

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

A meeting of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Committee was held on February 12, 2018 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by Supervisor David Dunning.

PRESENT: Supervisor David Dunning, Ron Brand, RLP Plans, Paul Wanzenried, Building Department Manager, James Ignatowski, Architectural Advisory Committee Chair, Al Hellaby, Planning Board VC, Steve Tarbell, Traffic & Safety Committee Member, Dorothy Borgus, Resident.

ABSENT: None

David Dunning: Did everyone get the meeting minutes from the last meeting? Any changes any issues. Are we okay to approve, any objections?

Dorothy Borgus: No.

David Dunning: Okay so those meeting minutes will be approved. I know Ron was working on I know we did send Ron the correct version of Chapter five to go back though again and so we will pick up because I think there is still some here that we wanted to pick up on where we left on Sub Area 3. I think we were going to start on Sub Area 3 in Section Five but Ron did you want to talk about this map at all.

Ron Brand: Well at some point I want, this is the map that I have that is in the plan.

David Dunning: For the sub areas?

Ron Brand: Yes. I am looking at it and I am thinking it does not look anything like I.

Al Hellaby: It does not look a thing like you what you need.

Dorothy Borgus: I don't remember a version like that.

Ron Brand: I don't ever remember a version of that either.

David Dunning: What chapter is that one in Ron?

Ron Brand: That is in Chapter Two, but there was in Chapter Five.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I was looking at Chapter Five.

Ron Brand: There was another one.

Dorothy Borgus: In Chapter Two?

Ron Brand: I don't know what.

David Dunning: That is a sub area map. Oh yea here it is mine looks like that too.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: What is the figure number on that?

David Dunning: 2-4.

Ron Brand: 2-4 it is on page 2-23.

David Dunning: I guess I don't recall this either but that does not mean anything.

Dorothy Borgus: I don't remember it either.

Ron Brand: Anyways I started looking at that and started making sense of this and realized that you just can't so in order for me to write Chapter Five the way in which we want it written I mean if you go way back to previous editions like 2000 you will see a different sub area map was created. But even that sub area map as I was starting to look at this rendering here really left some areas void from coverage so one of the things I think we have to come to grips is what this sub area map should look like. This is what the old one that is on the wall in there looks like and there is a world of difference between that on and that one.

Dorothy Borgus: But you know I think when we did the comprehensive plan before when we did the 2030 plan we purposely felt that some of those sub areas were not correct and that is why we made them different.

David Dunning: I think Dorothy is right I think that some of it had to do with what tied into what though to because we did not did that old one Ron did that have the Chili Avenue Corridor separated out?

Ron Brand: Yea.

David Dunning: It did.

Ron Brand: Well no it had it overlaid.

David Dunning: Which it will be. It should be right because you have some crossover between, but we talked about the last time and correct me if I am wrong but I thought we talked about the last time was that we were going to look at the sub areas and renumber them because of that crossover between the Black Creek Corridor and the Chili Avenue Corridor those are overlapping the other areas.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Al Hellaby: Correct.

Dorothy Borgus: But I did not think we were going to change the outlines.

David Dunning: I did not think we were going to change the boundaries at all.

Ron Brand: That is why when I looked at this map dated May 2008 it does not look anything like this map here in 2010. This had the Chili Center number two but you wanted it taken out.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: No what Jim suggested and I think was a great suggestion was to take the current sub areas if you were to take them on the maps and paper that we have here and cut them out around their boundaries and then put them together as a puzzle and make one big picture if I am right and then we would have all the little pictures.

Al Hellaby: You are correct.

David Dunning: So you would have identical to what we have on the little maps so you would have the yellow and red hash marks around the different areas here right isn't that kind of how.

Dorothy Borgus: Where did this map come from?

Ron Brand: On the wall in there.

Dorothy Borgus: Why was it drawn up and who drew it up?

Ron Brand: We drew it up in 2008.

Al Hellaby: That is two years prior to this one.

Ron Brand: So from when that was drawn up and when this one was adopted you see the difference.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea but where did those numbers even come from that are on there.

Ron Brand: Those came from the 2000 plan. Those were the same sub areas.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay then I don't know why we should even be looking at those because these are more recent.

Ron Brand: Well I am looking at those for two reasons; number one this map that I am looking at as far as I am concerned is very difficult to read.

David Dunning: Which one, this one, that I is why Jim's suggestion is really a good suggestion.

Ron Brand: Yea, now I understand why Jim is suggesting what he did.

Dorothy Borgus: What do those numbers mean?

Ron Brand: Those are each of the sub areas that were analyzed rather than trying to analyze it as a whole.

Dorothy Borgus: So that is a moot point right, so you can file it because it is history.

Ron Brand: Well yea, that is history, this is history and I think we need to come up with something new for this history.

David Dunning: So I mean I understand what you are saying but I think we kind of defined where we want to be right.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

Ron Brand: Well I understand that but I also understand that this map really is not there either in my opinion.

David Dunning: Yea and that maybe true I don't know that any of us have taken a look at if you have looked at that overlay between what we have in the little cut outs and things you have looked at that versus that and that is not right then what is in these little maps is more accurate to what was defined in the sub areas in this plan.

Ron Brand: Exactly and so therefore, these sub area maps.

David Dunning: Yes, there you go these should be accurate.

Ron Brand: Those should be accurate and for the most part they are with a couple of exceptions and those exceptions basically are the biggest one being in the southeast portion of town, which was originally Sub Area 8.

David Dunning: That would be closer to four or nine what is listed there but that is a bigger sub area now I think.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: Four was going to be two right.

David Dunning: Dorothy I have them out I was just kind of waiting to see what Ron was doing here.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, all right.

Ron Brand: Okay this is the one I am looking for Sub Area 9, is a big sub area.

David Dunning: Which is inclusive of some other areas.

Ron Brand: It is different than that.

David Dunning: Correct and that is fine.

Al Hellaby: You know actually looking at this Ron this depicts all those areas it is just extremely difficult to read.

Ron Brand: The legend.

Al Hellaby: Because of the color and there is no numbering, but these areas with the different shading are all these areas.

Ron Brand: Okay.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Al Hellaby: So it is right it is just is tough to understand because of the way it is laid out on paper I mean if it was highlighted some other way I think it would be what you are looking for because this jag right here is this.

Ron Brand: So we just forget the numbering on that one.

Dorothy Borgus: I would say.

David Dunning: Oh, absolutely.

Ron Brand: There was another question on.

David Dunning: But this was never updated Ron we did not update the printout this most of the maps in my conference room are old, old maps we just never had them reprinted.

Al Hellaby: This whole area right here is this corridor here, there is one upfront in there and this one here I think you will find that see the way it jags right there so they were all here it is just that you cannot figure them out because of the graphics. It is this gray area up in here.

Ron Brand: Okay so what is this here?

Al Hellaby: This down here they have listed as stripped that maybe a spot that is over looked but it is a separate area from this.

David Dunning: Can I ask a stupid question, what is the issue at hand then.

Ron Brand: Well I am trying to figure out how to draw this map. You did not want these corridor areas shown.

David Dunning: That is not true, what we talked about was taking the sub areas and the two sub areas that were kind of over lays which was the Black Creek Corridor and Chili Avenue Corridor those come out of the current order that they are in and we relabel the sub areas 1 – whatever, 1-6 I think it is and then put those as kind of the tail end or the beginning end but identify those as over laid because the text within Sub Area 2 for example comingled with the Chili Avenue I don't know if don't get the specifics there but comingled and crossed over the top and we were getting confused and so why this sub area says this and excludes this, that, and the other thing so sub area whatever that yellow shade that you have up in that upper area that deeper yellow at the upper left corner there. You have part of the Chili Avenue Corridor going thru that.

Ron Brand: Right.

David Dunning: For all intent and purposes that sub area should include all of that area of Chili Avenue in its language but then if there is specific language that needs that is specific to the Chili Avenue Corridor that should be a part of that sub area and specifically separately. Am I saying that okay?

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: Think of it as an over lay Ron.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: I wanted to say that so bad. That is kind of an inside zoning code joke.

Ron Brand: Okay so then I guess the question I have is to take each of these and for example, this one now is no longer Sub Area 3. Is there any special way you want me to number these.

David Dunning: I would say that is fairly irreverent, easiest way possible just so long as the Chili Avenue Corridor and the Black Creek Corridor show somewhat as an overlay as a separate sub areas either at the beginning or at the end I don't know that it matters.

Ron Brand: I would do it at the end, it is easier.

James Ignatowski: I guess if I was looking at it, I would try to just have numbers in rows instead of one here and five way over here something like that.

Ron Brand: Going across.

Al Hellaby: The bottom right that kind of thing.

James Ignatowski: Something that is logical.

David Dunning: Not like this one. This is one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight I mean it is not, come up with a pattern that.

James Ignatowski: This is more of a guide more than anything else.

Ron Brand: Go across the top. North to South.

Paul Wanzenried: West to East and North to South.

Ron Brand: Right starting in the North Chili area.

James Ignatowski: The sun rises in the east.

Ron Brand: Okay I think I can do that.

David Dunning: Are we good with that.

Ron Brand: I am now.

David Dunning: Okay. So we left off on Sub Area 3 on page 5-13.

Dorothy Borgus: It is 5-9 on mine.

David Dunning: That is actually, what I wrote in my notes because I wanted to make sure that I was capturing yours.

Dorothy Borgus: Did we resolve the issue with why there is different books.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

David Dunning: We did resolve the issue and why what Ron had to edit initially was not was approved was not the final version of Chapter 5 as we approved it.

Dorothy Borgus: That is what I thought.

Dorothy Borgus: There was one other chapter earlier on that was different too.

David Dunning: My page numbers and stuff might have been because it was just the edits, but I don't think the text was different. I don't recall that.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea.

James Ignatowski: Yea there was.

David Dunning: Was there? If you could.

Dorothy Borgus: It was early on.

David Dunning: I guess I don't recall that.

Dorothy Borgus: What did we start with one and two?

David Dunning: If you find it, Dorothy let me know and we will go back and take a look.

Dorothy Borgus: I will look for it I don't want to take everyone's time now I believe it was two.

