



Michael Havens
Superintendent of Schools

Phone: 315-524-0201
Fax: 315-524-4233
mhavens@wayne.k12.ny.us

Wayne Central School District

LETTER to the BOARD

May 27, 2005

"They say that time changes things, but you actually have to change them yourself." -- Andy Warhol

Greetings from Wayne Central. This will be a short letter since we just met last night

Newsletter:

1. **Moving Up Day:** Today was moving up day at our high school. The seniors had a parade of lawn tractors this morning. This is done, of course, to show their emerging independence from the high school. They were well behaved as expected. Sadly there weren't a large number. I am still waiting for them to surprise us with a huge parade including a few full size John Deeres. Perhaps next year.
2. **Last Week of School:** Enclosed is a chart showing the revised last week of school. Elementary and Middle schools teachers are getting two additional days to pack up their things to get us ready for summer construction. It was also a nice way to congratulate them on their fine performance on the ELA tests.
3. **Math Scores:** We have finished scoring the K-4 State Math exams. While the results are preliminary, it appears that 92-93% will have passed the exam. This will be an increase over last year's 90% passing rate.
4. **Wayne Central Foundation/Naming Rights:** The Board subcommittee continues to make good progress on establishing an educational foundation and setting up procedures for naming rights of certain facilities. A draft of the by-laws has been written and we hope to have a kick-off meeting of members in June.
5. **Elenbe Awards** - As you heard last night, when our students came to the Board meeting to see you, the Wayne High School Musical *Beauty and the Beast* won runner up for "Outstanding Performance in a Wayne County High School Musical – Best Production." I am very proud of the wonderful job our students did in this show, particularly with the unique nature of the performances, costuming and sets. Seth Palmer (Lumiere) won Best Supporting Actor and Ryan Lattanzio (Cogsworth) won runner up – a sweep in that category. Clearly, our students

have the talent to be the best in the area. We need to continue this level of performance and caliber of show to put Wayne Central firmly in the forefront of the Performing Arts “league” just as our academics and athletics are.

6. Events –

- 5/31 – OP/OE PTA Meeting @ OE – 3:30 p.m,
- 5/31 – HS Undergraduate Awards @PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 5/31 – MS Fossil Trip
- 6/1 - MS Awards Night @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 6/1 - MS Fossil Trip
- 6/1-2 – NYS Grade 8 Social Studies Tests
- 6/2 – MS Band Concert @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 6/3 – OP Grandparents Day
- 6/3 – FE Fifth Grade Banquet
- 6/6 – MS Choral Concert @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 6/7 – HS Choral Concert @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 6/8 – Varsity Club Awards @ PAC – 7:00 p.m.
- 6/9 – Board of Education Meeting @ DO – 7:30 p.m.

7. Attachments:

- a. Walworth Town Board Meeting Minutes – 5/19
- b. Ontario Town Board Meeting Minutes – 5/16
- c. End of School Year Information
- d. Retirement Gathering Invitation

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: Norman Druschel, Building Inspector
Michael Frederes, Highway Superintendent
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 Councilman Yale to approve the minutes of May 5, 2005 as presented. Seconded by Councilman Keyes and unanimously carried.

APRIL SUPERVISOR'S REPORT:

Motion by Councilwoman Marini to approve the April 2005 Supervisor's report as presented. Seconded by Councilman Maciuska and unanimously carried.

CLAIMS:

1. **GENERAL:**

Motion by Councilman Yale to approve payment of General Claims totaling \$37,442.05. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

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

Motion carried.

2. **HIGHWAY:**

Motion by Councilman Keyes to approve payment of Highway Claims totaling \$23,421.45. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

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

Councilman Yale Aye

Motion carried.

3. HIGHWAY GARAGE PROJECT:

Motion by Councilman Keyes to approve payment of Highway Project Claims totaling \$6,324.01. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

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

Motion carried.

4. LIGHTING:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska to approve payment of the following Lighting Claims:

Walworth Light District	636.83
Harvest Hills Light District	559.07
Gananda Light District	895.88
Brookside Light District	6.46

Seconded by Councilman Yale.

