

# Town of Farmington

1000 County Road 8  
Farmington, New York 14425

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, October 6, 2021 • 7:00 p.m.**

## **MINUTES—APPROVED**

*The following minutes are written as a summary of the main points that were made and are the official and permanent 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.*

---

The meeting was conducted at the Farmington Town Hall and via Zoom video conference.

**Board Members Present:** Edward Hemminger, *Chairperson*  
Adrian Bellis  
Timothy DeLucia  
Aaron Sweeney  
Douglas Viets

**Staff Present at the Town Hall:**  
Ronald L. Brand, Town of Farmington Director of Development and Planning  
Dan Delpriore, Town of Farmington Code Enforcement Officer  
Don Giroux, Town of Farmington Highway and Parks Superintendent

**Applicants Present at the Town Hall:**  
Joe Dora, CountryMax Stores, CountryMax Support Center, 6290 State Route 96,  
Victor, N.Y. 14564  
Edward Parrone, P.E., Parrone Engineering, 349 West Commercial Street, Suite 3200,  
East Rochester, N.Y. 14445  
Brad Payne, CountryMax Stores, CountryMax Support Center, 6290 State Route 96,  
Victor, N.Y. 14564  
Don Payne, CountryMax Stores, CountryMax Support Center, 6290 State Route 96,  
Victor, N.Y. 14564  
Jim Stathopoulos, G&A Development and Construction Corporation, 101 North Street,  
Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424  
Matt Tomlinson, CPESC, Marathon Engineering, 39 Cascade Drive, Rochester, N.Y. 14614

**Applicant Present via Zoom Video Conference:**  
Bobby Marchenese, Auto Wash, P.O. Box 451, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424

**Others Present at the Town Hall:**

First Assistant Chief Herb Hartman, Farmington Volunteer Fire Association

**Others Present via Zoom Video Conference:**

None/unidentified

**1. MEETING OPENING**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Edward Hemminger.

Mr. Hemminger said the meeting would be conducted according to the Rules of Procedure approved by the Planning Board on January 20, 2021.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2021**

■ A motion was made by MR. DELUCIA, seconded by MR. SWEENEY, that the minutes of the September 15, 2021, meeting be approved.

Motion carried by voice vote.

**3. LEGAL NOTICE**

None.

**4. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION**

**PB #0801-21                      Continued Preliminary Subdivision Application**

**Name:**                                      G&A Development and Construction Corporation, c/o Jim Stathopoulos, 101 North Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424

**Location:**                                      West side of State Route 332, south of State Route 96

**Zoning District:**                              GB General Business, MTOD Major Thoroughfare Overlay District, MSOD Main Street Overlay District

**Request:**                                      Preliminary Three-Lot Re-Subdivision Plat approval of land, identified as Tax Map Accounts 29.00-1-19.110 and 29.00-1-20.110 containing a total of 9.976 acres of land; and as further to be identified as Preliminary Re-Subdivision Plat Map for Lot #R-1, #R-2 and #R-3, G&A Development & Construction Corporation. The proposed Action involves creating Lot #R-1 consisting of 7.384 acres, Lot #R-2 consisting of 1.019 acres, and Lot #R-3 consisting

of 1.573 acres. Lot #R-1 and Lot #R-2 are to remain vacant as non-approved building lots requiring site plan approval before any Building Permits may be issued. Lot #R-3 is partially developed with an existing building and related site improvements known as Farmington Commons Plaza.

This application was reviewed by the Project Review Committee (PRC) on May 7, 2021; July 2, 2021; August 6, 2021; and September 3, 2021 (brief PRC discussion).

The Public Hearing on this application was opened on August 4, 2021; reconvened on September 1, 2021; and continued to the meeting this evening (October 6, 2021).

On August 4, 2021, the Planning Board classified this application as a Type II Action under the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) regulations.

Mr. Hemminger reconvened the Public Hearing on this application.

Mr. Tomlinson (Marathon Engineering) and Mr. Stathopoulos (G&A Development and Construction Corporation) presented this application.

(6:07) Mr. Tomlinson: Good evening everyone, Matt Tomlinson, Marathon Engineering, joined by Jim Stathopoulos who is the owner of the plaza. We have been before this board a couple of times before and I believe that the board also received a letter from us acknowledging that we don't anticipate any type of approval today and requesting continuation until the November meeting. We are working on revised plans addressing Town engineer and staff comments, but as part of the PRC meeting—which Jerry Goldman was part of the design team, and couldn't be here tonight, attended this past Friday—there were several questions or comments raised that had a significant impact to our mind to the hopeful preliminary approval that we want to obtain on November 3rd, so [we] wanted to take the opportunity to appear before you again tonight, talk through some of those things, hopefully give you folks an understanding of what we're proposing as well as get a better feel from the board's perspective on the items that would like to be addressed or completed within that preliminary application.

(7:10) Mr. Tomlinson: Since we appeared before this board, previous, we had made application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a side setback variance. That's one of the items that we requested feedback from this board last time we were here. We had proposed—and what's shown on this version of the rendering—a front setback variance as well as a side setback variance. The Zoning Board had previously approved a 280-a variance for no direct access out to the street. So, we revised the plan and had submitted a plan to the Zoning Board with the credit union slid back away from the road in order to comply with the 100-foot setback required by the MTOD overlay and still reflecting the requested side setback. The Zoning Board of Appeals did grant that side setback variance and again, that's part of the reason why we've been delayed coming back to this board, because that had an impact on the layout and the subdivision dimensions if that was not successful.

(8:13) Mr. Tomlinson: So that brings us today, and, a, what I wanted to show you folks is the updated rendering, the building slid back to the 100 feet, still representing the side setback that we did obtain the variance from. There were a couple of conditions including fencing and compliance with ATM safety lighting as part of that from the Zoning Board, so you'll see that reflected in the revised package. I'm going to touch on a couple of the questions that I know are outstanding from the Planning Board Chair relative to some of the circulation and some curb work on the front side, touch briefly on the Main Street overlay district items that we believe need to be addressed, and then I want to turn it over to the board for some of the dialogue of some other items that either I'm not aware of or that the board would like to raise. So . . .

(9:02) Mr. Hemminger: Give me just a second to explain to everybody what I did. You probably saw my comments. I sent in an initial set of comments which basically concerned more of the rear access and the right-of-way, those types of things; and then I sent a follow-up email that highlighted some of the streetscape and MTOD requirements, knowing that the applicant was going to look at the streetscape and MTOD guidelines and comply with them completely, but I just wanted to highlight some of things that certainly I would be looking at. So, and my comments on the rear of the building had to do a lot with house-keeping and some other things, but also that it was my understanding that there was a cross access easement across the back parking lot to 96. So, that's kind of where we started. I just wanted to make sure everybody was on the same sheet of music and it generated some of my comments, and some of them, you know, might be overkill, but at least I wanted to get them on the record, and to help you out because I wanted you to come back, to be able to—instead of coming in and then having me hit you with the questions, and then go back, and go back and forth. It doesn't make any sense to do it that way, so. OK?

(10:25) Mr. Tomlinson: Yes, and that's what we're prepared to discuss today. I'm going to start with the Main Street Overlay District. There is sidewalk, and we've talked about this with the board when we first came in, along Route 96, there's landscaping, there's benches and, you know, a small pocket park at the intersection that's been installed previously. It's our understanding that while there may be a couple of trash receptacles and/or benches required along Route 96, in addition to what's already presented or provided at the corner, that the main improvement, if you will, missing in order to upgrade the frontage along 96 is lighting along that sidewalk area, and that is something that we understand wants to be provided as part of first phase here, with the credit union, and it's our understanding that we'll stay within the guidelines, work with the Town engineer. We're not proposing to remove any of the pavements for the drive aisles runs, so some of the buffering or other requirements—we'll work with the Town on how to accomplish that, but essentially I believe that's grandfathered in, given, you know, the placement of the plaza which is not where it would be if we were coming in with a new build right now.

(11:30) Mr. Tomlinson: That being said, from a circulation standpoint, and that's really where I want to spend much of the time. We know, and have discussed with this board previously that, you know, the remaining development of this parcel is a TBD and a concept plan was submitted, both layout and utility wise, to demonstrate the potential viability to it. We recognize that what's shown here—if it was to be developed exactly this way—

would require variances, approvals through this board—same process that we’re going through with the credit union. The big hang-up on that—the issue that everyone knows is available—is traffic. Right? So we have submitted a traffic study. We’ve gotten feedback from State DOT. Basically if we build a shed that has one car that pulls up to it we have to do some mitigation and a lot of that is going to be tied in conjunction with items that we don’t have any control over which includes development off of our property. And, the developer has committed to working with the Town, working the adjacent owner for that future development, but because we can’t forecast that future—that’s where we are today.

(12:51) Mr. Tomlinson: And so, from a circulation and what is present out on the site today, ALDI was originally—this piece of land—was originally owned by Jim and his family, as well, and now it’s been sold off to a separate owner, but as part of that easements were put in place for cross access throughout the existing driveways on the site. So, some of the comments really related to cutting off—because this is no longer intended to be the main access point for a common drive or roadway, and that is now going to be handled by the extension of Mercier Road out to 96 further to the west. That driveway configuration really does not work anymore for what’s happening now, and that was a comment that was raised by the State DOT, reinforced by feedback from Town staff.

