

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE
VILLAGE OF AVON PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2018
6:00 PM, VILLAGE HALL**

I. ATTENDANCE

Paul M. Drozdziel, Chairman
Marilyn Borkhuis
Patrick McCormick
Kevin O'Donoghue (6:40 PM)
William Wall (7:20 PM)

GUESTS

John E. Steinmetz, Steinmetz Planning Group
Molly Gaudioso, Steinmetz Planning Group

QUORUM, 5 Present, 0 Absent

STAFF

Lance Brabant, Sr. Planning Associate, MRB Group
Brian Glise, Fire Marshal
Robert Hayes, Trustee, Village Board Liaison
Gary Margiotta, Deputy Clerk

ABSENT

Anthony Cappello, Code Enforcement Officer

*** ZONING CODE UPDATE**

Work Session

STEINMETZ PLANNING GROUP

John E. Steinmetz, Project Manager
Molly Gaudioso, Sr. Planner

The majority of the meeting would be spent on the 8-page Mixed Residential District (MR) draft the Steinmetz Planning Group had circulated, Gaudioso began, but they would also touch on the Village's Planned Residential Development District (PRDD).

The new mixed residential district would be its own district and not part and parcel of the PRDD? Trustee Hayes asked.

Yes, it would, Gaudioso responded.

It would be more *"developer friendly"* than the PRDD, Steinmetz added.

PURPOSE

The MR District would allow mixed-density, residential neighborhoods in keeping with Comprehensive Plan, Gaudioso said. Permitted uses would include:

- Single family dwellings
- 2-family dwellings, and
- Multi-Family dwellings

The goal was to create a variety of living opportunities in a unique, attractive environment close to goods and services. Village officials would evaluate development proposals according to the standards of the new district and the objectives in the code.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives would be the kinds of things Village officials would like to see in the MR District, Gaudioso told Board members. All of these, we talked about in the Comprehensive Plan, she added. The Mixed Residential District goals in the Comprehensive Plan had been:

- Providing an increased variety in housing options
- Enhancing pedestrian, bicyclist and vehicular access to nearby goods & services
- Ensuring new dwellings reflected the desired design & character of the Village

That defined what was done 100 years ago in a tasteful way, Trustee Hayes observed.

30.164 USE AND DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Gaudioso moved on to use and dimensional requirements. Table XV.4 in the Steinmetz draft showed two dimensions for some elements. The first number, Gaudioso explained, was a minimum requirement and the second the maximum allowed.

The front yard requirement for a single-family dwelling, for instance, was shown as 25/35 feet - which meant the minimum depth allowed was 25 feet and the maximum was 35 feet, Gaudioso explained.

The minimum lot sizes for permitted residential uses were:

- 8,000-square-feet for a single family home
- 10,000-square-feet for a 2-family home
- 20,000-square feet for a multiple family dwelling

A multiple family dwelling, Gaudioso continued, would be three or more units with a maximum of eight per acre. Responding to a question from Borkhuis, Gaudioso noted an acre was 43,560-square-feet.

Drozdzial had concerns over going to eight units per acre.

Avon Commons was 8-units per acre and Erie Station Village in Henrietta was 10, Gaudioso pointed out. She continued, saying specially permitted uses in an MR District would include:

- Nursing homes
- Day care facilities, adult & child
- Professional and medical offices
- Administrative offices, and
- Banks with no drive-thru's

Were Board members all right with those uses? she inquired.

Steinmetz chimed-in, noting the Board could say specially permitted uses would not exceed 20 to 30 percent of the district.

A Mixed Residential District could also be amended to allow a store or a funeral home, the over-riding concern was not to exceed the desired amount of traffic.

Borkhuis was unsure why a day care was in the draft at all when what they were talking about a mixed RESIDENTIAL district.

And, with nursing homes, how many is enough? Drozdziel asked, suggesting opening the door to more could be detrimental to the one that was here now.