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

Motion carried.

5. MEMORIAL TREE FUND:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska to approve payment of Memorial Tree Fund Claims totaling \$301.55. Seconded by Councilman Yale.

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

Motion carried.

6. SEWER DISTRICT:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska to approve payment of Sewer District Claims totaling \$33,631.03. Seconded by Councilman Yale.

Roll call vote: Supervisor Guelli Aye

Councilman Keyes	Aye
Councilman Maciuska	Aye
Councilwoman Marini	Aye
Councilman Yale	Aye

Motion carried.

7. TRUST & AGENCY:

Motion by Councilwoman Marini to approve payment of Trust & Agency Claims totaling \$30,213.40. Seconded by Councilman Keyes.

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

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: There were no comments from the public.

NYS POLICE 10 YEAR LEASE AGREEMENT:

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

WHEREAS, the New York State Police are desirous of continuing to lease the office and garage space at the Walworth Town Hall, 3600 Lorraine Drive,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Agreement with the New York State Police be continued, whereby office and garage space are provided at the Walworth Town Hall, 3600 Lorraine Drive, at no cost to the New York State Police agency. Said Agreement expires December 31, 2015.

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

Resolution adopted.

FIREMEN'S SERVICE AWARD PROGRAM:

A letter was received from David Rogers and Michael Mahlmeister, Financial Consultants, stating that they are no longer with Penflex, Inc., but have joined the investment firm of RBC Dain Rauscher. They requested that the accounts be transferred to the aforementioned company. Supervisor Guelli will invite Mr. Rogers and Mr. Mahlmeister to the June 2, 2005 meeting to discuss their request.

GINEGAW PARK: BARBECUE PITS USE APPROVED:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska authorizing the use of portable barbecue pits by Rick Halvorsen at Ginegaw Park on June 26, 2005, subject to the presence of the Walworth Fire Department and with the condition that all traces of the barbecue pits be removed at the end of the event. Seconded by Councilman Yale.

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

Motion carried.

FOSDICK ROAD DRAINAGE PROJECT APPROVED:

Motion by Councilman Keyes authorizing the cleaning of the swale on Fosdick Road for a cost not to exceed \$2,000.00, to be expended from SD1-8540.41. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini.

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

Motion carried.

It was noted that this is maintenance of a swale that was cleaned approximately 12 years ago.

RETENTION POND POLICY AMENDED:

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

WHEREAS, the retention pond is a tool used to meet NYSDEC Phase 2 Regulations regarding storm water management,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Walworth permit the use of retention ponds, only when necessary, to meet NYSDEC Storm Water Pollution Control Regulations.

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

Resolution adopted.

LIBRARY AUDIT REPORT:

Councilman Yale stated that the Library audit resulted in no significant findings.

FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS:

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

BE IT RESOLVED that the Account Clerk be authorized to transfer the following:

\$ 285.00 from Memorial Tree Fund Balance to CM4-7110.41

16.55 from Memorial Tree Fund Balance to CM4-7110.42

1,181.16 from A1990.41 to A1620.46.

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

Resolution adopted.

MEETING WITH THE ATTORNEY FOR THE TOWN:

Motion by Councilman Maciuska to adjourn to a meeting with the Attorney for the Town to discuss several legal issues. Seconded by Councilman Yale and unanimously carried. Time: 8:00 P.M.

RECONVENED:

Supervisor Guelli reconvened the meeting at 8:37 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Councilman Keyes to adjourn. Seconded by Councilwoman Marini and unanimously carried. Time: 8:38 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Englert, RMC
Town Clerk

MAY 16, 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 7:00 PM in the Ontario Town Hall. Present were Supervisor Joseph Molino, Councilmen: Donald Camp, Donald Shears, Ronald Fillmore (entered 7:15 PM), Director of Recreation and Parks William Riddell and Town Clerk Cathy Herzog.

Absent: Councilman Mark Brewer

The following members of the Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) were present: Vice Chairman Richard Clark, John Albright, Jason Ruffell and Craig Litt. Supervisor Molino and Councilman Shears were also members of the CPC.