(13:44) Mr. Tomlinson: So, as part of Phase 1, it’s been requested that we close off—and I’m going to zoom in just a little bit here, if I can—close off, right now, the configuration considered a roadway which was started here, that would split or straddle the property line all the way through. That’s no longer being contemplated. And there was a driveway cut here, and a driveway cut here. The one at the rear facilitates the larger trucks—the deliveries—that kind of traffic that proceeds. You can see, there’s a truck likely making a delivery right now. And, this was more intended for the passenger vehicles and allowing access into the plaza. As we all know, Route 96 is a busy intersection. That intersection has been there for a while. Right now, it’s not, or it was not, originally designed for two exiting lanes with left turn–right turn. And during busy times there’s back-up from the light, there is hold-up if somebody is trying take a left there, et cetera. And, part of that is also exacerbated by, if somebody pulls in and is trying to take a left there, when there’s queuing or back up, there’s very limited queuing in that driveway. So, one of the requests was to close that off and to allow for roughly three to four more vehicles worth of stacking and queuing that exit at that driveway, which I think makes an awful lot of sense.

(15:11) Mr. Tomlinson: Some of the questions that were raised is, well, where is the cross access easement present on this parcel? And so, just so the board knows, there is an easement which is intended to follow—slightly off the pavement here—but essentially rings the entirety of the plaza and all of the other drive aisles throughout, and also was extended in anticipation of future connection to that roadway on the west side of the parcel. I believe that it’s going to be the most straightforward for Jim and for his dealing with his tenants, and everyone else in the future, to remove those easements and just provide a blanket cross access easement that covers the entirety of all the properties so that—if drive aisles move—depending on what happens with the future development, that kind of thing, that question kind of goes away, because wherever the drive aisles are, people that are tenants or clients are going to have the right to drive over that. But we’ll work through the detail in the future.

(16:17) Mr. Tomlinson: So, the intention of closing this is not to force or change traffic patterns. Right now, if somebody wants to drive through the rear of this in order to access Burger King or ALDI coming in from here, that's a straight shot and will essentially remain a straight shot coming through, that through there. We do need to provide a back-up [?] to this plaza. Jim has many tenants in that plaza. It's been very successful and it is a busy plaza at times, especially during busier times for the Coffee Roasters in the morning, other tenants that he's got in there. So, from a traffic circulation standpoint, what this is going to do is clean up that—we're intending to provide a directional sign that directs plaza tenants here deliveries to the rear. We also anticipate providing stop control which would not allow folks to whip through here. Put a stop bar in—stop signage—in order to accommodate that. This intersection would also stop—entering vehicles will be allowed to free flow in. So, I know that there's also been some questions about traffic calming—could speed bumps be put in? But we believe that we can do that with some crosswalk striping, some stop bars, some stop signs. And, you know, ultimately this is a self-policed area. How well? But Jim can deal with that with his tenants on an as-needed basis and continue to think about those things as we develop the rest of the lot. Right now, there's limited driveway cuts, limited vehicles turning onto these stretches, and so it does allow people to get up to speed without having to worry about somebody coming to an intersection. That hopefully is going to change as we continue to develop this property.

(18:11) Mr. Tomlinson: So, I know there are some other questions or comments about providing some crosswalk striping. I understand that there is some question about some trash receptacles possibly along the rear of the plaza. Jim is aware of that and going to talk about moving them into the enclosures. As part of the future development of this, we do anticipate having to take a hard look at the loading for that, to make sure that it works for the tenants if and when some of these other changes proceed. We also anticipate that that would result in the relocation of these trash enclosures, as well. So, we'll work through all that portion in the interim. Phase 1—we do understand the concern up here—curbing, striping, directional signage. We are committed to putting that in as part of Phase 1 and think that that will alleviate a lot of the questions or comments that you had, Ed, about what's happening with the plaza itself. Okay? If there are code violations—things with trash that the Town's seeing—please let Jim know. He'll talk to his tenants and he'll take care of it. We can handle it kind of outside the site plan comments, if needed, but we can talk about that. So, I think with that relative to some items about snow storage, again, crosswalks, we want to understand where you're looking for those. We can see if we can accommodate that in the grand scheme of things, here. Hopefully, it will address some of the questions I can answer.

(19:44) Mr. Hemminger: Yeah, I think you did. To me, there's issues with driving along the back, especially when you're loading and unloading. We just need to have some kind of a delivery concept of how you're going to deliver so that you're not going to bring a tractor trailer in there and block the whole back easement. Certainly, they cannot come through the front. Nobody really wants to drive through the front all the way through with all the backing. Trust me, I've done it a million times. So, you know, we just need to that. I think the trash receptacle thing needs to be looked at. You probably need another enclosure down farther, the other end. That one that's sitting there—just enclose it. Clean up

those things a little bit as we look at things. Make sure that your tenants aren't storing a bunch of stuff on the back. We know there'll be some stuff. We know there'll be deliveries. But we can't have a bunch of trash and trash cans and stuff like that along the back if we're going to have more traffic in the back, which we are. So, I just think those were general comments to try to get everybody thinking about the bigger picture here. Because a lot of times when applicants come in they forget that this is our opportunity to bring everything up to code and up to our standards, with a lot of things, because this has been there forever, you know, and we understand that. So I think it's important that—you know, my comment about having a cross marking to get to the trash—that's probably overkill—but my thought pattern there was pretty simple. When you've got people zipping down through there, if you do that, then maybe they'll think a little bit so somebody bringing trash out won't get hit. That was my thought pattern on that. It's just more from a safety thing. I think you're going to need—you're going to need a crosswalk coming across into the plaza on the west side there and striped so that people can come on a far west closer to the entrance. You know, down in there. So from 96 in, so that way, you'll just get some—because people are not going to walk all the way down to the center to come in on there. They're going to walk across the grass, or whatever.

(21:50) Mr. Hemminger: And, the curbing I was really most concerned about is the roadway—in front right there, the roadway right in there. If you go in there today, I just was there today, people have driven off in the mud puddles.

(22:04) Mr. Bellis: It's narrow. It's very narrow.

(22:06) Mr. Hemminger: It's narrow to start with, but it's—and without the curbs there, people are going into the mud puddles and they're rutting up the sides of the road. People are going to fall in there and, you know, have a mess. So, I think you've got the curbing a little ways. You just need to include—continue it all the way to ALDI's, or the ALDI's piece, and make sure on the inside.

(22:25) Mr. Tomlinson: So, we'd like to talk about the curbing a little bit.

(22:28) Mr. Hemminger. Okay.

(22:29) Mr. Tomlinson: We are proposing it on the interior side, that's the [?] Burger King look and everything else. Along the east side of that drive, that road is designed without drainage and it sheet flows into the roadside swales and the lawn area. So, when we start talking about adding curbing, which I think would be an issue here, you've got to dig up the road, put in storm. There really isn't a place to take it because it all goes across the road right now. Our intention would be to leave that uncurbed—easier for snow plowing. It is narrow—it would need to be widened to put a curb in there to the Town's constraint. And so, it's very similar . . .

(23:05) Mr. Hemminger: How are you going to keep from running into mud puddles?

(23:10) Mr. Tomlinson: Well, that's one of the things that we'll look, at either gravel or a shoulder on there to clean that up. So, I'll work with Jim on it. I mean—his—we want to make the front of this look right. And I know there's a been a comment about some of the pavement condition. We're going to be in there, paving. We'll be striping. I don't think that those things are any type of issue that we'll have a problem addressing as we move this forward.

(23:33) Mr. Hemminger: Yeah, even if you did cuts in there to let the water go through or something. I just think curbing makes more sense in the long run.

(23:39) Mr. Stathopoulos: I'd like to bring up, Mr. Chairman, a couple of things. The trash receptacles—I think we're on our fourth set of gates for the trash receptacles. We've had discussions with tenants. We've hounded them to try and keep things out of the back of the plaza. Originally, when we were here 30 years ago, it was intended to sort of be like a four-sided front. There really wasn't a front, *per se*. So, and we've had other issues where people would come in there, they see it's convenient, and they come in the dead of night, so now we've got cameras and they come in there and throw couches, other garbage inside there, they destroy. We've been trying to figure out a solution for that. We'll work with the Town staff to do that.

(24:24) Mr. Stathopoulos: You also mentioned the traffic calming, like the speed bumps. We had those in there probably 10 or 15 years ago.

(24:28) Mr. Hemminger: I remember that, out front, right?

(24:30) Mr. Stathopoulos: Yes, they would do pass around, or the snow plows would get in there and they would destroy them. It was challenging. We can certainly try to figure that out again.

