

Town of Farmington

1000 County Road 8
Farmington, New York 14425

PLANNING BOARD **Wednesday, August 2, 2017, 7:00 p.m.**

MINUTES—APPROVED

The following minutes are written as a summary of the main points that were made and are the record of the actions taken by the Town of Farmington Planning Board. Remarks delivered during discussions are summarized and are not intended to be verbatim transcriptions. An audio recording of the meeting is made in accordance with the Planning Board adopted Rules of Procedure. The audio recording is retained for 12 months.

Board Members Present: Scott Makin, *Chairperson*
Adrian Bellis
Edward Hemminger
Mary Neale
Douglas Viets

Staff Present:
Lance S. Brabant, CPESC, Town of Farmington Engineers, MRB Group D.P.C.
Ronald L. Brand, Town of Farmington Director of Development and Planning
Don Giroux, Town of Farmington Highway Superintendent

Applicants Present:
Robert J. Cantwell, R.L.A., BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, N.Y. 14450
Mark Stevens, S. B. Ashley Management Corporation, 700 Powers Building, 16 West Main Street, Rochester, N.Y. 14614

Residents Present:
Gerald A. Bloss, 81 Gannett Road, Farmington, N.Y. 14425
Christopher Parks, 1691 Lillybrook Court, Farmington, N.Y. 1425, member of the Victor Central School District Board of Education
Brian Sandore, 6143 Hanover Road, Farmington, N.Y. 14425

1. MEETING OPENING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Since everyone in attendance was familiar with the Planning Board members, Town staff and emergency procedures and exits, Mr. Makin omitted introductions and the review of these items this evening.

Mr. Makin said the meeting would be conducted according to the Rules of Procedure approved by the Planning Board on March 1, 2017.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 19, 2017

■ A motion was made by MS. NEALE, seconded by MR. VIETS, that the minutes of the July 19, 2017, meeting be approved.

Motion carried by voice vote. Mr. Bellis abstained because of his absence from the meeting on July 19, 2017.

3. OPEN DISCUSSION

Town Board Referral to the Planning Board:

Report and Recommendation:

S. B. Ashley Management Corporation Incentive Zoning Application

**APPLICANT: S. B. Ashley Management Corporation
(attention: Mark Stevens), 700 Powers Building, 16 West Main Street, Rochester, N.Y. 14614**

ACTION: Request for rezoning approximately 130 acres of land located along the west side of State Route 332 and the south side of County Road 41 from GB General Business, LI Limited Industrial and R-1-15 Residential to IZ Incentive Zoning—the S. B. Ashley Incentive Zoning Program

Mr. Cantwell and Mr. Stevens attended the meeting.

Mr. Brand discussed the following points:

- This application was referred to the Planning Board by the Town Board (Resolution #318 of 2017, July 11, 2017).
- The application was reviewed by the Project Review Committee (PRC) on two separate occasions at which representatives of the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT), the Ontario County Department of Public Works, the Ontario County Planning Department and the Town Engineer attended to discuss with the PRC the issues associated with this development.
- Issues with this development include transportation and the associated traffic concerns at the State Route 332/County Road 41 intersection, the proximity of the corner of County Road 41 and Hathway Drive from the intersection, the existing

residential subdivisions in the vicinity and the traffic back-up at the intersection at peak travel times.

