

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on March 13, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Victor Town Hall at 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York, with the following members present:

PRESENT: Ernie Santoro, Chairman; Joe Logan, Vice Chairman; Heather Zollo, Al Gallina, Rich Seiter

OTHERS: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer Consultant; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; Cathy Templar, Secretary; Councilman Dave Tantillo, Town Board Liaison; Kate Crowley, Conservation Board; Town Attorney, Joe Picciotti; David Nankin, Lee Wager, Alan Friedman, Edwin Rueda, Fred Rainaldi, Douglas Fisher, Brian Emelson, Walt Baker, Suzanne Lawton, Lane & Kathy Boughton, Fred Salsburg, Bob Kelly, Doug Eldred; Steven Philippone

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Joe Logan, seconded by Heather Zollo,

RESOLVED that the minutes of February 27, 2018 be approved.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Al Gallina	Absent at this meeting
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

- Stephen Toomey re: Lane Rd Subdivision

BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES

Town Board reported by Councilman Dave Tantillo

- Route 96 Transformative Corridor Strategic Infrastructure Plan: Mark Tayrien from LaBella Associates will be presenting the actual plan to the Town Board on March 26, as well as the next steps regarding SEQR. There are six projects that are a part of the plan. Those six projects are: 1) A new Village street along the Ontario Central Railroad; 2) Route 96 three lane conversion going to a five lane conversion by the Thirsty Turtle; 3) Route 251/Lane Road connection; 4) Omnitech Place/Willowbrook Road connection; 5) Plastermill Road/Collett Road/Delray Drive connection; 6) A round about at the section of Lane Road, Victor-Egypt Road, and Church Street. Those six projects will be documented and quantified for cost. Part of the presentation will include the acceptance of the Town Board and the funding mechanisms. Three of the projects can be submitted for federal funding; all six for State funding, and obviously all six for local funding. Local funding meaning developers, we as residents.

- An Access Management Workshop was held yesterday from 6:00pm – 7:00pm. It was presented by Tom Harvey Director of the Ontario County Planning Board. The definition of access Management that he provided is a comprehensive control of the location, spacing, design, and operation of driveways, median openings, intersections, interchanges, and street connections to a roadway, balanced against the property owner's right of access. Why access management? To protect and enhance the traffic handling capacity of our public roads and it makes the public roads safer. Mr. Harvey is proposing to partner with the Town of Victor to come up with an access management plan that would look at the Route 96 Infrastructure Plan and the entire Town infrastructure and identify what roads need to be improved and what roads need to be created for one full safe network of roads. The future access management plan would be adopted and amended to the Town of Victor Comprehensive Plan and used as a tool by the Planning Board. Farmington, Gorham, and Canandaigua have already partnered with Ontario County for an access management plan. If the project is accepted the plan is to have it completed within 12 months.

Kate Crowley did not report anything from the Conservation Board.

Planning Board reported by Kim Kinsella

- March 27th meeting
 - 179 Miles Cutting Lane, in LDD, Site Plan for addition to house
 - Any carryovers from this meeting

TABLED FROM THE 2/27/18 MTG

WOODS AT VALENTOWN

High Point Dr

Owner – Woods at Valentown LLC

Acres – 106.32 w/Forest Park

Zoned – Planned Development District

BME Associates on behalf of Woods at Valentown LLC are requesting to construct 294 units contained within 14 3-story apartment buildings. Applicant has acquired 5.38 acres from Conifer Village @ Eastview and is before the Town Board to request the 5.38 acres be rezoned to the Woods at Valentown Planned Development District. This is a carry over from the 2/27 meeting. At this meeting a recommendation to the Town Board will be discussed.

Chairman Santoro – I would just like to comment to the Board that we have spent a lot of time on this. This is not a SEQR review, nor is it a site plan review. It's just for a recommendation to the Town Board. We'd like to get this accomplished and get it done and that's what we'll do tonight.

Doug Eldred from BME Associates addressed the Board.

Mr. Eldred – After our last meeting there were some comments that were brought out that I addressed in a letter. We have also had a couple of meetings with the Fire Marshal and Fire Chiefs. Let me briefly go over the changes we have made in that regard.

Probably the biggest change is, as you recall we discussed the proximity to Mr. Rueda's house who is located in the Forest Park at Eastview area, the northwest corner of the site. After considering the comments we decided to remove one of the buildings from that area and move it to the central area.

(Showing on Plan) We had a building in this area and we've moved that over to here. We also took the road that originally came in on this side of these two buildings. The thought process was if we flopped that and put the parking lot on the other side, the buildings themselves would provide additional buffer to Mr. Rueda's house. So we flopped that over. The end result is we reduced the density in that area by a third. We went from 63 units down to 42 units. We've increased the setback from Mr. Rueda's property. The closest point is about 130 feet from the property line and 165 feet to the building. So we've increase that significantly. We had some pavement that was previously in this area, it was 25 feet away. The closest pavement now is about 190 feet away. As you can see it was a significant change. An added benefit is that we are saving 1.4 acres of woods in this area. We have to remove 0.3 acres down here to make it fit, so we have a net gain of 1.1 acres of woods. I think this all works very well and does what we are trying to accomplish.

I'll show you a cross section now. The other consideration was Mr. Rueda's garage is on the north side, so his living area on the back is on this side. Taking that building away from here, took it out from his living area view, if you will. We have 140 feet of buffer now. It's all wooded with mature woods. Just for perspective, the required Town buffer from a residential zone to an industrial zone is 100 feet. So we are actually 40 feet more than that minimum requirement. With respect to the distance from his house to the closest building, it's 279 feet. Here is the 120 feet of wooded buffer in a cross-sectional view. Again, I think all these changes really reduce the potential impact of the project. The other thing is that putting the parking on this side, we do have the access to the underground garage. This road dives down, if you will, and we'll put a landscaped berm in this area so there won't be any headlights headed in that direction as well. The buildings themselves buffer the noise and the lights from the parking on the other side. I think that was a pretty significant change.

We met again with the Fire Marshall and two Fire Chiefs. We went through a list of items that the Rainaldi's have agreed to, to improve fire safety. The bottom line is that we got a letter today from Bob Graham saying that we basically met his concerns.

I responded to density considerations in the letter of March 6th, as well, mentioning the overall traffic projections that were in line with the FEIS (Final Environmental Impact Statement). Visual impacts offset by architecture, landscape buffers, elimination of garage, and maintaining wide separation between buildings. Ecological impacts offset by wetland mitigation, reforestation and landscaping. The density is about one half that allowed in the multi-residential Code. Last time I had that chart that showed there are in fact townhouse projects that can get close to ten units per acre. We are at 5.2 units per acre with our proposed development. So we are at about one half the typical density that could have been allowed in this area.

I mentioned before that we are going to provide all the fire safety measures and the Fire Marshall has signed off on those. Finally, the additional buffer.

The final part of the letter is with respect to the Victor Historic Society comments. They had concerns with regard to the sewage pumping station capacity, flood control and traffic. I

basically said in that regard there is a good response in the resolution concerning the sewage pumping station. Flood control, we are simply not allowed to increase flow in the stream. If you don't increase flow in the stream, then you wouldn't be increasing the flood depths. Finally, traffic, we spent a lot of time on how there is very little impact and how we are within the parameters that were established in the 2005 FEIS.

An update to the market study memo was provided. I think that is pretty much covered in your resolution as well.

There is a comment from Mr. Fisher about doing a pedestrian circulation plan. We will certainly do that prior to the final design plan. The intent, as we said before, is to provide complete circulation with respect to both getting from residences to the office buildings and retailers, as well as providing a number of nature trails. That will be forthcoming.

Is there anything else you would like reviewed? I will be glad to speak to it.

Mr. Logan – I appreciate, Doug, you and Fred, updating the site plan. You've heard all the comments that I've made and several of the Board members. I appreciate that. I hope Mr. Rueda agrees with that sentiment. You've gone a long way since we first starting talking about this project and I appreciate that.

Mr. Eldred – Thank you.

Chairman Santoro – Wes Pettee and Joe Picciotti are going to take us through this. Who wants to go first?

Mr. Picciotti – Wes, I'm happy to have you do it. I can chime in if you'd like. It was a draft of the resolution circulated Friday. There were some things that Wes and I talked about today that we revised. They weren't major. We've seen an earlier iteration of this document some weeks ago and there have been some changes based upon additional information. This document also incorporates the changes from the March 6, 2018 revised plan.

Mr. Pettee – About a month ago we reviewed in detail, paragraph by paragraph, the draft resolution. This is obviously an updated version and it takes into consideration the most recent plans. One of the items that the Planning Board mentioned that they wanted to hear more about was the project need. We've tried to spell that out based on the information that the applicant has provided starting on page 3 of the 17 pages. I'm not sure if we want to go through this paragraph by paragraph but we could on this topic of the need because it's barely a page.

