

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE
TOWN OF VICTOR CONSERVATION BOARD
April 19, 2022 – 6:30 pm**

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Conservation Board was held on April 19, 2022, at 6:30pm via Zoom, with the following members present:

The YouTube link to access the meeting is: <https://www.youtube.com/c/townofvictornewyork>

ATTENDING: Keith Parris; Matthew Matteson, Patrick Coleman, Tim Norman, Ed Kahovec, town board member

Guests: David Cocquyt

Absent: Andrew Phillips

Keith Parris called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm and explained the role of the conservation board to the guests.

VALENTOWN MEADOWS

06-SP-2022

7241 Valentown Road

Zoned – Residential 2

Owner – CoMark Holdings

Tax Map # 1.02-1-21.000

Applicant is requesting approval for a clustered subdivision of a 28.6-acre parcel into 8 individual lots ranging in size from 1.58 acres to 5.87 acres. The property is currently divided by Valentown Road with an existing house on south side of Valentown Road and existing barn structure on the north side of Valentown Road. This will be the third step in a 3-step process for a major subdivision. The Preliminary Plan was acknowledged complete March 22, 2022.

It was stated that a few of the board member had done a site walk at the property and this was a project that has been seen by the Conservation Board already. Chairman Parris stated that the purpose of this meeting was to determine what the easements would be for the project. The applicant stated that the project itself has not modified too much, he briefly updated the board stating that there have been some site line adjustments being made with the tree lines on the South side of Valentown Road to improve distance and timing for both driveways entering the 4 lots on the East end of the property as well as the South side of the property. The applicant is proposing some removal of trees and some light grading that will bring visibility, not only for the driveways but also for the curve, which the residents in the area are very concerned about, improving sight lines for traffic. Proposing an easement for the town to maintain that area, brush clearing and maintaining the area making sure it doesn't get overgrown in the future. The applicant stated that those are really the only changes that have been made to the project since the walk through that was done a few months ago. Keith Parris asked for clarification on the easements, asking if they are just asking for the town to maintain it or if they were asking about the other easements, stating that he was aware of 3 easements within the project. The applicant stated that within the conservation easements they will be going with the "middle of the road" conservation easement, no structures to be built, but the property owners would be able to maintain some of the areas within the wooded area, not

the most aggressive easement, but even still it would be conserving over 50% of the project as well as the stream buffer on the North side of the project as well. The applicant stated where it was possible, they did straighten some of the lines for the easements as requested and they plan to pin those areas with markers once they have final approval.

Chairman Parris asked if anyone had questions regarding the changes made to the project. The board stated that they agree that removing some of the vegetation is necessary to improve the visual sight lines. It makes sense and is not disruptive. The board supports the changes. Mr. Nearpass asked with the stream buffer and the conservation easement if they were planning on pinning both of these areas. And how they planned to go about accomplishing that, making sure the homeowners are aware the difference between the stream buffer and the conservation easement, and the different levels of touch for each. The applicant stated he couldn't say for certain. He believes the conservation easement is what is marked, on the west side, in a field behind the barn, he believes the conservation easement at that placement is very close if not on the same line as the 75' stream buffer. On the East side, there is some difference there, but he believes the conservation easement is wider than the stream buffer. He stated that they plan on pinning the Conservation easement on that. He does not believe there is any marking planned for the 75' stream buffer, separate from the conservation easement. Mr. Nearpass asked is the homeowners are allowed to mow within the stream buffer. Stating that the whole idea was to keep humans away from the stream. He also stated on the South side there are 2 properties and on the north side there are 4 properties where the homeowner is within both the conservation easement and the stream buffer, stating maybe having the conservation easement overlap the stream buffer would be a good idea. Stating as a homeowner it may be confusing the have different easements within their property. The applicant stated he would have to talk with the engineer for a more detailed answer. The applicant stated the field had been mowed in the past and stated that it was farmed at one point in the past as well. There would be 25-30' of woods on each side of the stream. The conservation easement is butted right up to the woods. As far as mowing within that area, the applicant is unsure, but for disturbance, the homeowners would not be allowed to disturb anything within that area. There was a question on what exactly is allowed by the homeowner within the stream buffer. The applicant stated that since the conservation easement does not go the whole length to the 75' stream buffer, and if there is a difference what can be done on the 2 different areas, stating it would have been an easy thing to move the conservation easement out to the stream buffer, will get clarification from the engineer. The engineer has been very thorough on what they are doing with the 2 delineations, the applicant suspects and will get conformation that there is a difference between maintenance allowed in those 2 areas/levels. No further comments at this time. The board is in support of moving forward.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- On a motion made by Matt Matteson and seconded by Pat Coleman to approve the minutes for April 5, 2022. With the striking of mention of water runoff from animals/horses.
- Ed Kahovec had nothing to share as far as town news. Spoke about the library, and stated that there was a vote planned for May, 17, 2022.
- Stated that everyone is okay continuing virtual meetings.

On a motion by Matt Matteson, seconded by Tim Norman the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:45 pm.