

*Town of Farmington*

1000 County Road 8  
Farmington, New York 14425

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

*Established July 15, 1957*

**Monday, February 28, 2022, 7:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES—Approved**

*The minutes are written as a summary of the main points that were made and are the official and permanent record of the actions taken by the Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals. Remarks delivered during discussions are summarized and are not intended to be verbatim transcriptions. An audio recording of the meeting is made in accordance with the Zoning Board of Appeals adopted Rules of Procedure. The audio recording is retained for four months.*

**Board Members Present:** Thomas Yourch, *Acting Chairperson*  
Kelly Cochrane  
Jody Binnix

**Board Members Excused:** Jeremy Marshall  
Tod Ruthven

**Staff Present:**  
John Weidenborner, Town of Farmington Zoning Officer  
Ron Brand, Town of Farmington Director of Development  
Dan Delpriore, Town of Farmington Code Enforcement Officer

**Applicant’s Present:**  
Paul Gillette, 6025 Denny Drive, Farmington  
Don Lewis, DH Lewis Engineering, PLLC

**Resident Via Zoom:**  
Michelle Ferguson, 5994 Redfield Drive, Farmington

- 1. MEETING OPENING**  
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Yourch.  
  
The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mr. Yurch said that the meeting would be conducted according to the Rules of Procedure approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals on January 25, 2021, as amended above. This meeting was held both in person at the Farmington Town Hall and virtually on Zoom. The safety measures were implemented in accordance with the Governor's relevant Executive Orders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. A sign-in sheet was not used to avoid contact with pens, pencils and papers. The names of those attending tonight's meeting is available for public tracing should it be deemed necessary. Hand sanitizers were available throughout the building. Public access was restricted to the lobby, the main meeting room, and the public restrooms.

## 2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2022**

■ A motion was made by MS. COCHRANE seconded by MS. BINNIX, that the minutes of the January 24, 2022, meeting be approved.

Motion carried.

## 3. **LEGAL NOTICE**

The following Legal Notice was published in the Canandaigua *Daily Messenger* newspaper on Sunday, February 20, 2022:

### **ZB #0201-22: A SAFE PLACE STORAGE, 6025 DENNY DRIVE, FARMINGTON, NY 14425**

The applicant requests an area variance, in accordance with Chapter 165, Article VI, Section 165-84.1 K of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant wishes to erect a 130ft wide x 131ft long mini-warehouse building [having a total square footprint of 16,929 square feet in area]. The Town Code states the max width for a mini-warehouse structure shall be 40 feet [with a maximum square footprint of 8,000 square feet in area]. The property is located at 6025 Denny Drive and is zoned LI-Limited Industrial.

### **ZB #0202-22: A SAFE PLACE STORAGE, 6025 DENNY DRIVE, FARMINGTON, NY 14425**

The applicant requests an area variance, in accordance with Chapter 165, Article VI, Section 165-84.1 Q of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant is requesting dedicated outdoor storage spaces designated to store vehicles. Town Code states there shall be no outdoor storage of materials or goods on a mini-warehouse site. The property is located at 6025 Denny Drive and is zoned LI Limited Industrial.

**SAID BOARD OF APPEALS WILL MEET** at said time and place to hear all persons in support of, or having objections to, such matters.

By order of:  
Jeremy Marshall, Chairperson

Zoning Board of Appeals  
TOWN OF FARMINGTON

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**ZB #0201-22: A SAFE PLACE STORAGE, 6025 DENNY DRIVE, FARMINGTON, NY 14425**

The applicant requests an area variance, in accordance with Chapter 165, Article VI, Section 165-84.1 K of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant wishes to erect a 130ft wide x 131ft long mini-warehouse building [having a total square footprint of 16,929 square feet in area]. The Town Code states the maximum width for a mini-warehouse structure shall be 40 feet [with a maximum square footprint of 8,000 square feet in area]. The property is located at 6025 Denny Drive and is zoned LI-Limited Industrial.

Mr. Yurch opened the Public Hearing on this application.