Mr. Picciotti – I think the first two paragraphs are preparatory. I would probably start, unless the Board feels differently, with the applicant engaged Vogt strategies.

Mr. Pettee – That's the new information.

Mr. Logan – The substantive information is what we would like to hear.

Mr. Pettee - The Applicant engaged Vogt Strategic Insights, a national real estate market research firm, who has provided a letter summary dated February 23, 2018 describing the following regarding the issue of alleged need for the apartments associated with the amended plan :

Within our market analysis, we concluded that the proposed apartments will target households with incomes of \$87,200 and higher. By 2019, a projected 1,559 income-qualified renter households will reside in the Site PMA (Property Market Analysis). Most of these high income renter households are already residing in the Victor market area (versus those renter households new to the area). Additionally, there will be a projected 4,022 homeowner households headed by a person age 65 and older with income of \$87,200 and higher, from which to draw support.

The Applicant has indicated that it has additional information based on a previously completed plan that, within 3 years of being built, the applicant will realize a 95% absorption rate, which takes into consideration a 25% turnover after year one. The need for the Amended Plan is based on the Applicant's assertion of a growing market demand for residential apartments in close proximity to commercial centers and workplace locales. This Amended Plan would fulfill the apparent need for apartment style housing.

Chairman Santoro – Does anyone on the Board have any questions or comments?

Mr. Logan – This is directed to Fred, the minimum income and group we are talking about are more in the empty nesters and seniors group? Is that how you would characterize that demographic for these apartments?

Mr. Fred Rainaldi - Correct. What the study does, much like a lot of review with consultants, it assumes a worst case scenario and it looks for driving trends in the market. What they do is, there are three levels of data creation. A lot of it based on census information because Ontario County specifically collects such detailed information through resources like Ontario County IDA. There is a lot of baseline plus growth. This is establishing a core market from which we are stabilized. It's our expectation that we have several categories below and above that center focus. What we are seeing in a local trend, and also a national trend is that there are what we *call life-style renters*. Groups that are deciding that this is a desired format to service their quality of life. One very cool thing about Victor and Ontario County is you have one of the most dynamic business landscapes and it is quite bizarre that there isn't a product like this that exists here because it often is part of a business review of a marketplace when they establish their ability to attract and retain workers. So our primary segment is identified through the category you had described and then we have very solid levels of anticipated renters both above and below that household income. You'll notice in one of the charts in the study that I provided that we're taking a very conservative approach to the pricing of these units.

Mr. Logan – OK, great, thank you.

The Board went on to number 2.

Mr. Pettee – Number 2, there wasn't a whole lot that changed. This is the point where the Planning Board would make a finding in what respects the amended plan is or is not consistent with the stated purposes of the Planned Development District.

Mr. Picciotti – Wes, if you're going to read it you should probably start at the bottom beginning at the amended plan because that's the conclusion and...

Mr. Pettee – The bottom of page 4: The Amended Plan states that the apartment buildings proposed constitute an alternative to single family housing within close proximity to commercial and business areas. The Town Board previously allowed for residential use within the existing PDD associated with High Point so the use insofar as concerns residential development is not proposed to change. The Amended Plan expands the uses associated with the High Point Business Park and provides a mixed use development that would meet what the Applicant contends is in demand for higher density housing compared to what is offered throughout the majority of the town. The Amended Plan appears to be consistent with the Planned Development District regulations as set out above [Section 211-27 (D)]. Insofar as the Amended Plan constitutes a significant revision to the number of units previously proposed, it is inconsistent on that basis with such original plan, but as indicated it is consistent with the purposes of Section 211-27 (D)(1)(c)(2).

Chairman Santoro – Comments or questions on this from the Board?

Ms. Zollo – Joe, you were on the Planning Board when this was approved. Were you aware that when the 72 Townhomes were proposed and you recommended it to the Town Board, that that also included the apartments and multiple dwelling, into the law, the actual PDD?

Mr. Logan – That the apartments were in there? (Yes) I don't recall apartments being in there. We had approved transitional residential, higher density residential.

Ms. Zollo – Townhomes, 72 Townhomes.

Mr. Logan – Yes, and whether it is rental or purchase, that is what we approved as Townhomes. This is a departure from that for sure.

Ms. Zollo – But did you know that when the PDD was written into law that it included the multiple dwelling?

Mr. Logan – Well, that's what the Townhomes were. They are multiple units. It wasn't single family homes. They weren't detached.

Ms. Zollo – But they are Townhomes, not apartments, there is a difference.

Mr. Logan – Well you said multiple dwellings and that's...

Ms. Zollo –That's what it says here. Two and three family shared wall residential buildings as opposed to Townhomes which typically a single family lives in a Townhome although they may be connected. I'm just asking because you were on the Board. It's a surprise to me that that was in there as part of the PDD.

Mr. Logan – I don't recall that specifically, no.

Mr. Pettee – Number three, this one has changed. A little bit of the organization and the content has changed. I'll start on the third paragraph on number three. This is:

The extent to which the plan departs from the zoning regulations formerly applicable to the property in question (including bulk, density and permitted uses) [Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (3)]

The Amended Plan's HOA Lot zoning amendment proposes to change the use from townhouse to apartments. The perimeter setbacks, interior and exterior buffers proposed for the townhouse development are retained or improved. The perimeter buffering is maintained and the separation between buildings is increased from a minimum of 20-feet to a minimum of 75-feet. The building footprint is similar in size to the footprint associated with the Townhouses previously approved, with the exception that the apartment buildings are taller.

The 3-story buildings are one story higher than typically constructed within the Town's residential districts. The increase in height is visually mitigated by the high end architecture that resembles a large single-family high end home instead of a lower quality apartment building. The appearance is compatible with the Valentown Road community that includes upscale single-family homes, which would be more compatible with the neighborhood and the approved townhomes.

With respect to the implementation of the project to include community activities and other public cultural experiences, Woods at Valentown, residents will have access to the proposed clubhouse, pool, trails and walkways located through the development. These amenities are encouraged by the Victor community and comprehensive plan.

The proposed 65% greenspace is almost double the minimum 35% generally required by the Town Code, and the proposed density of approximately 5 per acre is well below the typical apartment densities of 10 to 20 units per acre.

With specific regard to the High Point Business Park HOA Lands:

The previously approved Preliminary Development Plan, a component of the previous rezoning by the Town Board, anticipated seventy-two (72) townhouse units on 45.2-acres. The Amended Plan would allow for 294 units on 50.6-acres, as the Amended Plan incorporates an additional 5.4-acre parcel from the Forest Park PDD. This is an increase of 222 units.

Although never adopted, the Forest Park PDD conceptualized 33 rental units and a community center on the 5.4 acres proposed to be annexed to the High Point Business Park HOA lands for a slightly higher density compared to the amended plan. The 33 units are depicted on a May 22, 1998 preliminary development plan drawn by Environmental Design and Research. In comparison to the May 22nd preliminary development plan, as well as the 72 units currently approved for HOA lands, the proposed amended plan would result in an increase of 189 units.

With regard to the Forest Park at Eastview Terrace Lands:

Although the application materials focus on changes to the High Point Business Park PDD and rezoning/annexation of the 5.4 Forest Park at Eastview Terrace PDD (FPET PDD), it should be noted that, in addition to the rezoning, the Amended Plan also includes a revision to the existing plan for the FPET PDD. The approved site plan, entitled "Site Plan Conifer

Village at Eastview” dated May 2012 by Passero Associates depicts 88 apartment units, and the site plan did not propose/approve improvements to the portion of the parcel that is anticipated to be annexed by the Amended Plan.

As previously identified, the developers for the Forest Park at Eastview parcel proposed construction of 33 rental units on the portion of the property (5.4 acre parcel) where the Amended Plan now depicts two apartment buildings with 42 units. The applicant claims that the environmental impact of traversing the slope and clearing for the rental units would have had a greater environmental impact to the slope and woods than is currently proposed.

The use associated with the previously approved plan is not inconsistent with what is proposed in the Amended Plan, in that both propose residential units. That being said the number of units associated with the Amended Plan is a significant increase from the original approved plan, and, the height of the apartment buildings proposed is materially larger from the previously approved plan, thereby impacting the bulk of the Amended Plan. Nevertheless, because the Amended Plan provides for more open space, green space, and distance between structures as well as the additional acreage added to the site compared to the previously approved plan, the changes in bulk and number of units appear to be at least somewhat offset by such increased green space and other features. As a result, given all of these considerations, the Amended Plan does not appear to constitute a significant departure from the previous zoning regulations in place under which the previous plan was approved. This determination is also consistent with the Board’s review of the EAF, including Part II of same that was reviewed and completed by the Board.

