



Letter to the Board

Michael Havens

Superintendent of Schools

Phone: 315-524-1001

Fax: 315-524-1049

June 17, 2005

"A graduation ceremony is an event where the commencement speaker tells thousands of students dressed in identical caps and gowns that 'individuality' is the key to success."
~Robert Orben

Greetings from Wayne Central. Below are a few items of interest.

Board Agenda Items:

1. **Executive Session:** I have three things to discuss with you during executive session. First, I met with a team of administrators to discuss how we should run the high school until we can select a new leader. After much thought I am recommending that we leave Larry in the position. The advantages of doing this are that we can continue the improvements we have made at the high school. Teachers may be reluctant to follow a new interim. The high school is the area that has the greatest academic concerns and the place I have asked Larry to devote his time. I trust Larry and his commitment to carrying out academic progress including the model schools. Larry understands the high school needs and would not have to be brought up to speed.

There are some concerns about continuing Larry. He just had a baby girl Wednesday and needs to spend time with his family. We still have many mountains to climb at the middle school and high school levels. We also have to make sure we don't slip back on goals we have achieved.

To mitigate some of these concerns the team suggested that instead of hiring an interim principal we do a couple internal things. First, we pay a stipend to one of our elementary principals to oversee the instructional program there. Our elementary principals have made great growth these past four years and are ready for an additional challenge. That would leave Larry just in charge of high school and middle school.

Secondly, we offer a part-time "dean of students" type of position to one of the individuals who just completed their internship (Pete Derser or Mark MacMillian). That would free up the two assistants to try their hand at some of the principalship tasks that Larry is doing. It provides good training for them and gives us a chance to see them in that role. Between the high school administrators and myself we would take care of evening supervision. Larry would be expected to be home with his family unless there is an assistant superintendent activity.

Thirdly, we offer a stipend to another of our administrators, perhaps Bob Armocida to oversee the curriculum writing. Bob has the organizational skills that would be good for that, and again it allows me to see him in another role.

Each of the people will be taking on an extra role beyond their jobs so I suggest we pay them a stipend, perhaps \$5-6,000 for the semester. This would include Larry, an elementary principal and

perhaps Bob A. for curriculum. A .5 -.75 time Dean of Students for the first half of the year would be perhaps \$15-20,000. In all we will spend less than hiring an interim, will give some growth opportunities to some good principals and keep a much needed consistency.

Larry and I have spent a great deal of time discussing this. He believes it is the best solution and is actually excited about the opportunity to stay with the high school for the fall.

The second item we need to do in executive session is my evaluation. John will be presenting a summary of your individual evaluations to me. This will also provide an opportunity for us to have a dialogue.

Lastly, Mark Callahan has decided to take another position, working for a non-profit agency. This is a huge loss to us as he is such a wonderful part of the team. He is looking for a more challenging position. Because he works so closely with the Board, I asked him to spend a few minutes with you discussing his motivations for leaving.

2. **School Improvement Goals:** facilities and finance- Mr. Atseff is presenting the final school improvement report of the year. This one deals with the goals the Board and administration established for the areas of facilities and finance.
3. **Full Day Kindergarten:** Our charter class of full day kindergarten has completed their year. We promised a brief update of our progress. Elementary principals Bob LaRuche and Kim Cox will be sharing the information with you.
4. **TIES Program:** We have completed our first school year with the TIES program. Mrs. Woodard will be presenting a report for you.
5. **Performance Contract Report:** Enclosed is a summary of the Atlantic Energy performance contract recommendations. You last met with them in the winter. They will be reviewing their recommendations with you. We are disappointed they don't include a windmill but have not given up on the idea. It may be more feasible at a later time.
6. **Foundation/Naming Rights:** We discussed this at the last meeting. I hope the information I provided you was helpful. If you desire additional information or have any questions please email me. We will be looking for some direction from the Board.
7. **Retreat:** I'll just be reminding you of the date and place.
8. **Reserve Accounts:** You will recall from your meeting with Ray Wager that in July the Board will decide where to place extra money. Ray recommends we create reserve accounts this month in order to be prepared for where you will place the money next month. Creating the account does not bind you to place money in it. See the attached letter from Mr. Atseff on the resolutions for the creation of the accounts.
9. **Confidential Employees Agreement:** Attached is a memo from Mark Callahan with the recommended salary increases for confidential and non-represented employees. I concur with his recommendations.