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

Mr. Camp led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Shears opened the first of six planned workshops to review the proposed Comprehensive Plan (CP) by sections. He stated tonight's review will be "Land Use and Natural Resources and Environmental Protection". For the most part, Mr. Shears read the sections from the summary of the proposed CP that was provided to the public in January 2005 at a town board meeting.

Mr. Shears started the review by reading the section on page 5 "Land Use Overview". He read goals A – J. Under the section "Route 104 and Ridge Road" he skipped to page 9 and read a section he had highlighted "One option to support existing businesses and encourage additional commercial development along Route 104 is to develop a parallel service road to provide access to businesses." He went on to read the rest of that section then skipped to "The proximity of the railroad and difficulties obtaining approval for railroad crossings limit opportunities to develop land north of Route 104." He noted, as we go through the CP there is more about the railroad in a section on Transportation and Infrastructure.

On page 10, Mr. Shears read the policies and recommendations for Route 104 and under Ridge Road, the existing land use and a section on issues and opportunities. He offered to take questions and comments at any time.

Mr. Shears pointed out a proposed change to the Zoning Map (Map 3, Zoning Classifications) under the Route 104 recommendations: "the Industrial (I) Zoned district at the eastern boundary of the Town should be changed to Business Transitional (BT)". The proposed BT district was highlighted in brown on the map.

Mr. Clark stated the reason for the proposed change was to open up the area for other or similar uses. Commercial and retail, not just industrial uses.

Mr. Litt agreed the CPC suggested the change to allow for more uses.

Mr. Camp stated he was not opposed to that change, he added, the land would be easier to develop and market.

Mr. Shears read the policies and recommendations relative to removing the railroad tracks north of Route 104 to construct access roads and trails (he stated this is also covered under Transportation and Infrastructure).

Mr. Clark stated we have been trying to build a road north of the railroad for many years. He stated he is suggesting that that effort doesn't stop. Progress would be much easier if that railroad wasn't there. He noted several years ago a hearing with the DOT was held to petition for a railroad crossing at Lincoln Road. The railroad company testified, at that time, that the rail lines were used for only two trips a year west of Lincoln road. There was a discussion on use of the railroad past and present, ownership of the railroad, and advantages/disadvantages.

Mr. Clark stated RG& E owns the right a way, the railroad tracks are owned by the County and leased to Ontario Midland. Some people in the County think that the railroad is a great thing for Economic Development, he doesn't. When he was a Supervisor he stated he was unsuccessful in getting rid of the railroad.

Mr. Albright asked about the big poles RG&E has and the transmission lines. He asked how far from the poles do you have to be to build a road?

Mr. Clark stated when we talked about crossing the railroad at Lincoln road it was not a problem, there was a small pole that could be moved, the big poles were not a problem. He couldn't recall specifically what space was required. Different opinions were expressed on the distance needed for a road.

Mr. Riddell stated he is working with the Economic Development Committee (EDC) on a proposal to eliminate the railroad tracks along Route 104. To date: a survey has been completed, he has spoken with the County and with RG&E. The EDC is moving forward on the proposal.

Mr. Riddell stated RG&E has make it clear they are not in favor of having a parallel road north of Route 104, but they would not fight against an extension to Lincoln Road. The DOT will allow driveway cuts over the railroad. Mr. Riddell stated it was not possible to have an access road on the RG&E easement. So that means a parallel road is not feasible but a crossover/extension to Lincoln Road is possible.

Mr. Molino stated he thought it would be better to go to Timothy Lane and extend an access road from that point. He stated there would be a liability issue with putting a road on RG&E's right-of-way.

Mr. Riddell stated the EDC's decision to obtain the railroad lease has been based on what RG&E has told them. They, RG&E, is only concerned with preserving their easement. He explained that their easement covers the entire railroad bed and 15 feet to the north towards Route 104. The land, under the railroad, is owned by the County, the tracks are owned by railroad, Ontario Midland leases it from the County for a nominal fee each year. EDC is trying to get that contract now. There was a discussion on an access parallel road or a railroad crossing at Lincoln Road, removing the railroad line, cost, what we would/could do.