- The State DOT representative expressed concern about traffic that would attempt left- and right-hand turns from the northernmost access road of the development onto State Route 332 that would be located near the intersection. Mr. Brand said that this is an example of the nature of the concerns that the Town Board and the Planning Board seek to identify for study by the applicant's traffic engineer. He said that these concerns would inform the applicant about the issues of importance to the State and County regulatory agencies.
- The traffic from the development may also create an additional bottleneck at the State Route 332/County Road 41 which may require wider lanes for left-turn movements. The applicant's traffic study also may indicate the need for a longer traffic signal time to accommodate these movements. The DOT may have associated comments of how a longer signal time would affect traffic flows along State Route 332.
- The intersection of a future Town road (Proposed Road A) connecting traffic movements through the project from lands on the west side of the development to State Route 332 is depicted upon the Town's Major Thoroughfare Overlay District (MTOD) Official Map. The location for the future signalized intersection of Proposed Road A with State Route 332 is at a midpoint between the existing traffic signals on State Route 332 between the County Road 41 intersection and the State Route 332/Farmbrook Drive intersection. This location was selected years ago by the DOT. A redesign of the applicant's site plan is required for this area of the project to comply with the MTOD Official Map. Mr. Cantwell presented a revised site plan that depicts the redesign of this southernmost road (Proposed Road A) at its connection with State Route 332.
- The DOT representative did not look with favor on the development's northernmost entrance road off State Route 332 near County Road 41 because of the short distance involved.
- The DOT representative also was concerned with the left turn movements in the area along County Road 41 between Proposed Road K and the intersection of County Road 41 with State Route 332.
- The PRC also discussed the potential future traffic signal at the future intersection of County Road 41 and Access Road A. It is felt that such an improvement may be required at this location. It was also discussed that a new signalized intersection at this location could interrupt through traffic flow along County Road 41, which in turn could help to alleviate traffic back-ups at the intersection of New Michigan Road and County Road 41 intersection to the west. Mr. Hemminger said that he would like to have a design of the proposed major Town roads associated with this project that will revert the development's internal public roads from

becoming a fast-speed bypass for drivers seeking to avoid the signalized State Route 332/County Road 41 intersection.

- Highway Superintendent Don Giroux indicated the need for traffic calming measures within the development's loop road (Access Road A) off from County Road 41 to prevent motorists from using the development as a cut-through to State Route 332.
- The Town Board has expressed reservations about the number of, and site density shown, for the apartments and would like to see more commercial uses in the southeast portion of the property.
- The 60-foot-wide strip of land between the two developed sites along the west side of State Route 332—the existing medical office and the Mexican restaurant—is not to be used as another point of access from the development onto State Route 332.
- One of the Michigan U-turns on State Route 332 may have to be removed if a traffic signal is installed at the current location for the southernmost access road connection from the development (Proposed Road A) onto State Route 332.
- The Town is not interested in taking ownership of the wooded area around the existing Town-owned Hathaway Cemetery. Portions of the area around the cemetery could potentially be used by the applicant for the relocation of some residential units, thereby reducing the current footprint (density) of townhouses and apartments.
- The Town appreciates the applicant's design which indicates that the southern internal development road (Carmen's Way) is consistent with the MTOD Official Map.
- There is no room on the County Road 41 bridge over Beaver Creek for sidewalks. Therefore, the proposed sidewalk along the south side of County Road 41, which is understood to be placed outside the right-of-way, will need a pedestrian foot bridge crossing of Beaver Creek.
- The PRC did not determine that there was a need for sidewalks in the residential neighborhood to be located within the northwest portion of the development. The PRC felt that because of the proximity of planned sidewalks that are to be installed across the entire length of the site's frontage along County Road 41—from the Auburn Trail to existing sidewalks at State Route 332—that the six lots located within this small neighborhood would be adequately served and that such action would avoid the Town from incurring the on-going costs and responsibility of their maintenance in the neighborhood.

- In response to a concern about the number of apartments in the Town, Mr. Brand reported that the Town Assessor's records over the past 10 years indicate that there has been a total of 113 apartment units (Farmington Gardens = 88, Alloway Estates = 25) constructed in the Town during this period compared to a total of 545 townhouse units (Saratoga Crossings = 295, Collett Woods Phases 2 and 3 = 154) and a total of 513 single-family dwellings constructed throughout the Town during the period.
- The consensus of the PRC—which is reflected in the draft Planning Board Report and Recommendation—is that this application provides the Town with an opportunity to develop this large area consisting of two parcels—an important focal point—by advancing a comprehensive design, as opposed to reacting to individual piecemeal proposals. The application also presents an opportunity to legislatively determine the mix of uses for this property at a density of development that minimizes adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding properties.
- The PRC Clerk provided the minutes of the PRC meeting to Planning Board members and staff prior to the meeting this evening. These PRC minutes will be sent to the Supervisor's office for posting upon the Town website.
- This development requires a 12-inch-diameter water main to be constructed from the south property line (near Carmen's Way) to proposed Access Road A, and then along Access Road A between State Route 332 and County Road 41 to deal with the current water-pressure concerns in the area.
- The Town Water and Sewer Superintendent and the Town Engineer will review the application to determine its impact upon the sewer system. MRB Group—the Town engineering firm—is already studying the sewer trunk line capacity in the area.
- Transportation, the impact of the development upon the water and sewer utilities, and site densities are the major issues associated with this application.
- The dedication of a portion of land (located in the northwest portion of the site) to the Town by the applicant would provide access to enable users of the Auburn Trail to visually see the granite stone culvert bridge crossing of Beaver Creek that is on the abandoned Auburn Railroad line. In addition, there are a number of other access points to the Auburn Trail that are shown from various locations within the proposed development. Finally, one of the amenities being discussed is the clearing of a small portion of the Beaver Creek Park—north of Amber Drive—that would involve stone dust pathway connections to the Auburn Trail, one of which would enable the view of the crossing of Beaver Creek Bridge from the west side.
- In response to public comments about the overall density of the residential component of this development and the number of proposed apartment units, the draft Report and Recommendation provides the following findings: a total of 239 lots