Paul Gillette and Don Lewis both presented the above application. Mr. Gillette explains that he is looking to put up a large climate control building. Climate controlled being different than standard, from his point of view, the code is more for standard buildings. With the new regulations for the sprinklers, it makes a lot more sense to do a larger building because you have to do trench pours for your frost barriers. A larger building is more cost effective once you bring in all the water for the sprinkler system. Instead of bringing it into multiple buildings you are bringing it into one. Bringing in one heating and cooling system and insulating the whole exterior wall rather than doing smaller buildings there is more exterior lineage for the square footage. It just makes a lot more sense to do the climate control building as a larger building.

Mr. Yurch then asks for staff comments.

Mr. Brand states that the application before the board tonight is an application with a draft resolution to continue for SEQR compliance. The action is classified an unlisted action under SEQR and as such there are other involved agencies. In this instance, the Planning Board. There needs to be a coordinated review with the other involved agency. He states that he has drafted a resolution for the board to consider stating that they do not object to the Planning Board being lead agency. Unfortunately, because SEQR needs to be complied with before the board can act, we have to continue the public hearing to the next scheduled meeting. This will allow the Planning Board to do their SEQR review. We need the engineer to work on some revised drawings and revise Part 1 information on the SEQR form.

Mr. Yurch then asks for questions from the board members.

Mr. Yurch ask the applicant why the building is larger then allowed by Town Code.

Mr. Gillette explains that the warehouses to the left, right and across the street are all large warehouse metal buildings so we feel that it fits with the area. It doesn't look different

than Fed Ex across the street or the Morgan warehouse, which is much larger, or the lumberyard.

Don Lewis, site engineer for the project, states that the climate-controlled buildings in difference to regular dry storage self-storage buildings that you see, self-storage buildings are typically accessed from the outside with their own door. You can see that everyone has their own locking mechanism. Climate controlled buildings are more accessed from the interior. As Mr. Gillett stated you are controlling it with heat and humidity. You are storing more sensitive items like paper, clothing, collectibles, or furniture etc. The items have more value. To help with the climate control you do not have exterior access everything is interior always. That is why the building is the shape that it is and the size that it is because there are multiple hallways in different directions. Typical access is exterior, but this would be like indifference to have three separate buildings but like Paul said if you had a standard dry storage building there is no way to control the access because there is a door on all the exterior walls, so it is hard to control the heat.

Ms. Binnix asks the applicant if he feels the Town code as it stands that limits the building width to forty feet would preclude him from building an indoor air climate control building?

Mr. Gillette says that is correct.

Ms. Binnix says so it is an issue more with the code overall as it currently stands. She then asks the applicant if they have considered going to the Town Board to amend the code? She says that as her understanding is that this is in a limited industrial district and does not think that code has been updated in awhile to account for climate control storage. She adds that she lives by Route 332 and there is the Always Locked Building that she believes that exceeds the forty feet because that was incentive zoning so the Town Board may be amendable to changing the code to allow the applicant to build the bigger building. She then asks if that is something the applicant has thought about or talked with the Town about instead of seeking variances. If they chose to do that the applicant could talk to the Town Board next Tuesday and they might be able to see if they are willing to hear your case because she does think it is a good case especially if the code has not been amended for climate controlled in a while.

Mr. Gillette explains that he has done this before, and this was the process he followed last time, and no one pushed into that direction last time around. He did have to go before the ZBA last time and it flowed along, and it just seemed to be part of the process.

Ms. Binnix says that if the Town Board would allow a bigger building in the incentive zoning, then they should at least review the current code or at least give the applicant a fair shot at it.

Mr. Delpriore explains that the code was written pretty much for cold storage.

Ms. Binnix says so it's not for climate storage which is different than your average mini storage.

Mr. Delpriore adds that as the applicant has stated with the code update on sprinkler system requirements the applicant needs to allow room in the facility to house that equipment. He feels there is some justification for the bigger building. He adds that talking to the Town Board may be a good avenue for some legislation change but this code was pretty much for buildings with no heat and no utilities.

Mr. Weidenborner adds that applying for the variance is usually a one-month process verses going through a code change which could usually take three to six months as a good timeframe. He adds that if the Town Board is in support of this it will go a long way with the ZBA especially since this application has to be tabled anyways.