Mr. Litt stated the development of a parallel road north of the railroad track came up before the Planning Board with a proposal for the Salatino Industrial Park. He pushed strongly for that to happen, the equivalent of a service road or a different way to move traffic to minimize crossovers to Route 104. He felt that was necessary so that the town doesn't have the same problems on the north side of Route 104 as the south side, which is multiple curb cuts. Half of the businesses can't be reached easily and cars have to loop all the way around. That was the intent, it would have been a parallel road to the north end of the RG&E easement. Not within their easement

Mr. Camp stated he'd like to go back to #1 of the recommendations: to "maintain the existing zoning classifications and boundaries except the industrial zoning district at the eastern district proposal to change to BT". He asked Mr. Graziose how Gerber Homes, Inc. feels about that change.

Mr. Graziose stated they haven't really thought about it, the plan has always been for Industrial development. Gerber Homes, Inc. owns two parcels, one on Knickerbocker Road and one at Furnace Road near the Town Highway garage in the Industrial zone. He doesn't see the benefit of having a BT zone at this time.

Mr. Camp stated a BT zone would allow for retail and make it easier to market. The Industrial zoning limits the uses. There was a brief discussion on Zoning and the land that Gerber Homes owns in the Industrial area.

Mr. Shears went on to read sections on Ridge Road (page 10): existing land uses and issues and opportunities. He read the section about existing zoning and the policy and recommendations of the CPC. On Ridge Road the CPC "recommended no changes in Zoning and to continue to prohibit commercial entrances from Ridge Road for those properties with frontage on both Ridge Road and Route 104".

Mr. Graziose stated he heard several comments, one from the owners of Mr. Kinley's restaurant relative to access from Ridge Road to the restaurant. He stated it has been very successful for

Charlie's and Tom's Original to have access on both Route 104 and on Ridge Road. In his opinion, and from an economic development approach, there is some benefit to having that access. Because of improvements to Ridge Road, with stop signs at Lincoln and Slocum Road, he thought it may be safer and should be considered.

Mr. Molino added the owners of Mr. Kinley's visited him and they stated access to their restaurant is a safety issue, in the winter, cars don't have as much of a shoulder on Route 104 to get over and turn in. Mr. Molino stated he has used the Ridge Road access to other restaurants and has not seen a large volume of traffic nor has he heard of any accidents.

Mr. Graziose suggested access be made available for non-commercial vehicles only.

Mr. Shears read the section on Open Space and Visual Resources (page 11 and 12) and the CPC policy and recommendations. He stated there has been a lot of talk about more access to the lake. That is difficult because the town only owns waterfront property at Bear Creek harbor. He asked for comments.

Mr. Litt stated the planning and zoning process should encourage development along the lake front by being more broadly based, for instance if someone wanted to build a restaurant, like Hedges (in Webster) along the lake it should be allowed. Under current zoning it would not be allowed. He stated give investors the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Albright stated the problem with access to the lake is those high banks, there is no way to have boats or docks and it is difficult to get down to the water. The only place available is the harbor. He thought if the town was going to do something, it should happen there.

Mr. Charles Neuman, Ontario Drive, stated he knows that on Ontario Drive there are spots along the lake, with access to the lake. He asked, does the town own those or are they part of a sub-division? How does that work?

Mr. Camp thought they were easements, some for drainage.

Mr. Litt stated they are private property and lake front access has come up before the Planning Board everytime there has been a new sub-division in that area. The easements are for residents on Ontario Drive who live across the street from the lake. He wasn't sure who owns the land.

Mr. Shears stated there is also limited lakefront use for the homeowners in the Tamarack Sub-division.

Mr. Graziose visited the Assessor's office and looked at tax maps that showed ten (10) four (4) foot strips of land on the lake that are owned by the town. One, he noted, was at the end of Roder Parkway. He stated the towns of Webster and Williamson have nice parks on the lake. He feels

Ontario should consider purchasing more land for parkland on the lake. He added open space is nice but if the town is investing money in land it should be for people to walk on and enjoy, for parkland. He stated he thinks that is more desirable.