(24:43) Mr. Hemminger: I don't know what the answer to that is, to be honest with you. I mean, if you don't put curbing there, you got to come up with another solution so people aren't running off into the grass and mud, and make a helluva mess out there. It's a mess right now. I don't know how deep those puddles are. But I could see the ruts in there, that they're probably six–eight inches deep. People run off the edge of the road on there with a little car, that's not going to be a good thing. So, I think you need to come up with something there. As for the front of the plaza, and putting curbing in there, you probably don't need that. I will tell you, though, I was there today and I saw a guy backing a truck up back onto the grass and he pulled forward, so they're going to tear it up eventually. But that's just more of a—you know—to protect you, your property there. Again, my comments were more—we're going to be looking at pretty strong and hard, especially in the back, and work with staff and certainly work with me. Okay, we'll turn it over to staff. Ron?

(25:54) Mr. Brand: Since the opportunity is here, I think there's a couple of things. The Zoning Board of Appeals put some conditions on the variances that were granted. One of them is—they want some core testing of that existing roadway to see what it's comprised of, because it was put in a number of years ago. As Jim said here tonight, 30 years ago. It



may not withstand today's standards, especially for some of our heavy fire apparatus that has to access that area. So that's something that we're going to be looking for—the results of that are and how it affects that drainage patterns that you have. It shouldn't be, when you have the site developed, any runoff from the site across that driveway because of the MS4 Program. So, I want you keep that mind when you start thinking about not putting in curb.

(27:19) Mr. Brand: The other point that I want to just stress here is that the concept plan for the build out of this site, which I know is not something that you're necessarily looking at but if it's not addressed now, when it does become an issue, somebody will say well why didn't you bring it up? Okay, and that is I would never ever want to see this driveway road go in front of that plaza. Okay? It has to go around in back of that plaza. The parking configurations that you have there in front of the plaza right now are dangerous enough that we don't need large tractor trailer trucks or other vehicles going through that area—people trying get through that area to exit Route 96. So I will—if I'm still here—fight very strongly against that design that you have on that concept plan, and Jim, you can take that to the bank, or whoever you want to take it to.

(28:33) Mr. Stathopoulos: Can you clarify that, Mr. Brand? I guess I'm not understanding where you're talking about, actually, I want it clear my head, that's all. I hear what you're saying.

(28:42) Mr. Brand: You know how the existing alignment is where it curves off and you have people slowing down and making the turn? Your concept plan shows it going straight across there. That's not going to happen. Okay? The other thing that I would ask the Planning Board to think about is yes, we do have MSOD regulations. Those do call for benches. They do call for trash receptacles, and things of this nature. This site is somewhat unique. We've had the Chamber of Commerce go in there, John Malvaso has done—with Jim's blessing—extensive improvements creating a very attractive pocket park. I'd like you to take that into consideration when you think about how useful additional benches or things of this nature along 96 might be. My final comments address the issue that Matt has brought up and that is the two access points to the driveway that goes out to Route 96 on the west edge of the property. They don't meet today's MTOD standards. The one in the rear does. The one upfront doesn't. And the other thing that I would like to ask: is that perhaps if that area is closed off, then it might be more conducive to a sidewalk so that people walking along the sidewalk could go directly toward the plaza in that area without having vehicles interfere with that movement. So that's my sum and substance tonight. I think, that this is a very prominent—I'll call it a cornerstone. And Ontario County is always harping on us to maintain this gateway. It's a very valuable piece of property. I think it's got a tremendous potential. And I think that over the years a lot of things have been done by others for this site, such as the State DOT putting in sidewalks; putting in street trees; such as the Chamber of Commerce putting in a park and those amenities. Now, it's Jim's turn to come to the table and become part of the community.

(31:37) Mr. Hemminger. Cool. Okay, Dan?

(31:40) Mr. Delpriore: I have a few things I want to just reinforce. I agree with the Chairman on this regarding curbing along that road. I've gone down it, of late, and we've got to do something, especially even if there were some cuts in the curbs to allow the drainage to come out, so it could still flow—the water out. The other one is the trash receptacles out back. That's almost a property maintenance—a code issue—back there, especially the one that—I know that the main one looks like it's brick all the way all around. But the other one has like a fence that's not in great shape. So, that was a concern of mine. Traffic flow—again, I think we've all harped on that. I do like that the entrance is going to be modified in this space, I think that's important. But I think if we're pushing people up to the back corner you're going to have more people going behind. I do like the ideas of the stop signs for traffic calming devices. That plaza is very busy. We've been out there a few times, for even people going into the plaza, as Jim is well aware of. I don't know. There is a lot of traffic there. From a code point of view, though, with the plaza, I think that we're pretty much squared away. Jim has been out there with the fire marshal, and there has been some fire marshal stuff that had to be resolved and that he was graciously enough, and he got right on it for us, and that has been taken care of, so with that said, I don't have a lot more to offer from a code point of view.

(33:21) Mr. Delpriore: I agree with Ron's comments about the MSOD and the comments that—Ed—you sent out, which I'm sure [?]. I would like to comment for MRB who was not able to be here, our Town engineer. They stated that MRB issued a comment letter dated August 4th, it has not yet been responded to with revision plans, and that they don't have any additional comments on this one.

(33:53) Mr. Hemminger. Okay, cool. Highway, Don?

(33:58) Mr. Giroux: Okay, I have a couple of points to make, and again I'm going to beat a dead horse with that curbing around the front side over there, around that Burger King area on that east shoulder. Food for thought on that curbing would be a climb-able curbing of sorts, whereas a cut in the curbing, and go so far as to consider a green infrastructure of some sort where the curb cuts drain down into it, where you're actually putting the water-borne plants and stuff of that nature which would add to the landscaping along there and I'm sure that would be interesting points with the board on some of the landscaping there. Moving from that, part of my concern—and I'm going to steal a little of the Chief's thunder here—with closing that one entrance, though I agree with that for the stacking, it arises a concern with fire apparatus getting up and making a sweep across the front side of this building. If there was a fire of some sort, fire apparatus would need to get around the front, as well as the back, of this structure.

(35:14): Mr. Hemminger: Yeah, I think that's going to be an issue. Chief?

(35:19) Chief Hartman: The issue is that most of your stores are coming out from toward 96, so that would be the place where we're going to putting apparatus, plus the hydrants position, and then the other issue is when you have people evacuating out of there [and] us trying to come in, it's better if we have two points to come in, maybe just a crash bar, that they can't go out and we can pop the bar and come through that way.

(35:53) Mr. Hemminger: Would you parks the trucks along 96, more than get in to the parking lot anyway because of traffic, cars and everything else?

(36:02) Chief Hartman: In the calls we had there during the past, where we had vehicles going to Coffee Roasters and stuff, we basically—we take the center of the parking lot or if there are open spots along the edge, we go in there.

(36:25) Mr. Hemminger: The trucks can get in the other way around. You can get in both ways even with the ladder truck?

(36:33) Chief Hartman: The ladder truck can get in there. The problem is going to be, if you close off that, then we'll have to go all the way around the back and loop around to come around to the front.

(36:48) Mr. Hemminger: It's something to give thoughts to. Dan?

(36:50) Mr. Delpriore: I'm going to ask the applicant to provide us a turning radius for that, so that you guys can review that.

(37:03) Mr. Hemminger: Yeah, okay.

(37:04) Mr. Tomlinson: And we may be able to incorporate a mountable curb across there with the sidewalk—we'll take a look at that intersection for pedestrian and fire access, and come back with something for you.

(37:22) Mr. Hemminger: Again, this is just more general comments as they know they're not coming back until the November meeting. I wanted to give them some good constructive comments—not criticism, *per se*—but comments so they can understand where we're coming from, and not hit you a month later with—oh, wow, why didn't you tell us this? Tim?

(37:40) Mr. Delucia: My question would be around that new configuration on the west entrance. I understand . . . queuing more vehicles, but as Dan said, what's that turning radius? . . . if you have a car waiting to exit by turning right toward 96, can a car coming in get around him into the plaza? Looks pretty tight . . . that section that you honed in on? I don't understand from looking at this how much room there would be for a car, or a pick-up truck, a box truck, anything, to get around that corner, to get to the front of the plaza. So, that's a concern I have. . . . I agree with all the other comments that were made, as well.

(38:32) Mr. Hemminger: Okay. Doug?

(38:38) Mr. Viets: From when we first discussed this, I don't know that I have a lot more to add at this point. They're still out there.

(38:46) Mr. Hemminger. Okay. Adrian?

(38:49) Mr. Bellis: I'm good with all the comments that have been brought up today and with Ed's new ideas right now that are being shown tonight. I would agree with Ron, though, that if there's a second built-out of that little parcel, whatever, to have everything going through the front of that plaza will not be good—dangerous backing up. I couldn't imagine if you had to walk across there and somebody's going through there to cut through to get to the bank, or whatever. And that road is narrow down there by Burger King and stuff, with the mud, which I already brought up, is narrow, and we'll have to address somehow, in a decent manner, with that, you know. So maybe the bigger picture would be is this the right way to project it for the future build out right now? Maybe. I don't know.

(39:50) Mr. Hemminger. Okay. Thank you. Aaron?

(39:52) Mr. Sweeney: Is that back driveway the same width as the front? If the cars are parked on both sides of that back lot, can—is it wide enough for vehicles to go back—each other, one way?

(40:06) Mr. Tomlinson: Yes, there's at least 24–25 feet from both drive aisles.