David Dunning: Alright so I think as it relates to Sub Area 3 I don't know how this is going to work with some of the changes in the document but. We don't know.

Ron Brand: I have everything in there was either crossed out or highlighted in bold.

David Dunning: Yea but remember I sent you another version of Chapter 5.

Ron Brand: Right which is this.

David Dunning: Which is that.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: Okay. But you have not matched it up to what we have?

Ron Brand: I assumed this is what you have.

David Dunning: Chapter 5 maybe I am confused, we discussed this the last time was not correct. Whatever we had here in Chapter 5 was not what was in the Chapter 5 that was approved. So what we have here in the book still is not correct because you did not send us a new edited version. I think the version that we all have was the original edited version that was incorrect. You follow me.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: We did not redistribute Chapter 5 to everyone.

Dorothy Borgus: I have the one you sent.

David Dunning: Sent when?

Dorothy Borgus: I don't it was just before the last meeting.

David Dunning: No that was with the corrections was not it Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: This is with the corrections.

David Dunning: But remember at that meeting that last meeting we determined that Chapter 5 needed to be redone because the version that we had the language was not the same as what was in the approved Comprehensive Plan.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: Ron has not made those edits yet. So what we are looking at here in Chapter 5 now in your books is still the incorrect version of Chapter 5.

Dorothy Borgus: Even I have the right one.

David Dunning: No one has the right one. The only right one that you have is in your Comprehensive Plan Book.

Dorothy Borgus: No that is what I mean.

David Dunning: Yes, in your Compressive Plan Book should be right.

Dorothy Borgus: The one on page 5-9 is correct the one that we stopped.

David Dunning: I am just going through where the edits because trying to match up where they were edited where we wanted to make changes or where you may have had questions how does that cross over into what we have.

Al Hellaby: Can we make copies of that so that we are all working off the same paper.

Ron Brand: What I did was I took this edited it and made the editions or deletions where I am suggesting.

David Dunning: Oh, you did edited it then.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

David Dunning: I did not think that you edited Chapter 5 yet.



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Yes. That I had done. Then I got confused at the last meeting, which does not take me much.

David Dunning: I think we are all confused now.

Dorothy Borgus: Evidently, he has edited through page 5-38 according to my numbers.

Ron Brand: That is correct.

Dorothy Borgus: And we only reviewed it up until page 5-9 in my numbers because that is where we began to get into different verbiage.

Ron Brand: I mean I could give everyone a copy of this.

Al Hellaby: If we all got that, we are at least looking at the same paper.

Dorothy Borgus: Well I have it I copied my own off at home. We are still working off what he edited before the last meeting.

David Dunning: Which is incorrect. The edits may be correct to the language that is in here but the language that is in here (pounding on table or book) my understanding based on our last meeting is not the same as what is in here.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay I got you.

David Dunning: So I do not know if it is advantageous to go through anything more on Chapter 5 until we have Ron's edits.

Dorothy Borgus: I see what you are saying.

Ron Brand: Okay well.

David Dunning: To the correct version of the document.

Ron Brand: My notes show that we had gone through Chapter 5 back in June and July of last year.

David Dunning: We did. We just went through it the last time we were here, the last meeting we were going through Chapter 5.

Ron Brand: Right and going through that I was using this book here and not this.

David Dunning: Understood.

Ron Brand: It was my fault.

David Dunning: Understood. But how does that compare to that.

Ron Brand: This here compares to the editing notes that I took from these.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: How does the, forget about the edits the actual language in this, this and this how do they compare, because the language was completely different.

Dorothy Borgus: On some pages.

David Dunning: Yes and on some pages, we were talking about the particular paragraph and that paragraph was not in everyone's documents.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: I know it is difficult to follow what I am trying to say.

Dorothy Borgus: The two versions did not match.

David Dunning: Correct. If you have not gone through and compared what we have in this book Ron that we all started with as the chapters as you were sending them to us if you have not taken what I sent you two weeks ago or three weeks ago if you have not compared that with this (pounding on book) and made the edits then we still do not have anything to review on that chapter.

Ron Brand: Okay.

James Ignatowski: The problem was is that your language was different from our language in terms of the edits.

David Dunning: Correct.

James Ignatowski: A paragraph is missing so something somewhere along the line you got sent the wrong information in terms of the chapter itself so we were not comparing apples to apples there was difference in the language. Something got mixed up along the way but you are edits where not matching what was.

Ron Brand: So you want me to take this document, compare my edits here, and resend it.

David Dunning: Compare.

Ron Brand: My edits to this based on what I.

David Dunning: That document is that the one I sent you is that correct.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: Which is the same as what is in the book as far as we know.

Ron Brand: Right.

David Dunning: There are some paragraphs in there, several paragraphs or parts in there that don't match the same language so whatever edits we made in that one need to be made to that one providing that the, this is getting more confusing.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: I am confused what is that one.

David Dunning: I am assuming that is the one we.

Dorothy Borgus: The one you and I have.

David Dunning: The one that I have that we are working out of the chapters that once Ron sent.

Ron Brand: What does it say at the bottom of the page?

Dorothy Borgus: They all say the same thing.

David Dinning: Mine says updated 11-2017.

Dorothy Borgus: I think they both do.

Ron Brand: No this says 11-2011.

Paul Wanzenried: Would it be advantageous to drag out the overhead over there and put one up so that we can all look at it and then work from there or see if we can.

David Dunning: I mean I could have copies of that made real quick and we can go through it but we are going to have to go back through and read from the beginning of Chapter 5, which is fine I don't have a problem with that either we are not far along that we could not do that.

Dorothy Borgus: Well, so the one book is dated 2011.

Ron Brand: That was the book that was adopted back in 2011.

David Dunning: Well yours all of ours should say 11-2017 in the bottom right corner.

Ron Brand: Yep.

Dorothy Borgus: But they have verbiage in there that does not agree with.

David Dunning: Correct, but yours should say 11-2017.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe there was good stuff here that we should not forget.

David Dunning: I am not disagreeing I just want to make sure we are all on the same page as far as what you have in front of you. Does everyone have that it says 11-2017 in the bottom right hand corner.

Steve Tarbell: No.

David Dunning: What does yours say?

Steve Tarbell: 11-2-2011.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: I have both, this is the one you sent me, I copied it, and I have my own.

Paul Wanzenried: You want my book.

David Dunning: The one, when we reviewed Chapter 5 as a group.

Paul Wanzenried: When I looked at the revisions, you sent in an email it did not have a date on it.

Steve Tarbell: Those are 11-2017.

David Dunning: Those should be. If you got an email from me, if that is an email from me that means you got the last revisions that Ron made that we saw as a group.

Ron Brand: That is what people were going through to make sure we were in agreement with what changes needed to be made to the maps and everything else.

David Dunning: Correct.

Ron Brand: Then we got confused because.

David Dunning: Because the language was, the text was different.

Ron Brand: Some people were looking at one page and did not see.

David Dunning: No, it was that the text was completely different.

Ron Brand: I looked at this in two different locations and it looks very, very similar to me.

Steve Tarbell: The first paragraph in Sub Area 3 on the 11-2-2011 that first paragraph is different than the one you sent us updated one for 2017.

Ron Brand: Yes and the difference of Sub Area 3. The first paragraph of Sub Area 3 the only thing that is different in there is that this says "For the next twenty years" and I have "For the next thirteen years planning period". Then for the Chili Center, I did not show you that I had taken out for the "past twenty years the adopted comprehensive plan have identified the need for a master plan for this sub area to be prepared", because you said to take it out it has already been prepared. Now I can go back type it in there and draw a line through it.

Al Hellaby: The original master plan is dated November 2, 2011 that was what the original base line was.

Ron Brand: Right.

Al Hellaby: Where did the update of 11-2017 come from was that adopted by.

Ron Brand: We met on two different occasions.

Al Hellaby: To review this.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Right and take your notes directing me to make these changes.

Al Hellaby: So these revisions the date reflects the revisions that were made to the 2011 is what you are saying.

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Adopted 11-2-2011 if you go back I think that is the date that the Town Board actually adopted the plan.

Al Hellaby: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: As I understand, it that date was on the other version that several people on this committee had. In other words, the same date was on two different versions.

Ron Brand: Should not have had I don't know how that happened. Maybe I was just not being consistent when I took that one sentence out and threw everyone off. But the need for that sentence "for the past twenty years".

Al Hellaby: I think what is adding to the perplexment is the fact that the fonts are all different which extended the page numbers out so they do not line up. I think if they were the same font size and the page numbers where all right it would be a lot less headaches.

Ron Brand: I can go back and re-font it and retype it. What got even more confusing if I recall correctly the last time we met was when we did the first sub area we realized it went down Union Street further in the narrative than what the map had shown. Then as I started looking at and trying to identify the sub areas I looked at Sub Area 1, no problem, Sub Area 2 was the corridor which we are going to make sub area whatever on the map, and we are going to move Sub Area 3 to Sub Area 2.

Dorothy Borgus: Looking back to the beginning of Chapter 5 though with the book that Steve and I have and comparing it to the edits I think we are all right until we get to page 5-9.

David Dunning: I am trying to.

Dorothy Borgus: I went back to the beginning and it looks okay it is when we got to 5-9 that is when there were some major differences in verbiage.

Ron Brand: That is where you started out for the first sentence the only change that was made there was "the next twenty year planning period" it was changed to "the next thirteen years" and instead of "the committee", it is "the town", words like that.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe we are all right just picking up on 5-9.

Jim Ignatowski: Just go along with it and if something crops up again.

Dorothy Borgus: Then deal with it.

David Dunning: Okay.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: But what you do not have is for the second ‘For the past twenty years the adopted comprehensive plan have identified the need for a master plan for this sub area’.

David Dunning: Where are you Ron?

Dorothy Borgus: Are you at the beginning of Sub Area 3?

Ron Brand: Right, after the first sentence.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, “for the past twenty years”.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh okay that should be “thirteen” oh all right.

Ron Brand: No, I see what is confusing to Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: There is another sentence.

Ron Brand: I have taken out a sentence.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh right, there is not a sentence.

Paul Wanzenried: You have already taken that sentence out.

Dorothy Borgus: That is gone; we felt that was not important.

Ron Brand: Yes, correct.

