

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
VILLAGE OF AVON PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018
6:00 PM, VILLAGE HALL**

I. ATTENDANCE

Paul M. Drozdziel, Chairman
Marilyn Borkhuis
Patrick McCormick
Kevin O'Donoghue

GUESTS

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

ABSENT

William Wall

QUORUM, 4 Present, 1 Absent

STAFF

Lance Brabant, Sr. Planning Associate, MRB Group
Brian Glise, Fire Marshal
Gary Margiotta, Deputy Clerk

*** ZONING CODE UPDATE
WORK SESSION**

STEINMETZ PLANNING GROUP

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

MIXED RESIDENTIAL (MR) DISTRICT

30.162 Purpose Statement

The Steinmetz Planning Group hadn't prepared a formal presentation, Gaudioso began. What was the Mixed Residential (MR) District? she asked. Permitted residential uses included:

- single-
- two-, and
- multi-family dwellings

with no single unit dominating the district.

The intent was to foster a variety of living opportunities in a unique, attractive environment close to goods and services.

Table XV-2

A. Permitted Uses

1. Single Family Dwelling

The single family lot size had been upped from the 8,000 square feet in the original January 24 draft to 10,000 square feet, Gaudioso pointed out. Setback and height requirements remained consistent.

Noting the smaller lot sizes in developments such as Royal Springs in East Avon, Glise asked if the setback requirements for accessory structures and uses would be made proportionate to the lot sizes.

The side and rear setbacks for accessory structures in Table XV-2 was five feet and five feet was “pretty close” to the property line, McCormick observed.

O’Donoghue didn’t think five feet was too close.

Should the Board make green space a requirement? Drozdziel wondered.

Most uses had a 30 percent requirement for green space, Brabant remarked.

B. Specially Permitted Uses

Commercial Uses

The maximum footprint for commercial buildings had been doubled from 2,500 square feet in the original draft to 5,000 square feet, Gaudioso continued.

Meanwhile, the maximum lot coverage for nursing homes and day care facilities had been reduced from 65 percent in the original draft to 40 percent.

30.167 MR DISTRICT LOT & USE CONSIDERATIONS

Maximum gross acreage permitted was covered under Chapter 30, Section 167, Gaudioso noted.

The community center requirement in Paragraph D only applied to multi-family developments, Drozdziel confirmed.

30.168 OFF-STREET PARKING STANDARDS

TABLE XV-3

The minimum parking requirement for single-family swellings was one off-street space per unit for single-family dwelling, Gaudioso said.

Board members continued, reviewing the landscaping and screening standards in Chapter 30, Section 169. Lighting hadn’t been mentioned, McCormick pointed-out.

30.170 BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN STANDARDS

A. Single- and Two-Family Dwellings

Under Building and Site Design Standards in Chapter 30, Section 170, Paragraph A, Single-Family and Two-Family Dwelling Units, Item 5 said:

“5. Any new detached dwelling shall have a front porch or stoop no less than six feet in depth measured from the front property line to the interior of the lot.”

That should say “**covered**” front porch or stoop, Drozdziel contended, adding that was an important element in design.

McCormick asked for the definition of a “stoop,” and Drozdziel responded, saying, “set of steps. McCormick suggested taking “stoop” out altogether.

B. Multi-Family Dwelling Units

30.169, Landscaping and Screen Standards, Paragraph B said dumpsters should be “enclosed in solid fencing,” but then in 30.170, Building and Site Design Standards, Paragraph B, Item 6, said garbage disposal units, refuse storage and collection areas should be “screened,” they were being inconsistent, Drozdziel pointed-out.

Item 7 covered landscaping and McCormick noted, if trees died off, there should be a requirement to replace them.

Brabant suggested adding a prohibition against planting of trees in the Village right-of-way so as not to interfere with utilities.

ARTICLE XIII

PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (PRDD)

30.133 Applicability

Paragraph B stated a Planned Residential Development District (PRDD) shall contain not less than 15 contiguous acres. The first draft had said 10 contiguous acres, Gaudioso noted.

In 30.134 PRDD LOT & USE CONSIDERATIONS, absolute minimums had been added to Paragraph B Permitted Lot Sizes, Gaudioso pointed out.

In 30.135 BUILDING & SITE DESIGN STANDARDS, Paragraph A General Building Standards, Item 3 stated:

“3. Dwelling units located in a building common to other dwelling units shall be separated from such dwelling units by a firewall. Such firewall shall extend from the foundation to the roof and shall be unpierced.”

Did that item of the Code require a masonry firewall or a drywall firewall? Drozdziel asked.

Had Avon Commons tried to get away from that requirement? Glise followed-up.

Item 4 stated:

“4. Façade treatments on all sides of buildings within the PRDD shall be comparable in amenity to provide a visually and physically integrated development.”