could be constructed on this property within the current R-1-15 residential zone. The applicant is proposing 270 single-family dwellings (including townhouse units). Mr. Hemminger asked about future apartment units that have been proposed in the vicinity of this development. Mr. Brand replied that the Conifer Realty application proposes about 125 units and the Mercier Real Estate application (Home Leasing) proposes about 104 apartment units. The density of the S. B. Ashley application is comparable to the density of the Fairdale Glen development that was constructed about 12 to 15 years ago.

- In response to the impact of this development upon the enrollment of the Victor Central School District, Mr. Stevens was provided with the following data from the school district: For the past six years (2011–2016), the Victor Central School District has experienced a decrease of five students in grades K–12. Enrollment in grades K–3 for this time period has declined by 105 students, an eight-percent decrease. Mr. Brand noted that the school district is providing a different set of statistics than the opinions that have recently been expressed by some residents about the school district enrollment.

Mr. Brand then reviewed the two basic questions associated with the application, i.e., do the existing zoning classifications for this site comply with the land-use recommendations in the Town's *Comprehensive Plan* and would rezoning the site to IZ Incentive Zoning be consistent with the *Comprehensive Plan*'s adopted land use recommendations (see Page 1 of the Report and Recommendation on pp. 9–14 of the minutes).

Mr. Brand noted that a portion of the Limited Industrial-zoned land was no longer needed by the owner for industrial purposes, was sold, and is now part of this application. He also explained that the extensive wooded surrounding the existing Town-owned cemetery is reflected in the future land use plan and that the Incentive Zoning application is consistent with the future plan.

Mr. Brand said that the decision on whether to rezone this property to Incentive Zoning provides the Town's legislative body—the Town Board—with the ability to determine the extent of uses of the property, as opposed to having the Planning Board—an administrative body—make legislative decisions. He said that the Town, since the enactment of the Incentive Zoning provisions, has received benefits of more than \$1 million in improvements to roads, utilities and parkland over the years from several developers who have submitted Incentive Zoning applications that have been approved by the Town Board. It was noted that these amenities to the Town have save town taxpayers significant amounts of money and such action is specifically called for in the adopted *Comprehensive Plan*.

On a revised concept site plan, Mr. Cantwell reviewed the reconfigured southern internal road connection to State Route 332, the redesigned southern commercial component and the reduction of apartment units. He said the number of apartment units have decreased from 88 to 64 units and have been relocated on the site. He explained that these revisions

have been driven by feedback received from the Town Board during the applicant's presentations.

Mr. Cantwell said that the application has been reviewed two times each with the PRC, the Town Board, and now the Planning Board. He said that the Town's process for providing input and feedback is excellent and very extensive. He requested build-out support for the land uses as shown on the current plans in order to provide a basis for the traffic consultant to address the transportation concerns that have been raised during these meetings.

Mr. Cantwell said that the project began as a sense of community from a residential standpoint. With four different housing products, he said that the project is consistent with the diversity of housing which is an objective of the Town's *Comprehensive Plan*. He said that the applicant is trying to respond to the demand of the Town and to have a mix of housing price points and targets. He said that the diversity provides the quality of life that has a sustainable staying-power within a community.

Mr. Cantwell said that this development is primarily residential and that traffic calming measures and green space connectors would help to control the speed of traffic on the interior roads.

He said that the applicant prefers that the area around the Town-owned cemetery remain in private ownership. He said that it would be maintained as part of the overall property maintenance of the development and that the Town would retain ownership of the cemetery itself.