(40:16) Mr. Sweeney: Just from being back there, there's so much—there seems to be a lot of pedestrians going to the trash, loading and unloading. It concerned me that—I've seen kids—people—just speeding through there, going faster than they should, especially to avoid that front part. I would like to see—right in the middle of that plaza, somewhere—I know you said you have the stops—I would like to see a speed bump or something to that effect to really slow them down on that straight away. You said that before you had it, and they would just go around it. Even if they go around it, they're still slowing down.

(41:05) Mr. Hemminger: Don, aren't there some newer types of speed bumps that can actually be plowed over?

(41:10) Mr. Giroux: They have them out there.

(41:16) Mr. Hemminger: I remember the old one. But I've seen some that come up, level a little bit, and then come down. That tends to slow people down a little bit, too.

(41:24) Mr. Giroux: They're real similar to a raised crosswalk.

(41:33) Mr. Hemminger: Yeah, just a thought. Anything else, Aaron?

(41:35) Mr. Sweeney: Another thing. That entrance coming off 96. We're trying to make the city scape. That sidewalk is so close to—so close to 96—and there's going to be traffic there. I just don't know—is there a way to push pedestrian traffic further south of 96? Can you move the sidewalk back?

(42:00) Mr. Hemminger: Sidewalks are already there, unless you rip out all the existing sidewalks and bring them back. I don't think—and you've got trees there, too.

(42:11) Mr. Sweeney: Is there a way to make a crosswalk, and kind of push it back?

(42:15) Mr. Delpriore: Then you've got utilities there, also.

(42:17) Mr. Hemminger: That's true, too.

(42:20) Mr. Stathopoulos: I know that there's a utility line that comes right from basically—that would be the northwest corner of the plaza—it comes back over to 96. I know there's fiber optics, fiber, phone cable, all kinds of stuff, a big trunk of pipe that goes through there.

(42:39) Mr. Hemminger: I don't see how that can moved, as much as we'd like it.

(42:43) Mr. Tomlinson: If the question is to move pedestrians that are going to the plaza into the plaza at that front, that's what we're going to take a look at. If it's people just walking across 96 at that intersection—I don't know if there's a good solution for pulling that back further.

(43:02) Mr. Hemminger: Ron's got a response.

(43:04) Mr. Brand: That's even more reason not to want to, maybe, have benches and things of that nature along that area.

(43:12) Mr. Sweeney: In the interim, until Mercier Boulevard is there. That's all I have.

(43:27) Mr. Hemminger: If we get streetlights in there, that would be nice. Okay, and again, please take my comments as just some of the things that we'll be looking at, especially when it comes to streetscape and MTOD. Pull out those regs, look at them, see what's going on, make sure you meet them, and if you've got any questions talk to staff. Certainly Ron is the expert on all of that, as is Dan. And so, make sure—what we'd rather have you do is come in with as many things addressed ahead of time as possible so we can go through it quicker and get you out of here quicker. That's what we want to do for you for you.

(44:02) Mr. Hemminger: If the ZBA put in a requirement to do some core drilling to check the composite of that roadway, I would do that quickly, because—heaven forbid—you've got to replace that roadway, that's going to be the log falling the tent, I would think.

(44:19) Mr. Tomlinson: Yeah, I've got a copy of the resolution and I don't—there was a condition for fencing and something about lighting but there wasn't anything about the driveway, so . . .

(44:27) Mr. Brand: Yeah, there was when you look at the Area Variance for the 280-a.

(44:32) Mr. Tomlinson: Okay. I have the side setback variance so I'll have to pull that one out. There's a lot of paperwork from the Town.

(44:41) Mr. Brand: We only generate what we [?].

(44:45) Mr. Tomlinson. I understand. So we'll take a look at that.

(44:48) Mr. Bellis: On the bank, or whatever, the credit union, it's called, the big thing I'm concerned about right now to give you a heads-up is the lighting plan, because I'm concerned that the bank light is going to cause trouble.

(45:05) Mr. Tomlinson: Cause trouble for what?

(45:07) Mr. Bellis: The spillage on the adjacent properties, you know what I mean? I'm worried that there is going to be a lot of lighting for that bank.

(45:15) Mr. Tomlinson: Well, there will be.

(45:18) Mr. Brand: The Zoning Board of Appeals recognized that, and they put a condition in that there is to be a four-foot high solid wood fence or planting along that border between Burger King and the credit union so as to address the headlight issues with vehicles on both sides.

(45:43) Mr. Bellis: Just make sure we have decent renderings to understand that or ways to see it better. So, we'll have a fence there, you know what I mean?

(45:49) Mr. Tomlinson: Yeah, we are going to provide a fence, but it will be below eye level. The lights will be taller than that. From a light spill standpoint, just like ALDI's does now, just like Burger King does now with their lighting, their spill across those interior property lines. There isn't spill to the exterior, to the right-of-way, but that's a standard for a plaza like this with shared access drives and moving pedestrians through everything else. I guess I'm not understanding the concern if there's no impact to the right-of-way through here.

(46:26) Mr. Bellis: I don't know it until I saw it. Most banks have a ton of lighting.

(46:31) Mr. Tomlinson: So there's a lighting plan in the package that we submitted, in landscaping, already, specific to the bank.

(46:40) Mr. Viets: I guess what is spilling over, is part of code, we don't allow light spill between properties. It's reality. It might happen. But I mean I guess we need to look at that and see how you—

(46:56) Mr. Tomlinson: For interior property lines, just like there are interior property lines out here right now, and like we did across the street at the Taco Bell/KFC, there is common area lighting for roadways, for parking, for lighting that crosses all the property lines. That's very standard for a plaza like this. I don't know if there are exceptions for interior property lines. Obviously we had to get a variance for the side setback variance property

line, but I think spillage for an interior property line to a common plaza is handled very differently than to a residence on the side of ALDI, for example.

(47:32) Mr. Viets: That's one of the things we have to look in the code. I haven't looked at that in a little while.

(47:39) Mr. Hemminger: A lot of times they carve out separate lots. Usually it's one parcel.

(47:46) Mr. Tomlinson: Yeah, I don't mean to keep bringing up the property across the street, but again this is exactly what we did with this board, there's common lighting throughout the whole thing, just like this will be. So I think it's consistent with what this board has done at similar projects in the past, for when they are carved up into separate parcels.

(48:04) Mr. Tomlinson: Just so the board knows, we're planning on submitting the updated packages on the 14th in advance of the 3rd, that's the cutoff that we've been given. We also hope, and I think we're at least signed and we hope to tell you what financial institution it is and eventually we'll have some of the additional information for you relative to that.

(48:34) Mr. Hemminger: Hopefully it helped some. I didn't put those in to just upset anybody. I wanted you to know that there are some issues that we need to address.

(48:40) [?]: Resolutions.

(48:43) Mr. Hemminger: Oh, that's right, we do have resolutions. What do we have, John? Two continuations, right?

(48:49) Mr. Robortella: The first one is the subdivision continuation.

(48:50) [?]: Public hearing.

(48:51) Mr. Hemminger: It is a Public Hearing. You're right. Don has a concern.

(49:00) Mr. Giroux: With the turning radius, if you would, as I move closer to the credit union property itself, with all the canopies stuff of this nature, reference that back corner for fire apparatus to make that sweep and then come back around I guess to that southwest corner. This entrance, if I'm not mistaken, to the west, is not going to be in right away. Correct?

(49:24) Mr. Tomlinson: That is correct.

(49:25) Mr. Giroux: So fire apparatus that had to get back to this corner would probably come in here and have to make this sweep around. So if you would, on your turning radius, just reference that corner right there for apparatus to make that sweep.

(49:42) Mr. Hemminger: And the ability to get through past the canopy. Right?

(49:49) [?]: That's what we were talking about.

(49:50) Mr. Giroux: The distance on the canopy—I don't know that that's going to be a feasible access point for fire apparatus. That's why I mentioned the making sweep around and the turning radius in that back corner.

(50:08) Mr. Tomlinson: I guess I don't clearly understand when you say around—are you saying around it or turning around here.

(50:15) Mr. Giroux: When you come in the entrance way, just like they're going to—say they're going to the canopy, they would have to come in there, and they have to sweep that driveway right around the back over to that side for fire apparatus to attack on that back corner, that southwest corner.

(50:39) Mr. Tomlinson: Okay.

(50:40) Mr. Hemminger: How are they going to get out of there?

(50:41) Mr. Giroux: We back them back out. We put them in. We put the fire out. We worry about getting them out.

(50:47) Mr. Tomlinson: I think there's some allowances in the code for up to 150-foot dead-ended and some different things.

(51:00) Mr. Giroux: Chances are you've got it in there. Just reference that in there.

(51:02) Mr. Tomlinson: Sure, we can do that.

(51:03) Mr. Hemminger: Okay, just a couple housekeeping things. This is a Public Hearing. Do I have anyone here or online to speak for or against this application? Anyone like to make comments on this application, either here or online? Anybody online? Nobody online.

(51:19) Mr. Hemminger: Okay, so now we have the continuation resolution for the—first one would be for the subdivision.