As the Village's Zoning Code stood, nursing homes were allowed in:

- A, Agricultural Districts
- R-1, One-Family Residential Districts (with Planning Board approval)
- R-2, Multiple-Family Residential Districts

Erie Station didn't have nursing homes or day cares in it, Steinmetz commented.

I'm all for not putting a nursing home in an MR District, Drozdziel said, adding, a day care, all right, maybe, limiting the size.

We're talking about creating a district not saying where the district would be? O'Donoghue sought to confirm.

They had identified the Avon Commons area, Gaudioso began: Collins and Hosmer Streets, Theresa, Georgian and Amalfi Drives and Ryan Way – they were currently zoned PRDD.

And, the roughly 25 acres Richard E. Martin owned that ran from behind Hal Bar Road houses, west, wrapping around the back of the Avon Town Plaza and culminating at Pole Bridge Road – that acreage was zoned Agricultural. The Avon Central School campus and solar field, the Avon Nursing Facility, the plaza and a body shop bordered the property.

Either area would have to be rezoned for MR use then the Planning Board would have to grant a special use permit for something like a nursing home, Brabant noted. Then, Board could impose restrictions based on a traffic study, an environmental review or the proposed size of the building, he added.

The MR should be a walkable district first, Steinmetz stressed, adding it wasn't their intent to have a great deal of parking.

Borkhuis expressed concern over the 40-foot minimum lot width for a single-family dwelling, thinking that might be too narrow.

The Board could bump that up to 65 feet, Gaudioso suggested.

But, a 60 or 70-foot minimum lot width might seem silly for patio homes or retiree homes, Steinmetz countered, Borkhuis, he added, might be thinking more of homes for families with kids than for empty-nesters.

They might consider:

- A minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet for a single family dwelling, with
- A minimum lot width of 50 feet, and
- Maximum lot coverage – meaning the dwelling and all other impervious surfaces such as the driveway and garage – of 50 percent

Maximum Building Height

Maximum Building Density

The maximum building height for single-, two- and multi-family dwellings was 35 feet. The maximum density for 2-family dwellings was 6 units per acre and, for multi-family dwellings, it would be eight units per acre.

Avon Commons was “busy,” Steinmetz observed.

The maximum density for multi-family dwellings should be six (*not eight*), Drozdziel said.

I’m comfortable with eight, McCormick countered.

It’s hard for me to pick, Borkhuis said.

Eight would be a maximum, Steinmetz said. With site plan review, the Board could say when they felt eight didn’t work.

I like six better, but I like eight for the cash flow, Wall said.

30.167 LAND USE ALLOCATIONS

Each lot within a mixed residential district would have to be allocated to a particular land use. Single and 2-family residential units couldn’t take up more than 50 percent of the land and multi-family no more than 30 percent.

Passive and active recreational open spaces would have to be provided at the rate of 500 square feet per multi-family unit, Gaudioso noted. Multi-family developments would have to have a community center of at least 3,000-square-feet. And, a mixed residential district could not consist of a single land use.

30.168 OFF-STREET PARKING STANDARDS

Off-street parking standards were too high - in the Village’s current code, Gaudioso claimed. Their goal was to create more walkable neighborhoods. And, to achieve that, the draft the Steinmetz Planning Group had provided called for:

- 1 space per unit for 2-family dwellings
- ½ space per unit for multi-family dwellings
- ½ space per unit + 1 space per employee - at maximum shift - for nursing homes
- 3 spaces per 1,000-square-feet of floor area for commercial spaces

And, Gaudioso added, off-street parking standards could be modified according to the target market of a neighborhood. For instance, if seniors were the target market, you might not need one space per unit.

30.169 LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING STANDARDS

A. Yard areas adjacent to residential district or existing single-family use shall provide a landscaped buffer of at least 10-feet in width with trees, shrubs fencing or other materials to the satisfaction of the Planning Board.

Perhaps a 50-foot landscaped buffer should be required if a commercial use were proposed adjacent to a residential district or existing single-family use, Brabant offered.

