

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
TOWN OF VICTOR CONSERVATION BOARD
April 19, 2016**

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Conservation Board was held on April 19, 2016 at 6:30 PM at the Victor Town Hall, 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York, with the following members present:

ATTENDING: Joe Limbeck, Chair; Kate Crowley, Vice Chair; Jacob Post; Mathew Matteson; Frank Pavia

OTHERS: Bob Cantwell, BME Associates; Jerry Watkins, Riedman Development

PROJECT REVIEW:

BALLERINA COURT – Final Subdivision

McMahon Road

Appl. No. 1-FS-16

Applicant is requesting approval for the Final Subdivision plan for the Ballerina Phase Two Development.

Conservation Board noted that the development is in its final phase and no additional impact on existing natural resources is expected or called out on the site plan.

- **These comments were modified after Planning Board Approval of this project on April 26, 2016. The original comments that are part of the official record are attached.**

Comments to the Planning Board:

The CB supports the comments from Labella and respectfully requests that the easements are approved and filed prior to parcel sales. Three types of conservation easements were approved by the Planning Board and are noted on the site plan.

CB accepts and agrees with Recommendation #3 in Labella's comments. The area will be more conducive as a wildlife corridor and it will be easier for residents to comprehend the boundaries if the easement gaps are adjusted/removed.

The CB recommends modification to Recommendation #4 in Labella's comments describing where easement markers will be placed.

- 2.9.13.1 *At all intersections of property lines with the conservation easement boundary.*

Given the fact that the eastern boundaries are within wooded areas the markers are not a requirement.

The CB recently recommended to Katie Evans, Director of Development that new easement markers that distinguish the type of easement be made available to developers. CB asks that those markers be used (they are being designed by the CB with approvals expected in the near future) in this development.

BOUGHTON HILL ROAD SUBDIVISION

County Road 41

Appl. No. 1-MS-2016

Applicant is requesting to subdivide Lot 4 which consist of +/- 55.6 acres. Lot A will consist of 1.414 acres and Lot B will consist of 1.572, leaving +/- 52.5 acres.

Comments to the Planning Board:

Bob Cantwell represented the applicant for this proposal.

There is an NWI wetland present on the parcel. The CB asks that the limits of disturbance be clearly marked on all site plans and on the site prior to start of construction.

The Conservation Board asks the applicant to consider less disturbance to the trees located on the east boundary of the east parcel.

Per the Environmental Resource Mapper the project site returns a yes to the parcel being located "in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory."

There are some soils present that are of Statewide Importance. All of the soils present are highly or very erodible and taking precautions to limit erosion and unintended soil transport during construction are advised.

EAST VICTOR ROAD SUBDIVISION

1397 Brace Road

Appl. No. 1-PS-2016

Applicant is requesting the development of a 57.77 acre portion of the overall +/- acres into a 28 lot clustered subdivision. Riedman Acquisitions LLC is purchasing 13.77 acres from current property owner on which the lots and Town dedicated road right of way is located. +/- 44 acres will be permanently designated as a conservation easement/open space.

Comments to the Planning Board:

Bob Cantwell, BME and Jerry Watkins, Riedman Development, joined the CB to discuss the site proposal.

Mr. Cantwell provided a copy of the report from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) stating no findings of archaeological or architectural resources are present on the site.

The CB acknowledges that the applicant is using a dense cluster development approach; in lieu of this density they are proposing the required acreage to offset this density to be placed in conservation easement prior to development. This approach is intended to preserve steep slopes and stream corridors that co-exist today on the larger, adjacent parcel. The Town will need to develop appropriate agreements that allow the current owners to continue to use the resources on the parcel to conduct their business – of operating a public golf facility while protecting to the greatest extent possible the existing resources. The CB will provide recommendations on language to use for the easements.

The CB notes that the applicant is preserving a portion of the steep slopes and incorporating this elevation change into the site planning. Also of note is that the backyards will be landscaped by the developer (using the native plant manual as their guide) as they are visible from East Victor Road.

The CB notes that the applicant is working with Parks & Recreation to redo the substructure for the Auburn Trail easement located along the northern boundary of the site.

The CB asks that the applicant (see the November 2015 comments) consider adding additional lands to the conservation easements to eliminate or reduce development fragmentation (small areas left to be considered for future development).

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

On a motion of Frank Pavia, seconded by Matthew Matteson, the following resolution was

ADOPTED - AYES: 4 NAYS: 0

RESOLVED, that the minutes of April 5, 2016, be approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Stonington Ridge Conservation Easements

Joe and Kate provided an update on Stonington Ridge from the Planning Board meeting. The conservation easement types proposed for the development will not change. The applicant is asking that the easements be incorporated into the parcels to eliminate the

HOA. This work will be done as an administrative action with support from the Planning Board and Town Board.

Joe & Kate asked that the two infrastructure/conservation easements be retained, the no-touch easement in the middle of the development, originally intended for access, will be removed and incorporated into the two adjoining parcels.

The Director of Development noted that the easements must be rewritten and approved by the Town Board prior to parcel sales.

ACTION ITEMS:

- There was a brief discussion about Anton Rise and Hidden Creek. The Board will try to visit the sites ad-hoc in the next two weeks in lieu of receiving MS-4 reports. Joe will follow up with Katie to learn more about availability of MS-4 reports.
- Kate discussed modifying the Conservation Easement markers with Katie Evans. Katie supported the Board's recommendation to identify the type of easement using color and/or text. Kate will work up prototypes using the Board's input and circulate to the Board for approval.

OPEN ACTION ITEMS:

- **Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council Spring 2016 Local Govt. Workshop May 11, 2016**
- **Gullace Project-Annexation of Town land to the Village – Monday April 25, 6:30PM**
- **Public Information Workshop – Public Communication – Monday May 2, 6:00 PM**
- Site Walk & Site Plan Review Checklists
- Bruce Zaretsky is revamping the Victor Plant Manual

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:10 PM.

Notes taken by Kate Crowley, Vice-Chair

BALLERINA COURT – Final Subdivision

- **These comments were modified after Planning Board Approval of this project on April 26, 2016. The original comments that are part of the official record are below.**

Town of Victor Conservation Board comments on the following project:

BALLERINA COURT – Final Subdivision
McMahon Road
Appl. No. 1-FS-16

Applicant is requesting approval for the Final Subdivision plan for the Ballerina Phase Two Development.

Original comments from the April 19, 2016 Conservation Board meeting.

Conservation Board noted that the development is in its final phase and no additional impact on existing natural resources is expected or called out on the site plan.

The CB supports the comments from Labella and respectfully asks that we make sure that the easements are filed prior to parcel sales. Three types of conservation easements were agreed upon during the planning discussions and are noted on the site plan.

CB accepts and agrees with Recommendation #3 in Labella's comments. It is more conducive as a wildlife corridor and it is easier for residents to comprehend the boundaries if the easement gaps are adjusted/removed.

The CB recommends an adjustment to Recommendation #4 in Labella's comments describing where easement markers will be placed.

- 2.9.13.1 At all intersections of property lines with the conservation easement boundary.

Given the fact that the eastern boundaries are within a wooded area the markers are not a requirement. For the western demarcations the CB agrees that markers be placed according to code.

The CB recently recommended to the Planning Director that new easement markers that distinguish the type of easement be made available to developers. CB asks that those markers be used (they are being designed by the CB with approvals expected in the near future) in this development.