Board Letter:

1. **Pat Yates:** Pat is home from the hospital. She is quite tired but optimistic. The Board sent her welcome home flowers. I will give you additional news as it becomes available.
2. **Megan Spring:** Megan was born Wednesday morning at about three A.M. Both mother and daughter are doing fine. It is expected that they will arrive home sometime Friday. I banned Larry from the district until at least next Monday.
3. **NYSSBA Annual Convention:** The convention will be held in Rochester this year on October 27-30 at the Rochester Riverside Convention Center. Please set aside these dates and plan on attending as many of the sessions as possible. We hope to have our Science Olympiad Team hosting a booth again this year as well. Details will follow soon, but there is less of a rush this year as we do not require housing arrangements.
4. **Upcoming Events:**
 - June 19 – Father’s Day
 - June 22 – 8th Grade Convocation @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
 - June 23 – Graduation Rehearsal @ PAC – 9:00 a.m.
 - June 24 – Graduation Ceremonies @ FLCC Performing Arts Center – 7:00 p.m.
 - July 4 – Independence Day Holiday – Schools Closed
 - July 7 – Board Workshop
 - July 14 – Organizational Meeting
5. **Attachments:**
 - a. [Ontario](#) Town Board Meeting Minutes – 6/6
 - b. [Walworth](#) Town Board Meeting Minutes – 6/2
 - c. Wayne’s World – June Edition

JUNE 6, 2005

ONTARIO TOWN BOARD WORKSHOP MEETING

REVIEW OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A workshop meeting of the Ontario Town Board was called to order by Supervisor Joseph Molino at 7:10 PM in the Ontario Town Hall. Present were Supervisor Joseph Molino, Councilmen: Mark Brewer, Donald Shears, Donald Camp, Ronald Fillmore, Chairman of the Planning Board Eduard Kerkhoven and Town Clerk Cathy Herzog.

The following members of the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) were present: John Albright and Jason Ruffell. Supervisor Molino and Councilman Shears were also members of the CPC.

Sixteen residents and visitors were present at portions of the meeting.

Mr. Shears opened the third six planned workshops to review the proposed Comprehensive Plan (CP) by sections. He stated tonight's review would be "Housing and Residential Neighborhoods". Mr. Shears read the goals on page 71. He stated many of the elements of the housing and residential development sections have been covered in the last two review sessions. On page 82 and 83 he reviewed the 18 recommended actions and he referred to the "New Residential Housing" map # 16 and to the "Future Land Use" map # 4.

Mr. Brewer noted, from the last review session, on map # 4 "Future Land Use", that from a residential prospective, he feels there are two major changes, one is the Ontario on the lake area, classifying that as SR versus RR/AG. He supports that change. Another large change would be in portions of the northeastern quadrant, in the Knickerbocker/Furnace Road area. After the discussion at the last session he stated he felt the standard for lot size and open space requirements would be a "double whammy". He explained, if you are currently in the RR/AG and stay in RR/AG the lot size requirement would increase but if you are SR going to RR/AG you would be getting a double hit. He stated there are utilities on Furnace Road and on Knickerbocker Road near Lake Road so he suggested, what is currently zoned SR should remain SR.

Mr. Shears noted a large portion of that area is also covered in the Conservation Overlay on map # 5.

Mr. Brewer stated the recommended actions are pushing the town board to look at the future land use map and adopt it. He stated he feels that there should be sub-committees formed to address specific topics and the maps are one of those issues. He added he is not "set in stone" and he is willing to listen to other arguments or points of view for changes to the map.

Mr. Brewer stated it would be interesting how the board handles # 10 "Develop a sidewalk plan and policy that addresses the extension of sidewalks as well as maintenance and financing". He asked how and who will tackle this issue or he asked will it just sit in the CP and not be addressed? He suggested a sub-committee or are we going to expect the Planning Board to handle this when it comes up?

Mr. Shears asked the Chairman of the Planning Board, Mr. Kerkhoven, how often this comes up? Mr. Kerkhoven stated not that often. Mr. Shears asked for public comment on sidewalks.

Mr. John Graziose stated he is concerned about how the town will direct sidewalks. In the Centennial Village subdivision, it is fairly close to the schools, there has been a lot of discussion during the planning review sessions on sidewalks. He stated from a developer's prospective they are expensive. The development already has walking trails around the ponds. In the western end (near the Connor Farm) the planning board has expressed an interest in sidewalks. It could become a sticky issue. He stated he does not think they are needed in all sub-divisions and he feels the town board needs to give direction on this topic.

Mr. Brewer stated he agreed. If the town board keeps #10 in the CP, who would handle what direction we go in with sidewalks needs to be addressed.

Mr. Molino stated there are a lot of pro/cons on sidewalk development, the bottom line is the cost to install them and who pays to maintain them. It is an expensive proposition. Snow removal is another problem.

Mr. Shears stated that is the problem we have had with the sidewalk issue.

Mr. Brewer stated people want to walk on sidewalks and want them maintained and the people who have them in front of their homes don't want to maintain them. It's a difficult thing. He asked Mr. Graziose about other Gerber's developments, outside of Ontario, how do other towns handle sidewalks?

There was a discussion on the towns of Penfield and Webster and how they regulate sidewalks. Penfield wants them and Webster does not (outside of the Village). There was a discussion on: town-wide sidewalk districts, what board should have power or authority, sidewalk benefit districts, town code or regulation, financing and maintenance of sidewalks.