Ms. Zollo – I have a question. I’m wondering why we are including, the “although never adopted, the Forest Park PDD conceptualized 33 rental units”, and two paragraphs below again, “proposed construction of the 33 rental units”. Since those were never approved why is that relevant to this?

Mr. Logan – I’d offer that the area having rental units in that concept, Heather, is evidence, which we are looking to have, that it’s not inconsistent to have other apartment units style buildings on this particular development. The density is trying to be justified with that reduction from the other development because they are all moved down the hill. The fact that you have apartments is consistent with other areas in the vicinity of this development, so apartments are not an unreasonable departure from the previously approved site plan.

Ms. Zollo – But they are an unreasonable departure from this proposal because remember the original 100 acres, rezoned residential, the reduction in commercial and the switch from the commercial to the 72 Townhomes was what got this thing over the finish line to begin with. That’s why I’m wondering why something that was proposed but never approved is included in trying to justify that it is the same thing, when it wasn’t approved.

Mr. Logan – Well, you could say that the whole site is a departure from the original zoning, by saying, like you said, it was residential and they put commercial buildings on top of the hill. Then they looked to buffer that with residential between those buildings and the residential properties to the East and North. If the developer is looking to satisfy....

Ms. Zollo –But isn’t this supposed to be our document?

Mr. Logan – Yes.

Ms. Zollo – That’s why I’m wondering, why is it in there when it was never approved?

Mr. Logan – If we wanted to support the change from Townhomes to Apartments it would be a good idea to point to other potential development that has been done or proposed in the area that could have been approved. The format was changed at the other development off of Turk Hill to justify that.

Ms. Zollo – It doesn’t make any sense to me as it wasn’t approved. I don’t see why it’s relevant.

Mr. Logan – It’s still apartments in that area from that adjacent development. That’s how I look at it.

Ms. Zollo – Not yet, proposed. I’m just looking at it as it wasn’t approved, so why include it. Carry-on.

Chairman Santoro – Is your request to eliminate that?

Ms. Zollo – I wouldn’t have put it in there.

Chairman Santoro asked the other Board members how they felt.

Mr. Gallina – I’m fine either way. It’s a historically correct statement. Whether it has bearing or not...I’m fine either way, to keep it in or strike it.

Mr. Logan – I would leave it.

Mr. Seiter – I would take it out.

Mr. Gallina – If Heather feels strongly about it we can strike it because it doesn’t fundamentally change.

Mr. Logan – If that’s how you want it Heather, I can’t go against it. It’s just my preference to leave it in, but if you are uncomfortable with it, take it out. It’s not going to materially change the outcome.

Chairman Santoro – So take it out.

Mr. Picciotti – So it’s the reference to the 33 rental units. There are a couple of references to it as Heather alluded to. You would strike both of the references presumably.

Chairman Santoro – It’s on page 6. The second paragraph after the Bold “with specific regard to the High Point Business Park HOA lands”, and the last paragraph on page 6 as well. Anything more on this section? (There was not) Let’s go on to number four.

Mr. Pettee continued:

4. The existing character of the neighborhood and the relationship, beneficial or adverse, of the proposed development to this neighborhood. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (4)]

The proposed development provides a footprint with preservation of significant areas of woods, hillsides, and wetlands. The architectural design incorporates a look of a large English country house estate. That having been said, the Amended Plan's bulk departs from the one previously approved, including based on the height of the buildings (additional stories) as well as based on the significant number of additional units. The bulk of the apartment buildings, including their height have been identified by one neighboring property owner and others in the community as an adverse element of the Amended Plan. This past week, the Applicant has agreed to move one of the apartment buildings further away from the closest neighboring property and this constitutes a beneficial design change to mitigate the impact of the bulk associated with the apartment buildings. In terms of the materially larger number of units associated with the Amended Plan, the additional acreage to be included in the Amended Plan does offset to some degree such increased density.

As indicated previously the neighborhood includes a wide variety of uses, including those associated with the Historic District on the one hand (though there is substantial screening associated with the woods in the area from the apartments) to the office uses and other uses in the area. In considering the Amended Plan's elements compared to the pertinent criteria, while there are adverse components of the Amended Plan, including the bulk of the structures and the number of units, those adverse components appear to be somewhat mitigated by the other features of the Amended Plan as discussed (additional acreage, open space and green space). The Board's review of a SEQRA EAF form regarding features associated with the Amended Plan is also consistent with a determination that adverse or potentially adverse features are mitigated for the reasons stated. Further, the relocation of the one apartment building away from the closest neighbor provides a significant benefit in terms of eliminating impacts to such nearby property owner.

Mr. Picciotti – I just want to say, because it's in the change. I did reference the SEQR review that we had done as a Board some time ago. Just as a refresher, we went through Part II of the EAF which identifies the significance of impacts. One of the impact areas is community character and the Board was comfortable with the finding based on the Amended Plan. Obviously, that was before the latest change in terms of the movement of the building away from the residential home, and it was determined that there was little or no impact. That's why that was referenced in the findings and it was also referenced in the preamble that we did. We did review the EAF and the EAF can be reviewed not only for SEQR findings but for findings like this.

Chairman Santoro made sure all Board members were OK with Section four and indicated that they could go on to number 5.

5. The location of principal and accessory buildings on the site in relation to one another and to other structures and uses in the vicinity, including bulk and height. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (5)]

Quite a bit of this is new, so I'll start up from page 8.

In response to concerns by the adjoining resident and Planning Board concerns regarding impact to Mr. Rueda's residence located southwest of the Forest Park at Eastview parcel, the applicant has provided a March 6, 2018 letter and an updated Preliminary Development Plan last updated March 6, 2018, which relocates a 3-story, 21-unit building away from Mr. Rueda's residence to an area within the northeast portion of the development, and describes the reduced effects of the modification to the Rueda residence, which are:

1. The density proposed in the Forest Park at Eastview area is reduced by one-third from three buildings to two and from 63 units to 42 units.
2. The apartment building removed was from the primary view shed of Rueda's living area. The remaining two apartment buildings are on the garage (north) side of the Rueda residence. The living area of Rueda's house is in the south side with the garage on the north side.
3. The Amended Plan preserves an additional 1.4 acres of mature woods in the Forest Park at Eastview area. The relocated apartment building will require removing about 0.3 acres more woods from the central development area resulting in a net additional preservation of 1.1 acres of woods.
4. The view, noise and lighting of the parking areas for the two apartment buildings will be buffered from the Rueda property by the mature woods, the apartment buildings themselves and a proposed landscaped berm between the buildings.
5. The closest apartment building to the Rueda property line has been increased from about 130-feet to about 165-feet.
6. The closest paved area to the Rueda property line has been increased from about 25-feet to about 190-feet.
7. The minimum depth of woods now preserved between the Rueda property and clearing limit has been increased from 20 ft to 140 ft.

The proposed apartment buildings will be located on the site to maximize the open space and retain the environmentally sensitive wooded hillsides, and wetlands. Existing vegetation around the perimeter of the property will be maintained. The proposed roadway(s) and parking areas will mostly be located on the interior of the property so that adjacent neighbors are buffered from view by the existing perimeter vegetation.

Unlike the townhouses, there will not be garages in the front of the buildings that would diminish from the architecture of the apartments. The access to the basement garages will be at a lower level hidden from view. The streetscape will be of the buildings set at least 75-feet apart with small blocks of visitor and resident parking separated by landscape islands. The layout of roads and the increased separation between the buildings will allow for a fairly

continuous view of the wooded hillsides, augmented by reforestation and extensive landscaping. The location of principal and accessory buildings on the site in relation to one another and to other structures and uses in the vicinity, including bulk and height appears to be appropriate, including in light of the other factors discussed herein.

Chairman Santoro – Questions or comments?

Mr. Seiter – The reference to access to the basement garage would be at a lower lever hidden from view. The plan shows the overhead door at the end of the building which is not depicted on this rendering. How does that enter the building? This rendering we are looking at, the floor plan of the garage shows the door on the right end of that building, on the side, not the back.

Mr. Eldred – The garage door is in the basement a level down. It's deeper down, you can't see it. The driveways to the basements start from the roadway that is about 11 feet higher than the basement, so the driveway down to the basement will cut down about 11 feet. So it would be 11 feet below.

Mr. Seiter – The elevation is almost 60 feet from grade. The building shows 46 feet overall, now the driveway is cut in 11 feet, so from that perspective the overall height of the building is nearly 60 feet.

Mr. Eldred – Oh, height, I'm sorry. It would be 11 plus 46.

Mr. Seiter – Thank you.

Mr. Pettee – Number 6 didn't really substantively change compared to what we reviewed previously so I might propose that we just move to number 7. I can say that number 6 is in regard to the provision for pedestrian circulation and open space in the Planned Development.

There was a consensus of Board members that they skip number 6 and go on to number 7.