David Dunning: What are you saying I am sorry I am missing something here?

Dorothy Borgus: The first sentence on Sub Area 3.

David Dunning: Which says, “This sub area is perhaps the most important sub area”.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes Ron wants to take that out.

Ron Brand: No, “for the next thirteen year planning period” okay period.

David Dunning: Right.

Ron Brand: Okay the next sentence does not do anything.

David Dunning: “The Chili Center hamlet” is that what you are saying.

Paul Wanzenried: No.

Ron Brand: No.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: The one before that.

Paul Wanzenried: If you have a sentence that reads “For the past twenty years the adopted comprehensive plans have identified the need for a master plan to be prepared for this sub area”. That should be deleted.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Steve Tarbell: He already did in the handout right that we got.

Paul Wanzenried: He did in the handout.

Steve Tarbell: It has already been deleted.

Ron Brand: But what is confusing to Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: No, no I see what we are doing.

Ron Brand: She did not see me type that out and then draw a line threw it.

Dorothy Borgus: That is right I did not see that, it was not on here and crossed out you are right. It was an edit that was not shown as an edit.

Ron Brand: Okay, so then the next one is correct that one did not change. And while there was no piecemeal, we just added some verbiage there.

Paul Wanzenried: That is correct.

Ron Brand: “While there has been piecemeal efforts they did not exist until the completion and adoption of the Chili Center Master Plan in 2016. So that sentence the last sentence “While there have been piecemeal efforts” that is gone and has been replaced.

David Dunning: Huh, mine has not been replaced; this still says, “While there have been piecemeal efforts”.

Paul Wanzenried: In the edits.

Ron Brand: Right “While, in the past there have been piecemeal efforts to create parts of an undefined land use puzzle, the desired picture did not exist until the completion of the”.

David Dunning: Right, okay I though you said you took that out.

Paul Wanzenried: No, no, no.

David Dunning: That is what I thought I heard you say that you took that out.

Ron Brand: So then, after that the next paragraph is gone and has been replaced with this “The Chili Center Master Plan has made an appendix to this 2030 plan” which is an insert. So these two paragraphs up there at the top of page 5-11 of the 11-2011 version have been deleted and replaced. Then you start off with “In addition to the spot safety improvements”.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Are we removing the word “hamlet”?

Ron Brand: Yes, we call it “Chili Center”.

Paul Wanzenried: And should that be consistent throughout this document? Because if you go back a couple of pages Ron you refer to it as the “Chili Center Hamlet”, paragraph 1, Sub Area 3.

Ron Brand: Which is what it was originally referred to as.

Paul Wanzenried: So you keep it there and we are taking it out from here on out.

Ron Brand: Yes, because we start here calling it “completion and adoption of the Chili Center Master Plan”, the word “hamlet” is not in that document.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay thank you.

Dorothy Borgus: On your page 5-15, those edits about the Chili Center Master Plan are those points taken directly from the plan, the bullets.

Ron Brand: To the best of my knowledge. Did anyone find anything that was not?

Dorothy Borgus: I did not compare it I just questioned it; no just information only is all.

Jim Ignatowski: Can I ask a question, on that opening sentence “The Chili Center Master Plan is made an appendix”, was that made an appendix does the English sound correct on that one is my question.

David Dunning: It is made an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan that is true.

Ron Brand: Right.

Jim Ignatowski: I thought it was “has made” not “is made”.

Paul Wanzenried: No Chili Center itself is the appendix that is what it referring to.

Jim Ignatowski: Oh, okay all right.

Paul Wanzenried: In that paragraph after the bullet point items it says, “There are several emerging considerations that are emphasized in the Chili Center Master Plan” “Continuing development and site improvements to the Father’s House site”.

David Dunning: They have approvals for more there.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay but is our vision dependent upon those that continuation.

David Dunning: Hold that thought for a minute. Ron go, Dorothy you have your actual published version of your comprehensive plan there. On page 5-9 we have one, two, the third paragraph, which matches up with what we have on 5-15 of the edits, that next paragraph, is gone.



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: So that is true, we were getting rid of that paragraph.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: Okay.

Paul Wanzenried: The paragraph that begins with?

Ron Brand: "State NY initiative"

David Dunning: What is confusing here is that some of these they are struck through and indicating that you are getting rid of them then, and then where they are gone and not struck through.

Ron Brand: People are getting confused and I realize that.

David Dunning: Okay.

Paul Wanzenried: It just disappeared into the wind.

Dorothy Borgus: So what are we looking at on the edits on 5-16?

Ron Brand: Yes. Paul do you have the Chili Center Master Plan handy?

Paul Wanzenried: I can get it.

Ron Brand: I am pretty sure that was the wording.

Paul Wanzenried: "Continuing development and site improvements to the Father's House site".

Ron Brand: Yes, do you think that is misleading.

Paul Wanzenried: No, I just question why we are.

Dorothy Borgus: We are talking about it.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, why we are making that a part of our comprehensive plan.

David Dunning: That is in anticipation of becoming it our community center.

Dorothy Borgus: Well you know as far as the Father's House goes if you read the lead into that all you are doing is saying that these are big things that are important.

David Dunning: There are substantial additional.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Shared services.

David Dunning: There are substantial additional construction plans at the Father's House that just have not happened between the parking lot that is one, but their building included another fifteen, twenty thousand square foot of building if not more, maybe thirty thousand.

Dorothy Borgus: That is a big impact.

Al Hellaby: They are still talking about that Lowes or something in that big vacant parcel.

David Dunning: No not in the Chili Center Master Plan. No that is gone now, that cannot happen.

Al Hellaby: That is right the apartments are there.

David Dunning: The apartments are all in there or the townhouses are in there that can't happen. But the Father's House has an approval for another I am going to say another twenty or thirty thousand square feet of building for their gym and other things that they wanted to put in there and the parking lot. So those would have a significant impact on the growth of Chili Center area.

Dorothy Borgus: Certainly, on traffic and infrastructure there is an impact there that is serious it should stay I think.

Ron Brand: So are we all set up to and in addition? What you wanted to do was leave the identities, identify locations but eliminate roundabouts relying on transportation master plan finding. So, this has to be further revised.

David Dunning: Which one are you on Ron, the second paragraph.

Ron Brand: The top of 5-17, where it says "In addition to the Chili Center Master Plan's recommendations, there are two safety spot improvements associated with sub area whatever that is going to be. That should be addressed during the next thirteen year period one of these is the installation at Beaver Road with Chili Scottsville Road the other at Chili Avenue with Beaver Road where a signalized intersection is envisioned over the next thirteen year period. My note was to identify the location but.

Al Hellaby: But remove the solution right.

Dorothy Borgus: Right, that is what my note says, identify the spots but eliminate the recommendations.

Ron Brand: Okay, now we jump back "In addition to the safety spot improvements listed above there still remains an ongoing concern about the number of individual curb cuts", "Therefore, the recommendation is for a Transportation Master Plan to initiate an access management overlay district".

David Dunning: No, I think we are good that is what we talked about.

Ron Brand: "The Future Land Use Plan Map" we did not have any change there. "The Chili Center Sub area includes".

Steve Tarbell: Should there be a hyphen in there.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: All sub areas have to have hyphens.

David Dunning: The um, the only thing I had on that one Ron, is that last paragraph where it says “Finally, the large area between”.

Ron Brand: Yep.

David Dunning: Is that we may want to make that we may want to make some reference that the land is now occupied by American Packaging. Because even though the plan recommends that it remain LI, well it is going to remain LI.

Steve Tarbell: Did you mark that Ron.

Dorothy Borgus: In the sentence, you just want to recommend.

David Dunning: Change the language that basically says that says it is what it is, I mean it’s.

Dorothy Borgus: But you want to identify the firm there, the company.

David Dunning: We have in other places; we have identified Fed Ex, any of the larger parcels I think like that Dorothy we have identified.

Dorothy Borgus: That is fine.

Ron Brand: How big a site is that Paul?

Paul Wanzenried: Which one?

David Dunning: Forty-eight acres.

Paul Wanzenried: Who?

David Dunning: American Packaging.

Paul Wanzenried: Where the building currently resides, forty-eight acres plus or minus. Then there is fifty acres next door.

David Dunning: That they own.

Paul Wanzenried: Fifty plus acres next door.

David Dunning: That they own but that does not necessarily mean anything. Oh never mind if you read the next sentence we have included it. Oh, except I have got a note here that we are going to delete that, is that correct.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: We are going to omit that is that right that change.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: That is what my note says.

Dorothy Borgus: What where it says, "This area has been".

David Dunning: "The plan also recommends in this Sub Area #3, that Beaver Road Extension, at the east end, align with the property line of the American Packaging property under development". I have that as an omit.

Ron Brand: Do you want it omitted we just talked about it.

Dorothy Borgus: Didn't we talk about it and say we did not understand what that meant?

Paul Wanzenried: Because Beaver Road extends over, the Beaver Road Extension crosses over the property line.

Dorothy Borgus: And since we did not know, what that meant the way it was worded we did not know really, what it meant. I mean we understood it in concept but.

Ron Brand: Yea, I have we take that one out.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay, yea I have it crossed off.

Ron Brand: We are into Sub Area 4.

Dorothy Borgus: How about that part about King Road are we going to leave that? "King Road may need to be improved when development of this kind begins in earnest and traffic increases".

David Dunning: Where are you?

Dorothy Borgus: Oh wait a minute. No that was just a page that was stuck in from my other version forget it.

David Dunning: Messing us up Dorothy. That is what you get for making notes on old paper and turn them over.

Dorothy Borgus: That is right; it was from 5-11.

David Dunning: Okay Sub Area 4.

Ron Brand: First two, three paragraphs.

David Dunning: I do not know what pages you have 5-18 we did not make any changes to that at all.

Ron Brand: I got some editing. On the second paragraph, about the fifth line down.

Dorothy Borgus: See this is where we are going to get in trouble.

Steve Tarbell: "Concern".

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Yes, “there is concern”.

David Dunning: Huh?

Jim Ignatowski: There was a grammar.

Ron Brand; Grammar.

Dorothy Borgus: “There is concern over the development of the frontage along”.

Ron Brand: “Of just the frontage portion of these lots along Union Street, with considering”.