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

■ A motion was made by MR. BELLIS, seconded by MR. DELUCIA, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as submitted by the Town staff:

**FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
PRELIMINARY RE-SUBDIVISION PLAT APPLICATION, LOTS #R-1, #R-2 AND #R-3,  
G&A DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION—CONTINUATION**



**PB #0801-21**

**APPLICANT:** **Jim Stathopoulos, c/o G&A Development and Construction Corporation, 101 North Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424**

**ACTION:** **Preliminary Re-Subdivision Plat approval for the creation of proposed Lot #R-2, a part of the proposed Preliminary Plat Map prepared for Lots #R-1, #R-2 and #R-3, G&A Development and Construction Corporation, a 44,408.3-square-foot lot**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) on Wednesday, September 15, 2021, took action to continue the Public Hearing and its deliberations upon the above referenced Action to tonight’s meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has reopened the Public Hearing at tonight’s meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has received and has given consideration to the Zoning Board of Appeals decision (File ZB #0701-21) dated September 27, 2021, which results in Conditional Approval of a requested Side Yard Setback Area Variance to allow the proposed roof overhang for the proposed credit union building that is to be located 18.6 feet from the south Lot Line; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant’s Engineers, Marathon Engineering, Matt Tomlinson, CPESC, has submitted a letter to the Town Planning Board Chairperson, dated October 1, 2021, requesting the Board to table further discussion upon the Preliminary Re-subdivision Application (PB #0801-21) and to continue Board’s deliberations upon this application (PB #0801-21) to a continued Public Hearing/meeting to be held at the November 3, 2021, Planning Board meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has received testimony at tonight’s continued Public Hearing upon the above referenced Application (PB #0801-21).

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board does hereby move to table further discussion upon the above referenced Action (PB #0801-21) to the Planning Board’s scheduled meeting on Wednesday, November 3, 2021.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board directs the Clerk of the Board to provide a copy of this resolution to the Applicant, the Applicant’s Engineers; and the Applicant’s Attorney.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye

Aaron Sweeney                      Aye  
Douglas Viets                      Aye

Motion carried.

**5. CONTINUED PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN**

**PB #0802-21                      Continued Preliminary Site Plan Application**

**Name:**                      G&A Development and Construction Corporation, c/o Jim Stathopoulos, 101 North Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424

**Location:**                      West side of State Route 332, south of State Route 96

**Zoning District:**                      GB General Business, MTOD Major Thoroughfare Overlay District, MSOD Main Street Overlay District

**Request:**                      Preliminary Site Plan approval to erect a 2,600-square-foot single-story financial institution upon Lot #R-2.

This application was reviewed by the Project Review Committee (PRC) on May 7, 2021; July 2, 2021; August 6, 2021; and September 3, 2021 (brief PRC discussion).

On August 4, 2021, the Planning Board classified this application as an Unlisted Action under the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) regulations and established the SEQR 30-day review period from August 5, 2021, to September 3, 2021.

On August 4, 2021, the consideration of the Preliminary Site Plan was continued to September 15, 2021.

On September 15, 2021, consideration of the Preliminary Site Plan was continued to the meeting this evening (October 6, 2021).

On August 18, 2021, the board recalled Resolution #0802-21 (August 4, 2021) regarding the SEQR classification of the Preliminary Site Plan as an Unlisted Action and reclassified the Preliminary Site Plan as a SEQR Type II Action.

■ A motion was made by MR. SWEENEY, seconded by MR. VIETS, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as submitted by the Town staff:

**FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION—CONTINUATION**

**PB #0802-21**

**APPLICANT:** Jim Stathopoulos, c/o G&A Development and Construction Corporation, 101 North Street, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424

**ACTION:** Preliminary Site Plan for a 2,600-square-foot single-story financial institution to be located upon proposed Lot #R-2 of the proposed Preliminary Plat Map prepared for Lots #R-1, #R-2 and #R-3, G&A Development and Construction Corporation (Farmington Commons)

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has tonight continued its deliberations upon the above referenced Action; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant’s Engineers, Marathon Engineering, Matt Tomlinson, CPESC, has submitted a letter to the Town Planning Board Chairperson, dated October 1, 2021, requesting the Board to table further discussion upon the Preliminary Site Plan Application (PB #0802-21) and to continue Board’s deliberations upon this application at the November 3, 2021 Planning Board meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has received testimony at tonight’s continued public meeting upon the above referenced Application (PB #0802-21).

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board does hereby move to table further discussion upon the above referenced Action (PB #0802-21) and agrees to continue the public meeting upon the proposed Preliminary Site Plan to the Planning Board’s scheduled meeting on Wednesday, November 3, 2021.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board directs the Clerk of the Board to provide a copy of this resolution to: the Applicant; the Applicant’s Engineers; and the Applicant’s Attorney.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Aaron Sweeney	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

**6. FINAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT**

**PB #0602-19 Final Site Plan Amendment Application**

**Name:** DiFelice Development Corporation, 91 Victor Heights Parkway, Victor, N.Y. 14564

- Location:** Southwest corner of Collett Road and Hook Road
- Zoning District:** LI Limited Industrial
- Request:** Amendment to Site Plan (PB #0703-17) approved by the Planning Board on December 6, 2017.

The Planning Board received an informal discussion from the applicant's engineer for the construction of a proposed industrial building at this location on August 19, 2015.

The State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) 30-day public review and comment period was held from February 18, 2016, to March 25, 2016. The Planning Board approved a SEQR determination of Non-Significance on April 6, 2016.

On December 6, 2017, the Planning Board approved the Final Site Plan with conditions.

On June 5, 2019, the Planning Board approved the Final Site Plan Amendment with conditions (PB #0602-19).

On February 5, 2020, the Planning Board approved the first and second 90-day extensions to the Final Site Plan from February 5, 2020, to May 5, 2020 (PB #0602-19).

On May 6, 2020, the Planning Board approved the third 90-day extension to the Final Site Plan from May 6, 2020, to August 4, 2020.

On August 5, 2020, the Planning Board approved the fourth 90-day extension to the Final Site Plan from August 5, 2020, to November 3, 2020.

On November 4, 2020, the Planning Board approved the fifth 90-day extension to the Final Site Plan from November 4, 2020, to February 3, 2021.

On February 3, 2021, the Planning Board approved the sixth 90-day extension to the Final Site Plan from February 3, 2021, to May 4, 2021.

On March 17, 2021, the Planning Board approved a 180-day extension to the Final Site Plan from May 4, 2021, to October 31, 2021.

On September 1, 2021, the Planning Board approved the Final Site Plan Amendment with conditions, required that revised drawings be submitted to the Development Office on or before 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 22, 2021; and continued the consideration of the application to the meeting this evening (October 6, 2021).

The Farmington CountryMax proposal for this location was discussed by the Project Review Committee on May 7, 2021; June 4, 2021; July 2, 2021; August 6, 2021; and September 3, 2021.

Mr. Parrone (Parrone Engineering), and Mr. Payne and Mr. Dora (CountryMax Stores), presented this application in the meeting room.

Mr. Parrone said that the comments on this application which were received at the previous meeting have been incorporated in the revised plans which had been submitted to the board and to the Town staff prior to the meeting this evening.

Mr. Parrone also said that he, Mr. Payne and Mr. Dora attended the Project Review Committee meeting on October 1, 2021. He then provided the following highlights of the modifications which have been made to the original site plan and which are now reflected on the revised plans:

- Revised plans which address all previous comments from the Planning Board and MRB Group were submitted to the Development Office on September 22, 2021.
- A modification to the wall design on the south side of Collett Road reflects a 1:2 slope and will be treated with stone (no landscaping) to address the fiber optics cable which is only approximately one foot deep along that portion of Collett Road. Mr. Parrone extended thanks to Mr. Giroux for advising him of the shallow depth of the cable. He [Mr. Parrone] said the stone will be the most appropriate treatment for this area due to the difficulty in trying to maintain some type of growth.
- The construction of the sidewalks has been modified per the Planning Board comments. Additional landscaping will be included in the southeast corner of the property. Landscaping in this area is limited to the number of existing easements. Mr. Parrone said that the applicant's landscape architect has added as many trees and related plantings as possible.
- The amount of exterior lighting has been reduced. Mr. Parrone said that exterior lighting has been substantially modified.
- A revised Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be submitted to MRB Group for review.
- A licensed architect has been engaged to prepare updated elevation renderings of the building. Mr. Parrone said that the revised elevations are an improvement over the original elevations. He said that he hopes that these will be satisfactory to meet the concerns of the Planning Board. The exterior colors will be earth tones per the CountryMax design.
- Mr. Parrone said that a credible job has been done with the design of the enclosed storage area. He said that a small portion of the storage area will be exposed to the outdoors but that the storage area is tucked away where passersby coming from the west will not see it. He said that it would be even more difficult to view when coming from the east (Hook Road).

Mr. Parrone said that the applicant filed the Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 and Part 2 with the Town even though a full State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) review was completed in 2016.