Mr. Barone explained the town of Penfield's program of paying into an escrow sidewalk account, he stated they also require an easement for the future development of sidewalks. Webster doesn't want sidewalks in sub-divisions and if there are sidewalks they are located on private property, not town property.

Mr. Barone stated the cost for sidewalks is \$6.00 a square foot, or \$30.00 a running foot to install. He added that adds \$3,000.00 to the cost of a home on a 100-foot wide lot. The cost is substantial. He feels it is very important that the town knows what direction they want to go in, it isn't a small issue.

Mr. Barone has proposed installing sidewalks in his cluster development (small lots for empty nesters) and he stated he feels the extra he is spending is a marketing tool and that it is worth the expense. He stated in some places sidewalks are appropriate and some they are not.

Mr. Shears asked Mr. Barone who would own the sidewalks?

Mr. Barone stated the sidewalk would be in the right of way owned by the town. He plans to have the property owner maintain the sidewalk in front of their property. He hasn't worked out all of the details yet, how that easement will be worded, maintenance issues.

Mr. Albright stated if they are on the highway right a way they are the town's responsibility. He stated the town has a duty to maintain them.

Mr. Brewer stated, in a maintenance perspective, in the town code, it is the homeowner's responsibility. Enforcement is a problem.

Mr. Brewer stated this is an area that he believes needs to be discussed in detail by a sub-committee. The town attorney needs to be included for legal issues such as liability and town code. He stated he is aware that the Highway Superintendent is very much against sidewalks because of the issues of snow removal and cost.

Mr. Kerkhoven stated he is also aware of the Highway Superintendent's strong opinion on sidewalks but the town already has sidewalks up and down Ridge Road. He feels the residents are pleased about that. He stated we don't want to see kids walking or people pushing strollers up and down Ridge Road, it gets them out of the road. The town hasn't dealt with some of the issues (snow removal) but Ontario is growing and we are putting together a community, a real sense of community and he feels sidewalks are important. He noted in Centennial Village, you see people walking in the development all the time. He suggested on a case by case basis there is a need to look at sidewalks. He added that the town needs to "bite the bullet" and come up with a policy to deal with sidewalks

Mr. Brewer stated he agrees but snow removal in the winter is a problem.

Mr. Barone stated he agrees there needs to be a sub-committee that addresses town wide sidewalks, how to finance them, consider the creation of a town-wide district or have separate districts as subdivisions are developed.

There was a discussion on cost, maintenance, a sidewalk district, calculating how much needs to be put aside for replacement and repair, affordability and how to maintain new versus old sidewalks.

Mr. Shears asked Mr. Ken Gerber if he had any issues he wanted to address? (Mr. Gerber attended the public hearing on the CP)

Mr. Gerber referred to recommended actions # 6 "When residential subdivisions are proposed that abut active farmland, require effective buffers to be incorporated into the subdivision design." He agreed that buffers are needed, especially if you are taking out hedgerows, there needs to be a boundary. The farmer needs room to work. There needs to be a distance between agriculture and residential housing.

Mr. Gerber noted there are not many farms left in Ontario. He stated he has concerns about the lot size proposal in the CP. It makes him want to leave and sell his land while he still has a say in what happens to his property. He stated the few farmers that are left are outnumbered by the people who say they want open space.

Mr. Gerber talked about drainage issues, specifically Mill Creek, and the recent problems with the snag and clear project. He thinks what the town has done with watershed management is fantastic. He talked about the importance of good drainage on the farming industry.

Mr. Gerber stated he doesn't want the lot sizes to be 5-7 acres. He stated he feels there is enough regulation in the planning board approval process to determine the size of the lot. If you have good land that will perk and produce houses you should be able to do that. He stated he can't sell his land as a farm,

he has to get out of agriculture he can't make money and he doesn't want the town to dictate what he can or cannot do with his land. He talked about wasting the land, letting it go wild, if you have the potential to develop, let the landowner do that. If the land has wild life on it or if the land is wetlands let that be your open space. He wants the useable land to be used and open space to him should be unusable land, parks and hiking trails.

Mr. Gerber, back to buffers, he stated Mr. Thompson has had issues with spraying the vineyards with the Bear Creek subdivision so close to his property. Mr. Gerber asked how much of a buffer is enough when using pesticides and fertilizers?

Mr. Molino agreed with Mr. Gerber that farmers need the creeks to flow and cleaning out the waterways is very important. He stated with new MS4 requirements and the controls are governed by the Army Corp of Engineers, DEC and Wayne County Soil and Water there are more and more regulations. More wetlands are being created and that is tough on the farmers.

Mr. Gerber stated he just doesn't see farming as an industry in Ontario any more and he is sad to leave. He didn't like the looks of the large lots, some maintained and some not on Lincoln Road (the old Benedict farm).

Mr. Molino stated farming has been impacted by economics, you can't expect to continue farming if you can't make any money.