David Dunning: What is that paragraph start out as?

Paul Wanzenried: “The 2030 Plan recommends continued commercial development along both sides of Union Street, north of the I-490 Interchange”.

Ron Brand: The next sentence is correct no change.

Dorothy Borgus: See there is a sentence further down and it starts with “Concern over the development” you have to put “There is concern over the development”, it did not make sense. “There is concern over the development”, now it makes sense.

David Dunning: Got you.

Ron Brand: “Of just the frontage portion of these lots along Union Street without considering the interior lands and how to integrate those”.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea we agreed to reword that sentence and Ron was going to wordsmith it.

Ron Brand: Then in the third paragraph under this the sentence starting with “Consequently” I got “Consequently, the recommendation that a drainage evaluation be prepared which covers this area too”. We were going to take out “sewer feasibility study and” “and a general plan”. So, “Consequently, the recommendation is that a drainage evaluation be prepared which covers this area too”.

Paul Wanzenried: That whole second paragraph that begins with “The 2030 Plan recommends”. Aside from the first sentence that is totally different from what is in the Master Plan. It is not highlighted or delineated that this is an addition or an edit.

Dorothy Borgus: I think that this is where we started to get into serious problems with the different versions.

Ron Brand: Well, no Sub Area 4, the first paragraph is the same. The second paragraph is the same with the only change being editing of some verbiage.

Paul Wanzenried: I disagree with that Ron.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Yea right, I do too.

Paul Wanzenried: The second paragraph according to the, the second paragraph in the plan reads, “The 2030 Plan recommends continued commercial development along both sides of Union Street, north of the I-490 Interchange”.

Ron Brand: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: That correlates with the edited, hat is the version that you emailed us.

Ron Brand: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: The second one says “This area has the potential to attract different types of highway” am I on the right one.

Dorothy Borgus: “Interchange” yes you are on the right one.

Paul Wanzenried: “Different types of highway interchange such as hotels, motels, land uses”. But I do not see where it comes up with “Concern” in the book in the master plan you say “West Chili the intersection of Routes 33A, County Route 260 will continue to be an exception to the opportunities listed above”. “This intersection continues to operate in a poor condition and any increase in land use intensity that generates additional traffic through this intersection will need to be carefully evaluated”. But that is not what I am reading here.

Dorothy Borgus: Right and I had that highlighted when I went through this originally.

Ron Brand: Okay and we did not take it out during our edits.

Dorothy Borgus: No.

Al Hellaby: No.

Dorothy Borgus: It just was never in the copy that you were using.

Paul Wanzenried: It was taken out Ron.

Dorothy Borgus: It is in the approved version.

David Dunning: Correct.

Ron Brand: I got that but it did not come over here.

Dorothy Borgus: That is an important statement.

Ron Brand: Okay. You want that left in.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I think so.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Okay.

Dorothy Borgus: Someday when push comes to shove statements like that are going to be what make the state do something there. If it is not in our master plan, we have lost the battle right there.

David Dunning: So that whole starting with “Concern” that whole section all the way to the end does not exist in the.

Ron Brand: That is new.

Paul Wanzenried: In the original.

David Dunning: Right and that was not added correct.

Dorothy Borgus: No, this was no. What was left out starts with “West Chili”.

David Dunning: Right no I get that. I just want to make sure, so that we are so that this other part needs to be taken needs to get taken out.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I see what you are saying.

Ron Brand: No, “As with the bordering areas North”.

Dorothy Borgus: I see what he is saying.

Ron Brand: That is in there.

David Dunning: Huh?

Dorothy Borgus: I think the part that was left out starts with “West Chili, the intersection of State Routes”.

Ron Brand: Right those two sentences.

Dorothy Borgus: That should go right in should be inserted before “Concern”, “There is concern” where we are going to make that correction that is where it should go.

David Dunning: But where did that “Concern” come from.

Dorothy Borgus: I do not know.

David Dunning: That is what I am saying so should that be stricken because that is not a part of the language.

Dorothy Borgus: No and I don’t know. Is there something from a planning standpoint in the town, has there been a thought about doing a corridor study for Union Street.

Paul Wanzenried: It is important to note that what you are reading in your edits is dealing with 490 North what that is in the book is dealing with is 490 South.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: 490 South you are right.

Paul Wanzenried: So they are both valid but two different directions.

David Dunning: But where did this language come from it did not come from anything that we input. It did not come from anything we asked to be put in here and it did not come from the original text of the comprehensive plan.

Paul Wanzenried: I do not have any notes to that effect.

David Dunning: So from this particular spot it should be stricken and that “West Chili from the intersection” should be inserted. Am I right?

Ron Brand: Right but.

Paul Wanzenried: I would agree.

Dorothy Borgus: Right yes, I would agree.

Ron Brand: But on page 5-12 the third paragraph “As with the bordering areas in North Chili” that looks good.

David Dunning: It is just that one sentence.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

Ron Brand: That needs to be put back in.

Dorothy Borgus: And “Concern over the”.

David Dunning: One taken out and one put in its place.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, so we would take out.

David Dunning: From “Concern to 1990’s” and insert “West Chili to evaluated”.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, so that would take out all mention of this planned study.

David Dunning: The planned corridor approach, yes. Those two sentences I am sorry.

Dorothy Borgus: The two should come out.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Eliminate okay.

Ron Brand: So what is it I am taking out David?



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: From where we said there should be a “There is” where “Concern” is starting with “Concern” and ending with the “1990’s”.

Dorothy Borgus: Take that out.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: That whole thing gets stricken. Then inserted from the language from the Comprehensive Plan which should be “West Chili to evaluated”.

Dorothy Borgus: Do you see that there Ron, the “intersections of State Routes 33” have you got that.

Ron Brand: Yes mam.

David Dunning: Okay we good.

Dorothy Borgus: Now we are good.

David Dunning: Any other questions on that.

Paul Wanzenried: The fourth paragraph there “When sewer services is provided”. I think we have batted this around Paul Road extended to Union Street I forget what committee I was in that we were talking about this.

Dorothy Borgus: No, we talked about it here.

Paul Wanzenried: That is not going to happen. There was monies but now they are gone.

David Dunning: Could it come back sure. I mean if the sewer was extended down that way.

Dorothy Borgus: It might come back.

David Dunning: Would this then be feasible. The answer is still no but because you still have to do a bridge I believe right.

Dorothy Borgus: Right. There is a lot of land down there though if you could get it hooked up down to Union Street.

David Dunning: With Fed Ex in there now does that now hurt the possibility of bridge. I thought it did.

Paul Wanzenried: It all centered around the bridge. I thought that is where it in a previous discussion I believe that is where I thought we ran into an issue was the bridge, Fed Ex that whole little.

Dorothy Borgus: Well does it do any harm to leave it in there the way it is. I mean I do not see any if it is not feasible when the time comes at least it is in here as a suggestion if no one follows up on it later. So what.

David Dunning: Why wouldn’t they have just done a gated crossing there?

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: I think it was, you mean and left it there.

David Dunning: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: It was the shape of the bridge; the bridge was in horrible shape.

David Dunning: Oh.

Dorothy Borgus: It was bad.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: It was bad.

David Dunning: The railroad bridge.

Dorothy Borgus: The one over the railroad they did not think it was safe. The one on Paul Road you are talking about.

David Dunning: You know what I have not been down that is there a bridge over the railroad track now.

Dorothy Borgus: Now no, not now.

David Dunning: Oh, they took it out.

Dorothy Borgus: But the reason that there was a lot of anxiety about closing that off but it required a lot of money and nobody was willing to come up with money to replace the bridge or to make it serviceable anymore.

David Dunning: Oh, okay.

Paul Wanzenried: Not only that but you are going to disrupt the lives of those people.

David Dunning: We talked about that the last time and if I lived there, I would not want it.

Dorothy Borgus: Well no but that should not stop a project, not everybody likes everything but it still happens.

Paul Wanzenried: The comprehensive plan is still somewhat of a priorities based document. Is putting a bridge in there a high priority, is that a town road Steve I believe it is so then who foots the bill for that bridge.

David Dunning: Depends on who we get the money from.

Dorothy Borgus: That is right.

Paul Wanzenried: That is right. Like Dorothy said, you can leave it in there.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: I don't see what harm it would do.

David Dunning: I don't have a problem with leaving it in there.

Ron Brand: So this map that shows this connection from here to here does not exist.

David Dunning: Where to where?

Ron Brand: Here is Paul Road, 490; here is the southern portion of Paul Road where it comes up.

David Dunning: Yes they do not connect. There is no connect to it.

Paul Wanzenried: Ron are those the maps. We should really question Passero to find out what they are using as their base map, because Lindsay and I found some streets that were missing, somethings that where on there that where dotted and depicted in such a way that it was not accurate. So they should really check their base mapping and see that it is up to date.

Ron Brand: Have you provided them a list of those things.

Paul Wanzenried: I have made some doodling's and etchings on these maps. Do I have a written description, no?

Ron Brand: Would they be able to read the doodling's and figure out.

Paul Wanzenried: Yea or I will write up something to Mr. Savage and tell him, if you would prefer that.

Ron Brand: The clearer you can make it to him the better off you will be.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, they have a problem understanding. They are not high on my list.

Ron Brand: Don't put me on that list Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: Listen a large part of why it took two and a half years to complete the comprehensive plan last time was a large share of their fault.

David Dunning: Moving forward.

Ron Brand: So what did we decide to do with the bordering areas in North Chili that paragraph there?

David Dunning: Where are you?

Ron Brand: 5-18, second paragraph from the bottom.

Steve Tarbell: That is on the new update.

David Dunning: I thought we were fine with that. We were going to take out that "sewer feasibility study" and that was it.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: Then we are good. Going to the next page however on 5-20. The first paragraph “The location makes future request” matches up with the current comprehensive plan. The next does not. The next in the comprehensive plan says, “The major constraint to development in this portion of the sub area is created by the intersection of Union Street and Chili Avenue and the lack of open lands”. This says, “The principal change” and “The principal issues”, so the next one, two, three, four.

Paul Wanzenried: No, wait the one that starts with.

Ron Brand: At the top of 5-14.

Paul Wanzenried: At the top of 5-14, I believe is.