Mr. Clark disagreed. He felt people want open space even if they don't have access. He said that that was the opinion expressed in the survey. In the survey people stated they wanted to move here because it was rural, for the open space and because they liked the way it looks, they did not say they had to have access to it.

Mr. Albright agreed with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Litt stated newer urban settlers have a different opinion from the older long time residents. It depends on who you are talking to. Older long time residents want to see the farms and forest and the open spaces. He feels there needs to be a balance.

Mr. Albright stated everyone moves out of the city to see the open spaces and scenery, they don't want to see development. He suggested Gates Grove was the place for the town to have lake front access. He stated he believes RG&E owns the property. There was a discussion about the property.

Mr. Shears read the section titled "Future Land Use Plan" on page 13 of the summary. He also referred to the "Future Land Use map #4" in the CP. He stated the map is intended as a guide and will be a very important tool as the Town Board moves ahead. In the next section he read about "Rural Residential/Agricultural" on pages 13, the issues and opportunities and on page 14 he read the section on existing zoning, policy and recommendations. He asked for comments.

Mr. Clark stated he thinks a misconception needs to be clarified relative to large lot sizes. ("Rural Zoning-areas not served by public sewers, limit over-all density of development, 5 – 7 acres per dwelling unit, minimum lot size requirements of 35,000 sq. ft."). He gave this example: 5 acres per unit on a 20 acre parcel (proposed CP you could only build 4 houses on 20 acres), one way could be that each house (4) could be built on a small piece (1/2 acres or any smaller portion) of the total amount of the land, the rest of the land could be homeowners association or the rest of the land could be left wild or farmed. Not just big lots, that is not the concept.

Mr. Riddell stated the word "utilize innovative zoning techniques to limit the over-all density" in the CPC's recommendations is very important. He stated he has researched conservation easements, cluster sub-divisions. An example is the Town of Victor's 50/50 sub-division. He stated he can see what the survey people were saying, that there are ways to keep that open space they are talking about. He stated he feels that it is important when the CP is applied and amends Zoning. There are a lot of ways for planning/developing land use.

Mr. Litt stated the concept is not easy to grasp.

Mr. Riddell stated as an example the Town of Victor has done a great job conserving open space.

There was a discussion on deed restrictions, ownership of vacant land, cluster development situations where the town takes over the land, conservation easements, good guidelines of what the developer can and cannot do.

Mr. Jason Ruffell asked what concept zoning was? Mr. Riddell explained how that would work. There was a discussion on the different uses of large parcels of land, density and the resulting open space.

Mr. Graziose stated cluster zoning, PUD and contract zoning are great ways, and developers in town are currently doing them. He stated that gives you the advantages you are talking about. The density suggested in the CP, low-density of 5 to 7 acres, has some significant value. The other issue that needs to be addressed is affordability of houses. In the survey, and he added survey's can be misleading, in how you interpret the results, He agreed that a lot of people want to see open spaces and that can be encouraged. He stated he doesn't believe that people are willing to pay the price. He believes that affordability of housing, the need to provide housing for the workforce, children and grandchildren is important. Taking the density and bringing it up to the level of 5 to 7 acres per parcel increases the cost of housing. That decreases the value of a 20-acre parcel and increases the cost to new homeowners. He went on to say people, nurses, secretaries, teachers need housing, and whether or not we like it the population is coming our way from the Rochester area. The town needs to plan for it so that the development is the way they want it to be. He suggested the town encourage PUD and cluster development. He noted there are already areas that can't be developed (ore beds), non-valuable land. Keep that for open space and use the developable land for affordable housing. Use resources wisely.

Mr. Clark stated the CP proposal for 5-7 acres per parcel only applies to the Rural/Agricultural zoning. He stated if you want smaller lots and smaller homes there are lots of areas designated for that use. The Rural Residential/Agricultural zoning areas are the only areas the prices would be higher.