Mr. Cantwell said that at this point the project is being driven as a residential development. He said that the commercial uses would be smaller in scale than what previously had been proposed and would complement the project and the drive-by traffic.

Mr. Hemminger asked about the private internal roads and the roads to be dedicated to the Town. Mr. Cantwell described these on the site plan.

Mr. Hemminger asked about the number of two-story residential apartments in the revised plan. Mr. Cantwell said that there would be approximately 64 two-story residential apartments. He also noted that the revised concept plan would be refined as needed for consistency with the MTOD Official Map regarding the southern access road location onto State Route 332.

Mr. Hemminger said that he likes the revised plan, that it seems less congested and that it addresses most of his issues.

Ms. Neale asked about the existing Town-owned Hathaway Cemetery and the surrounding woods. Mr. Cantwell said that the applicant would not take ownership of the cemetery.

Ms. Neale asked about paths or amenities in the wooded area surrounding the cemetery. Mr. Stevens said that paths would be mowed and maintained, that small brush would be cleared, and that trees would remain to make the wooded area an accessible location.

Mr. Viets asked about the effect of the development upon property tax revenues and about the calculation of the number of residential units that have been proposed. Mr. Cantwell discussed the process that was used to calculate the number of lots. This process includes consideration of the setbacks, existing wetlands and the amount of land required for the internal roads and site improvements. He noted that there are no steep slope areas on the parcel. He also said that the applicant understands that the the number of lots that would be available under the conventional zoning of the property must be calculated in order to establish the baseline and to confirm the Incentive Zoning calculations. Mr. Viets said that these calculations are important for the understanding of the application.

Mr. Viets asked about parking areas for users for users of the Auburn Trail who may wish to access the trail from areas within the development. Mr. Brand said that a trail parking area in the vicinity of Ivory Drive and Carmen's Way near the Cerone property south of this site has been included in the trail capital project plan. Mr. Brabant reviewed the location of this parking area on the plans. Mr. Viets asked if additional parking areas would be provided. Mr. Brand said that additional parking would be available at Mertensia Park—which is about a five-minute walk from the trail entrance on County Road 41—and from prospective parking areas at Beaver Creek Park upon its development. He noted that the goal is to not have non-residents parking within neighborhoods and then using the trail system.

Mr. Bellis expressed concern with the internal loop roads becoming high-speed cut-throughs by motorists traveling from County Road 41 to State Route 332 attempting to avoid the signalized intersection at State Route 332 and County Road 41. Mr. Brand said that the road configurations may change following the results of the traffic study. Mr. Cantwell said that the traffic study may determine that the northernmost internal road onto State Route 332 may be more appropriate as a right-in/right-out access point.

Mr. Bellis asked if any portions of the development would be a gated community. Mr. Stevens said that no portions of the development would be gated and that all roads would be open [to the public].

Mr. Makin said that predictions about increased growth in the Town of Farmington following the near build-out of the Town of Victor and the end of the recession have been correct, especially with the rapid growth in the vicinity of the State Route 96/State Route 332 intersection. He said that the most cogent aspect of this application is its approach to develop this site in a coordinated manner as opposed to a hodge-podge of various applications.

Mr. Hemminger asked if the Planning Board could provide a conceptual report and recommendation to the Town Board but withhold final decisions until the completion of the traffic study. He expressed concern about tying the hands of the Town Board to a particu-

lar layout and site design without the traffic study findings. Mr. Brand said that the layout of the development is expected to change and be refined as the application process moves forward and that the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) would address a number of concerns including the impact on traffic. Mr. Hemminger said that he had no issues with the draft Planning Board Report and Recommendation to the Town Board.

Mr. Makin said that the Town Board indicated at its previous meeting that there could be more of a back-and-forth discussion with the Planning Board as this application moves forward and the Town Board members consider the various impacts of the development.

Mr. Brabant noted that the Planning Board would have the ultimate decision on the layout and site design of the development. He said that the engineering data has not yet been provided and that water, sewer and highway impacts would dictate many of the final design decisions. He said that the Town Board's review is a legislative determination on the Incentive Zoning amenities and the permitted uses on the property and that the Planning Board acts in an administrative role—as it has been charged in the Town Code—to review and approve subdivisions and site plans.