Chairman Santoro – Would you just read the last line on number 6 please.

Mr. Pettee - Open space is provided via conservation easement, undeveloped land, and landscaping. A total of approximately 47-acres would be greenspace with the proposed Amended Plan.

Chairman Santoro – OK, number 7.

7. The traffic circulation features within the site, including the amount of, location of and access to automobile parking and terminal loading areas Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (7)]

Internal traffic circulation will be from private drives spurred off of High Point Drive. High Point Drive is a dedicated road that traverses the High Point and Woods at Valentown properties extending from Route 96 to Valentown Road. Such circulation appears to be appropriate and well integrated. Parking will be accommodated by surface parking and underground parking. Underground parking would provide for increased maneuverability in

and around the project site. Traffic circulation features, including the amount and location of access to automobile parking etc. appear to be appropriate for the site in light of the Amended Plan.

- 8. The amount of traffic generated at peak hours and the provisions for adequately handling such volumes, with particular reference to points of ingress and egress, potential hazards, such as inadequate sight distances and intersection design, and the nature and suitability of the connecting street or highway system to absorb the anticipated changes. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (8).**

The Town's Traffic Consultant, Clark Patterson Lee, found pursuant to its January 5, 2018 letter that "We agree with the findings in the TIS that the roadway infrastructure improvements provided as a result of the 2005 FEIS are adequate to meet the needs proposed in the High Point PDD". These improvements included the widening of the Cobblestone Court-NYS Route 96 (K-Mart) entrance drive, lengthening the left and right turn lanes on NYS Route 96 at the same entrance drive, installation of a "no-turn-on-red" sign from 4:00PM to 6:00PM sign for the northbound right turn lane at this same entrance drive, modifying the traffic signal timings at the NYS Route 96 (K-Mart) entrance drive intersection and at the NYS Route 96/High Street intersection, lengthening the left and right turn lanes on NYS Route 96 at the High Street intersection, widening High Street to provide three lanes entering onto NYS Route 96, further widening of High Street through and past the Valentown Road intersection, installation of a southbound left-turn lane on Valentown Road at High Street, and installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Valentown Road with High Street.

These measures were implemented in part on an assumed background growth in traffic on the surrounding roadway network. That growth was overestimated resulting in a form of reserve capacity in the system which addresses the increase in traffic as a result of the Amended Plan.

Based on Clark Patterson Lee's analysis and the Planning Board's review of traffic matters it finds that under the Amended Plan, the amount of traffic generated at peak hours is adequately addressed, including based on considerations of ingress and egress at both the site and at adjacent properties, sight distances and intersection design, and the nature and suitability of the connecting street or highway system to absorb the traffic associated with the Amended Plan.

With regard to concerns about traffic and access to and from the Valentown Museum, and whether the increase in traffic would lead to difficulties getting in and out of the Valentown property, the Town's Traffic Consultant provided a March 9, 2018 letter that offered in part the following:

The proposed project will add traffic to High Street in the vicinity of the Valentown Museum. The increase between the anticipated 2018 traffic volume with the project versus without the project is less than 30 vehicles per hour during the PM peak.

Therefore, the expected increase in volume is less than one car every two minutes. In

addition, with the installation of the traffic signal at Valentown Road, it will cause traffic to stop on High Street, leading to potential gaps in traffic vehicles can use to enter/exit the Valentown property. As a result, the Amended Plan appears to provide for the adequate handling of traffic (with the features installed as discussed) including ingress and egress considerations, and considering potential hazards associated with the same, including giving consideration to sight distances and intersection design, and in light of the consideration of connecting streets.

The Chairman asked for comments and there were none.

9. The provision for storm, sanitary and solid waste disposal and other utilities on the property adjacent to the site as well as the site itself. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (9)

The only new information I believe is the last paragraph, so I'll read that.

Other public utilities are available directly adjacent to the subject property. Public water, electric, gas, and communication services are all currently located adjacent to the site within the Highpoint Business Park development. Utility service demands will be within the limits of what the existing infrastructure can accommodate and therefore appear to be appropriate for the Amended Plan.

Ms. Zollo – I have a question about the pump stations and their part of the Auburn Trail Sanitary Sewer Project and is that at the Town's expense to replace pump stations #18 and #14?

Mr. Pettee – I believe those pump stations are in the budget for the Auburn Trail Project.

Ms. Zollo – So, at the Town's expense?

Mr. Pettee – That's my understanding, yes.

Ms. Zollo – OK, just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Picciotti – Just so I understand the analogy, were the pump stations to be replaced pursuant to the Auburn Trail Project, is that a previously proposed project?

Mr. Pettee – Yes, those pump stations are part of a capital project being undertaken by the Town and would be taking place even without the proposed development here. Does that clarify? (There were no other comments) Number 10 is somewhat new:

10. The proposed landscaping and signage. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (10)]

The PDD will establish guidelines for landscaping and signage which are similar to those established for High Point Business Park HOA lands. These will be determined utilizing the intent of Chapter 211-27.1F (3). Landscaping will include tree, shrub and lawn plantings within the common areas of the site. The internal traffic and private roadway network provides large green space areas throughout the development which can be utilized by the residents for

passive and active recreational purposes. Signage that may be proposed for this area within the site will conform to the underlying PDD requirements of the district. Existing trees around the perimeter of the site will be retained and supplemented with additional tree and shrub plantings to provide adequate screening to neighboring properties. Reforestation is also proposed using transplanted trees and saplings.

All existing trees that are to remain will be protected during construction and integrated in the design of the proposed landscaping where practical. The Applicant has indicated it is willing to commit to insuring such trees remain in place and to provide appropriate landscaping features. The Planning Board recommends per the below, that the Town Board condition any ultimate approval of the Amended Plan on the Applicant meeting appropriate criteria for preservation of trees and the development of landscaping, as well as signage in keeping with Code provisions. As long as these conditions are incorporated in any such approval the Board finds that landscaping and signage are appropriate for the Amended Plan.

Mr. Pettee – There is a little bit of new material in number 11 as well.

11. The manner in which the physical design makes adequate provision for service demands (water, sewer, fire, etc.), adequate traffic control and the amenities of light, air and visual enjoyment. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (11)]

The Applicant states the Amended Plan would provide a unique, quiet residential neighborhood contained within the current wooded area of the site. Existing trees to remain provide buffering qualities to adjoining neighborhoods.

The proposed 3-story apartments with underground parking, combined with the placement of parking areas and large landscape islands, intends to minimize the development footprint and maximize the conservation of environmental features. The 3-story buildings minimize the footprint and allow for extensive preservation of the wooded hillsides and valley (65% greenspace). The proposed density of just over 5 units per acre is well below the normal apartment densities of 10 to 20 units per acre.

Continued consultation with other agencies such as the Monroe County Water Authority, Town of Victor and Town of Farmington (for sewer), and emergency services will be required throughout the second step of the PDD rezoning process (site plan review). Based on the foregoing findings of this resolution, including those related to traffic, the availability of adequate utilities and services and the amenities offered as part of the Amended Plan, including pedestrian trails and the use of green space and open space, the design provides for adequate provision for service demands (water, sewer, fire, etc.), adequate traffic control; and such design includes appropriate amenities of light, air and visual enjoyment..

Chairman Santoro – I'd just like to point out that this resolution, the Town Board can act on it; they cannot act on it; they can accept part of it; they can accept all of it. This is not an approval of the project.

Mr. Logan – I have a question about apartment densities. The second paragraph under 11, Wes, the last sentence, second paragraph. “The proposed density of just over 5 units per acre” “normal apartment densities of 10 to 20 units per acre”. What is normal, what is the maximum density for the Town of Victor? Isn't it 10?

Mr. Pettee – I think 10 is.

Mr. Logan – So I wouldn't say normal apartment density is 10 to 20 units per acre. I would say is well below the maximum apartment density of 10 units per acre or half the density.

Chairman Santoro – I'd agree with that.

Mr. Logan – Because 10 to 20 units is just vague and it's not even accurate for the Town of Victor.

Chairman Santoro – Or take 20 out and just leave 10.

Mr. Logan – I would just say well below the maximum apartment density of 10 units per acre. Not normal, because in Victor I don't think we have a normal 10 units.

Chairman Santoro – So it should read “the proposed density is just over 5 units per acre and is well below apartment densities permitted by the Town of Victor of 10 units per acre.

Mr. Logan – That's fine, thank you, other than that I'm fine with it.