Mr. Brand states that the regulations were written about ten years ago and at the time climate-controlled buildings were not around.

Mr. Gillette adds that they have become a lot more popular, and he has a lot more demand for climate-controlled storage. There are building standards along with it but now there is just more demand for the newer climate-controlled storage.

Mr. Brand adds that the other part of that is the Town Board should set the standards [legislate] because there are other mini-warehouse buildings coming, we already know that. Rather than have the Zoning Board of Appeals set those standards it might be better coming from the legislative body then the next one will know what they can expect. It wouldn't take six months to get it approved. Theoretically, if they went to the Town Board next Tuesday and they [Town Board] thought it was a good idea we could have something for the county to act on in April, and it may not be necessary to come back here to this Board. If the amended code goes to the county in April, then we could act on it at the second meeting in April. This is pretty straight forward and it would not involve six months.

Mr. Gillette explains that they are completely out of units. He explains that the demand is now. He purchased this property about a year ago and he is attempting to get something put up as soon as possible. He is trying to expedite whatever they can do for the public.

Mr. Brand adds that the Town Fire Marshal did a research project and came up with approximately 1300 mini-storage units in the Town that we know of and there is another application pending for an additional 609 units. There is a demand out there and every time you put single family homes, especially those on smaller lots, you have to have someplace to put all your stuff.

Mr. Gillette says that he has found in this [real estate] market people were selling their houses with not necessarily some place to go so they needed somewhere to put their stuff. He has people stop in all the time thinking they are just going to have something available. The market is hot, so the demand is high.

Ms. Cochran asks how many storage units will be inside the building.

Mr. Gillette says approximately eighty-five units in various sizes with the largest size being 10x20.

Ms. Binnix then confirms with the applicant that he is also building more outdoor buildings.

Mr. Gillette says yes, they are putting up standard storage buildings as well.

Ms. Binnix then asks if the standard building all meet code.

Mr. Gillette says yes.

Ms. Binnix then ask Mr. Gillette if he owns Denny Drive.

Mr. Gillette says he thinks he does since he purchased and combined his two lots.

Mr. Brand then asks if the propane company and the boat company both have a cross access easement.

Mr. Gillette says yes.

Mr. Brand states that if they have access easements, with liber and page, then that information can be provided to the Planning Board.

Mr. Lewis says that yes, he could get copies of it.

Mr. Yurch asks the applicant what made him decide to build the building that big.

Mr. Gillette explains that with the easement running through the lot they needed to put the building north or south of the utility easement so the shape of the lot with the easement through the middle it just makes sense.

Mr. Lewis adds that the proposed building has two hallways in it running north to south with four different alignments of rooms inside and there is a hallway that goes east to west as well. The hallways are inside and protected with heat and air conditioning so you can access on either side of the hallway in those two hallways and the third one that goes across.

Mr. Gillette adds that the more linear outdoor square footage of the building's linear square foot the more you are going to have so the bigger building costs less to heat than a long skinner building with a lot of outdoor walls. A bigger square building loses less heat per square foot cost wise.

Ms. Binnix asks the applicant if he was to build the standard storage and the climate-controlled storage if the site will be fully built out.

Mr. Gillette says this is it with the green space requirement they can only build on about seventy percent of the lot. They will not be building all at once. The site improvements and the climate-controlled building will be in phase one.

Mr. Lewis explains that the buildings Paul currently has were all phased out as well.

Ms. Binnix says speaking of greenspace there was county comments about the sewer easement not being used in the greenspace calculations and asks the applicant if they were aware of that.

Mr. Gillette says that he knows that wastewater could not, but he didn't know the easement couldn't.

Mr. Lewis explains that the stormwater retention could not be used but the easement could be used.

Mr. Delpriore explains that the easement can be used in the calculations, but their stormwater retention pond could not be used in the calculations. The Water & Sewer Superintendent has said that nothing could be in that easement because he wants full access to that area.

Mr. Binnix then asks if that would include the proposed fence posts.

Mr. Lewis explains that they cannot be in the easement but that is still up for discussions with the Planning Board because the width of the easement that is there is wider than the standard fence post.