Mr. Brand said that this application is a major change from the original Psyllos application for this property which called for big-box stores and a large—almost regional-scale—commercial site.

Mr. Giroux said that his concerns are: 1) the need for traffic-calming measures; 2) adequate size of the proposed cul-de-sacs for turning and access for the Town snowplows; and 3) water retention areas sized to maintain—if not improve—run-off rates, and that regulated stormwater runoff that would not adversely affect properties located downstream. He encouraged the applicant to consider rain gardens and the use of pervious materials to address and regulate the runoff.

From the audience, Mr. Parks, expressed concerns about the density of the development and the transportation issues that have been discussed. He said that the development as proposed calls for 119 more residential housing units than would be permitted under the current zoning. He said that these additional housing units could bring upward of about 200 more vehicles to the site and the adjacent roads. Mr. Parks said that the traffic study will be important and that the development would bring much more traffic to the area than people realize.

Mr. Parks—who is a member of the Victor Central School District Board of Education—asked about the school district enrollment figures cited by Mr. Brand. Mr. Stevens said that he received these figures today from the Victor Central School District office. Mr. Parks said that he would confirm them.

Mr. Parks said that the Victor Central School District is a destination district to which parents want to send their children. He suggested that the comparative school district data included in the applicant's presentation to the Town Board be revised to provide data specifically from other destination school districts. Mr. Stevens said that the school dis-

tract data that was provided are from identical developments that are owned and operated by the S. B. Ashley Company. He said that this data provides a good foundation from which to begin the review of the impact of the development upon the school district. Mr. Parks said that accurate data from comparable destination school districts would be more important in the Planning Board's review.

From the audience, Mr. Sandore said that he had no comments or questions this evening.

Mr. Brand said that a draft resolution has been prepared for the Planning Board's consideration this evening.

Mr. Viets expressed concern about the density of the development if several of the internal roads have to be increased in width or length because of the prospective traffic study. Mr. Cantwell said that the diversity of housing on the site would help to address the traffic concerns. He noted, for example, that not everyone living in the development would be leaving for work and returning home at the same hour.

Mr. Makin said that a Planning Board application is a snapshot in time on what is saleable today. Mr. Stevens said that his company responds to the market, owns the properties and builds for a long-term commitment. He said that the company seeks to build and meet a long-term demand for its product.

Mr. Cantwell said that this project is a response to the current market and appeal of these types of residential housing units. In comparison, he noted that about 500 to 600 rental apartment units have been constructed in the Town of Perinton in Monroe County in just the last year alone.

There were no further comments or questions on this application this evening.

Mr. Makin then asked the clerk to read aloud the following resolution:

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN BOARD
S. B. ASHLEY INCENTIVE ZONING PROJECT**

APPLICANT: S. B. Ashley Management Corporation (attention: Mark Stevens), 700 Powers Building, 16 West Main Street, Rochester, N.Y. 14614

ACTION: Report and Recommendation of the Planning Board: Request for rezoning approximately 130 acres of land located along the west side of State Route 332 and the south side of County Road 41 from GB General Business, LI Limited Industrial and R-1 15 Residential to IZ Incentive Zoning—the S. B. Ashley Incentive Zoning Project

WHEREAS, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as Planning Board), has received a draft report and recommendation from the Town Director of Planning and Development upon this rezoning Action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has received testimony at the July 19, 2017, and August 2, 2017, Planning Board meetings upon this proposed rezoning Action and the subsequent intent to develop 88 two-story apartments for lease (11 buildings with 8 apartments in each building), 60 two-story townhomes with one-car garage for lease, 76 one-story ranch townhomes with two-car garage for lease (22 buildings with three to four units per building), 54 single-family detached villa homes for sale (approximately 10,000-square-foot lots), 84 single-family homes for sale (approximately 12,000-square-foot lots on a Town-dedicated road, a commercial component, and other site related improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has, by Resolution #318 of 2017 (July 11, 2017), requested the Planning Board to prepare a report and to make a recommendation upon said rezoning Action.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board does hereby accept the attached Report and Recommendation, dated August 2, 2017, and directs it to be submitted to the Town Board, for its consideration at their August 8, 2017, meeting.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Board directs copies of this resolution be provided to: Mark Stevens, S. B. Ashley Management Corporation; Robert J. Cantwell, R.L.A., BME Associates; the Farmington Town Clerk; the Town Highway and Parks Superintendent; the Town Water and Sewer Superintendent; the Town Director of Planning and Development; the Town Code Enforcement Officer; and the Town Engineering Firm, MRB Group, D.P.C.