Mr. Pettee – I think we should take a look at this next section, after number 11, because it is new. This is a Draft we wanted to present to you for your consideration.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Town of Victor Planning Board hereby recommends that rezoning of the subject parcels to amend the Planned Development District include, as a condition of the rezoning, the following provisions:

- a) Specifying that the maximum residential density upon the site shall not exceed an absolute maximum density equivalent to 294 units;
- b) Requiring that the Final Development Plan resolve concerns identified by the Fire Marshall in his February 26, 2018 “Coordinated Fire Service Site Plan Review”;
- c) Preserving the Town Planning Board's discretion and flexibility, during review and approval of the Final Development Plan, to further consider environmental and other site constraints or factors and to :
 - i. Impose further limitations upon the maximum density of 294 units authorized in the rezoning action based upon its findings during review of the Final Development Plan;
 - ii. Make final determinations with respect to the final layout and configuration of all buildings (including building height), streets, parking areas, pedestrian amenities, setbacks, open spaces, screening, buffering, easements and intersections,

landscaping and tree preservation as well as signage without regard to the specific layout depicted in the Preliminary Development Plan; and,

- iii. Make a final determination with regard to the Final Development Plan’s impact to the Town’s Sanitary Sewer conveyance system, and what improvements, if any, would be required by the developer.

So this is acknowledging that a full designed site plan hasn’t yet been prepared and there are going to be elements and questions that we have today about a site plan that maybe this preliminary development plan hasn’t addressed, but we don’t want to get bogged down in the review of the design of the final site plan. We can leave that until the site plan application comes back to the Planning Board, if it ever does come back to the Planning Board, and review those details at that time.

Chairman Santoro – I think this is appropriate. Does anyone have a comment?

Mr. Logan – Thank you Wes.

Mr. Pettee – There are just a couple more paragraphs here.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, with respect to the other factors set out in Section 211-27 D (1) (c) including the four conditions noted in the April 12, 2005 Planning Board Recommendation, the Planning Board’s recommendation to the Town Board as set forth herein for the Amended Plan hereby incorporates by reference the original recommendation without change and exactly as it was first articulated in the Planning Board’s 2005 Rezoning Findings and further determines that any additional factors are not germane to the Amended Plan;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, those copies of all of the Planning Board meeting minutes and these findings is forwarded to the Town Board for their use.

Joe Logan made the motion to send the discussed Resolution to the Town Board as amended, Al Gallina seconded it.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Nay
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Nay

Approved 3 Ayes, 2 Nays,

The amended recommendation that was sent to the Town Board is as follows:

At a regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board held on March 13, 2018, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Victor Town Board (“Town Board”) received an application on or about May 26, 2017 from BME Associates (“the Application”) on behalf of Woods at Valentown LLC (the “Applicant”) seeking to amend the existing High Point Business Park Planned Development District (“High Point Business Park PDD”) in the Town of Victor, by which the Applicant petitioned the Town Board seeking to amend the preliminary development plan previously approved by the Town Board for the area identified in Section 211-27, Paragraph G of the Victor Town Code (referred to as “the High Point Business Park Homeowners Association Lot” which is located in the eastern portion of the High Point development), by proposing: twelve (12) new apartment buildings, consisting of two hundred sixteen (216) total residential units in place of the seventy two (72) townhouse units planned and previously approved, with the proposed apartment buildings comprised of a mix of 2 and 3-story buildings, and constructed in locations where the previously approved plan shows townhouse buildings, and proposing (ii) the construction of a residential clubhouse and pool (hereinafter the plan referenced in the Application will be referred to as “the Amended Plan”). The Application for the Amended Plan has been assigned Project Number 4-RZ-17 by the Town Board; and,

WHEREAS, as described in an update to the Application dated October 27, 2017 submitted to reflect economic feasibility issues associated with the Amended Plan, and to respond to concerns about screening, the Amended Plan provides for changes to the proposed Phase 5 area (formerly Forest Park at Eastview application) to include screening to be located in proximity to the adjacent homeowner, which would allow for a total of 294 apartment units contained within fourteen (14) three-story apartment buildings (hereinafter the Amended Plan will also include the changes set out in the October 27, 2017 update to include the fourteen three-story apartment buildings and 294 apartment units) ; and,

WHEREAS, in response to Planning Board concerns regarding impact to Mr. Rueda’s residence located southwest of the Forest Park at Eastview parcel, the Applicant has provided a March 6, 2018 letter and an updated Preliminary Development Plan last updated March 6, 2018, which relocates a 3-story, 21-unit building away from Mr. Rueda’s residence to an area within the northeast portion of the development, and outlines what the Applicant alleges are the reduced effects of the modification to the Rueda residence (this revision will hereafter be considered to be part of the Amended Plan as referenced) ; and,

WHEREAS, the Town Board referred the Application for the Amended Plan to the Town of Victor Planning Board (“Planning Board”), and in accordance with applicable requirements, the Planning Board has considered the Amended Plan as a proposed amendment to the High Point Business Park PDD based on the eleven criteria specified in Section 211-27 D (1) (c) of the Victor Town Code entitled “Planned Development District regulations” (hereinafter the “Development District Regulations”) as well as comparing the Amended Plan to the Planning Board’s PDD rezoning recommendation and finding, dated April 12, 2005 which reviewed the previously submitted development plan for the previously approved rezoning (hereinafter referred to as “the 2005 Rezoning Findings”), and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board’s 2005 Rezoning Findings recommended that the rezoning be approved subject to the following:

1. That prior to rezoning the Town Board evaluate and balance the applicant's compliance with the Town's Corridor Overlay District Regulations and the need for relief therefrom.
2. That the Town Board determines and balance applicant's compliance with the Town's comprehensive plan.
3. That the Town Board requires reasonable compliance with the Town architectural and design standards.
4. That the Town Board determine and balance applicant's compliance with the Valentown Historic Preservation District goals and objectives; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board hereby undertakes its review of the Amended Plan and as set out in detail herein, and the Planning Board makes findings herein concerning the Amended Plan; and

WHEREAS, in order to properly analyze the Application and Amended Plan, the Planning Board and staff reviewed in detail the Applicant's submissions, including the original preliminary development plan (approved as part of the High Point Business Park Planned Development District by the Town Board and for which the Planning Board issued certain recommendations in 2005), Amended Plan documents, updates concerning traffic and other matters, including but not limited to reviewing the Applicant's submission of part 1 of a Full Environmental Assessment Form and drafts of part 2 thereof and other submissions related to traffic, and other issues and carefully reviewed the impacts of the Amended Plan in accordance with applicable requirements under the Development District Regulations.

WHEREAS, in addition to reviewing and analyzing the submissions by the Applicant, and each of the other submissions and documents made available for the Application, the Planning Board also carefully reviewed correspondence and documentation provided by the public including but not limited to correspondence provided by Douglas Fisher, and others and it also independently completed part 2 of the EAF in order to assess and analyze the Application and Amended Plan in light of the applicable criteria under the Development District Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, with respect to criteria in Section 211-27 D (1) (c) of the Development District Regulations of the Victor Town Code, the Planning Board makes the following findings and recommendation to the Town Board regarding the Amended Plan:

1. The need for the proposed development associated with the Amended Plan. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (1)

The Town's 2015 Comprehensive Plan found that regarding historic growth including that taking the form of single family home subdivisions, "*market dynamics within Victor have recently shifted to favor more dense residential forms such as apartments, townhouses and patio homes. Despite this change, there is no evidence suggesting a long-term decrease in the demand*

for residential development within Victor” (Page 4.6, Existing Conditions). Chapter 4 of the Town’s 2015 Comprehensive Plan also discusses the anticipated build-out that has become regarded as an important benchmark (Page 4.15, Anticipated Build-out Benchmark).

The Amended Plan proposes residential housing for the workforce of the High Point Business Park, adjacent commercial district, as well as the growing populations of the Town of Victor. The Applicant has stated in support of it, that in its experience, apartment dwellers are more tolerant of existing features such as the high power lines compared to townhouse occupants would (such as previously proposed) which would be less tolerant in this regard. In sum, features such a power lines at the site are more of an imposition to the quality of life for the typical single-family resident, compared to apartment dwellers.

The Applicant engaged Vogt Strategic Insights, a national real estate market research firm, who has provided a letter summary dated February 23, 2018 describing the following regarding the issue of alleged need for the apartments associated with the amended plan :

Within our market analysis, we concluded that the proposed apartments will target households with incomes of \$87,200 and higher. By 2019, a projected 1,559 income-qualified renter households will reside in the Site PMA (Property Market Analysis). Most of these high income renter households are already residing in the Victor market area (versus those renter households new to the area). Additionally, there will be a projected 4,022 homeowner households headed by a person age 65 and older with income of \$87,200 and higher, from which to draw support.

The Applicant has indicated that it has additional information based on a previously completed plan that, within 3 years of being built, the applicant will realize a 95% absorption rate, which takes into consideration a 25% turnover after year one. The need for the Amended Plan is based on the Applicant’s assertion of a growing market demand for residential apartments in close proximity to commercial centers and workplace locales. This Amended Plan would fulfill the apparent need for apartment style housing.