B. Dumpsters shall be enclosed by solid fencing with landscaping to the satisfaction of the Planning Board.

Should we have a clearer direction for dumpsters, Drozdziel wondered. The Village recently had a developer propose plunking a dumpster down at the end of a parking lot.

But, the Planning Board could tell the developer what they wanted during the site plan review process, McCormick pointed out.

C. Existing mature trees, historic landscape features, mature groves of trees, streams, wetlands and prominent topography shall be conserved.

D. Streets and vehicular access shall be landscaped with a minimum of one shade tree per 40 feet of linear frontage.

E. Parking lot landscaping:

1. The interior of uncovered parking lots of 10 spaces or more shall be landscaped according to the provisions of this subsection
2. Trees shall be the primary landscaping material used in parking lots. Shrubbery, hedges and other planting materials may be used to complement tree landscaping
3. One shade tree for every five parking spaces
4. When adjacent to a residential district or use a landscaped buffer shall be required to the satisfaction of the Planning Board
5. A landscaped island – at least 8-feet x 5-feet- shall be required for every five parking places
6. Landscaped areas shall be protected by curbing

Drozdziel asked about site lighting.

The Planning Board would deal with that during site plan review, Gaudioso answered.

30.170 BUILDINGS AND SITE DESIGN STANDARDS

A. Single-Family and Two-Family Dwelling Units

Under the four standards listed, Gaudioso highlighted that:

- Garage entrance/exit doors would be prohibited on the front façade of buildings
- Attached garages should be located at least 10 feet behind the front building line
- Detached garages should be located in the rear yards

B. Multi-Family Dwellings

Under the five standards listed, Gaudioso highlighted that:

- Buildings shall not have large or long continuous wall or roof planes
- Shall use varied roof heights, projecting bays, gables, recesses and porches to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale visually compatible with the Village’s distinctive aesthetic character

- Larger buildings shall be divided into smaller sections, not longer than 150 feet, by gaps, recesses or other architectural devices to prevent out-of-scale, monolithic appearances
- Multi-family buildings shall be laid out so multiple entrances face the public street. Each entrance shall be connected by sidewalk to the Village’s public sidewalk system. Garage entrance/exit doors are prohibited on the front façade of buildings
- Accessory structures shall be located in a manner that doesn’t encroach upon the public realm of the site such as pedestrian walkways or the roadway

C. Nonresidential Buildings

Of the half-dozen standards listed, Gaudioso highlighted:

- Buildings shall exhibit a clearly defined base, mid-section and crown. This can be accomplished using a combination of architectural details, materials and colors; and
- All buildings shall have a prominent street level entrance visible and accessible from the public sidewalk

The standards she had highlighted all went towards building design with the goal of creating more visual interest, Gaudioso explained.

D. Primary buildings shall be constructed of or clad with materials that were durable, economically maintained and of a quality that would retain their appearance over time. Prohibited materials would include smooth-faced concrete block – painted or stained – or smooth-faced concrete panels; unfinished wood or corrugated metal siding.

E. Air conditioning units, HVAC systems, exhaust pipes or stacks, elevator housing, satellite dishes and other telecommunications receiving devices shall be thoroughly screened from view of public right-of-way and from adjacent properties.

As far as satellite dishes were concerned, McCormick pointed out there were only certain places from which you could get a signal.

Placement would still be an option through the appeals process, Brabant remarked.

Placement might be a consideration with a 6-foot dish, but an 18-inch dish wouldn’t harm him driving down the road, Glise commented.

A dish screened from the view of the public right-of-way as well as from adjacent properties so his neighbors wouldn’t have to look at it either? McCormick asked, suggesting the standard seemed excessive.

And, the Building and Site Design Standards the Steinmetz Planning Group had submitted didn’t mention roofing materials, shingles, metal roofing or other materials, McCormick noted.

PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PRDD) - PROCESS

Gaudioso reviewed the PRDD process as it was and with proposed revisions.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 8:38 PM.

Gary Margiotta
Deputy Clerk