Mr. Brand said that the CountryMax plan increases the footprint of the building from its original 72,000 square feet to 74,610 square feet. He said that the Town staff felt that it was necessary to update the environmental record to identify the action which is before the board this evening. He said that the staff took a hard look about re-coordinating with the previously identified SEQR Involved Agencies. Mr. Brand said that the staff did not feel the need to establish a second SEQR coordinated review because the Involved Agencies had no objections to the Planning Board's designation of itself as the Lead Agency for making the SEQR determination of significance, and because the Involved Agencies had no substantive comments in 2016.

Mr. Brand said that Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 and the Part 3 narrative was added to Part 1 which was provided by Mr. Parrone. He said that a draft resolution has been provided for the board's consideration this evening for a SEQR determination of non-significance of this application. Mr. Brand said that this is a SEQR Unlisted Action because the threshold for a SEQR Type I action is for building having an area of over 100,000 square feet.

Mr. Brand also said that the revised plan shows a reduction in the impervious surface area from the previous plan, and that this is a positive.

Mr. Parrone confirmed this.

Mr. Brand discussed draft Condition #3 regarding the requirement that a "Sidewalk Ends/ No Pedestrian Crossing" sign be installed along and within the portions of the highway right-of-way for Collett Road and Hook Road, from where they currently end at the FedEx site on Collett Road, and in the locations shown on the Parrone Drawing No. C1.0. He said that the Town must protect itself to identify the end of the sidewalk and that there is no crosswalk going to be installed Hook Road in this location. Mr Brand requested that Mr. Parrone work with Mr. Giroux to coordinate the wording, sizes and materials of the signs.

Mr. Delpriore said that the Development Office staff reviewed the revised plans. He said that the applicant did a great job, that color elevation renderings have been provided, and that the staff's concerns from a code point of view have been addressed. He said that any outstanding issues have been addressed in the draft Final Site Plan Amendment resolution which is now under consideration by the board.

Mr. Delpriore said that MRB Group completed the engineering review of the revised site plan and will provide a comment letter later this week. He noted that the draft approval resolution requires that the applicant address all MRB Group engineering comments contained in the May 31, 2019, and the October 6, 2021, reports.

Mr. Delpriore said that the building mounted lights are not a full cutoff. He requested that a full cutoff should be provided, as noted in the MRB Group engineering comment letter of October 6, 2021, i.e.:

### **Site Plan and General Comments**

2. It appears that the proposed wall pack fixtures do not meet the shielding/cutoff requirements per the Town Code. A fully shielded lighting fixture should be utilized. Please provide a detail that reflects this requirement.

Mr. Hemminger said that he has no issue with this. Mr Delpriore said that he also agrees that it should be a full cutoff. Mr. Hemminger requested that this be added as a condition of Final Site Plan Amendment approval.

Mr. Delpriore said that MRB Group had no objections to the Planning Board moving forward [with this application] at this time.

Mr. Giroux and Chief Hartman had no comments on the application this evening.

Mr. Bellis asked about draft Condition #8 (the number of the condition in the draft resolution) which requires that any dead trees on the property which have been planted within the past two years must be replaced within 30 days. Mr. Bellis said that he did not see any dead trees on the site. Mr. Hemminger said that Mr. DiFelice had a number of trees planted, that some of the trees died, and that Mr. DiFelice had them replaced. Mr. Hemminger said that he did not see any dead trees which need to be addressed at this time.

Mr. Bellis asked if any materials or merchandise will be stored outdoors or in the parking lot. Mr. Hemminger said that no outdoor storage of materials or merchandise will be permitted.

Mr. Bellis asked about the loading and unloading of trucks, and if truck trailers would be parked on the property for lengths of time. Mr. Payne said that CountryMax has four tractor trailers in the system and that truck trailers on the site will be in use. Mr. Bellis asked if a trailer would remain on the site for a week. Mr. Payne said no.

Mr. Hemminger said that the maximum time that a truck trailer may be on the site would be two to three days. Mr. Payne said that this time is at the most and that the only trailers remaining on the site would be their own vehicles. Mr. Hemminger suggested that a condition of approval be added to restrict the number of days that a truck trailer could be parked on the site to a maximum of three days. He said that adding a condition of approval would provide the Code Enforcement Officer with the “teeth” to enforce the Planning Board’s conditions of approval.

Mr. Bellis said that he liked the colors and the way that the building is looking. He said that he is happy that there will be no access or driveway off Hook Road and that the plan has a number of pluses. He extended his thanks to Mr. Payne for these efforts.

Mr. Viets asked about the intent of the 2,300-gallon propane tank [which is shown on the site plan]. Mr. Payne said that the propane will potentially be used for the building’s heating system.

Mr. Viets suggested that 3,000K or 4,000K lighting be considered instead of the proposed 5,000K lights. He said that the lower lights might be less intensive for the neighbors and would still provide the same photometrics. He said that lower temperature [lights] are not quite as intense.

Mr. Hemminger then reviewed the following amendments to the conditions of approval:

New Condition #9: All comments contained in the May 31, 2019, and October 6, 2021, reports from MRB Group, D.P.C., are to be addressed before the Town Engineer signs the Final Site Plan Amendment drawings.

Condition #10 (originally numbered #8 on the draft resolution) Regarding the dead trees—it was decided that this condition should remain in the resolution.

New Condition #16: There will be no outdoor storage of merchandise or materials outside of the specified storage enclosure areas as shown on the Final Site Plan Amendment.

New Condition #17: No truck trailers may be parked anywhere on the site for a period of more than three (3) consecutive days.

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

■ A motion was made by MR. BELLIS, seconded by MR. VIETS, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as submitted by the Town staff:

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
DiFELICE INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX SITE, FINAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT—  
COUNTRYMAX  
SEQR DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**PB #0602-19  
APPLICANT:**

**Donald Payne, CountryMax Stores,  
6290 State Route 96, Victor, N.Y. 14564**



**ACTIONS: SEQR Determination of Significance for Final Site Plan Amendment Approval, for a CountryMax Warehouse/Office Building and related site improvements on property located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Collett Road and Hook Road**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as Planning Board) has received an application to amend a previously approved Final Site Plan for the proposed DiFelice Industrial Building (hereinafter referred to as Action); and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed Action is neither classified within Parts 617.4 or 617.5 of Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (ECL), the State's Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board, is the only involved agency for this Action.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Board does hereby classify the proposed Action as being an Unlisted Action under the above referenced sections of the State's ECL.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Board has reviewed and does hereby accept the findings contained in Parts 1, 2 and 3 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the proposed Action and directs the Planning Board Chairperson to sign and date the FEAF Part 3.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Board has reasonably concluded the following impacts are expected to result from the proposed Action, when compared against the criteria in Section 617.7 (c):

- (i) there will not be a substantial adverse change in existing air quality, ground or surface water quality or quantity, traffic noise levels; a substantial increase in solid waste production; a substantial increase in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems as the result of the amended site plan; and
- (ii) there will not be large quantities of vegetation or fauna removed from the site or destroyed as the result of the proposed action; there will not be substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species as the result of the proposed action; there will not be a significant impact upon habitat areas on the site; there are no known threatened or endangered species of animal or plant, or the habitat of such species; or, are there any other significant adverse impacts to natural resources on the site;
- (iii) there are no known Critical Environmental Area(s) on the site which will be impaired as the result of the proposed action;

- (iv) the overall density of the site is consistent with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan land use recommendations;
- (v) there are no known important historical, archeological, architectural, or aesthetic resources on the site, or will the proposed action impair the existing community or neighborhood character;
- (vi) there will not be a major change in the use of either the quantity or type of energy resulting from the proposed action;
- (vii) there will not be any hazard created to human health;
- (viii) there will not be a substantial change in the use, or intensity of use, of land including open space or recreational resources, or in its capacity to support existing uses;
- (ix) there will not be a large number of persons attracted to the site for more than a few days when compared to the number of persons who would come to such a place absent the action;
- (x) there will not be created a material demand for other actions that would result in one of the above consequences;
- (xi) there will not be changes in two or more of the elements of the environment that when considered together result in a substantial adverse impact; and
- (xii) there are not two or more related actions which would have a significant impact upon the environment.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that based upon the information and analysis above and the Action’s supporting documentation, the Board determines that the proposed Action WILL NOT result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that based upon the above determination the Board does hereby make this Negative Declaration under the provisions of the State’s SEQR Regulations.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that the Board directs that this determination be filed as provided for under the SEQR Regulations.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Aaron Sweeney	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

■ A motion was made by MR. BELLIS, seconded by MR. DELUCIA, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as amended:

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
ACTION RESOLUTION— FINAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT  
APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