2. In what respects the Amended Plan is or is not consistent with the stated purposes of the Planned Development District. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (2). *(Review of the applicable regulations for Planned Development Districts as well as those associated with the previously approved High Point Business Park Planned Development District is appropriate.)*

Section 211-27, A of the Victor Town Code concerning general planned development district requirements states:

The purpose of this district is to provide a means of developing those land areas within the community considered appropriate for new residential, recreational, commercial or industrial use or a satisfactory combination of these uses in an economic and compatible manner while encouraging the utilization of innovative planning and design concepts in the areas without departing from the spirit and intent of these zoning regulations.

Section 211-27.4 of the Victor Town Code Provides the current approved plan for the High Point PDD, including the High Point Business Park Homeowners Association allows among others the following uses:

- (a) *Single-family dwellings;*
- (b) *Two-family dwellings. Two-family dwellings include duplex units and semi-attached, single-family dwellings;*
- (c) *Multiple dwellings. Multiple dwellings include, but are not limited to, two- and three-family shared-wall residential buildings such as townhomes;*

The Amended Plan states that the apartment buildings proposed constitute an alternative to single family housing within close proximity to commercial and business areas. The Town Board previously allowed for residential use within the existing PDD associated with High Point so the use insofar as concerns residential development is not proposed to change. The Amended Plan expands the uses associated with the High Point Business Park and provides a mixed use development that would meet what the Applicant contends is in demand for higher density housing compared to what is offered throughout the majority of the town. The Amended Plan appears to be consistent with the Planned Development District regulations as set out above [Section 211-27 (D)] Insofar as the Amended Plan constitutes a significant revision to the number of units previously proposed, it is inconsistent on that basis with such original plan, but as indicated it is consistent with the purposes of Section 211-27 (D)(1)(c)(2).

3. The extent to which the plan departs from the zoning regulations formerly applicable to the property in question (including bulk, density and permitted uses) [Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (3)]

Chapter 4 of the Town's adopted 2015 Comprehensive Plan discusses the anticipated build-out that has become regarded as an important benchmark (also detailed within Chapter 1), and recommends institution of a growth management program that states the following:

It is recommended that the anticipated build-out, as presently estimated, be adopted as the target size. At the same time, the growth management program should not strictly preclude all actions that could be expected to increase the anticipated build-out. Instead, the program should require close monitoring of the build-out estimate and careful consideration and management of any actions that would, through rezoning or some other approval, potentially increase density so as to also inflate the anticipated build out.

The Amended Plan's HOA Lot zoning amendment proposes a change in use from townhouse to apartments. The perimeter setbacks, interior and exterior buffers proposed for the townhouse development are retained or improved. The perimeter buffering is maintained and the separation between buildings is increased from a minimum of 20-feet to a minimum of 75-feet. The building footprint is similar in size to the footprint associated with the Townhouses previously approved, with the exception that the apartment buildings are taller.

The 3-story buildings are one story higher than typically constructed within the Town's residential districts. The increase in height is visually mitigated by the high end architecture that resembles a large single-family high end home instead of a lower quality apartment building. The appearance is compatible with the Valentown Road community that includes upscale single-family homes, which would be more compatible with the

neighborhood and the approved townhomes.

With respect to the implementation of the project to include community activities and other public cultural experiences, Woods at Valentown, residents will have access to the proposed clubhouse, pool, trails and walkways located through the development. These amenities are encouraged by the Victor community and comprehensive plan.

The proposed 65% greenspace is almost double the minimum 35% generally required by the Town Code, and the proposed density of approximately 5 units per acre is below the maximum allowable density of 10 units per acre.

With specific regard to the High Point Business Park HOA Lands:

The previously approved Preliminary Development Plan, a component of the previous rezoning by the Town Board, anticipated seventy-two (72) townhouse units on 45.2-acres. The Amended Plan would allow for 294 units on 50.6-acres, as the Amended Plan incorporates an additional 5.4-acre parcel from the Forest Park PDD. This is an increase of 222 units.

With regard to the Forest Park at Eastview Terrace Lands:

Although the application materials focus on changes to the High Point Business Park PDD and rezoning/annexation of the 5.38 Forest Park at Eastview Terrace PDD (FPET PDD), it should be noted that, in addition to the rezoning, the Amended Plan also includes a revision to the existing plan for the FPET PDD. The approved site plan, entitled "Site Plan Conifer Village at Eastview" dated May 2012 by Passero Associates depicts 88 apartment units, and the site plan did not propose/approve improvements to the portion of the parcel that is anticipated to be annexed by the Amended Plan.

The use associated with the previously approved plan is not inconsistent with what is proposed in the Amended Plan, in that both propose residential units. That being said the number of units associated with the Amended Plan is a significant increase from the original approved plan, and, the height of the apartment buildings proposed is materially larger from the previously approved plan, thereby impacting the bulk of Amended Plan. Nevertheless, because the Amended Plan provides for more open space, green space, and distance between structures as well as the additional acreage added to the site compared to the previously approved plan, the changes in bulk and number of units appear to be at least somewhat offset by such increased green space and other features.

As a result, given all of these considerations, the Amended Plan does not appear to constitute a significant departure from the previous zoning regulations in place under which the previous plan was approved. This determination is also consistent with the Board's review of the EAF for the Amended Plan, including part 2 of same that was reviewed and completed by it.

4. The existing character of the neighborhood and the relationship, beneficial or adverse, of the proposed development to this neighborhood. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (4)]

The approved plan includes 72 units on the HOA Lot, and the Amended Plan proposes

294 units (252 units on the HOA Lot and 42 units on the Forest Park area). As mentioned under findings for criterion number 3, above, the Amended Plan would increase residential units by 222 units. The predominant land uses within the vicinity of the project are office, commercial and residential land use would remain the same compared to the plan approved in 2005. Eastview Mall, Cobblestone Court, High Point Business Park, Lot 1 and Phase 2 are within ½ mile of the subject property. The Amended Plan would be compatible with the character of the commercial neighborhood nearby, and also in character with the residential areas to the south and east.

The proposed development provides a footprint with preservation of significant areas of woods, hillsides, and wetlands. The architectural design incorporates a look of a large English country house estate. That having been said, the Amended Plan's bulk departs from the one previously approved, including based on the height of the buildings (additional stories) as well as based on the significant number of additional units. The bulk of the apartment buildings, including their height have been identified by one neighboring property owner and others in the community as an adverse element of the Amended Plan. This past week, the Applicant has agreed to move one of the apartment buildings further away from the closest neighboring property and this constitutes a beneficial design change to mitigate the impact of the bulk associated with the apartment buildings. In terms of the materially larger number of units associated with the Amended Plan, the additional acreage to be included in the Amended Plan does offset to some degree such increased density.

As indicated previously the neighborhood includes a wide variety of uses, including those associated with Historic District on the one hand (though there is substantial screening associated with the woods in the area from the apartments) to the office uses and other uses in the area. In considering the Amended Plan's elements compared to the pertinent criteria, while there are adverse components of the Amended Plan, including the bulk of the structures and the number of units, those adverse components appear to be somewhat mitigated by the other features of the Amended Plan as discussed (additional acreage, open space and green space). The Board's review of a SEQRA EAF form regarding features associated with the Amended Plan is also consistent with a determination that adverse or potentially adverse features are mitigated for the reasons stated. Further, the relocation of the one apartment building away from the closest neighbor provides a significant benefit in terms of eliminating impacts to such nearby property owner.

5. The location of principal and accessory buildings on the site in relation to one another and to other structures and uses in the vicinity, including bulk and height. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (5)]

In response to concerns by the adjoining resident and Planning Board concerns regarding impact to Mr. Rueda's residence located southwest of the Forest Park at Eastview parcel, the applicant has provided a March 6, 2018 letter and an updated Preliminary Development Plan last updated March 6, 2018, which relocates a 3-story, 21-unit building away from Mr. Rueda's residence to an area within the northeast portion of the development, and describes the reduced effects of the modification to the Rueda residence, which are:

- The density proposed in the Forest Park at Eastview area is reduced by one-third from three buildings to two and from 63 units to 42 units.

- The apartment building removed was from the primary view shed of Rueda's living area. The remaining two apartment buildings are on the garage (north) side of the Rueda residence. The living area of Rueda's house is in the south side with the garage on the north side.
- The Amended Plan preserves an additional 1.4 acres of mature woods in the Forest Park at Eastview area. The relocated apartment building will require removing about 0.3 acres more woods from the central development area resulting in a net additional preservation of 1.1 acres of woods.
- The view, noise and lighting of the parking areas for the two apartment buildings will be buffered from the Rueda property by the mature woods, the apartment buildings themselves and a proposed landscaped berm between the buildings.
- The closest apartment building to the Rueda property line has been increased from about 130-feet to about 165-feet.
- The closest paved area to the Rueda property line has been increased from about 25-feet to about 190-feet.
- The minimum depth of woods now preserved between the Rueda property and clearing limit has been increased from 20' to 140'.