PLANNING BOARD REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

TO: Farmington Town Board

FROM: Farmington Planning Board

DATE: August 2, 2017

RE: Report and recommendation on the request for rezoning approximately 130 acres of land, located along the west side of State Route 332 and the south side of County Road 41, from GB General Business, LI Limited Industrial and R-1-15 Residential to IZ Incentive Zoning – the S. B. Ashley Incentive Zoning Project.

In response to Town Board Resolution # 318 of 2017, dated July 11, 2017, the Planning Board has prepared this advisory report; and makes the following recommendation upon the above referenced action in accordance with the provisions contained in Chapter 165, Section 34.1. H. of the Town Code.

Report

There are two basic questions associated with the above referenced rezoning action. First, do the existing zoning classifications for this site comply with the land use recommendations contained in the adopted 2011 Edition of the *Town of Farmington Comprehensive Plan* (hereinafter referred to as the Plan)? The answer, for the most part, is yes. The exceptions are the Plan Map Number 10, Future Land Use Map (hereinafter referred to as the Plan Map), envisions a mix of GB General Business (a much larger area than the current strip along the west side of State Route 332) and Residential Single Family (10,000–20,000 square foot lots) in the western portion of the proposed incentive zoning site. This density is different than the current R-1-15 (15,000 square foot lots). The Plan Map also does not distinguish Residential Multi-Family (apartments) types of land use. The Plan Map further recommends continued LI Limited Industrial use of the Hansen Steel lands along the south side of County Road 41, while the proposed IZ Concept has reduced the size of these lands to half their size. Finally, the Plan Map identifies a portion of the site's wooded area around the Hathaway Cemetery, which the proposed IZ Incentive Zoning design is proposing to remain as open space. The level of detail shown on the proposed incentive zoning map is much greater than the generic land use mix shown on the adopted Plan Map. The Planning Board finds, that for the most part, the proposed incentive zoning map is consistent with the adopted Plan Map.

The second question is, would rezoning the site to IZ Incentive Zoning be consistent with the Plan's adopted land use recommendations. The Planning Board finds that the proposed rezoning and planned development of the entire site in a manner such as shown on the incentive zoning plan would be consistent with the purpose contained in Chapter 165, Section 34.1, of the Town Code in that the project advances the Town's specific physical, cultural and social policies in accordance with the Town's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Board feels that having one overall plan providing a mix of dwelling units for the distinct residential neighborhoods does meet the Plan's Housing and Residential Land Use Goal . . . "To promote the availability of diverse, high quality and attractive places for people to live."

The Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) further finds that without the proposed rezoning there would likely be frontage developments of the commercial strip of land along the west side of State Route 332. Such pattern of commercial development would be piecemeal and, at best, fragmented/unrelated. The Board further finds that without IZ Incentive Zoning there would likely be piecemeal commercial and limited industrial types of strip frontage development of the lands along the south side of County Road 41 near the intersection of State Route 332. The Board further finds that without rezoning there would likely be difficulty obtaining access to and improved public visibility of the historic Hathaway Cemetery. The Board further finds that it is preferred to address all of the proposed commercial uses of the site at one time, in a comprehensive manner, to avoid segmentation of the adverse impacts upon the environment associated with separate actions. The Board further finds that incentive zoning of the site avoids the potential of a number of special permitted land uses being requested as is otherwise allowed under the current GB General Business District. Those special permitted uses do

not have specific criteria listed in the Town Code for approving such uses. The Planning Board feels that such decisions should be a legislative decision, such as associated with the incentive rezoning, and not an administrative decision to be made by the Planning board.

The Planning Board further finds that another benefit associated with the above referenced rezoning action is that the proposed Incentive Zoning does complement other goals, objectives and policies contained in the Plan? The answer is yes. For example, the adopted Plan contains a specific implementation objective (page 3–13) that reads . . . “Have developers pay for a fair share of the off-site infrastructure costs resulting from new development, based upon a cost/benefit analysis, which would otherwise be borne wholly by the Town.” To accomplish this objective the Plan recommends that the Town should . . . “Consider the enactment of incentive zoning to enable the Town to receive off-site infrastructure costs in exchange for site amenities provided for under Town Law.”