Mr. Delpriore explains that the Water & Sewer Superintendent has said that nothing can be in that easement. You also show the fence posts going quite a way around the pond area and he has already made the comment that cannot happen.

Mr. Lewis adds that now that they have aligned the buildings there is room to move the pavement up out of their easement.

Mr. Delpriore says that is more site plan related and is something that can be discussed with Town staff at the PRC meeting and with the Planning Board. Tonight, the applicant is not looking for a variance regarding the easement.

Mr. Brand says there is one variance that he would like to ask about and that is the part 1 of the SEQR form that was filled out. The applicant identified that a variance would be needed for a building larger than forty foot wide. If we continue with the variance procedure to approve a building larger than the forty by two hundred or 8,000 square feet will we need yet another variance to allow the proposed 16,292 square foot building?

Mr. Delpriore clarifies that the requested variance is for the forty-foot width.

Mr. Brand then asks about a variance for total square footage.

Mr. Delpriore explains that is not in the code. The code states that the width could be up to forty feet with a length up to 200 feet, which is 8000 square feet, but that is not specifically stated within the code. If you have a variance to the width, then by default the square footage increases. The code doesn't give us a line item of a maximum square footage.

Mr. Yourch then asks if there are any further questions or comments pertaining to this variance request.

Michelle Ferguson, a resident of Redfield Grove Subdivision, asks the applicant how the outdoor lighting will change with the additional structures. Will it be higher? Will it be more? She adds that there is already quit a lot that goes directly into their development.

Mr. Gillette explains that everything will be down lit whether with multiple buildings or single buildings. There is always a light plan. They will be all down lit and dark sky compliant. These buildings are all along Collette Road not anywhere near the Redfield Subdivision. This is more toward the propane location. He does not believe that the climate-controlled building will be visible from Redfield. This is the farthest point from Redfield.

Ms. Ferguson explains that she can see those storage facilities from her property line. She can see the current existing storage structures.

Mr. Gillette explains that the current area is completely built out and nothing new will be there.

Ms. Ferguson clarifies that this is a new addition with no changes to the existing one.

Mr. Gillette says that is correct.

Mr. Yourch then asks for any other comments or questions.

Mr. Delpriore would like to address the lighting. He explains that the lighting is covered in site plan. The Planning Board does request a lighting plan. The lights are required to be dark sky compliant, and they cannot have light shed on to other properties. Those are all things that the Planning Board will review during site plan.

Mr. Yourch then asks for any further comments or questions.

Hearing none. Mr. Yourch continues the public hearing for this application.

**ZB #0202-22: A SAFE PLACE STORAGE, 6025 DENNY DRIVE, FARMINGTON, NY 14425**

The applicant requests an area variance, in accordance with Chapter 165, Article VI, Section 165-84.1 Q of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant is requesting dedicated outdoor storage spaces designated to store vehicles. Town Code states there shall be no outdoor storage of materials or goods on a mini-warehouse site. The property is located at 6025 Denny Drive and is zoned LI Limited Industrial.

Mr. Yurch opens the public hearing on this application.

Mr. Gillette and Mr. Lewis are also present the above application. Mr. Gillette states that they requested a clarification of the interpretation of what vehicles are defined by Town code. The Town code refers to outdoor storage of materials or goods. When you look up the definition of materials and goods its things used to build things and things that were built for sale not for vehicles.

Mr. Yurch the asks for comments from Town staff.

Mr. Delpriore states that he has done a lot of research including talking to Town staff including the Director of Development, the Zoning Officer, and the Supervisor. The code does read that for a Special Use Permit there should be no outdoor storage of materials or goods on a mini-warehouse site. With that being said he feels the question here is what is materials and good. That is not defined in our codebook. When we look at the Webster's Dictionary, the applicant is correct, it is defined as things that are being built or sold. The next avenue that we are taught to use is to look up the items that are in question like vehicles. Vehicles is defined in the code along with travel trailers and recreational vehicles, all items that the applicant would like to store outdoors. Is that correct?

Mr. Gillette says that is correct.