**PB #0602-19**

**APPLICANT: Donald Payne, CountryMax Stores,  
6290 State Route 96, Victor, N.Y. 14564**

**ACTION: DiFelice Industrial Complex Site, South Side of Collett Road,  
East of State Route 332 and West of Hook Road—  
Final Site Plan Amendment**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as Planning Board) has received a request for Final Site Plan Amendment Approval regarding the construction of a 74,610-square-foot mixed use (warehouse/office) building and related site improvements, to be owned and operated by CountryMax, with nine (9) loading docks, a second story 5,128-square-foot office area, one (1) 2,500-square-foot covered three-sided outdoor storage area, one (1) 2,900-square-foot three-sided outdoor storage area, one (1) 3,400-gallon LP Tank with pad, one (1) 640-square-foot open air shelter and one (1) enclosed trash receptacle located upon land at the southwest corner of Collett and Hook Roads; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board is the designated Lead Agency under Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations on Wednesday, October 6, 2021, under separate resolution; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board, as the designated Lead Agency for this action, has previously completed and accepted Parts 2 and 3 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) under separate resolution, thereby establishing the environmental record for this Action; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board did, under separate resolution, make a Determination of Non-Significance upon this Action; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has tonight opened a public meeting in compliance with New York State Town Law with regards to the proposed Final Site Plan Amendment and has given consideration to the comments provided upon the above referenced Action.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Board having closed the public meeting tonight upon this application does hereby move to grant Final Site Plan Amendment Approval with the following conditions:

1. Final Site Plan Amendment approval is based upon the set of drawings prepared by Parrone Engineering, identified as “Amended Site Plans for DiFelice Industrial Complex,” drawings C0.0 through C8.5, having latest revised date 9/22/21; and two (2) building elevation drawings (one black and white and one color) dated 9.21.2021, entitled “Design Development Country Max Farmington,” Project Number: 21-150, prepared by Rozzi Architects, Sheet Number SD101, with the following Conditions of Approval:
2. The title of the Parrone Drawing No. C1.0 is to be amended to read . . . “Final Site Plan CountryMax, Amendment to DiFelice Industrial Complex Site.”
3. Sidewalks, crosswalks, Pedestrian Crossing Signs and an “Sidewalk Ends No Pedestrian Crossing” Sign are to be installed along and within the portions of the highway right-of-way for Collett Road and Hook Road, from where they currently end at the FedEx Site on Collett Road, and in the locations shown on the Parrone Drawing C1.0, prior to or at the time the Certificate of Occupancy is issued for the building by the Town Code Enforcement Officer. These improvements are to be made part of a Letter of Credit for this project.
4. There is to be a sign added at the end of the proposed sidewalk at Collett Road that reads . . . “Sidewalk Ends No Pedestrian Crossing.” The location of said sign is to be shown on the Parrone Drawing C1.0 and the details of this sign is to shown on the Parrone Drawing CC 8.1. These are to be reviewed and approved by the Town Highway Superintendent prior to his signing of the set of Final Site Plan Drawings.
5. The Parrone Drawing C1.0 is to have the location of the Street Identification Numbers added to the Front of the proposed Building and placed near the entrance to the Building.
6. Drawing C 1.0, Final Site Plan, and Drawing C 8.1, Traffic Sign, Sign A, are to be removed from these two drawings (i.e., the directional sign that reads . . . “Trucks Left Turn Only”).
7. Drawing C 8.1, Traffic Sign, Sign D, is to have added the arrow pointing towards the crosswalk on Collett Road.
8. All required easements are to be accepted by the Town Board and filed with the Town Clerk prior to the Town Code Enforcement Officer issuing a Building Permit for this project.

9. All comments contained in the May 31, 2019, and October 6, 2021, reports from MRB Group, D.P.C., are to be addressed before the Town Engineer signs the Final Site Plan Amendment drawings.
10. Any dead tree that has been planted on this site within the last two (2) years, prior to tonight's date, is to be replaced within 30 days from the date of this resolution.
11. The untitled, unidentified, color photo simulation of a portion of the North Building Elevation is to have a title block added, along with a signature block for the Planning Board Chairperson, a date, and the location of the proposed Street Address Identification Sign.
12. Final Site Plan Amendment approval is valid for a period of 180 days from today. If final site plan drawings have not been submitted and signed within this time period, then this resolution shall be null and void and a new application for Final Site Plan Amendment Approval will be required.
13. Once the revisions have been made to the Final Site Plan Amendment Drawings, the Final Building Elevation Drawings and the Color Photo Simulation of the Building's North Elevation, then one copy of each is to be provided to the Town Code Enforcement Officer for his review and determination that all planning board conditions have been made. Then, upon notice from the CEO, a total of total of five (5) additional sets of these drawings and the photo simulation are to be provided for signing by Town Officials.
14. Once all signatures have been affixed to the Final Site Plan Drawings, then one copy is to be returned to: the Town Highway Superintendent; the Acting Town Water and Sewer Superintendent; the Town Construction Inspector; the Town Engineers, MRB Group, D.P.C. and the Town Building Department. The sixth (6th) copy of the signed drawings is to be returned to the Applicant's Engineers, Parrone Engineering. If additional set(s) of signed drawings are necessary then those additional set(s) are to be provided at the time of signing.
15. Prior to scheduling a Pre-Construction Meeting, the Applicant and his Engineer, is to prepare a Letter of Credit (LOC) Engineering Estimate of those components of this site plan approval that are to be dedicated to the Town. This LOC Engineering Estimate is to be reviewed and accepted by the Town Construction Inspector and the Town Engineers then forwarded to the Town Director of Planning and Development for drafting resolutions to be acted upon at a future Planning Board meeting and a future Town Board meeting. Once the Town Board has approved of the LOC and it has been provided to and filed with the Town Clerk, then a Pre-Construction Meeting may be scheduled.
16. There will be no outdoor storage of merchandise or materials outside of the specified storage enclosure areas as shown on the Final Site Plan Amendment.

- 17. No truck trailers may be parked anywhere on the site for a period of more than three (3) consecutive days.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Aaron Sweeney	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

**7. FINAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT**

**PB #0704-21 Final Site Plan Application**

**Name:** Auto Wash 6 LLC, c/o Robert Marchenese, P.O. Box 451, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424

**Location:** 6124 State Route 96

**Zoning District:** GB General Business and MTOD Major Thoroughfare Overlay District

**Request:** Amending the Final Site Plan approval of July 21, 2021, for approval of the placement of a pylon sign.

This application was reviewed by the Project Review Committee (PRC) on January 8, 2021; May 7, 2021; June 4, 2021; July 2, 2021; August 6, 2021; and September 3, 2021.

The State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) classification (Type II Action) for the Preliminary Site Plan, and the Preliminary Site Plan, were approved by the Planning Board on May 19, 2021.

The SEQR classification (Type II Action) for the Special Use Permit, and the Special Use Permit, were approved by the Planning Board on June 16, 2021.

The Final Site Plan was approved with conditions by the Planning Board on July 21, 2021.

The Planning Board approved a recommendation to the Town Board to establish a Letter of Credit for site improvements in the amount of \$46,285.78.

Mr. Marchenese presented this application via Zoom video conference.

He said that the application before the board this evening is to amend the Final Site Plan regarding the location of the sign. He asked if this is correct. Mr. Hemminger and Mr. Brand said yes.

Mr. Brand said that inadvertently the location of the sign was not depicted upon the Final Site Plan, for which an amendment is proposed to show the location of the sign. He called the applicant's attention to the Main Street Overlay District (MSOD) guidelines which require the square footage of landscaping around the base of the sign must be at least equal to the square footage of the sign (61 square feet of landscaping to correspond to the sign of 61 square feet in this application).

Mr. Brand said that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBAS) approved the applicant's Area Variance for the sign on September 27, 2021, i.e., an Area Variance to erect a 61-square-foot freestanding commercial speech sign with 28 square feet of it being a moving/motion message signage when the Town Code prohibits signs with messages which move or simulate motion in any district.

Mr. Delpriore said that this will be a digital sign with the same conditions of approval which the ZBA has applied to other digital signs in the Town. He said that the Planning Board's concerns are the placement of the sign on the property and the landscaping at its base.

Mr. Bellis asked if the sign will be placed in the same location as the sign for the previous car wash on the site. Mr. Brand said yes.

Mr. Viets asked about the conditions of approval of the Area Variance by the ZBA. Mr. Delpriore said that the only difference with this approval from other ZBA approvals is that the time and temperature will be displayed when the car wash is closed. He said that these types of signs do not actually turn off but that they black off at night. The sign vendor suggested that it is better for the function of the sign to have something displayed at all times. Mr. Delpriore said that the sign will display a fixed message when the car wash is open, and will display only the time and temperature when the car wash is closed.

Mr. Hemminger requested that a condition of Final Site Plan Amendment be added regarding the landscaping to be installed to comply with the MSOD guidelines. Mr. Marchenese said that he believes that the proposed landscaping around the sign already exceeds the MSOD guidelines.

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

Mr. Hemminger then reviewed the following amendment to the conditions of approval:

New Condition #6

The landscaping around the sign is to meet the requirements of the Town of Farmington Major Thoroughfare Overlay District (MTOD).