Mr. Gerber stated many people do not want to mow and maintain seven acres of lawn. He stated the people who came out to Ontario, saw the open space saw the farms and crops, they like what they saw and want things to stay that way. But the farmers can't make a living here, there isn't anyplace in Ontario to buy fertilizer, he talked about some of the other problems farmers face.

He stated it is very hard to farm legally.

Mr. Barone stated asking people if they want open space is like asking them if they want clean air. Everyone is going to say yes, they want it. There are ways for the farmers to retain the value of their land and to accomplish this and not hurt anyone. He suggested cluster development and gave an example of cluster development of a large parcel.

Mr. Shears stated he appreciates everything Mr. Gerber has done for the community and he is sad to hear what he is going to do. He said, your comments are well taken, thank you.

Mr. Brewer asked if the CPC talked about things like painting a business on "Main Street" purple? Is that under recommended action #15 "encourage older housing to programs that assist with renovating housing", did the CPC discuss the issue specifically in the "hamlet area"? He asked if an architectural review board might be a way to go to review properties in the downtown business district for making improvements.

Mr. Ruffell stated it certainly came up during the whole process, the CPC recommended a sub-committee for the "hamlet area" regulations and for issues like lot sizes and sidewalks. There are numerous ways to handle some of these recommendations. The CPC did not set a specific way to handle it.

Mr. Brewer talked about adopting the CP, amending the CP, a timeline for forming and creating sub-committee meetings. He stated if all sides of an issue are not going to be addressed by a sub-committee he

would want it out of the CP. He'd like to see how many committees we might have, what specific topics would be covered before the board votes on the CP. He stated if the town board votes yes on the CP, that is an endorsement. If the board doesn't agree on something it should come out.

Mr. Ruffell suggested just one sub-committee could be formed after adoption, it could be comprised of one member of the CPC, the ZBA, the TB, a developer and a resident. One sub-committee to address all of these issues.

Mr. Brewer stated he favors a different committee for a different issue, not just one committee.

He stated he is pleased with the number of people who have attended the review sessions and the interest that has been shown in the CP. Hopefully, he said, we can get people to volunteer for committees.

Mr. Graziose pointed out recommended action # 18 "Ensure thorough subdivision and site plan review of proposed new developments that roads interconnect or provide the opportunity for future interconnection with each other and existing roads. Avoid the creation of dead end streets and cul-de-sacs where possible." In cluster development or PUD developments, you are providing open space, he stated he thinks #18 would be a conflict in cluster development, which encourages open space.

Mr. Graziose stated he thought recommended action #4 "Establish a minimum open space requirement for subdivisions of five or more lots" was too restrictive. He noted a five-lot subdivision was too small to talk about open space. He stated he could see the difference with a 50 acre or 100 acre parcel.

Mr. Barone agreed, and he added cul-de-sacs are an internal part of cluster development and he thought that that is very attractive. He is aware that they are difficult for the highway department to maintain. Mr. Barone suggested this could be balanced because houses on the cul-de-sacs could be worth more money and pay more taxes.

Mr. Brewer stated # 18 is not a change to code, just a guide for the planning board.

Mr. Graziose talked about how roads are set up in a cluster development and what he thinks works and what doesn't.

Mr. Barone stated anything the town board suggests he thinks that the planning board takes that very seriously. With new members on the board and with Mr. Kerkhoven in attendance the planning board might think that the town board wants them to avoid cul-de-sacs. He cautioned, be careful how #18 is worded, the CP is the planning board's guidance. They want to do the town boards will and they will follow the CP.

Mr. Brewer, on recommended action # 4 (establish minimum open space), it's difficult to talk about rural, lots per dwelling and dedicated open space. He feels that as recommended, this could be a "double whammy", so maybe it can't stay there. Until the town board takes a straw vote and decides what is in or out, we have to see where we are at, this has to stay as an open discussion.

Mr. Albright stated he wants to go on record for the CPC and he explained, again, the concept of 5-7 acres per individual dwelling. "If the town continues to build houses on the smallest lot possible, so you can sell them to more and more people, you get into the equation of 2.4 children per dwelling, which means there is roughly \$12,000.00 of associated expense to educate those children, and for servicing the families needs that are not picked up by the taxes that are derived from that lot. So he said, "that gets spread out

throughout the rest of the community, everyone else picks up the expense associated with that lot". "So, if you want a community that nobody can really afford to live in, just keep building those types of houses." "We already have a supply of those types of houses, we have 500 approved building lots for development of that type of house." "The CPC idea was to spread it out to get housing that is more expensive so that it will actually cover its own expenses." "The housing that is already in existence and scheduled to be built gets recycled and you are meeting the demands of the people already present and want to sell their property." "But at the same time you are conserving the character of the community that the residents enjoy." "I have been here all my life I don't want to see it change." "I don't want to see it built up like Webster, I don't want to see it built up like Greece." He stated he doesn't think that he is alone, it was demonstrated by the town wide survey. Mr. Albright said "if you are building a house it seems to me that building it on a larger lot with dedicated open space creates a demand for that piece of property to build on, it will support itself if it is taxed accordingly." "At the same time you preserve the open space and rural character of the town and developers can still make a living." "That is the emphasis the CPC put on those lot restrictions in the RR/AG, not the entire town but where it made sense."