Mr. Delpriore says the last part of his research is to look at other applicants and what has been done in the past. He states that our Planning Board in 2016 ruled that for mini-warehouses that no parking of recreational vehicles would be allowed. Using this code, he cannot see anything to support that ruling. At this point he feels it would be up to the Planning Board to figure out how to regulate it and protect it. Materials and goods by code by definition is not vehicles. The problem is the code defines a vehicle and in the LI District we allow for outdoor parking. At this point he would say that a variance is not needed and suggests the applicant withdraw his application.

Mr. Lewis then asks if they go back to the Planning Board now for interpretation.

Mr. Delpriore says no it is now up to the Planning Board to tell them how many they can use and how it will be protected. They will make sure you have turning radius', landscaping, and if they say you can only park ten there then that's all you get. So, what is proposed is what will be enforced, and it will be monitored very closely.

Ms. Binnix then asks about the Always Locked having outdoor storage for boats, travel trailers, and what not but again that is part of the incentive zoning. Would it be appropriate for them to go to the Town Board to clarify the code?

Mr. Delpriore says they could definitely have more clarification there.

Ms. Binnix asks is that will help the Planning Board make their decision.

Mr. Delpriore says when you look at outdoor storage in the LI District there is different code sections for special use. If Mr. Gillette came to us and said he wasn't going to do mini storage he was going to do all outdoor storage, he could do that. There is nothing that prevents that. All of a sudden because he is doing mini storage it says he cannot have outdoor storage of material and goods. It's there to prevent a lot of junk sitting there. But when you look at the code there is an outdoor storage for materials and goods that can be done in the LI District but there are regulations on how that can be done.

Mr. Gillette explains this outdoor storage is for the people that live in places like Redfield that have no place to store their recreational vehicle. They need somewhere to put it.

Mr. Delpriore adds that the Planning Board is going to be very strict, and they are going to require them to shield it, buffer it, or hide it.

Mr. Delpriore then asks the applicant if he would like to withdraw his application.

Mr. Gillette says yes, he would like to withdraw this application.

Mr. Yurch then closes the public hearing on this application only.

**5. BOARD BUSINESS—DELIBERATIONS AND DECISION**

<b>ZB #0201-22</b>	<b>A Safe Place Storage 6025 Denny Drive Farmington, N.Y. 14425</b>	<b>Area Variance</b>
--------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

■ A motion was made by MS. BINNIX, seconded by MS. COCHRANE, that the Public Hearing remained open and continued until March 28, 2022.

Motion carried by voice vote.

**FARMINGTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS RESOLUTION  
CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING**

**FILE:                    ZB #0201-22 Area Variance**

**APPLICANT:**            **A Safe Place Storage, 6025 Denny Drive, Farmington, New York 14425**

**ACTION:**                **Area Variance, Chapter 165, Article VI, Section 84.1 K. of the Farmington Town Code, to construct a mini-warehouse building having a total of 16,929 square feet in area. Continuation of Public Hearing**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has received the above referenced Action for an Area Variance; and

**WHEREAS**, a Public Hearing upon the proposed Area Variance was opened tonight by the Board, at which testimony from the Applicant and the public was received and entered into the public record on this Application; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has considered the classification of the proposed Action as is contained within Sections 617.4 and 617.5 of 6 NYCRR (effective as of January 1, 2019), the State’s Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board determines that the proposed Action is neither classified as a Type I, or Type II Action and, therefore, is classified as an Unlisted Action under SEQR.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Unlisted Actions under the SEQR Regulations are subject to a coordinated review with other involved agency or agencies, which in this instance is the Town Planning Board (hereinafter referred to as Planning Board).

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board understands that the Town Planning Board at their meeting on Wednesday, March 2, 2022, will be continuing a public hearing for a special use permit and preliminary site plan approval for the construction of the above referenced mini warehouse building and other related site improvements, and will be considering action in compliance with the State’s SEQR Regulations.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board does hereby declare that the Planning Board is the more appropriate involved agency for making the determination of significance upon the Actions under review by both Boards, and further declares that it has no objection to the Planning Board, at their meeting identified above herein, designating themselves as the lead agency for completing the coordinated review under the State’s SEQR Regulations.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** the Board understands that until the State’s SEQR procedures have been satisfied by the lead agency, by making a determination of significance upon the involved Actions, no decision upon the requested area variance may be made by this Board and, therefore, continues the public hearing upon the above referenced Action to Monday, March 28, 2022.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that a copy of this resolution is to be provided to the Town Planning Board for their meeting next Wednesday evening, the Applicant; the Applicant’s Engineer; the Town Code Enforcement Officer; the Town Zoning Inspector; and the Town Director of Planning and Development.