Mr. Albright stated the CP proposal provides for the "lower end" housing. The problem with developing the town with that kind of housing is that "for every one of those houses you build you have added approximately \$12,000.00 of demand for services that the property does not pay for in taxes". So if you keep building in the affordable housing range, pretty soon everyone's taxes are out of sight. He stated he thinks the plan, as proposed, strikes a balance between encouraging more expensive housing and keeping open space. Someone who is going to buy a seven-acre parcel is going to build a house that will pay for itself, tax wise. That was the CPC plan to come up with a balance that would accommodate both interests.

Mr. Shears read what the current zoning calls for in different zoning classifications. He referred to the proposed "Future Land Use" map # 4 and pointed out the area designated in yellow for the rural residential/agricultural zone.

Mr. Camp stated the majority of the town is designated in that zone. He was firm in his opinion that the CP calls for a 5 – 7 acre lot size for a large portion of the town.

Mr. Clark and Mr. Litt clarified the plan is for controlling density, not lot size. There was a discussion on the difference between lot size and density.

Mr. Graziose agreed with Mr. Camp. He stated you are still driving up the cost of housing with limiting the number of homes that could be build. He stated the area of SR is extremely small compared to the designated area R/AG. He is not against changing some of the zoning but he feels this proposal (CP) is too much, too much of the town is R/AG. He stated the argument of a house paying for itself (taxes for services) is controversial. A lot of things come into play, such as housing, industry, commercial development and jobs. Other things of value come in with new houses, roads, new sewer lines, water and he noted the park right now is planning to built a community center and with a portion of the funding from the developers fees paid with every new housing permit. Not just taxes, it's not just straightforward in his opinion.

Mr. Albright stated the parkland developer's fee is a one shot fee. The larger parcels we are talking about divided up, maybe means the developer is going to pay more to the owner if they want to sell it or when you build houses you are going to build better quality houses. The new owner will have the benefit of the open space surrounding them and you may have just one parcel in a development with more acreage, possibility the land can be for horses or whatever, or the property can be left for agriculture. Those are the hopes and goals of the CPC. He stated it doesn't necessarily impact the landowner that wants to sell.

Mr. Camp stated he doesn't agree that the bigger lot is going to drive a higher quality home. Affordability means that the bigger lot may in fact drive a smaller home to make it affordable. The size of the lot doesn't reflect the size of the home. A working man may have to build a smaller home because he had to pay for a larger lot. Cost is what determines the size of the house. I agree I'd like to see \$300,000.00 homes built in the Town of Ontario but you have to get people to buy them, you have to keep housing affordable. Part of the survey said people would like more shopping. Demographically we aren't going to get that if we don't build population. Look at the survey as a whole, do they want open space, yes they do, do they want shopping, yes they do, you have to have a balance.

Mr. Litt stated that is the difficulty you have to deal with. The CPC was not going to give you all of the solutions. Again he referred to urban settlers and long time residents. The people who move here for the open space are used to the amenities. You can't give everyone everything they want, there is going to have to be a balance. We are focusing on one piece. We haven't considered

the conservation overlay. The CPC spent a lot of time talking about that. There are some of the rural areas that won't be conducive to open space; they may be more conducive to higher density areas. Regardless, we don't have that many areas for affordable homes, I mean, like Brown Square, apartment buildings, condos, that is what Mr. Litt called affordable housing.

Mr. Graziose stated there is a difference in affordable housing and workforce housing. Today, two people have to work to afford the average priced home. Affordable and low-income housing are two different things. Workforce housing is for the teachers, nurses' people who work in our community; those people need a place to live. There are government grants available for below the average media income for housing loans. He was talking about average income people's housing. People want to live in the community where they work. The more we raise the cost of housing the more we raise the cost of land.

Mr. Shears stated he appreciates the comments. He read the sections on Suburban Residential on page 14, relation to existing zoning and policy and recommendations on page 15. He stated we have talked about this zoning classification a great deal tonight under the Rural section.

Under the "High Density Residential" he read, on page 15, the issues and opportunities, relation to existing zoning and policy and recommendations. He asked if there were any more questions?