David Dunning: Is good, that looks okay. So this second, third and fourth paragraph don't.

Dorothy Borgus: Agree, in fact that one above that does not either David because the one that says, “The location makes future requests for such uses likely, especially as North Chili grows”. That is okay and it does not say anything about traffic, which has been added here and then from there on it does not even look like that paragraph either.

Paul Wanzenried: No that is what he is saying.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I thought we were dealing with the one that started with “The major” I thought he was worried about on from the next paragraph “The major constraint”.

Paul Wanzenried: The first one starts with “The principal change” Dorothy, the second one starts with “The principal issues”.

Dorothy Borgus: No the one above it though “The location makes future requests” is not right either. That does not agree with what we got in the other book.

Paul Wanzenried: You are right that has changed.

Dorothy Borgus: That is different.

David Dunning: Oh yea.

Paul Wanzenried: There is different language in there.

David Dunning: “These can be served by on-site sewage disposal” and this says, “A used car dealer is already located” right.

Dorothy Borgus: I do not know where this ever came from.

David Dunning: Yea so, that part of it is good.

Dorothy Borgus: Part of it is good and part of it is added.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: It stops at “likely” or “especially” and “as North Chili grows”.

Dorothy Borgus: It does not say anything about traffic in the original plan.

David Dunning: Right. So on the first paragraph on your 5-20 Ron, after “North Chili grows”, the rest of that does not match up with the current comprehensive plan.

Dorothy Borgus: All the way down to “The other significant concern”, one, two, three, four paragraphs.

David Dunning: Correct.

Ron Brand: But what is in the comprehensive plan and those others they should remain?

David Dunning: I do not know.

Dorothy Borgus: I don’t know we need to look at it.

David Dunning: We would need to go back and review that because we did not review that.

Ron Brand: Okay. I have a note here that we need to in this sub area reference the Farmland Protection Plan.

David Dunning: That could be.

Ron Brand: I do not see that coming into because there is not much up there in North Chili on the Farmland Protection Plan.

Dorothy Borgus: Do we need to look at those four paragraphs and see.

Ron Brand: Rather than retype them.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, and then are we making work. Maybe we should look and see if we want to leave any of that in there from the original. What did your version read like this one?

Al Hellaby: Well I have the original and the new one here.

Dorothy Borgus: But what I am thinking is that maybe my original, the original, original and the one you have that we thought was an original and maybe they don’t agree is what I am thinking. You follow me, like maybe your book and my book to agree to start with.

Jim Ignatowski: On mine the paragraphs don’t even match up, it is out of order.

Dorothy Borgus: I know it that is what I am saying.

Al Hellaby: From the original review and the edits, the only thing I got noted is that during the first five years of plan period in the second from the last paragraph there is stricken out and the rest of it is all left.

Dorothy Borgus: The rest of it we left.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: That is what I got.

David Dunning: Not for nothing, you know where these three look like they came out of.

Dorothy Borgus: Where?

David Dunning: The twenty ten plan. That language looks old.

Dorothy Borgus: You mean in the book.

David Dunning: Not the real one but the changes one, it looked like these could have come over out of the twenty ten plan. That is what it looks like to me, because the language looks pretty old. "The principal change that is expected for the area between I-490 and the Black Creek, is additional development of single family residences", well that has already happened and "open lands". And between that area of the creek, not a whole lot of open lands left because you have a fairly good size sub division in there now.

Dorothy Borgus: See I do not know what they have in their books so it is hard to. I was fine with it the way it was in the book that I had. The original, original, not the original the final. I was fine with it except that "first five years" take that out of there. Other than that, I did not have any problem with it.

Ron Brand: So she is saying that these four are okay.

Dorothy Borgus: Except for that "five year", you know. The one that starts as "improvements to this intersection should be a high priority for the State Department of Transportation to correct" period.

Ron Brand: During the plan period.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, "during the plan period". They came from somewhere.

David Dunning: That is what it looks like to me. I mean just reading it looks.

Paul Wanzenried: They sort of say the same thing, just kind of worded differently.

Dorothy Borgus: But as David says, there is no land left. I am not reading what he is reading but there is no land left over there.

David Dunning: No and they are talking about which is very clear and we already know about that "portion of the sub area does not appear feasible for sewer extensions" which is true. We are not going under the creek.

Dorothy Borgus: We should take those paragraphs out then.

David Dunning: And replace the ones that where.

Dorothy Borgus: Replace the ones that were omitted verbatim.

Ron Brand: So take these out.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: Take out “The principal change”, the paragraph there, “The principal issues”, and “The neighborhood commercial area” and replace it with from the comprehensive plan, “The major constraint to development” starts with that and then “The existing Neighborhood Commercial area”. Which is similar to what is in the in this one that you are taking out but not the same.

Paul Wanzenried: Are you going back to the original “The location makes future requests” paragraph or are you using the revised one.

David Dunning: Huh?

Dorothy Borgus: You know the only thing that is really different there is that the “traffic” is not mentioned other than that there and there was no car dealer mentioned.

Paul Wanzenried: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: There is no car dealer mentioned in the original.

Al Hellaby: Yea they are going to put this back and eliminate this.

Ron Brand: Yea I got these three.

Al Hellaby: Right you eliminate and you are putting this back in there.

Ron Brand: Then insert.

David Dunning: Where it says “The major”, you already got the “location one”, well that has got to be redone. On 5-12 of the comprehensive plan “The location makes future requests” right, that language needs to get inserted in this first one and eliminate the stuff that is different.

Ron Brand: That is here yea.

David Dunning: Then the next paragraph, which starts with “The major constraint to development”, needs to get inserted after that. Then “The existing Neighborhood Commercial area”, needs to get inserted after that. Then I think you are okay with “The other significant concern”, which is the very next paragraph in your edits.

Dorothy Borgus: I had that marked okay.

David Dunning: You follow all that.

Ron Brand: Yep. “The town has already extended water mains”.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, because we agreed that the second sentence in the original after sanitary sewer service was to be gone and it is gone. There again it was taken out and there is no lines.

Ron Brand: I am bad.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: When it says, “When sewer service is eventually established”, now I had it that we were going to leave that paragraph and change “When” to “If”, but in your edits, you have that gone.

Paul Wanzenried: That whole paragraph is gone isn't it?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes. Should it be though?

Al Hellaby: I don't think it should be. We had it marked as.

Dorothy Bogus: As staying, yea.

David Dunning: So it is “If sewer service is eventually established” is that what you are talking about?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes. It is the way it is in the edits but we had it as left and now it is taken out. And we had changed “When” to “If”.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: Coming down to that next paragraph Ron, it is in the red “A large portion of this sub area has been rezoned and is developing as a single family housing”, that was not rezoned, that is Rose Hill Estates. That was not rezoned.

Dorothy Borgus: There again it was a discussion when we did this book originally that we were under the misguided impression I guess that when we got this plan done and it was approved that the zoning would change to match the plan and it didn't happen.

David Dunning: Correct.

Dorothy Borgus: So when somebody wants to build on it in complete opposition to the plan the zoning law was still the old way.

David Dunning: Correct.

Dorothy Borgus: Right, unfortunately.

David Dunning: Well in all fairness though, I am sure that there are other areas of the town that the Future Land Use map shows is different than what is on the current Zoning map and we did not rezone any of that either. We did not just do a blanket rezone of all these properties that we the Future Land Use map and that is what you are referring to is the Future Land Use map indicated that the land should be rezoned. But we just did not do a blanket rezoning of all the properties that we said in the Future Land Use map should be rezoned.

Dorothy Borgus: Well I guess it was our impression that this book was going to matter more when we did it.

David Dunning: Well it is come on now Dorothy give us some credit we have done an awful lot of work that mattered in this book and awful lot. There is just one or two particular things that you would have



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

liked to have seen differently that did not get done the way you would have them does not mean that we did not pay attention to it or it did not matter.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

David Dunning: Okay. You see what I am saying Ron that was not rezoned so that needs to get changed. Anything else on that one?

Dorothy Borgus: Now I have a note here that we were going to define the recreation area in the edits.

Ron Brand: Conservation and Recreation area we were going to do that then we decided to take it out. That is what I am showing.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay that is all right.

Paul Wanzenried: Once we put in that "If sewer service is eventually" paragraph is the next paragraph going to be "A major change to the 2030 Plan". Is that a paragraph out of the edits?

Ron Brand: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: That would be the next paragraph.

Ron Brand: That is the way it is here yes. So why do we need to say, "If sewer service is eventually established".

Dorothy Borgus: Wait a minute that is not in the edit I got here. The edit is "If sewer service is eventually established" that is one paragraph then the next one is on mine is "Another land use change in this sub area is the land south of Beaver Road".

Paul Wanzenried: My question is where did all this come from and is he taking this out because he put all of that in there.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I see what you are saying.

David Dunning: Well if you go to the 5-14 of the comprehensive plan that is where it starts the "Another".

Paul Wanzenried: Right and in the edits he has the "When sewer service" paragraph stricken and above it he has this whole brand new paragraph in the edits which I think he meant instead of putting it after the stricken paragraph he put it before it. I defer to Ron.

Ron Brand: Correct. I mean that is gone "When sewer service is available eventually established".

Dorothy Borgus: And you think it is included in the edit above Ron?

Ron Brand: Yea because we said the recommendation is that, the sewer feasibility study not be undertaken. The basis for that why we are saying that is that I inserted there that it comes from the Farmland Protection Plan. Which identifies these areas within the map PRD zone is being predominately farmland and therefore needs to be included in the map Farmland Protection Plan.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I see all right.

Ron Brand: So that there has come out.

Dorothy Borgus: So that paragraph would be omitted then, “When sewer service is eventually” we take that out.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay because it is included above.

David Dunning: All right where are we, are we all caught up, let us go to 5-23.

Ron Brand: So as I go back through here I should follow the text that is in this document. Anything I am taking out leave in and draw a line through it and things that are different that I want to add I should make bold.

David Dunning: I think Sub Area 5 we captured pretty good.

Dorothy Borgus: I had that paragraph just above Sub Area 5 is “The final recommended change” I had that in our original discussions as being omitted.

Jim Ignatowski: Same here.