The above resolution was offered by **MS. BINNIX** and seconded by **MS. COCHRANE** at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals held on Monday, February 28, 2022. Following discussion, the following roll call vote was recorded:

Kelly Cochran	Aye
Jody Binnix	Aye
Tod Ruthven	Excused
Tom Yourch	Aye
Jeremy Marshall	Excused

Motion carried.

## 6. OTHER BOARD MATTERS

- The Board Members decided to wait until there is a full board to approve the Draft 2022 Rules of Procedures

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENTS—OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

NONE

## 8. DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

- No Update

## 9. ZONING OFFICER UPDATE

- Next Meeting will be March 28, 2022
- Open Clerk of the Board of Position

## 10. TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

### ■ 2022 Municipal Bootcamp:

Hancock Estabrook and MRB Group are offering a free annual training program to assist local governments, municipal officials, and planning and zoning boards. The program will include 10 hours of remote training designed to provide a comprehensive education that encompasses all aspects of municipal governance. Each program in the series will be provided remotely on the fourth Thursday of each month with subject matter experts from MRB Group and knowledgeable attorneys from Hancock Estabrook LLP. Topics will be

lively, useful and—potentially as important—qualify for the education requirements for members of planning boards and zoning boards of appeal.

Sessions in 2022:

***Thursday, March 24, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

How Appealing: The Role of the Zoning Board of Appeals in Community Development

***Thursday, April 28, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Here Comes the Sun: Shaping Solar and Battery Storage Projects

***Thursday May 19, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Keep the Grass Green and the Water Clean: Your Role in SEQR Review

***Thursday, June 23, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

How it All Fits Together: Long-Range Plans and Near-Term Challenges

***Thursday, July 28, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Ask Us Anything: Hot Topics in Planning, Zoning and Community Development

***Thursday, September 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

What Not to Say and What Really Not to Do: Avoiding Sexual Harassment

***Thursday, October 27, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

A History Lesson: Managing Projects with Historic Significance

***Thursday, December 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.***

Santa’s Nice and Naughty List: The Best and Worst of 2022

*Select this link for the 2022 Municipal Bootcamp information page. RSVP and registration tab are at the bottom of the website page.*

<https://www.hancocklaw.com/events/the-2022-municipal-bootcamp/>

**■ New York Planning Federation Recorded Webinars:**

For information: (518) 512-5270 or nypf@nypf.org

***The Essentials of Planning and Zoning:***

Introduction to Planning, Zoning and Land Use

Everything You’ve Ever Wanted to Know About Preparing a Comprehensive Plan

Understanding and Applying SEQRA (NY State Environmental Quality Review Act)

The What, Why, and How of Site Plan Review

Common Mistakes and Mishaps in Site Plan Review

***Meeting Process and Communication:***

Enhancing Transparency Effectiveness in Planning Proceedings

Innovations and Best Practices for Planning/Zoning Boards  
 Engaging Diverse Communities and Dealing with Difficult People  
 Working with Elected Officials and Understanding Everyone’s Role in Planning  
 The Open Meetings Law for Zoning and Planning Boards, Part 2  
 Working with Developers to Foster Investment in the Community  
 Communication, the Media and Social Media  
 Open Government and Planning and Zoning Decision Making

■ **General Code e-Code**

Daily drop-in lunchtime training Q&A sessions plus webinars in several categories.  
 Information:

<https://www.generalcode.com/training/>

■ **Future Training Opportunities Online:**

Ontario County Planning Department website now lists upcoming training:

<https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/192/Training>

**11. NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be held on Monday, March 28, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. at the Farmington Town Hall, 1000 County Road 8.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

■ A motion was made by MS. COCHRANE, seconded by MS. BINNIX, that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion carried by voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_ L.S.

Sarah Mitchell  
 Clerk *Pro Tem* of the Zoning Board of Appeals