turner asked the Board for comments regarding determining a process to expedite code review. Mr. Turner suggested that items that are determined to be causes for concern should be tracked throughout the year. The Board could then provide feedback as to how to best address these issues.

Chairman Heischman stated that some problematic issues appropriate for discussion were already evident, such as the issues of swimming pools allowed three feet from the property line, and the issues of height versus distance in accessory structures. Board member Toni Judd suggested that it would be a good idea to expedite the process by setting a date twice a year when the Board would review problems and concerns. Board member Earl Fontaine suggested that a list of problematic items be kept; Board member John Hoffman suggested that as problems or areas of concern are identified at Board meetings, they be recorded throughout the year, and discussed at the workshop sessions. Chairman Heischman inquired as to what the procedure would be for budgeting for extra meetings to address the code changes. Mr. Turner suggested that the Board could make and enact changes at the rate of one per year.

Mr. Turner stated that the significance of the code would need to be considered when enacting changes. Village attorney Mike Tobin stated that it was important that the public receive the most current information regarding the code. Mr. Tobin suggested establishing dates in January and June for the purposes of workshop meetings to discuss code review.

Mr. Turner suggested that the Board review updates of the Code individually, taking a section at a time, making notes and comments until the entire code is reviewed, and the outdated and unwanted parts of the Code are identified. Chairman Heischman suggested that a copy of the Zoning map be included in the Code book, and check to see if it the most recent version. Mr. Tobin noted that the last change to the Code was in 1996, he suggested that the Board members check their individual copies for accuracy. Chairman Heischman inquired if the Planning Board should coordinate their Code review effort with the Village Board; Mr. Tobin stated that he was not aware of any plans for the Village Board to review the Code; that the Code was specific to items addressed by the Planning Board, such as site plans, subdivisions, etc.

### **FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION OF JUNE 14, 1999 WORKSHOP MEETING**

Several changes in submission guidelines that were discussed at the workshop meeting were reviewed. Mr. Tobin suggested that establishing policy and procedure guidelines such as a site plan checklist, as per the workshop discussion would help the Board to work more efficiently.

Mr. Turner mentioned that the County Planning Department now wants seven (7) copies of site plan submissions, so the total number needed by the applicant now would increase to twelve (12). A discussion ensued amongst the Board regarding the total number of copies needed by the applicant, and the disbursement of the copies amongst the various departments and agencies involved. Mr. Turner pointed out that major projects are required to submit more plans to be distributed amongst the departments. but that the term "major project" was based on loose criteria, such as number of acres affected, or a subdivision greater than ten (10) parcels. It was decided that 18 copies would be sufficient with the application for site plans on projects which would be going to Monroe County Planning Board for review, and that eleven (11) copies would be sufficient for other projects. Mr. Tobin indicated that a redraft of this section of the code would reflect this change.

Mr. Tobin and the Board discussed the proposed change which would call for a Public Hearing for all site plan reviews. It was decided that for those site plan reviews which are fairly routine, a preliminary review by the Building Inspector and the Planning Board Chairman would help to expedite the process.

The Board then reviewed specific changes to the Village Code. The following changes proposed by Mr. Tobin were:

#### Section 190-138. Procedure.

(A): "An applicant for site plan review under this Article shall file with the Planning Board Clerk not later than four (4) weeks prior to its regularly scheduled meeting 11 copies each of the site plan documents (see Appendix A for requirements)."

(D): "The Planning Board shall hold a public hearing within sixty-two (62) days after determining that the application is complete. Notice of the public hearing shall be published in the official newspaper of the Village at least ten (10) days prior to the public hearing and the applicant shall post a notice of public hearing on the premises being reviewed for site plan for ten (10) days prior to the hearing. The Planning Board shall render a decision on the application within sixty-two (62) days from the time of hearing. The Planning Board's decision, rendered in writing, shall consist of either:

1. Approval of the site plan based upon a determination that the proposed plan will constitute a suitable development and is in compliance with the standards set forth in this Article;
2. Disapproval if the site plan based upon a determination that the proposed project does not meet the standards for review set forth in the Article: or

3. Approval of the site plan subject to any conditions, modifications and restrictions as required by the Board which will ensure that the project meets the standards for review."

190-139. Submission Requirements.

- I. For accessory structures 600 square feet or less in area, detached from the main use building, which are not more than one story in height and cannot contain more than two automobiles, the applicant shall submit the following:
  - A. A survey map drawn to scale showing the following:
    - a) the complete footprint of all structures on the lot at the time of application with dimensions,
    - b) the boundary lines of the lot, the scale of the survey,
    - c) the footprint of the proposed structure, the dimension of the proposed structure,
    - d) the distance the proposed structure is from the front, rear and side lot lines and the primary building.
    - e) Elevations drawn to a scale of  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch equals 1 foot, of the proposed structure for the
  - B. front, side and rear exteriors to include location, dimensions and size of all windows, doors, trim, and architectural details.
  - C. The type of materials to be used for the proposed structure.
- II. For any structure with an area of more than 600 square feet the applicant shall submit the following:" (The current submission requirements will than follow the above preamble.)

The Board discussed the proposed changes and agreed that they generally reflected what the Board had discussed at their workshop meeting. It was agreed by the Board that they would review the policy and procedure, as well as a site plan submission checklist submitted by Mr. Tobin to expedite the site plan process.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 7, 1999 AND JUNE 14, 1999 MEETINGS**

As the minutes were not made available for the Board to review, approval of minutes was postponed until the next Planning Board meeting. It was noted that the date of the September Planning Board meeting would be rescheduled to compensate for the Labor Day holiday. Notice will be given via the Sentinel.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sheila Coleman  
Planning Board Secretary.