The proposed apartment buildings will be located on the site to maximize the open space and retain the environmentally sensitive wooded hillsides, and wetlands. Existing vegetation around the perimeter of the property will be maintained. The proposed roadway(s) and parking areas will mostly be located on the interior of the property so that adjacent neighbors are buffered from view by the existing perimeter vegetation.

Unlike the townhouses, there will not be garages in the front of the buildings that would diminish from the architecture of the apartments. The access to the basement garages will be at a lower level hidden from view. The streetscape will be of the buildings set at least 75-feet apart with small blocks of visitor and resident parking separated by landscape islands. The layout of roads and the increased separation between the buildings will allow for a fairly continuous view of the wooded hillsides, augmented by reforestation and extensive landscaping. The location of principal and accessory buildings on the site in relation to one another and to other structures and uses in the vicinity, including bulk and height appears to be appropriate, including in light of the other factors discussed herein.

6. The provision for pedestrian circulation and open space in the planned development Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (6)

Pedestrian circulation for residents will be handled through the use of the trails and walkway proposed along the private road network and through the natural environment.

The trail and walkways deliver a truly walkable community from residential to office to retail. They are designed to fully connect hikers, walkers and joggers with the setting of hillsides, woods, wetlands and meadows and the wide variety of wildlife that is attracted to these varied habitats.

Open space is provided via conservation easement, undeveloped land, and landscaping. A total of approximately 47-acres would be greenspace with the proposed Amended Plan.

7. The traffic circulation features within the site, including the amount of, location of and access to automobile parking and terminal loading areas Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (7)]

Internal traffic circulation will be from private drives spurred off of High Point Drive. High Point Drive is a dedicated road that traverses the High Point and Woods at Valentown properties extending from Route 96 to Valentown Road. Such circulation appears to be appropriate and well integrated. Parking will be accommodated by surface parking and underground parking. Underground parking would provide for increased maneuverability in and around the project site. Traffic circulation features, including the amount and location of access to automobile parking etc. appear to be appropriate for the site in light of the Amended Plan.

8. The amount of traffic generated at peak hours and the provisions for adequately handling such volumes, with particular reference to points of ingress and egress, potential hazards, such as inadequate sight distances and intersection design, and the nature and suitability of the connecting street or highway system to absorb the anticipated changes. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (8)

The approved 2005 FEIS contained required infrastructure improvements at the following locations:

- Route 96 at the Cobblestone Court/Eastview Mall Intersection
- Route 96 at the High Street /Eastview Mall Intersection
- High Street /Valentown Road Intersection.

RainBros LLC. has completed and/or participated in the construction of the improvements so that each of the referenced features is now in place and operational.

The Town's Traffic Consultant, Clark Patterson Lee, found pursuant to its January 5, 2018 letter that "We agree with the findings in the TIS that the roadway infrastructure improvements provided as a result of the 2005 FEIS are adequate to meet the needs proposed in the High Point PDD". These improvements included the widening of the Cobblestone Court-NYS Route 96 (K-Mart) entrance drive, lengthening the left and right turn lanes on NYS Route 96 at the same entrance drive, installation of a "no-turn-on-red" sign from 4:00PM to 6:00PM sign for the northbound right turn lane at this same entrance drive, modifying the traffic signal timings at the NYS Route 96 (K-Mart) entrance drive intersection and at the NYS Route 96/High Street intersection, lengthening the left and right turn lanes on NYS Route 96 at the High Street intersection, widening High Street to provide three lanes entering onto NYS Route 96, further widening of High Street through and past the Valentown Road intersection, installation of a southbound left-turn lane on Valentown Road at High Street, and installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Valentown Road with High Street.

These measures were implemented in part on an assumed background growth in traffic on the surrounding roadway network. That growth was overestimated resulting in a form of

reserve capacity in the system which addresses the increase in traffic as a result of the Amended Plan.

Based on Clark Patterson Lee's analysis and the Planning Board's review of traffic matters it finds that under the Amended Plan, the amount of traffic generated at peak hours is adequately addressed, including based on considerations of ingress and egress at both the site and at adjacent properties, sight distances and intersection design, and the nature and suitability of the connecting street or highway system to absorb the traffic associated with the Amended Plan.

With regard to concerns about traffic and access to and from the Valentown Museum, and whether the increase in traffic would lead to difficulties getting in and out of the Valentown property, the Town's Traffic Consultant provided a March 9, 2018 letter that offered in part the following:

The proposed project will add traffic to High Street in the vicinity of the Valentown Museum. The increase between the anticipated 2018 traffic volume with the project versus without the project is less than 30 vehicles per hour during the PM peak.

Therefore, the expected increase in volume is less than one car every two minutes. In addition, with the installation of the traffic signal at Valentown Road, it will cause traffic to stop on High Street, leading to potential gaps in traffic vehicles can use to enter/exit the Valentown property. As a result, the Amended Plan appears to provide for the adequate handling of traffic (with the features installed as discussed) including ingress and egress considerations, and considering potential hazards associated with same, including giving consideration to sight distances and intersection design, and the nature of the consideration of connecting streets.

9. The provision for storm, sanitary and solid waste disposal and other utilities on the property adjacent to the site as well as the site itself. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (9)

The approved sanitary sewer flow for the 72 townhouse units was 19,250 gallons per day (gpd). Expected flows for the 294 units and clubhouse are 45,100 gpd (14 apartment buildings and 588 bedrooms).

The Applicant conveyed that the construction and occupancy schedule is dependent on when, or if, the Town Board moves forward with the PDD amendment. The construction and occupancy schedule are critical for evaluating downstream pump stations. In general, the occupancy date for the proposed units will determine whether sanitary sewer improvements are required.

Although Pump Stations 18 and 14 are overloaded and do not have additional capacity to accommodate the Amended Plan, the Town's Auburn Trail Sanitary Sewer project will include replacement of Pump Stations 18 and 14. The replacement of Pump Stations 18 and 14 will allow for increased capacities and would accommodate the Amended Plan. Additional down-stream pump stations would need to be evaluated depending on the developer's schedule; however, it is likely that other downstream pump stations, such as 5 and 11, would have the capacity for the Amended Plan after the Town's Auburn Trail Sanitary Sewer Project is completed and operational.

Other public utilities are available directly adjacent to the subject property. Public water, electric, gas, and communication services are all currently located adjacent to the site within the Highpoint Business Park development. Utility service demands will be within the limits of what the existing infrastructure can accommodate and therefore appear to be appropriate for the Amended Plan.

10. The proposed landscaping and signage. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (10)]

The PDD will establish guidelines for landscaping and signage which are similar to those established for High Point Business Park HOA lands. These will be determined utilizing the intent of Chapter 211-27.1F (3). Landscaping will include tree, shrub and lawn plantings within the common areas of the site. The internal traffic and private roadway network provides large green space areas throughout the development which can be utilized by the residents for passive and active recreational purposes. Signage that may be proposed for this area within the site will conform to the underlying PDD requirements of the district. Existing trees around the perimeter of the site will be retained and supplemented with additional tree and shrub plantings to provide adequate screening to neighboring properties. Reforestation is also proposed using transplanted trees and saplings.

All existing trees that are to remain will be protected during construction and integrated in the design of the proposed landscaping where practical. The Applicant has indicated it is willing to commit to insuring such trees remain in place and to provide appropriate landscaping features. The Planning Board recommends per the below, that the Town Board condition any ultimate approval of the Amended Plan on the Applicant meeting appropriate criteria for preservation of trees and the development of landscaping, as well as signage in keeping with Code provisions. As long as these conditions are incorporated in any such approval the Board finds that landscaping and signage are appropriate.

11. The manner in which the physical design makes adequate provision for service demands (water, sewer, fire, etc.), adequate traffic control and the amenities of light, air and visual enjoyment. Section 211-27 (D)(1) (c) (11)]

The Applicant states the Amended Plan would provide a unique, quiet residential neighborhood contained within the current wooded area of the site. Existing trees to remain provide buffering qualities to adjoining neighborhoods.

The proposed 3-story apartments with underground parking, combined with the placement of parking areas and large landscape islands, intends to minimize the development footprint and maximize the conservation of environmental features. The 3-story buildings minimize the footprint and allows for extensive preservation of the wooded hillsides and valley (65% greenspace). The proposed density of just over 5 units per acre is below the maximum allowable density of 10 units per acre.