RECESS: 8:00 PM

RECONVENE: 8:10 PM

Mr. Shears began on page 16 reading the section on Downtown Business District, issues and opportunities, relation to existing zoning and policy and recommendations. He stated as you are aware there is a big push going on now by the businesses downtown for a Business Improvement District and he stated he thinks that is probably going to be very successful in the next few years.

He stated he noticed thirty years ago there was an attempt to improve the downtown area so it has been an ongoing issue for many years. Any comments?

Mr. Clark noted there are three vacant properties available. He went on to tell he had lunch at the newest restaurant downtown, the Neon Frog, and he stated it was very good.

Mr. Camp referred to the Zoning Classifications on map #3, he stated the area highlighted in red "Adult Entertainment" is not on the Future Land Use map #4.

Mr. Albright stated he owns that area. There was a brief discussion on that use.

Mr. Graziose stated on the "Future Land Use" map #4 an area at the south end of Paddy Lane is Suburban Residential and the Carriage Court Sub-division is being built in that location. Under the new proposal that area is classified as Rural and they would not be able to develop the parcel

the way they are under the new proposal. He noted a sub-division being built by Barone is also in the Rural area on Ridge Road.

Mr. Litt stated those developments would be pre-existing. Mr. Shears stated the maps will have to be looked at and updated before the CP is adopted.

Mr. Shears read, under the "General Commercial" section on page 16, the issues and opportunities, relation to existing zoning, policy and recommendations (south side of Route 104).

Mr. Shears read the "Highway and Commercial" sections and "Industrial" section on page 17. He asked for comments.

Mr. Camp stated as he looks at that, he feels the Adult Entertainment District should be separate from the Industrial zoning district.

On page 18 Mr. Shears read the section on "Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities". He stated as most are aware, the town has been very active in securing funding for a new Community Center in Casey Park, and the town has received several grants from NYS.

On "Conservation Overlays" section on page 18 he read the recommendations. On page 181 of the summary under the "Recommended Actions" of the CPC, "General", "Natural Resources and Environmental Protection" and "Agriculture and Farmland" Mr. Shears stated he would highlight some of the high points in those sections.

#3 "Consistently enforce conditions imposed by the Planning Board on approved subdivisions and site plans."

Mr. Litt stated that is very important and that doesn't get done enough. One thing he suggested is a database, something that was started by Mrs. Burolla before she was hurt, where any contingency that the planning board sets or any approvals would be listed by property. That is not being done. A simple database where the lot number, subdivision and what the criteria is, and any approvals granted by the Planning or Zoning boards.

Mr. Shears stated # 5 under General, recommended actions, has also been discussed many times but is not being done, that is to have regular joint meetings of the Town Board, Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Shears read under "Agriculture and Farmland", # 13. "Establish a program, utilizing funding from government and private grants, to purchase the development rights to farmland in designated preservation areas as shown in the Conservation Overlay map."

He stated, as you are aware the town has been successful in securing a grant this year for the Albright Farm.

Mr. Litt stated one thing he noticed was lacking in the Zoning regulations was the inability of starting a vineyard and selling wine there. There are some products listed under Agriculture but he stated he felt it should be cross-referenced in this section.

Mr. Clark stated we did limit farm markets to only the stuff produced on the property. We are suggesting we broaden that category to related items.

Mr. Litt stated we should include a section that includes something like the Casa Largo industry.

Mr. Shears went on reading on page 182 under "Transportation and Infrastructure" and he asked about the criteria for extending sewers.

Mr. Riddell stated there is a formula that has to be met.

Mr. Litt asked if consolidation of sewer districts is being considered?

Mr. Riddell stated Mr. Wykle would have to answer that question.

Mr. Shears stated he would like to hold these meetings to just two hours so he asked to review the section on "Natural Resources & Environmental Protection" for the next review session on May 23rd. He will also review the section on "Agriculture and Farmland" after the regular meeting. He thanked everyone for coming and for their comments and invited them to attend the next session.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Herzog
Ontario Town Clerk