Mr. Graziose presented an article from the Empire State Builder, demographics, on the local impact of building 100 single and 100 multi-family homes in the average US City. He had highlighted "It is clear that the housing industry is here to stay. Not only is it the cornerstone of family security, stability and prosperity, but it also strengthens communities, the state and the nation." He stated housing impacts businesses and commercial businesses. He listed the benefits of having population, and the impacts on the economy besides taxes. Mr. Graziose stated there are a lot of businesses in town that are suffering. He listed other benefits of having people in town, he stated we are providing people with a place to live and keeping housing affordable not just so we, the developers, can make money. Housing does have a significant impact on the economy.

There was a discussion on how many acres are large enough for taxes to support it. There was discussion on the cost to educate children and provide services; different views were expressed as to how much it would cost a house to support itself.

Mr. Camp stated acreage doesn't dictate the price of the house. He added you can build a \$300,000 house on just an acre. And that house will support itself.

Mr. Albright stated the idea is to maintain the rural character of the community. A \$500,000 house on an acre of land doesn't preserve the rural character. He repeated the people who responded to the survey wanted to keep Ontario rural/agricultural. This (CP) is an attempt to get a balance, a compromise. It makes economic sense and doesn't injure people that own land and want to sub-divide it and get rid of it for whatever reason. If you do it efficiently so that your not running your water lines and sewer lines every which way all over the town at an enormous expense but parcel it out in areas where it make sense you can accommodate both interests. He stated that was the focus of the group.

Mr. Barone stated, to your point Mr. Albright, if you look at the Zoning Classification map #3 there is a lot of green (rural). He said "I don't see the town filling up like a city, it's not going to happen". "The town is going to grow rural, the "dye is already set" this town is already rural and will remain rural." "One of the goals you mentioned is diversity." "I'm looking at 90% rural on the map." "That's not diverse." He stated I think we need some high density, some medium density areas and some large lots, we need a balance. There is no balance on this map.

Mr. Camp stated this is almost two different arguments. He stated he understands the rural part, he understands open space. But to tie that into the tax base is not comparing apples to apples. We can make houses that support themselves that are not on 5 – 7 acres. "I understand the tax part I understand the open

space part but they are not the same in my mind." To say that we have to build on large lots to support the taxes is not factual.

Mr. Albright stated you're right, people who want to put a \$500,000 house up will probably put it on a large piece of property.

Mr. Camp stated we shouldn't stop anyone from doing that if that is what they want. I'm looking at the person who wants a \$300,000 house on a smaller lot. If we go the direction of the CP we aren't going to allow that. He stated he thinks there is a market for a \$300,000 house on a one acre lot.

Mr. Gerber agreed, and he added you can maintain that lot size. He said "it seems to him that you're not giving the land justification because you're saying 5 - 7 acre lots, you're saying you have to have that large of a parcel to put a house on."

Mr. Albright clarified, you don't have to put the house on 5 – 7 acres, but you are going to set aside acreage for green space, open space.

Mrs. Anne Tobin asked who pays for that?

Mr. Camp stated nobody maintains it but the person who buys the house pays for it.

Mr. Gerber says that is the problem as he sees it, if you want to build a house you have to have a 5 - 7 acre parcel to do that.

Mr. Albright stated that isn't correct.

There were examples discussed, concept discussions, lot size, impact on sales, the market, the price a developer is willing to pay because he can build less homes in the RR/AG, ownership of the open space and uses for the land.

Mr. Camp stated Mr. Barone is building a cluster development and he is donating 28 acres for open space to the town. The cost of the donated land (28 acres) is being paid for by the people that buy in that development. He stated he thinks it is wonderful that that land will come to the town but the people who buy in that development have to be willing to pay the price for the land that they don't own.

Mr. Gerber gave some examples and stated, to him, if the vacant land is left to go up to weeds, it is a waste of property. He stated he felt the people who like open space might like plowed fields and farmed land not just overgrown brush.

Mr. Albright stated that depends on if you think that open space is worth while. He thinks it is and if it grows up to weeds its still good for wildlife and he likes how that looks.

Mr. Brewer stated no one is wrong, everyone is right. He stated that this is the issue before the town board. The problem is conflicting advice, do they want open space yes, do they want to pay for it no. He gave some examples that showed the difficulty of making a decision on adopting the CP and how hard it will be to be fair to everyone yet give guidance to the future of the town. He stated he is sure not everyone will be happy.