The intent there seemed to be to match or mirror the existing character of the Village, McCormick observed.

30.135, Paragraph B Single- and Two-Family Dwellings said,

“1. There may be not less than 2 and not more than eight units in a townhouse or attached single family group.”

In other words, no more than eight in a row, Gaudioso said, adding that could be taken down to six.

I’d like to take it down to six, McCormick said.

30.135, Paragraph C Multi-Family Dwellings, Item 4 (**Connectivity**) said:

“4. Multi-family dwellings shall be laid out so that multiple entrances face the public street. Each entrance shall be connected by sidewalk to the Village’s existing sidewalk

sytem.”

30.135, Paragraph C, Item 7, said:

“7. In addition to any storage area within individual multi-family dwelling units, two hundred (200) cubic feet of storage area shall be provided for each dwelling unit in a convenient, centrally located area in the basement or ground floor or elsewhere, where personal belongings and effects may be stored under lock and separate from the belongings and effects of other occupants.”

I struggle with the 200 cubic feet, Drozdziel conceded, especially with the lack of garages. He said he didn't know what to do with Item 7.

Two hundred cubic feet is like a walk-in closet, McCormick observed, suggesting they require basements.

They could remove the specificity and simply say storage units will be provided, Gaudioso offered.

In Farmington, they had asked for additional storage for multi-family dwelling units, but, by not dictating it, you were limiting yourself, Brabant cautioned.

Two hundred **square** feet was a parking space, Steinmetz noted.

Board members went on to address 30.135, Paragraph E, Site Design and Connectivity, Item 2, Parking areas, noting they shall be no closer than 20 feet to any property line then 30.136 PRDD Applications, Paragraph D regarding the hard copies and electronic version of materials required by the Board.

Under Paragraph F Application Requirements, Item 12 Lighting Plan, McCormick requested sodium be eliminated under bulb type and replaced with LED.

30.137 PRDD REVIEW PROCEDURE

A. Pre-Application Conference

Item 3 said the Village Board may hold a pre-application conference at a regularly scheduled meeting and that the Planning Board may be invited, Drozdziel asked that the Planning Board be included.

C. Site Plan Review

Item 3 If construction had not commenced and was not completed within three (3) years of the date of approval, final site plan review shall be required as outlined in Article XII (Site Plan Review) of this Chapter. An extension to this construction period may be granted by mutual written agreement of the applicant and Village Board.

Gaudioso said the applicant would HAVE to come back after three (3) years.

D. Planning Board Recommendation

Item 5 said, “If no report has been rendered within sixty (60) days, unless such time limit has been extended by formal action of the Planning Board, it may be assumed by the applicant that the report is favorable, and the Planning Board shall be so informed.

Gaudioso said that Item would be stricken.

E. Village Board Action

The Village Board has to have a public hearing, that was optional for the Planning Board, Gaudioso said. Item 6 stated the Village Board may establish the maximum number of dwelling units therein. Drozdziel said he was struggling with the maximum number of dwelling units.

Where's our control over density? Gaudioso asked.

We already have the belt, is this the suspenders? Drozdziel wondered.

Can we strike Item 6? Gaudioso asked.

30.138 PRDD REVIEW CRITERIA**B. Appropriateness of a PRDD site plan**

. . . contained the review criteria for a site plan.

Item F. said costs incurred by the Planning Board or Village Board for consultation fees or other extraordinary expense in connection with the review of a PRDD application shall be charged to the applicant, not to exceed Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) per acre or fraction thereof.

Where had the \$50 figure come from and did it cover costs?

Gaudioso suggested striking the "not to exceed Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) per acre or fraction thereof."

30.138 PRDD REVIEW CRITERIA

Item D The Planning Board and Village Board may consult with other Boards, Village Staff, the Town of Avon and other local, county or federal agencies to aid in the review of a PRDD application.

Did that mean Village should ask Avon Central School District, if the district could handle an additional 200 kids, if a proposed development suggested that sort of an increase?

Every application in Farmington got referred to the Victor School District, Brabant responded. Perhaps that should that be part of the Village of Avon's PRDD review process along with consultation of the Village Fire and Police Departments?

Snow removal and snow storage should be considerations as well, Drozdziel stated.

PRESENTATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD

The drafts would be updated for presentation to the Village Board, Gaudioso said. The Village Board was scheduled to meet Monday, March 19, at 6:00 PM.

The next phase of the Zoning Code update would involve reviewing and revising the other zoning districts and the Village's zoning map as well as the special use permit regulations.

The Board should consider a public zoning workshop to let the public know what we're up to.

Could that happen in April? Drozdziel asked.

Gaudioso suggested Tuesday, April 17, with their work session at 6:00 PM followed by a ZONING PUBLIC WORKSHOP at 7:30 PM with members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and Comprehensive Plan Committee as invited guests.

II. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Gary Margiotta
Deputy Clerk