Dorothy Borgus: I have a note here to insert to be Agricultural Conservation.

Paul Wanzenried: Right to Farm.

Dorothy Borgus: That is what my note says.

Ron Brand: So that comes out.

Dorothy Borgus: That should be omitted “The final recommended change” goes away.

David Dunning: Um, no the change is incorrect. The Future Land Use Plan Map should recommend, if I am looking at this correctly, this land be made to be put back in the AC, is what the Farmland Protection Plan recommended. North of Bowen and between Union and Stottle all that pink area if you have your map which is now Rural Residential should go back to the AC I believe.

Ron Brand: This area over here.

David Dunning: It is that “L” shape Ron, yea right underneath the sub division there. That was my.

Ron Brand: AC.

David Dunning: AC I believe.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: But it says Rural Residential.

David Dunning: I understand, but I believe it is supposed to I believe that the Farmland Protection Plan recommended that be converted back to AC. And all of that.

Paul Wanzenried: There was not enough development out there.

David Dunning: Actually, it may be even further any of that area in there was supposed to convert back.

Paul Wanzenried: South of Bowen, was it South of Bowen and East of Stryker?

David Dunning: I thought it was North of Bowen, West of Stryker.

Paul Wanzenried: That should not be revert back to AC.

David Dunning: Yes, North of Bowen, West of Stottle.

Paul Wanzenried: Is Park Place.

Ron Brand: No further North.

Dorothy Borgus: North of Bowen between Union and Stottle.

David Dunning: I would have to get the current Zoning Map because this is based off the Future Land Use Map and not the current Zoning Map.

Ron Brand: The current zoning probably has it as residential.

David Dunning: It is PRD; it is all of the PRD should be converted to AC. All the remaining PRD over there. Maybe it is East of Stottle and South of Bowen. I would have to look at the Zoning Map. But it is consistent with whatever the Zoning Map is Ron.

Paul Wanzenried: There is only a few parcels undeveloped parcels North West of.

Too many speaking at once inaudible.

Ron Brand: East of Stottle?

Paul Wanzenried: East of Stottle gives you what? You are only going east for so long.

David Dunning: South and East.

Ron Brand: So how does that Future Land Use decrease in density for the area? East of Stottle and North of Stryker.

David Dunning: For this one yes East of Stottle, North of Stryker for this sub area. Any land in there that is currently PRD would revert to AC.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Al Hellaby: Yea because you could never use PRD because there is no sewers out there.

David Dunning: Right, they rezoned way, way too much land out there.

Paul Wanzenried: That makes sense.

Steve Tarbell: That last paragraph in that should that be changed where it says, “Therefore this area has been changed” should that say, “this area be changed”.

Ron Brand: We are taking that out.

Dorothy Borgus: That is my question should it be now that we talked about it.

Steve Tarbell: The way that it is worded now, it is not correct.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not correct the way it is worded. But now that we talked about that.

David Dunning: It needs to be reworded for this particular it should be “East of Stryker Road” Bowen Road would be out of the picture because it is South of Bowen that we would be looking at which is outside of this particular sub area. East of Stryker I am sorry East of Stottle, North of Stryker which is currently PRD and it is all the way up to the creek. What is currently zoned PRD should be rezoned to AC. So your Future Land Use Map would show that as AC.

Dorothy Borgus: So we are not going to omit we are going to change this.

Paul Wanzenried: So he is changing that both off the existing document and the edited version too.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Ron Brand: I will combine those two; I will retype this, take this out and correct it.

Paul Wanzenried: Is Scottsville Road 386?

David Dunning: Chili Scottsville Road is 386.

Paul Wanzenried: So do you want forgive me where is Mill Creek.

David Dunning: South.

Al Hellaby: The other side of Clifton I think.

David Dunning: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: It is down the other side of Clifton right.

David Dunning: Yes, why part of it. It may run into this sub area, yea it runs into this sub area Mill Creek runs up to.

Paul Wanzenried: I want to say north of Stryker Road or do I want to say south of Stryker Road.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

David Dunning: For what?

Paul Wanzenried: The next sentence.

David Dunning: Where are you looking?

Paul Wanzenried: It does not matter either one edits an or the original book it starts with “South of Mill Creek, north of Stryker Road and west of State Route 386”, it would seem to me that should say “south of Stryker Road”.

David Dunning: South of Mill Creek, which is down here, west of 386, which is over here and north of Stryker, which is way over here, oh Mill Creek does run through there. No that statement is accurate.

Al Hellaby: Yea it is.

David Dunning: That statement is what we just said basically. I did not realize Mill Creek went up that far.

Paul Wanzenried: Is that the creek that runs behind Manning’s house, it crosses under the bridge off Stottle.

David Dunning: Yea at Stottle and Bowen.

Ron Brand: Sub Area 5.

David Dunning: I know we wanted to change this Ron about the adding in the Black Creek Trail Study. “Has resulted in the two phased project no longer being feasible to undertake in the Town of Chili”. It is partially true, it is still feasible but not in the form in which this was defined by the original intent. Sub Area 5 is all of Black Creek, which we are going to redo kind of.

Dorothy Borgus: How about taking out “Following completion of the study” there should be a comma in there “public opposition has resulted in the two phased project no longer being undertaken in the Town of Chili”.

David Dunning: In the form in which it was intended, because there is still a feasibility study out there that does indicate a trail as such, however it has taken a very different route than originally intended.

Dorothy Borgus: You just need a few words in there to word smith it a little bit.

David Dunning: I fear that at some point, we get the state or the county or the town comes up with some money to do what was recommended as a part of the Black Creek Trail Study that not having any support in this document for it would or basically saying that you said that it is not feasible anymore. Well it really is in some form it is just a different form in what we originally had thought.

Paul Wanzenried: Put it is the result that benefits the Town of Chili in there.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: Right absolutely.

Ron Brand: So after “Town of Chili” put “in the form originally intended to benefit the town”.

David Dunning: No.

Paul Wanzenried: I think you want to be specific to the benefit that it resulted in this. The development of trails, here, here and here in the Town of Chili or whatever the outcome was.

David Dunning: “The completion of this study, the public opposition has resulted in modifications to the trail alignment and at this time determined not to be feasible as originally intended” or something like that I don’t know. I don’t want to dismiss it or lose it all together. Anyone else have anything on five.

Paul Wanzenried: I am just curious in the edits why you did not strike though “waterfront recreation opportunities plan”. That is the only thing in that whole paragraph that you did not strike through. Is it just that you did not highlight it and strike it through or did you leave it out to bring to discussion or.

Dorothy Borgus: Where is that Paul?

Ron Brand: The top of 5-16 in the plan.

Paul Wanzenried: Page 5-16, page 5-23 in your edited version.

Jim Ignatowski: What was the question again?

Paul Wanzenried: Why was not “waterfront recreation opportunities plan” struck from?

Dorothy Borgus: It was.

Steve Tarbell: It is on the paper we have.

Paul Wanzenried: It is not on mine.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5, 6? Anyone have anything on 5-25, 5-26 was the map, 5-27?

Dorothy Borgus: I am just looking at the edits and compare to my notes in that first paragraph I think it is okay. Just a grammatical thing on “overdue” should be one word there Ron where it starts “The last ten years saw the removal” in your edit the third line from the bottom “overdue” is one word.

Paul Wanzenried: I have a question, on the edits in the paragraph that starts with “The last ten years”, if you go down it says, “This entryway to the airport terminal should be promoted by Monroe County which would, in turn, stimulate opportunities for additional motel/hotel development within this portion of the sub area”. “Once established, then the long overdue improvements to the Brooks Avenue underpass of the existing railroad in the area could be undertaken with minimal disruption to the air traveling public”.

David Dunning: Yea what is your question?

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Where is Brooks Avenue underpass?

David Dunning: Well that is in the Town of Gates obviously.

Paul Wanzenried: Thank you.

David Dunning: However, this is showing where as if you were to further develop the airport entrance on Scottsville Road where it should be better to find would give some better development opportunities and economic development opportunities in Chili as well by doing that you would benefit the Town of Gates and not the Town of Gates necessarily but air travelers by allowing you would have a full blown entrance on Scottsville Road and then you could repair or do something with the Brooks one without shutting down or disrupting air services. It is just supporting it is all. Showing you how all this works by doing this would help get something else done for the airport without disruption. Besides, to get some Chili properties you have to go down that way don't you, little Bourbon Way. Anything on 5-27.

Dorothy Borgus: Where that last sentence has been stricken, "Some zoning changes may be needed to get the zoning map to conform to the plan in this area".

Ron Brand: No, we decided that the zoning was correct over there we just needed a way to promote it.

Dorothy Borgus: Fast Trac was rezoned, yes, okay.

Steve Tarbell: There is just a grammar error on Sub area on 5-27 on the new version where the hyphen.

Dorothy Borgus: What is that Steve?

Steve Tarbell: There is just a grammar thing on 5-27 on those updates that we email to us. The last paragraph on the bottom of the page. "Airport Major Investment Study Area". Just a hyphen there.

David Dunning: Anything more on 5-27, 5-28?

Dorothy Borgus: The second paragraph says "The 2030 Plan recognizes that an update to the Airport Master Plan" has that been redone, I had that question here.

Ron Brand: No, it has not. We are asking for it to be done during the next thirteen years.

David Dunning: Even with the current renovations and things that they are doing they didn't, really, wow, okay.

Dorothy Borgus: They are always tearing that up.

Ron Brand: That Airport Master Plan was more than just the terminal renovations, I mean that was lands around the airport that they wanted to do a multimodal, remember.

David Dunning: Yea, getting rid of the trailer parks.

Ron Brand: Connect the airfreight with the rail with surface.

Al Hellaby: That all fell by the way side several years ago.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Yea but they never.

David Dunning: That was back when Randy Kuhl was a Congressman that they got all that money.

Al Hellaby: They still own the Gottrey building over there.

David Dunning: The Gottrey you mean, yea the county. Anything else on 5-28, 5-29?

Steve Tarbell: On the top paragraph did we change that one sentence that was separated into two. Where it says, "This would not be conversion of existing residences" in other words "to create larger sites". And then start a new sentence that would say "These which would then", something like that I had it marked in my notes.

Ron Brand: What page of the document.