Mrs. Tobin asked what percentage of the land that is rural/agricultural do we need to keep rural or agricultural or green space? What percent is unusable land, that is considered wetland? Do we have these figures?

Mr. Molino stated he asked that question himself. He quoted there is approximately 22,000 acres in the town of Ontario, what percent should be open space? He didn't think anyone had that answer.

Mrs. Tobin asked if we should start in the beginning and work from there? Then do the overlays and incorporate the land that is already unusable into the areas of open space?

Mr. Albright stated to the extent that it was possible the CPC did that. He stated the rural/agricultural areas are in the overlay maps.

Mr. Ruffell stated Stuart Brown Associates (consultant to the CP) might have that information.

Mr. Brewer asked if it was a percent of acreage that the CPC wanted to remain open space?

Mr. Albright stated the land types were taken into consideration, the farming areas, rural areas and wetlands.

Mr. Shears read an index on page 37 "Open space index". It stated that Ontario was made up of 21,000 acres, 5,300 acres woods and brushland and 2,500 acres were in orchard use in 1979.

Mr. Brewer stated we should explore the option of purchasing land through grants.

Mr. Barone agreed he doesn't want Ontario to look like Greece, but he stated he didn't think that would happen. The concept of green space/open space is relatively new and wasn't used when towns like Greece were developed. Open space was called a park, green space is new concept, purchasing development rights is a new concept. He stated he didn't think it was fair to say Ontario could develop like the town of Greece. He went on to say development in Ontario is relatively young, and he stated he feels that is not going to happen, its not realistic, balance is everything.

Mr. Brewer asked how do we get there? Where and how much open space do we need? How much of the taxpayer's dollars should we spend to do that? Should we ignore open space or be proactive to get space now when we can. Once the land is gone, it's gone.

Mr. Graziose agreed the town needs to be proactive. 20 years ago we didn't have cluster development, it's a new tool and we should encourage it. He described how Gerber Homes has purchased land and how they plan for use of land for a new development. Cluster works great and provides green space.

Mr. Brewer gave some examples of land development from his viewpoint. He stated after awhile, under the new guidelines, he thinks the land value will come back up.

Mr. Graziose quoted statistics for building permits issued in Monroe County. He stated Ontario is no where near a rapid rate of development. Ontario is only building 50-60 homes per year. He stated new zoning techniques such as cluster development were not around years ago when the towns of Webster and Greece were developed. He stated limiting density could also limit growth.

Mr. Camp stated, 60 building permits for an average lot (½ acre @ \$18,000) an average house that was built in Ontario this past year only chewed up 30 acres of land.

Mr. Barone asked where is the panic coming from? He stated upstate NY is a very depressed housing market compared to the rest of the country.

Mr. Gerber asked what is the development that we don't want? He stated things went well in the past to get where we are. If land is good land and it will perk, it should be ok to have a smaller lot, if not then larger lot.

Mr. Shears went back to the purpose of the CP. He stated two years ago we decided we needed to revisit our Master Plan, we hired a consultant, organized a committee, and they have developed the proposed plan. The town is growing and he stated he thinks it was time. He agrees with Mr. Graziose and Mr. Barone, there is no need to panic but we did need to revisit and plan for the town's future growth. He asked about the survey result.

Mr. Ruffell and Mr. Albright quoted statistics from the town wide survey.

Mr. Shears read on page 12 highlights from the resident survey from the fall of 2003. 74% agree with the statement "in order to preserve open space, scenic views and wildlife habitat for the future, the town of Ontario should establish a program to purchase undeveloped land and/or the development rights to the land to keep it from being developed". "More than ½ (55%) would be willing to pay extra taxes to preserve open space". He stated that is the point of forming a committee. We, the town board, are in a "darn if you do darn if you don't" place. Mr. Shears stated the CPC was driven by this survey and this is where we have to work from.

Mr. Barone stated he respects what you are trying to do.

Mr. Kerkhoven stated there are two kinds of open space. The example that was given on Lincoln Road, some people would call that open space. He suggested you go down Berg Road or Boston Road, there are a lot of homes but some people would still call that open space. You don't have access to that land, someone owns it. The long-term goal here is to not to turn neighborhoods like Boston Road and Berg Road into a Centennial Village type of development. He agrees subdivisions belong in certain spots. Just because there is a lot of green (rural) on the future development map that doesn't mean there are no houses. He stated he feels that there are not a lot of developmental lots left in Ontario (so he has been told). And not too many road frontage lots, that are good, are left to build on. There is open space and it is not all buildable land. We need a road map of where to go with development. That is what the CPC is trying to do.

Mr. Brewer thanked the builders for coming. He stated he understands that they have a vested interest, that this is their livelihood. He added we've focused a lot on lot sizes, open space and size per dwelling. Are there changes we could make from the current code that wouldn't "fly in your face" that you could stand or that you could support or is your position it "ain't broken don't fix" what we have is fine? Where are we and where should we be from your prospective?

