

**Village of Penn Yan Planning Board
Meeting Minutes June 3, 2019**

Street Superintendent, Erik Decker – *‘Sidewalk must be continuous through driveway. Curbing restored to allow water to flow past new driveway to storm service. Concrete for sidewalk through driveway to meet new sidewalk specs. Any new curbing installed be updated to granite curb. Curbing added along face of driveway/road w/a 1” reveal to control water flow down N. Avenue so as not to puddle in new driveway. New DI installed to catch water coming off curb line before new additions driveway. DI set in valley where driveway/road meet.’*

Mr. Dates said he would meet with Public Works Department and cooperate with all requirements.

Electrical, Charlie Bush – *‘The electric is fine. No concerns.’*

Water/Sewer Maintenance Supervisor, Ron Keech – *‘Nothing pertains to the water & sewer at this time.’*

Police Chief, Tom Dunham – *‘N/A’*

Fire Chief, Bill LaRock – *‘Everything looks good.’*

Yates County Planning Board – Chairman Olevnik noted he received the following letter from the Yates County Planning Board; *‘The Yates County Planning Board will not be in session for the May 23rd meeting and under Resolution 1017 in such instances where the planning board is not meeting and referrals have been received, the planning department shall provide a written review and recommendations to the referring municipalities. A report of final action shall still be provided for the county’s records within 30 days of that municipality’s final decision on the referral. The action is considered to have no county-wide or inter-municipal impacts as shown in the application provided to the county. The county has no objections or additional conditions other than those required by the Village of Penn Yan for zoning and code compliance. In the event that the applicant makes substantive changes to the proposed work the county planning office shall be contacted to determine if the alteration may constitute resubmittal of the referral.’*

The Board then proceeded to the Environmental Assessment Form for an evaluation of impacts.

The Chairman asked if the board had any comments or questions regarding Part 1 SEQR. There were none.

A MOTION by Sarah Vestal and a **SECOND** from Austin Lapp to designate the Village of Penn Yan Planning Board as Lead Agency and to find that the project was consistent with an UNLISTED action.

Brent Bodine–aye. Sarah Vestal–aye. Jean D’Abbracci–aye. Austin Lapp–aye. **Motion carried.**

The following were listed as potential impacts; None.

The Planning Board’s final determination was that the action would not have a significant negative impact therefore a negative declaration statement would be prepared.

A MOTION by Brent Bodine and a **SECOND** from Jean D’Abbracci to adopt the SEQR.

Brent Bodine–aye. Sarah Vestal–aye. Jean D’Abbracci–aye. Austin Lapp–aye. **Motion carried.**

A MOTION by Jean D’Abbracci and a **SECOND** from Austin Lapp to issue approval of the site plan.

Brent Bodine–aye. Sarah Vestal–aye. Jean D’Abbracci–aye. Austin Lapp–aye. **Motion carried.**

SITE PLAN APPROVED.

**Village of Penn Yan Planning Board
Meeting Minutes June 3, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS:

- Cursory look at submittal from David Genecco for townhomes at 200 South Avenue. (Attorney Brockman)
Chairman Olevnik recused himself from any discussion due to conflict of interest because of a business relationship with the applicant. He selected alternate Mike Willis as a participating member. Attorney Brockman stated he wanted the planning board to look at the submittal that just came in to see if there should be additional items required. Code Officer Lyon said he only had the plans for a day or so and had only given them a quick look. He said it was immediately obvious the plans included the Town of Milo part of the development instead of just the village portion. Board member Bodine said after reviewing the SEQR handbook it was a clear case of SEQR segmentation something the applicant should be questioned about. Attorney Brockman explained segmentation happened when a project was presented for approval in segments, each having a separate SEQR form like in the case of this development with a Milo and a village portion. He said to get a more accurate assessment of impacts that would be associated with the entire development the State DEC required one SEQR form to be completed for the whole project. Board member Bodine said if the SEQR done for the Milo portion must be redone to include the entire project then the board would not need to act as lead agency for the village portion. Attorney Brockman indicated the village could evaluate the 8-unit townhomes as a separate project with its own SEQR if there was no access road from it to the Milo development. There was discussion about a traffic study requirement with the submittal. It was not clear if that requirement would yield results of traffic impacting Sunset and Hillcrest unless there were no other outlets. There was discussion about a sidewalk requirement and crosswalk striping for pedestrian traffic across Route 54 to the park and marina. Vice Chair Vestal conveyed her opinion that the village should work with the developer rather than create obstacles for them. She pointed out the development was going to result in a significant improvement to the Lake Street corridor.

A MOTION by Brent Bodine and a **SECOND** from Sarah Vestal to deem the site plan submittal from David Genecco incomplete based on segmentation of the SEQR and proposed new road to be dedicated that will not meet Penn Yan road construction standards as described in the *Design and Construction Standards Handbook*. Brent Bodine–aye. Sarah Vestal–aye. Jean D’Abbracci–aye. Austin Lapp–aye. Mike Willis. **Motion carried.**

- Senior citizen housing. (Attorney Brockman)
Attorney Brockman said the 6 month moratorium resolution was on the agenda for the June Trustees meeting. He said in the meantime the board should be deciding what amendment language they wanted to draft for review then public hearing at the August Trustees meeting. He said the following was the most direct and least cumbersome option:

Delete from the code book the two references to Senior Citizens Housing –

- 1.) In the Definitions Section.
- 2.) In the Use Regulation Table.

There were questions regarding the effect on future senior housing proposals if the references were removed from the code book. Attorney Brockman explained it would have no affect on whether or not to allow buildings for a certain age group. He said housing would continue to be built in the village in zones where dwellings were allowed. The resulting owners, not the code book, would decide on any special parameters for tenants. Board member Bodine indicated his MOTION to recommend that the village attorney draw up amendment language