The Planning Board finds that the proposed project does appear to provide a balance in equity between the incentives being requested and the amenities being offered. Amenities, in this instance, that the incentive zoning plan provides greenways along the site’s many stream corridors, promotes important open spaces and historic resources such as the Hathaway Cemetery, and includes additional points of access to the Auburn Trail. It protects and promotes high-quality scenic areas such as the historic stone arch railroad bridge for the Auburn Trail crossing over Beaver Creek. It makes significant contributions to identified public works improvements such as over-sized water mains, connections to highway improvements identified on the MTOD Official Map and parkland improvements (i.e., in the adjacent Auburn Meadows Tract) which are in excess of that necessitated by separate projects developing in this area. Finally, the Planning Board finds that the proposed incentive zoning project provides a more desirable environment than what would be possible through the strict application of existing zoning regulations.

Finally, in response to the public comments that have been made about the overall density of the residential dwellings, especially the number of apartment units in this project, the Planning Board has looked into the proposed residential densities and makes the following findings:

1. The portion of the site now zoned R-1-15 Residential finds a total of 239 lots could be constructed in this area. The total number of single family dwellings (includes townhouse units) being proposed is 270.
2. The total number of proposed apartments is 88.
3. According to the Town Assessor’s records over the past ten years there has been a total of 113 apartment units (Farmington Gardens [88] and Alloway Estates [25]) constructed in the Town of Farmington, compared to a total of 545 townhouse units (295 townhouses in Saratoga Crossings and 154 townhouses in Collett

Woods (Phases 2 and 3), and a total of 513 single family dwellings constructed throughout the Town.

The Planning Board has reviewed the concept plan for the incentive zoning for this project and finds that the density of apartment units appears consistent with the density of other recently approved apartment units. The Planning Board finds that there may be some confusion between an apartment unit (which is considered multi-family) and townhouse units (which are single family dwellings). The Planning Board finds that there is a total of 136 townhouse units proposed for this project (both rental and owner occupied). While the incentive zoning drawing does show a concentration of townhouse units the density shown is similar to that approved for the Fairdale Glen Townhouse Project years ago.

Recommendation

The Board, based upon its review of the documentation submitted at the July 19th meeting, the presentation made by the applicant, Mark Stevens, of the S. B Ashley Group; Lincoln Swedrock, of the B.M.E. Associates, the Project Engineers; and the review of the draft meeting minutes of the June 7th and July 28th Project Review Committee Meeting minutes; makes the following recommendations to the Town Board:

1. The Board recommends that the Town Board be satisfied that there is indeed a balance of equity being provided by the applicant, in the form of site amenities, that is comparable to the increased value that the applicant is likely to expect from the development of this site in the manner being proposed by the incentive zoning design over the conventional design that is otherwise allowed by the GB General Business District, the LI Limited Industrial District and the R-1-15 Residential District regulations. Among the factors to be considered when making such a balance of equity are the costs associated with the Town having to maintain public streets, utilities, and sidewalks verses having a portion of these costs maintained by an established homeowners' association.
2. The Board endorses the proposed 12-inch looped water main system that is being offered, as an amenity with this request for rezoning, finding it is indeed a benefit to the community's water supply and fire protection as it is sized larger than the 8-inch water main normally required to serve separate individual sites within this area. The Board also finds that the Town's Water and Sewer Superintendent has identified this need for the 12-inch water main running through the project and along the south side of County Road 41 that is to be connected with the 12-inch water main ending on County Road 41 at the intersection of New Michigan Road.
3. The Board recommends the Town Board take action to formally consider the requested zoning amendments of this large portion of land that will complement the MTOD Official Map that has recently been amended and is reflected with this application.

- 4. The Board finds that there are a number of specific site design concerns that have been identified by the members of the Town’s PRC, the representatives of the County Departments of Planning and Highway, as well as the New York State Department of Transportation. All of whose input are made in the betterment of the health, safety and general welfare of the community.