■ A motion was made by MR. VIETS, seconded by MR. SWEENEY, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as amended:

**FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
FINAL SITE PLAN AMENDMENT**

**PB #0704-21**

**APPLICANT: Robert Marchese, P.O. Box 451, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424**

**ACTION: Final Site Plan Amendment to Auto Wash Facility to replace existing freestanding Commercial Speech Sign located at 6214 State Route 96**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has received and reviewed the above referenced Action; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has under separate resolution classified the above referenced Action as a Type II Action under Part 617.5 (c) of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has received and has given consideration to the Town Zoning Board of Appeals resolution (ZB #0901-21), dated September 27, 2021, which grants an Area Variance with conditions for the proposed freestanding Commercial Speech Sign that is the subject of this Site Plan Amendment under consideration; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has conducted a public meeting tonight, received testimony and has given consideration thereto; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has received and given consideration to the Ontario County Planning Board's Referral No. 186-2021, a Class 1 with no formal recommendation to deny or approve applications (referrals) for signs that comply with local limits on size and or number comments only.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Board does hereby grant the following amendment to the final site plan for the Auto Wash, N.Y.S. Route 96 and Mertensia Road:

1. This Approval is for the Amendment to the Final Site Plan Drawings, having revision date of 10/06/2021, Drawing Number: CA 100, Sheet 03 of 07, prepared by Costich Engineering, identified as Project Number 8006, entitled . . . "Final Site Plan Auto Wash, N.Y.S. Route 96 & Mertensia Road," as is further amended below herein.
2. Final Site Plan Amendment Approval is further based upon the above referenced drawing being submitted for signatures by the Town Highway Superintendent; the



Acting Town Water and Sewer Superintendent; the Town Engineer; and the Town Planning Board Chairperson. Until all of these signatures have been affixed to this drawing no building permit for the erection of said Commercial Speech Sign shall be issued. Finally, one all signatures have been affixed to the amended drawing then adequate copies of the signed drawing shall be provided to the Town.

- 3. Final Site Plan Amendment Approval is further based upon the drawing prepared by Skylight Signs Inc., for the Auto Wash Car Wash, 6214 NY Route 96, Farmington N.Y., entitled “Cabinet/EMC, 8/30/2021, Auto Wash Car Wash, 6214 NY Route 96, Farmington, NY.” This drawing is to be further amended by providing signature lines for the Town Code Enforcement Officer and Town Planning Board Chairperson, along with a reference note to the above referenced Zoning Board of Appeals File (ZB #0901-21).
- 4. Final Site Plan Amendment Approval is based further upon the drawing prepared by Skylight Signs Inc., for the Auto Wash Car Wash, 6214 NY Route 96, Farmington N.Y., entitled “Cabinet pole sign, 8/30/2021, Auto Wash Car Wash, 6214 NY Route 96, Farmington, NY.” This drawing is to be further amended by providing signature lines for the Town Code Enforcement Officer and Town Planning Board Chairperson, along with a reference note to the above referenced Zoning Board of Appeals File (ZB #0901-21).
- 5. Final Site Plan Amendment Approval is based further upon the Applicant’s compliance with the seven (7) conditions of approval contained in the above referenced Zoning Board of Appeals Resolution (ZB #0901-21).
- 6. The landscaping around the sign is to meet the requirements of the Town of Farmington Major Thoroughfare Overlay District (MTOD).

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT** once the Applicant has made all amendments to the above referenced three (3) drawings, then two (2) amended sets are to be submitted to the Town Code Enforcement Officer for his review and acceptance before signing by Town Officials. Upon acceptance and signing, one (1) set of the signed drawings is to be returned to the Applicant’s Engineer. Then a total of five (5) additional sets of the signed drawings are to be submitted to the Town.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Aaron Sweeney	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

## 8. PLANNING BOARD ACTION ITEMS

### A. Letter of Credit Release—Hathaway’s Corners, Phase 1:

■ A motion was made by MR. DELUCIA, seconded by MR. BELLIS, that the reading of the following resolution be waived and that the resolution be approved as submitted by the Town staff:

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION  
LETTER OF CREDIT—PARTIAL RELEASE #5  
HATHAWAY’S CORNERS, PHASE 1, UTILITIES**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as Planning Board) has received a request from Lance S. Brabant, CPESC, MRB Group, D.P.C., the Town Engineer, dated October 5, 2021, to approve the partial release of funds (Release #5) from the established Letter of Credit for the above referenced project; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has also received and reviewed the signed Letter of Credit Town Surety Release Form (G-2.0); and

**WHEREAS**, under the provisions of Chapter 144, Section 32. F. of the Farmington Town Code, the Planning Board is to render recommendations to the Town Board whether or not to honor the requested establishment of the Letter of Credit.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Board, after having reviewed the file on this project and the recommendations from the Town Construction Inspector, Town Department Heads and the Town Engineers, does hereby recommend that the Town Board take formal action to approve the request for the fifth partial release of funds from the established Letter of Credit in the total amount of \$984,820.58.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Town Supervisor is to sign the above referenced Town Surety Release Form (G-2.0) upon the Town Board’s authorization on October 12, 2021.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that copies of this resolution are to be provided to: Peter Ingalsbe, Town Supervisor; Marcy Daniels, Confidential Secretary to the Town Supervisor; Michelle Finley, Town Clerk; the Applicant, Mark Stevens, Hathaway’s Corners, LLC; the Applicant’s Engineers, Ryan Destro, P.E., BME Associates; Don Giroux, Town Highway and Parks Superintendent; Robin MacDonald, Acting Town Water and Sewer Superintendent; Matthew Heilmann, Town Construction Inspector; Dan Delpriore, Town Code Enforcement Officer; Ronald Brand, Town Director of Planning and Development; and Lance S. Brabant, CPESC, MRB Group, D.P.C., the Town Engineers.

The following vote upon the above resolution was recorded in the meeting minutes:

Adrian Bellis	Aye
Timothy DeLucia	Aye
Edward Hemminger	Aye
Aaron Sweeney	Aye
Douglas Viets	Aye

Motion carried.

## 9. OPEN DISCUSSION

### ***Director of Development and Planning Report:***

Mr. Brand said that this evening he spoke with a property owner in the Estates at Beaver Creek Subdivision whose application for Area Variance for the placement of the shed in the front yard portion of her lot had been denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He said that although the property owner was not pleased with the denial of the variance at the time, the property owner now cannot be more satisfied with the redesign of the backyard which occurred following the revision of the plans and the handling of the inspection by Code Enforcement Officer Dan Delpriore.

Mr. Delpriore said that he made the inspection of the property owner's pool and fence, that the installation is gorgeous and that the property owner could not be happier with result.

### ***Code Enforcement Officer:***

Mr. Delpriore reviewed the board's agenda items for the meetings on October 20, 2021, and on November 3, 2021. The October 20th agenda will include the applications for Preliminary Site Plan and Special Use Permit for the Loomis Road Industrial Park, the Preliminary Site Plan for A Safe Place Storage, and the Preliminary Two-Lot Subdivision for James and Nancy Falanga.

### ***Highway and Parks Superintendent:***

Mr. Giroux said that the Highway Department staff is closing up a number of summer projects and preparing for the winter season.

As a follow-up of the discussion at the previous meeting (September 15, 2021) on the stockpile of road millings on the American Equipment property on the northeast corner of State Route 332 and Collett Road, Mr. Giroux said that some of the millings (about one-third of the stockpile) were offered to the Town and have been removed from the site by the Town Highway Department. Mr. Delpriore said that the removal of the some of this

material was progress, for which the Development Office is happy, and that it is promising that the property owner will continue efforts to remove the entire stockpile.

## 10. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

## 11. TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

### ■ 2021 Municipal Bootcamp:

A free annual program to provide certification credits to newly elected officials, planning and zoning boards and town officials sponsored by Hancock Estabrook and MRB Group. The program includes 10 hours of remote training designed to provide a comprehensive education that encompasses all aspects of municipal governance. Each program will be provided remotely on the fourth Thursday of the month with subject matter experts and attorneys from Hancock Estabrook and MRB Group.

Remaining sessions in 2021:

***Thursday, October 28, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Session 9: Well, Aren't You Special?

***Thursday, December 23, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Session 10: All the Right Forms in All the Right Places

### **Questions to:**

Wendy A. Marsh, Partner, Hancock Estabrook  
wmarsh@hancocklaw.com  
(315) 565-4536

Matt Horn, Director, Local Government Services, MRB Group  
matt.horn@mrbgroup.com  
(315) 220-0740

### **Registration link:**

<https://register.gotowebinar.com/rt/4608077833213548299>

### ■ New York Planning Federation 2021 Summer Programming

“The Essentials of Planning and Zoning”

“Meeting Process and Communication”

“Clean Energy”

“Planning Past, Present & Future”

Each session lasts about an hour. Watch at your convenience for training credit hours.

To enroll: **nypf@nypf.org** to receive a link to watch any program in the NYPF library. Include your municipality and position.

■ **General Code e-Code**

Daily drop-in lunchtime training Q&A sessions plus webinars in several categories.

Information:

<https://www.generalcode.com/training/>

■ **Future Training Opportunities Online:**

Ontario County Planning Department website now lists upcoming training:

<https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/192/Training>

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

■ A motion was made by MR. BELLIS, seconded by MR. DELUCIA, 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 on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 7:00 p.m., at the Farmington Town Hall, 1000 County Road 8, Farmington, N.Y. 14425.

Following the meeting, the front doors to the Town Hall were locked.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Robortella, Clerk of the Board L.S.