Steve Tarbell: 5-29, the top, it says, "to create larger sites," should that be broken down into two different sentences instead of one.

Ron Brand: That is simple enough but.

Dorothy Borgus: It is a run on sentence.

Ron Brand: "This would not be conversion of existing residences, but rather, consolidation of existing residential properties to create larger sites."

Dorothy Borgus: "These would then be redeveloped".

Ron Brand: Yes, "These would then be redeveloped for uses that are more compatible with the neighboring airport use".

David Dunning: Anything else on 29?

Dorothy Borgus: Yea wait a minute I got some notes, as we get further down here.

Paul Wanzenried: The paragraph in the edits that starts "Land on the south side of Paul Road and on the north side of Beaver Road is already partially developed for industrial uses.

Dorothy Borgus: You know what the problem is Paul that was not in the original book.

Paul Wanzenried: Sounds like he is not in the right sub area. It is not in the original book.

Dorothy Borgus: The wording is different again.

Paul Wanzenried: And, does he want to say the north side, the south side of Paul, north side of Beaver.

Ron Brand: Beaver Road or Black Creek.



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: No Beaver Road it says.

Paul Wanzenried: It says Beaver Road.

Ron Brand: I know.

Paul Wanzenried: You are talking APC. That is the only area north of Beaver and is south of Paul, Limited Industrial Use.

Dorothy Borgus: Correct.

David Dunning: Either that or Beaver Road should be Ballantyne Road.

Paul Wanzenried: North of Ballantyne south of Paul that could be, you have to go through the creek and swamp to get there but yea. You have to cross CSX for that matter.

David Dunning: But that is not a part of this sub area though.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what I am getting at.

David Dunning: Because this goes down Paul Road correct or no, no huh I see what he is, I see what he is looking at.

Paul Wanzenried: Where are you Ron?

David Dunning: Paul Road is the loop around the airport, Beaver Road would be still south of that and the development in there, and the only development in there right now is the Eco Park.

Paul Wanzenried: That is not Beaver.

Dorothy Borgus: That is Ballantyne.

David Dunning: That is what I am saying Ballantyne, not Beaver.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe we just need to leave Beaver/Ballantyne Road. Just add that so it clarifies it.

Paul Wanzenried: We are talking Sub Area 6 right.

David Dunning: And Beaver Road has nothing to do with, absolutely nothing to do with Sub Area 6.

Jim Ignatowski: That was back in Sub Area 5.

Paul Wanzenried: Right. It would make more sense if it was in Sub Area 5.

Ron Brand: So take this and put it in sub area whatever.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay but the plan calls for expansion into that area? If we switch Beaver for Ballantyne, nobody is expanding into the swamp.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: Well, yea you are right.

Paul Wanzenried: And the airport because the airport almost dangles to the railroad track you got what Eco Park and that is it at best.

David Dunning: Right.

Ron Brand: There is the area that he is talking about.

David Dunning: And that is the only development in that area, unless you want to include Scottsville Road which then on our side of the river which this would run. Our side of the river is Metalico, 84 Lumber, right.

Dorothy Borgus: I got a note here maybe this will clear it up, it says; “Ron’s draft adds a paragraph here” we are talking about the land on the south side of Paul Road. We are talking about that paragraph “Ron’s draft adds a paragraph here not committee approved and not in red”. So it is not in red in the edits, we never approved that paragraph at all that says “Land on the south side of Paul Road” I do not know where that came from. Is that in the other version? The one most of the committee has.

Paul Wanzenried: In the original version, it is not there.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not there.

Ron Brand: No.

Dorothy Borgus: So I mean where did it, we are debating whether it is correct or not and it was never there in the beginning. So maybe it should just be taken out. It does not belong there because it was never there from the start.

Paul Wanzenried: No and it goes onto to talk about the commercial or industrial uses on Paul Road for the next two paragraphs.

Ron Brand: So we take it out.

Dorothy Borgus: I think so because it was never part of a change because it was never there. I think we take it out. What are we spending time debating something about if it wasn’t right in the first place?

Paul Wanzenried: Here, Here.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay let us take it out.

Paul Wanzenried: What does the detention facility is that like a storm water or water detention facility. Okay.

Dorothy Borgus: Where are we looking at? Where are we? What paragraph?

Paul Wanzenried: “For the Paul Road area” paragraph.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: "Is close to the airport".

Paul Wanzenried: Yes but it also states that.

Dorothy Borgus: Again, that was never in the original book. I am looking it is not there.

Paul Wanzenried: It is in the original book. The paragraph that starts with "For the Paul Road area, the existing zoning already conforms to the plan".

Dorothy Borgus: Yea but there is another paragraph in the edits that is between the two.

Paul Wanzenried: He has changed it.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not in red, no it is not changed.

David Dunning: This paragraph, that paragraph right after that is new.

Dorothy Borgus: "The Paul Road area is close to the airport".

David Dunning: "The Paul Road area is close to the airport" that is not in the original.

Paul Wanzenried: That is correct.

Dorothy Borgus: No, it is not.

Paul Wanzenried: I was referring to this one.

Too many speaking at once inaudible.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not in red so why is it added.

Too many speaking at once inaudible.

David Dunning: In here, it says "The Paul Road area is close to the airport and an excellent area" and you have "For the Paul Road area, the existing zoning already conforms to the Plan".

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: That is different language than in the book. I think you are just getting.

Ron Brand: Where is that? So we are going to take that one out too.

Dorothy Borgus: Well I don't know.

David Dunning: Where did it come from?

Dorothy Borgus: Where did it come from?

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: It was on the disk.

Dorothy Borgus: Not in red but added but not in my copy, I have written in here.

Paul Wanzenried: But “The Paul Road area is close to the airport and an excellent area for airport-related businesses”. “Both areas have access” what both areas are you talking about Paul Road area.

Ron Brand: In the paragraph above it so if you are going to keep this paragraph.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay but “Both areas have access to the West Shore Branch railroad which also provides a good way of separating industrial development along Beaver and Archer Roads from commercial and residential development along Chili Avenue and Paul Road”. You are all over Chili man.

Ron Brand: I know what that says.

Paul Wanzenried: While there is truth to what you are saying in the paragraph, you have traversed three different sub areas.

Dorothy Borgus: Well what do we want to do with it?

David Dunning: Get rid of it, we don’t know where it came from.

Paul Wanzenried: Not only that it has nothing to do with the sub area most importantly.

Dorothy Borgus: Well it came out of the blue, all right. This has to go.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Paul Wanzenried: Now for the paragraph that begins with “For the Paul Road area”, again I believe that the Paul Road area borders this sub area.

David Dunning: It is well contained in this sub area. Yes, because Paul Road wraps around the airport don’t forget all the way out to Scottsville Road. That loop that 252A.

Paul Wanzenried: No, no I got it. “It appears that a regional detention”, in the original book it says. You have change the wording again Ron.

Ron Brand: It is there on 5-30. But as I am thinking about this is really something that we want to promote. A facility that geese that would fly into an aircraft taking off and landing.

Paul Wanzenried: I am sure the airport would frown upon such, especially since they are trying to get rid of the geese.

Ron Brand: Well why do we just say, “special consideration need to be given to the design of a detention facility so as not to negatively impact the nearby wetland areas and airport operations”.

Paul Wanzenried: When you say, “It appears that a regional detention facility might be developed”, is that mean you would have knowledge of one circulating in some circles.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Ron Brand: Well I believe there was at one time, because it was in the original plan in 2011.

Paul Wanzenried: Could you say, “therefore this is another area where a general evaluation in a preliminary plan for drainage and mitigation so as not to negatively impact nearby wetland areas and airport operations”.

Ron Brand: For drainage mitigation, so as not.

David Dunning: Why don’t you just get rid of from “It appears” on and leave it the “preliminary plan for drainage should be done” and then get rid of the rest of it. “It appears that a regional detention facility might be developed to serve this area”, “Special consideration and blah, blah, blah.

Dorothy Borgus: So you are taking out what.

David Dunning: From “It appears” and everything there then after.

Dorothy Borgus: Everything to the end.

Ron Brand: Yep.

David Dunning: Everything in until the end in that paragraph Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: Now the next paragraph, “The area south of the CSX railroad”.

Ron Brand: That is gone.

Dorothy Borgus: It is gone, but on my notes I thought we were only going to eliminate “it should be done in conjunction with a similar study” to the end, I thought that was what we were going to omit and leave the first two sentences. We were going to leave “The area south of the CSX railroad is not located within the sewer district, and much of it could not be provided with sewer service unless a new trunk sewer was extended. A sewer feasibility study is needed to determine how this service might be provided”. I thought we were leaving that.

Paul Wanzenried: I have that being stricken.

Al Hellaby: I do too.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5-29, 5-30 oh, we are there right, 5-30, Sub Area 7.

Dorothy Borgus: I had a note here that we were going to mention Vistas in that paragraph I don’t see where it was added.

Ron Brand: You were going to mention what?

Dorothy Borgus: Vistas.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Here is a good example right here is how that Chili Avenue Corridor plays out.

Ron Brand: Right, exactly.

Paul Wanzenried: It is essentially you look at this the sub area map it splits right in two.

Ron Brand: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: Which it should be dare I say it, an overlay so that the borders are contiguous.

Ron Brand: I agree so you come down where Paul Road is and you take all that stuff along Chili Avenue out and just extend it right across the gates.

Dorothy Borgus: Well you mention east of Archer Road so you maybe you don't have to mention Vistas exactly. It does not specifically say the Vistas but it does say east of Archer Road so I guess it is right. In that paragraph that starts with "The remaining land", the last paragraph in Sub Section 7, are we going to do anything with that second sentence, "The 2030 Plan recommends general industrial use of this land and a corresponding change in the zoning"? I had that underlined for some reason, "corresponding change in the zoning". I don't know why I underlined it. Should it be different?

Paul Wanzenried: When we say, "recommend for retention".

Dorothy Borgus: Where are we?

Paul Wanzenried: "The existing residential areas in the Jacklyn Drive-McNair Drive area". If you read through that "For them, consolidation and conversion are not as important and are economically infeasible, so they are recommended for retention". Is it to retain the current zoning?

Ron Brand: Retain the current zoning.