Mr. Barone stated that where there is sewer/water available allow ½ acre lots. He stated he thinks that the sewer is limited to two or three areas. As far as large lots, all towns have some large lot zoning, he'd like to see diversity in large lots, one acre, two acre, three acre or maybe more, you don't have to go blanket and designate all lot size. He stated that might encourage long narrow lots that may not be attractive. He

noted a lot of "amateurs" built their own homes on odd lots, some are nice. He thinks a good builder does a good job and that there is an obvious difference. To discourage good builders from building nice communities in the Town of Ontario is doing a disservice. Open space and green space are important, keeping the rural character you want and having good quality is important.

Mr. Graziose stated the future land map showing rural is too large an area to him. He agrees some large lots are needed. He stated he believes there needs to be a balance. He thinks the SR should be significantly increased. He loves biking and hiking, and he likes the idea of building a community center and having sufficient parkland.

Mr. Gerber agreed that quality was key in development.

Mr. Shears thanked everyone for attending. The next session is on June 13th following the regular town board meeting at 7:00 PM and will be about "Economic Development and Parks and Recreation".

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Herzog

Ontario Town Clerk

JUNE 2, 2005

WALWORTH TOWN BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The regular Town Board meeting, held at the Walworth Town Hall, 3600 Lorraine Drive, was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Supervisor Frank Guelli. Board members present: Daniel Keyes, Frank Maciuska, Patti Marini and Thomas Yale.

Other town employees present: Debora Germain, Recreation Director
Susie Jacobs, Receiver of Taxes
Richard Morris, Attorney for the Town
Paul Russell, Town Engineer
George Schaller, Sewer Superintendent
Phil Williamson, Code Enforcement Officer
Marcia Englert, Town Clerk

MINUTES:

Motion by Councilwoman Marini to approve the minutes of May 19, 2005 as presented. Seconded by Councilman Keyes and unanimously carried.

CATCH A BUSINESS AWARD: CAREY LAKE:

Supervisor Guelli presented Bruce Carey, owner of Carey Lake, a "Catch A Business Award" for partnering with Walworth Recreation such that the Town's youth may participate in fishing programs year round.

EAGLE SCOUT PROJECT:

Aaron Mack presented his project to construct an elevated walkway from Wildflower Drive through a forever-wild area to the lower soccer field at the Gananda Middle School, which would prevent the youth from walking across private property and shorten the distance to the school. Supervisor Guelli stated that there are concerns about property ownership, liability, adjacent neighbors and congregating youth. Aaron stated that it wouldn't become a hangout as there would be no lighting and the geography would not entice the youth. He noted that Rich Struzzi stated that Gananda Partnership would be willing to deed that parcel to the Town. Aaron stated that only one resident had reservations but is willing to negotiate. Richard Morris recommended that Paul Russell review the plans. Councilman Maciuska stated that the issues include ownership of the land, liability, long-term maintenance, and the need for engineering plans. Richard Morris stated that a letter might be required from DEC regarding the walkway's proximity to the wetlands. Supervisor Guelli stated that he will contact Rich Struzzi with a request that Gananda Partnership retain the land, thereby eliminating the liability and maintenance issues. A decision will be made at the June 16, 2005 meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**EMPIRE ZONE:**

Mike Jacobs, 3366 Heatherbrook Lane, inquired about the status of the property in Town within the Empire Zone. Supervisor Guelli stated that it is under review by the State as the regulations have changed.

GREYSTONE GOLF CLUB PUBLIC ASSEMBLY PERMIT:

Motion by Councilman Yale authorizing the issuance of a Seasonal Public Assembly Permit to Greystone Golf Club, effective June 2, 2005 through November 30, 2005. Seconded by Councilman Maciuska.

Roll call vote:	Supervisor Guelli	Aye
	Councilman Keyes	Aye
	Councilman Maciuska	Aye
	Councilwoman Marini	Aye
	Councilman Yale	Aye

Motion carried.

AGRICULTURAL GRANTS:

Supervisor Guelli stated that the Federal grants have been approved for the Keyes and Weber farms. Richard Morris will review the documents.

LOCAL LAW # 3 HEARING AUTHORIZED:

Councilman Yale offered the following resolution and move its adoption, seconded by Councilman Maciuska to wit:

BE IT RESOLVED that Local Law No.3 of the year 2005, entitled "A LOCAL LAW AMENDING THE TOWN OF WALWORTH MUNICIPAL CODE MORE PARTICULARLY AMENDING PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO SEWER RENTS SETTING FORTH SEWER RENT CHARGES AND PROVISION FOR MINIMUM SEWER RENT NOT TO BE CHARGED IN CASE OF DISCONNECT FOR MORE THAN 30 CONTINUOUS DAYS; ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS IN ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY UNTIL RECORDING OF CONVEYANCES OFFERED IN DEDICATION; AMENDING PROVISIONS IN RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS TO PROVIDE THAT BROADCAST RADIO ANTENNAS NOT INTENDED FOR COMMERCIAL USE (INCLUDING HAM RADIOS) SHALL BE A PERMITTED ACCESSORY USE UPON ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT; ADDING INVISIBLE FENCE PROVISIONS; AMENDING SIGN REQUIREMENTS; NEW BUILDING PERMIT FEES SHALL BE REQUIRED AND CERTAIN EXISTING FEES SHALL BE INCREASED BEFORE A BUILDING PERMIT MAY BE ISSUED ALL AS SET FORTH IN CHAPTERS 85, 139, 151 AND 180 OF SUCH CODE" be and is hereby introduced before the Town Board of the Town of Walworth in the County of Wayne and State of New York, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of the aforesaid proposed local law be laid upon the desk of each member of the Town Board, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town Board hold a public hearing on said proposed local law at the Town Hall, 3600 Lorraine Drive, in the Town of Walworth, New York at 8:00 o'clock P.M. on Thursday, June 16, 2005, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town Clerk publish or cause to be published a public notice in the official newspaper of the Town of said public hearing at least five (5) days prior thereto.

Roll call vote:	Supervisor Guelli	Aye
	Councilman Keyes	Aye
	Councilman Maciuska	Aye
	Councilwoman Marini	Aye
	Councilman Yale	Aye

Resolution adopted. Copy is attached.

WATERFORD ROAD SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT/REPAIR:

1. **BIDS RECEIVED:**

Hynes Concrete: \$14.00 linear foot

Monroe Roadways: 15.00 linear foot

It was noted that the total cost of the project would be approximately \$22,000, as an additional \$8,000 for concrete, stone, asphalt and topsoil will be incurred from work done by the Highway Department.

2. **DISCUSSION:**

Councilman Maciuska stated that the sidewalk on Waterford Road from Route 350 to Woods Edge and the sidewalk on the northeast side of Wildflower Drive have significant damage. He recommended that all the work be done at once, which would probably result in a better price. He stated that the decision would only be delayed two weeks.

3. **BID AWARD:**

Motion by Councilman Keyes authorizing the replacement/repair of the Waterford Road sidewalk by Hynes Concrete for a cost of \$14.00 linear foot, to be expended from line SM5410.41. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

Roll call vote:	Supervisor Guelli	Aye
	Councilman Keyes	Aye
	Councilman Maciuska	Nay
	Councilwoman Marini	Aye
	Councilman Yale	Nay

Motion carried.

Supervisor Guelli stated that he will have Mike Frederes look at the entire project.

SURPLUS EQUIPMENT SALE RESULTS:

A report was received from Mike Frederes stating that the auction proceeds, totaling \$28,170, were as follows:

1 ton roller	\$ 1,400
1998 Chevy PU	8,900
1988 backhoe	21,000
less 10% commission	3,130

EQUALIZATION RATE:

Supervisor Guelli stated that the State has established the Equalization Rate at 100%.

RECREATION DEPT. EXPENSE APPROVED:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska authorizing the purchase of baseball/softball trophies from Penfield Trophies for a cost of \$1,656.75, to be expended from line A7310.43. Seconded by Councilman Keyes.

Roll call vote:	Supervisor Guelli	Aye
	Councilman Keyes	Aye
	Councilman Maciuska	Aye
	Councilwoman Marini	Aye
	Councilman Yale	Aye

Motion carried.

WATER DISTRICT EXTENSIONS:

Paul Russell stated that the Burrow Road information will be submitted at the June 16, 2005 meeting. Regarding the Atlantic Ave. project, Paul recommended that it also include the east end beginning at Cream Ridge Road and extending to the wetlands and at the west end beginning at County Line Road east to the homes.

HIGHWAY GARAGE ADDITION ELECTRICAL CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER #2:

Motion by Councilman Keyes authorizing Change Order #2 to the electrical contract for a cost not to exceed \$2,138.33. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

Roll call vote:	Supervisor Guelli	Aye
	Councilman Keyes	Aye
	Councilman Maciuska	Aye
	Councilwoman Marini	Aye
	Councilman Yale	Aye

Motion carried.

DRAINAGE REPORT:

Paul Russell submitted the 2005 Storm Drainage Study Report for review, including a priority list. Easements and wetlands permits will be necessary. He will meet with Mike Frederes to determine the cost if the work was to be done by the Highway Department.

REC DAYS:

Deb Germain stated that Rec Days events are being held June 3rd & 4th in celebration of the Recreation Department's 50th anniversary.

MEETING WITH THE ATTORNEY FOR THE TOWN:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska to adjourn to a meeting with the Attorney for the Town to discuss legal issues. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini and unanimously carried. Time: 8:30 P.M.

RECONVENED:

Supervisor Guelli reconvened the meeting at 8:53 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Councilman Yale to adjourn. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini and unanimously carried. Time: 8:54 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Englert, RMC
Town Clerk