The Planning Board appreciates this opportunity to review and comment upon this most important project at this early stage in the rezoning process. The Board’s recommendations are intended for the Town Board’s consideration. Should the Town Board have any concerns with the content of this report, or the Planning Board’s recommendations please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Scott Makin, Chairperson
Town of Farmington Planning Board

- c: Farmington Town Clerk
Farmington Town Highway and Parks Superintendent
Farmington Water and Sewer Superintendent
Farmington Director of Planning & Development
Farmington Conservation Board
Farmington Code Enforcement Officer
Farmington Construction Inspector
Farmington Town Engineers, MRB Group, D.P.C., Attn: Lance Brabant, CPESC
Greg Trost, Assistant Resident Engineer, NYSDOT Region 4 Office, Ontario County
Emily Smith, P.E., Fisher Associates, Auburn Trail Engineering Firm
Tim McElligott, P.E., Ontario County Department of Public Works
Regina Sousa, Senior Planner, Ontario County Department of Planning

Mr. Viets asked about the specific figures of the residential units and structures that are included in the Planning Board’s resolution. Mr. Makin and Mr. Brand said that these figures may change as the application moves through the process with the Town Board and the various State and local agencies that would participate in the review process.

■ A motion was made by MS. NEALE, seconded by MR. HEMMINGER, that the preceding resolution and Planning Board Report and Recommendation to the Town Board be approved.

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Scott Makin	Aye
Mary Neale	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

Director of Development and Planning:

Mr. Brand commented on the following topics:

- The partial Letter of Credit release for MiniTec Framing Systems is not ready for Planning Board action. This will be included on the agenda for the meeting on August 16, 2017.
- No further action is expected on the Final Site Plan application for the DiFelice Industrial Complex on the southwest corner of Collett Road and Hook Road until review and approval of the Planning Board's requests by the applicant (Primo DiFelice).
- The Farmington fire department conducted a test of fire apparatus clearance at the driveway underpass at the Finger Lakes Hotel on Loomis Road. Photographs of the fire department's largest vehicle were presented in hard copy and distributed via e-mail to Planning Board members and staff. The photographs indicate that the clearance of the truck is tight. This will be discussed when the applicant returns to the Planning Board on August 16, 2017.
- A Letter of Credit is being prepared by the applicant for Redfield Grove, Section 1.
- The Ontario County Planning Board is now reviewing the Conifer Real Estate rezoning application of a 15.9-acre parcel of land south of County Road 41 and west of Running Brook Road from PD Planned Development to RMF Residential Multi-Family.
- Upcoming meetings:
 - Monday, August 14, 2017:* Town Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting with a representative of the Finger Lakes Land Trust on Purchase of Development Rights and Transfer of Development Rights agreements
 - Tuesday, August 15, 2017:* Town Solar Regulations Advisory Committee meeting.
- Mr. Brand noted that an inquiry has been received about construction of a drive-in theater in the Town. No details are available at this time.
- Bridge design details are being finalized for the crossings of Beaver Creek from trails in the Monarch Manor and Auburn Meadows subdivisions.
- Mr. Brand noted that the next meeting of the Planning Board on August 16, 2017, should be held at the new Town Hall facility.

Highway Superintendent:

Mr. Giroux reported that the second phase of the Mertensia Road improvement project is progressing well. He said that topsoil has been installed and will be seeded, and that final paving and road striping remains to be completed.

Town Engineer:

Mr. Brabant reported that the Town Board adopted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the MTOD Official Map on July 25, 2017. He said that hard copies of these would be distributed to the Town staff and that PDF files would be provided for posting upon the Town website.

Mr. Brabant also reported that MRB Group worked with the Town on the preparation of the \$1.9 million grant application for Phase 1 of the Beaver Creek Park development. The application deadline was July 28th. Mr. Brand reported that the grant application received strong support from residents of the Auburn Meadows, Estates at Beaver Creek and Monarch Manor subdivisions.

Planning Board Members' Comments:

Mr. Hemminger commended the Town Board for funding the clerk's time to attend and provide minutes at the monthly Project Review Committee meetings. He said that the minutes are informative and helpful to the Planning Board in obtaining details on the applications that come before the board.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

■ A motion was made MR. HEMMINGER, seconded by MR. BELLIS, that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion carried by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Planning Board will be held at the Farmington Town Hall, 1000 County Road 8, Farmington, N.Y. 14425, on Wednesday, August 16, 2017, at 7:00 p.m.

Following the meeting, Mr. Giroux secured the building.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Robortella L.S.
Clerk of the Farmington Planning Board