Steve Tarbell: On the update that we got he changed "feasible" and put "infeasible".

Paul Wanzenried: Yep.

Steve Tarbell: I have that circled and a question mark. Should that be "feasible" Ron?

Paul Wanzenried: Yea it is in the edits and it is not highlighted nor noted that he has changed the word from "feasible" to "infeasible".

Ron Brand: So, let me find it here.

David Dunning: Second paragraph, fifth line down.

Ron Brand: That needs to be made bold.

Dorothy Borgus: So back to my question about the zoning change is that something that we really wanted to do or maybe I don't have any idea why I underlined that I don't have any note by it. In the second

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

sentence of the paragraph, that starts “The remaining land that currently has residential zoning”. I guess you would have to leave it because you are talking about, you are talking about changes and that is.

Ron Brand: That is a corresponding change in the zoning.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, so I guess it is fine the way it is.

Paul Wanzenried: The lands north, the remaining land that is north of Jacklyn and McNair and west of Fisher is Wegmans property.

Ron Brand: West of Fisher or East of Fisher.

Paul Wanzenried: It says west of Fisher.

Ron Brand: That is not Wegmans property over there is it.

Al Hellaby: Yes.

David Dunning: Most of it is, well you got Rochester Drug, although Rochester Drug is a little bit further down.

Paul Wanzenried: I thought I was under the impression that was Wegmans campus.

Al Hellaby: I think they bought that last parcel.

Paul Wanzenried: There are parcels that border Fisher on the west side, you have tracks for Jacklyn and McNair and then there are parcels of houses, residential properties that border west, but the vast majority of that is just before you get to the Gates Town line there is an access road, it is gated that goes into Wegmans ballfields.

Al Hellaby: Right.

Ron Brand: Is this it right here?

Paul Wanzenried: Al can show you where it is.

Ron Brand: And it is being shown here on this plan as being General Industrial. So what is the question?

Dorothy Borgus: The description?

Paul Wanzenried: Yea I guess. So are you saying that all of those residential parcels should be converted to industrial that are on the west side?

David Dunning: The west side of Jetview or the west side of Fisher?

Paul Wanzenried: The west side of Fisher.

Ron Brand: North of Jacklyn and McNair all of those in there.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

David Dunning: Well that is what the Future Land Use shows.

Paul Wanzenried: Right okay. When it says “could have a road system that connects to Chili Avenue, Paul Road and Fisher Road without passing through residential areas”. Doesn’t Jetview accomplish, although Jetview doesn’t attach to or run into Fisher. But doesn’t Jetview attach to Chili Avenue to Paul Road and if you were to extend Airline Drive, I believe that would be your Fisher connection. I think that is south of Jacklyn and McNair.

Dorothy Borgus: But Paul it does not say that, that is the only one, it just says that, that would be a possible road.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay.

David Dunning: Isn’t most of that land sold up and used now. There is not much left back there anymore is there.

Paul Wanzenried: Off of?

David Dunning: Jetview, any of those connecting roads that are south of Jacklyn and McNair.

Paul Wanzenried: West of Fisher and off that I believe of Airline there is a parcel or two and that extends down to Paul Road along the west side of the tracks.

David Dunning: All right, I did not know if there was anything left back there or not.

Paul Wanzenried: Just a couple of parcels back in there and then there is one I believe on the east side of Jetview between Sydor and C&M or something like that.

David Dunning: Anything else on 32, Sub Area 8, Sub Area 9. Again with the overlay’s.

Dorothy Borgus: I had a note here that last, that first paragraph under Sub Area 9, from the third sentence on was going to be re-written to be to reflect the Farmland Protection Plan.

Paul Wanzenried: It is, see the red.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, down below okay I see.

Paul Wanzenried: Now I do not know if he meant to strike through the first two or.

Ron Brand: I did not have any indication that they should be stricken.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay.

David Dunning: Where are you, what page are you on Paul.

Paul Wanzenried: 5-34.



**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: I have nothing there to be stricken either.

Paul Wanzenried: Dorothy just had a question.

Dorothy Borgus: As long as it is reflected below, I just thought it had not been done, but it is done below.

David Dunning: The only thing we got is the Agricultural Conservation Overlay District. We will talk more about that at some point but you know how we don't want the, you know how we are not fond of these overlays.

Ron Brand: Swap your Rural Agricultural Overlay 20 District for AC.

David Dunning: And again, "hamlet" on 35 the very first the top "the Ballantyne Hamlet" now.

Ron Brand: You are on 5-35 right.

David Dunning: I know I am just waiting.

Dorothy Borgus: On 5-35, "The 2030 Plan recommends", is crossed out and I did not have that crossed out when we went through this before. The one that starts "The 2030 Plan recommends that the single and multi-family residential, industrial and institutional designations in the Ballantyne area correspond to the existing parcel boundaries". I did not have that crossed off.

Ron Brand: I don't either.

Jim Ignatowski: I didn't either.

Dorothy Borgus: But yet it is crossed off on the edit.

Ron Brand: It will be in. I will put it back in.

Dorothy Borgus: Put it back in.

Ron Brand: The paragraph underneath that where it says, "the other areas are appropriately zoned", that comes out.

Dorothy Borgus: I did not have it marked off before but maybe we missed it.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe that should come out.

Paul Wanzenried: Where are you?

Dorothy Borgus: The one, two, where it says, "It is a recommendation of the 2030 Plan".

Paul Wanzenried: You are removing that whole paragraph.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting  
2/12/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: No, just.

David Dunning: No, it is already stricken out on the edit.

Dorothy Borgus: You have identified what the current large lot residential zone is, you inserted the zoning designation is all the rest is the same right.

Ron Brand: RAO-20, large lot residential zone.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

Ron Brand: Which technically.

Dorothy Borgus: Now, we get into to. The next paragraph that is not in the edits is not shown in red before and it is not noted for change by the committee. Where it says “90 acres of town owned parkland”, it is not on the edits you have to go back to the book. That is not in the edits.

Ron Brand: I think it needs to be put back in.

Dorothy Borgus: Put back in, it is good information.

Paul Wanzenried: That land by the Genesee Land Trust that is the one that.

David Dunning: Brookdale Preserve.

Paul Wanzenried: Brookdale Preserve that is the one that extends from Brook Road to Ballantyne Road along the Greenway Trail.

David Dunning: Up to Ballantyne Road some of that is the town property, Brookdale does not come up to Ballantyne.

Paul Wanzenried: Is that the area up on Reed Road?

Al Hellaby: The one on Reed Road is owned by the land trust.

Paul Wanzenried: That is the one I am referring to.

Al Hellaby: Back in behind that is the one that is land locked, it is actually owned by the Rochester Museum and Science Center.

Paul Wanzenried: “275 acres of land under a conservation easement maintained by the Genesee Land Trust and an additional 163 acres of land that is owned by State of NY (the Genesee Valley Greenway Trail)”.

Al Hellaby: There is a miss in there because I tell you that the Rochester Museum and Science Center owns a big portion of that Reed Road.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

David Dunning: Well, Brookdale Preserve goes from Brook Road and it does touch Ballantyne only at the width of the Greenway it looks like, because there is a good portion of that the town owns. Which goes up to Ballantyne, but it starts over Brook Road and goes north.

Dorothy Borgus: I am wondering if that paragraph that we are talking about here is the same in all of our books.

David Dunning: What is that Dorothy?

Dorothy Borgus: “There are approximately 90 acres of town owned parkland/open space”. Is that the same in both versions of the books we are looking at, that we are going to put back I want to make sure it is put back is the version from the original if there is a change there.

Ron Brand: Right, that is what I have.

David Dunning: Yea, “approximately town owned parklands/open space” you have the same one from 11/2/2011 from when it was adopted.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, I am just wondering if that is what you got and that is what you are using and not the other book.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

David Dunning: Anything else on 35, 36, and 37 I mean.

Steve Tarbell: Second paragraph from the top, forth there is just a grammar it is missing a comma after “farmed”, between “farmed” and “but”.

David Dunning: On the third paragraph.

Ron Brand: Okay “no longer being farmed but being used for” and you want it changed to.

David Dunning: “Farmed” comma “but used for”.

Dorothy Borgus: After “farmed” right.

David Dunning: On the next paragraph, under your edits Ron, “in this sub area, especially on lands that have the following characteristics” we took out all the following characteristics so should that not be stricken also?

Ron Brand: Yep, good catch.

David Dunning: Anybody else have anything on that page?

Dorothy Borgus: I am still looking at 5-37 I had a question.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting**  
**2/12/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: I am curious about this statement that is in both versions “Finally, there is”, it starts with that.

David Dunning: You are on the next page and we are not done with 37 yet.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay that was what my note was about now it makes sense. On page 5-37, there is no number on it but it is 5-37. Right above where it is all crossed off “The 2030 Plan”, in red, “The 2030 Plan places emphasis upon protecting the Class 1 through 4 soils, as determined by the Monroe County Soil Conservation service in this sub area, especially on lands that have the following characteristics”. Then are not any.

David Dunning: Dorothy! Really Dorothy.

Al Hellaby: We just said that.

David Dunning: I have been waiting fifteen minutes for that.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay we are going to take that out.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, all right.

David Dunning: That is what I said there are no characteristics left. All right Paul finally.

Paul Wanzenried: In that paragraph that begins “Finally” it says the “Wheatland town boundary, that is already developed for residential use and that has the full range of public facilities”. Then it goes down to say, “The plan does not recommend such development, but acknowledges the possibility and recommends that only single family development be considered only if the full range of public facilities can be provided”.

Ron Brand: So take out “only if the full range of public facilities”?

Paul Wanzenried: Right you in the beginning you are telling me that it has the full range. And down here, you are saying well only if the possibility exists.

Dorothy Borgus: Well you know what I can tell you how that was. They are talking about the land in Wheatland, the first part. In the land in the Town of Wheatland has already developed with residential use and that has, I don’t know maybe that was the assumption on our part that they had public facilities in Wheatland. But they were saying that when you get into Chili they are not there.

Paul Wanzenried: Oh okay, I did not catch the word “south”, I bad.

David Dunning: Yet. Anything else?

The next meeting of the committee will be TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.