Continued consultation with other agencies such as the Monroe County Water Authority, Town of Victor and Town of Farmington (for sewer), and emergency services will be required throughout the second step of the PDD rezoning process (site plan review). Based on the foregoing findings of this resolution, including those related to traffic, the availability of adequate utilities and services and the amenities offered as part of the Amended Plan, including

pedestrian trails and the use of green space and open space, the design provides for adequate provision for service demands (water, sewer, fire, etc.) and it provides for adequate traffic control; and such design includes appropriate amenities of light, air and visual enjoyment.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Town of Victor Planning Board hereby recommends that rezoning of the subject parcels to amend the Planned Development District include, as a condition of the rezoning, provisions:

- d) Specifying that the maximum residential density upon the site shall not exceed an absolute maximum density equivalent to 294 units;
- e) Requiring that the Final Development Plan resolve concerns identified by the Fire Marshall in his February 26, 2018 “Coordinated Fire Service Site Plan Review”;
- f) Preserving the Town Planning Board’s discretion and flexibility, during review and approval of the Final Development Plan, to further consider environmental and other site constraints or factors and to :
 - i. Impose further limitations upon the maximum density of 294 units authorized in the rezoning action based upon its findings during review of the Final Development Plan;
 - ii. Make final determinations with respect to the final layout and configuration of all buildings (including building height), streets, parking areas, pedestrian amenities, setbacks, open spaces, screening, buffering, easements and intersections, landscaping and tree preservation as well as signage without regard to the specific layout depicted in the Preliminary Development Plan; and,
 - iii. Make a final determination with regard to the Final Development Plan’s impact to Town’s Sanitary Sewer conveyance system, and what improvements, if any, would be required by the developer.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, with respect to the other factors set out in Section 211-27 D (1) (c) including the four conditions noted in the April 12, 2005 Planning Board Recommendation, the Planning Board’s recommendation to the Town Board as set forth herein for the Amended Plan hereby incorporates by reference the original recommendation without change and exactly as it was first articulated in the Planning Board’s 2005 Rezoning Findings and further determines that any additional factors are not germane to the Amended Plan;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, those copies of all of the Planning Board meeting minutes and these findings is forwarded to the Town Board for their use.

This resolution was put to a vote with the following results:

Ernest Santoro	“Aye”
Al Gallina	“Aye”
Joe Logan	“Aye”
Rich Seiter	“Nay”
Heather Zollo	“Nay”

Adopted Ayes 3, Nays 2.

Chairman Santoro – You are in the Town Board’s hands now.

The legal notice for the public hearings appeared in “The Daily Messenger”. Post Cards were mailed to property owners within a minimum of 500 ft from location of each application along with “Under Review” signs being posted on the subject’s parcels.

PUBLIC HEARING

Speakers are requested to limit comments to 3 minutes and will be asked to conclude comments at 5 minutes

AUCTION DIRECT

6600 St Route 96

Appl No 1-SP-18

Owner – Cane Bogojevski Zoned – Commercial/Light Industrial

SBL #28.02-1-51.000

Alan Friedman, Director of Operations for Auction Direct is requesting approval to continue utilizing an area of vacant land on the site as a staging area for incoming vehicles. The site consists of approximately .35 acres, is owned by Cane Bogojevski and is zoned Commercial/Light Industrial. This is the first time this application has been before the Board.

Alan Friedman, Director of Operations for Auction Direct, addressed the Board.

Mr. Friedman – We’ve been using that piece of property for probably the past six, seven years unbeknownst that we needed the Board’s approval. We just stage cars there. They come in and out continually. It’s vehicles that come from the auctions that has been inspected at the auctions prior to our arriving, waiting for our reconditioning process. We are in the process of buying the property from Cane once this is approved. It’s a necessary part of our business at that location.

Chairman Santoro – Does anyone have any questions? There is a new map that shows the exact size of that area and it is up on the overhead also.

Ms. Zollo – Did you say you were in the process of purchasing this property?

Mr. Friedman – Yes.

Mr. Logan – Currently, what is the state of the ground surface there? Is it gravel overlay or is it grass?

Mr. Friedman – It's got dirt, gravel, and now it has millings on top of it as well. That's actually how this all came about but we had millings placed on top of the ground as well.

Mr. Logan – So once you purchase the parcel, once that goes through, you need to pave it I believe. Is that consistent with the Town Code? Unless you had some other design for that.

Mr. Friedman – Just a temporary parking lot.

Mr. Logan – It's a parking area that's like if you go to Victor Chevrolet, they have a parking lot technically but they stage cars in and out but it is their display lot.

Mr. Friedman – This isn't a display lot and no customers were over there, just store employees. The cars stay there anywhere from 24 to 96 hours depending on how busy the service department is.

Mr. Logan – I'd be interested to get Al's opinion (referring to Al Benedict).

Ms. Zollo – So did you say you are paving it or you are not paving it.

Mr. Friedman – Right now we don't own the property so I wouldn't pave something we don't own.

Ms. Zollo – But you are not planning to when you purchase it?

Mr. Friedman – My plan would not be to pave it. There is no functional reason to pave it.

Mr. Logan – Did you read the Code Enforcement Officer's comments on this regarding paving? Its item 2, it's from Al Benedict and it says, "Applicant has not indicated whether the proposed area will be grass, gravel or pavement. (You just did) The property where the parking area is indicated has a motor vehicle repair station use. The Auction Direct site also has a motor vehicle repair station use. It specifies the article in the Code and indicates that all access roads shall be paved and any area where vehicles are operated shall be maintained to prevent dust. You need to show that what you proposed to do is going to prevent dust being kicked up. Right now it's dirt and millings. I don't know if millings are the whole area, but I would suggest you have a conversation with a Code Enforcement Officer about what his acceptance level would be for the treatment of that ground. Then it talks about reduction of green space if you do pave it. It kind of hits you both ways. I would like to see those addressed as a condition of approval. Thank you, that's all I have.

Ms. Zollo – The County comments recommended that the applicant should be required to inspect newly purchased vehicles for leaking oil transmission fluid, and other toxic liquid before parking cars on this dirt surface. Do you have provisions for that?

Mr. Friedman – The cars are inspected prior to them ever arriving. There is no leaking. They get inspected at the auction prior to us ever taking delivery of them.

Chairman Santoro – That doesn't mean they can't leak sometime.

Mr. Friedman – Any car leaks sometimes. Keep in mind again, we've been using this hill for six years with zero problems with oil leaking, dust, or anything else. The cars come in almost empty of gas. I'd be more concerned with what is sitting at Mr. Tire than I would be sitting on my hill. There are only so many liquids sitting in a car. Oil is not going to spill like that. Most of the cars come in with almost no gas in them. That's a minimal risk.

Ms. Zollo – OK. I believe in the Conservation Board comments there was an adjacent creek with a water quality that is not the greatest. I'm not finding where I read that

Chairman Santoro –Kate (Crowley Conservation Board Chair) is approaching the podium.

Ms. Zollo – Thank you Kate!

Ms. Crowley – We met with Mr. Friedman at a Conservation Board meeting. We were not aware that the parcel was under consideration of being purchased because our comments might have been a little different based on that. One of the things that we noticed on the Short EAF filled out by the applicant is that it was not recognized that this parcel is in a flood plain. That whole area there, with Auction Direct, this parcel and the one adjacent to it is part of the AE flood zone. That means that it's part of the 100 year floodplain. Ganargua Creek, to answer Heather's question, Ganargua Creek is the west boundary of the parcel. Ganargua is a stressed creek. Fish Creek is the eastern boundary on the other side of Auction Direct. I would also point out that the soils on this parcel are highly permeable and there is a very low depth to the water table on the site. It's about 20 inches throughout the site. Obviously, the site has been built up at some point so there is a bit of a crest there. The Conservation Board was very concerned that it is not asphalt. We do understand that the cars are inspected, but they are brought in and stored for short periods of time before they are checked, cleaned, and ready for resale. It is our opinion that any work on that parcel should take into consideration the impact on those streams and the groundwater that is there. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro – Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak on this application? (There was no one) I entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Joe Logan, seconded by Al Gallina, and by unanimous vote, the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Santoro – There is a resolution if you would like to consider it. As indicated that last time I was here, we were putting the resolutions up on the screen. I'm not going to read all the whereas'.

RESOLUTION:

On a motion by Joe Logan, seconded by Al Gallina

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A site plan application was received on January 2, 2018 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled 6606/6608 State Route 96.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to continue utilizing an area of vacant land on the site as a staging area for incoming vehicles.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and was published in "The Daily Messenger" and whereby all property owners within 500' of the application were notified by U.S. Mail. An "Under Review" sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on March 13, 2018 at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The Action is classified as an Unlisted Action pursuant to Section 8 of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations, and the applicant provided Part I of the Short Environmental Assessment Form.
6. The Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on March 13, 2018 and identified no significant impacts.
7. The Conservation Board reviewed the project on January 16, 2018 and requested that all cars be inspected for leaking fluids due to the proximity of Ganargua Creek and Fish Creek.
8. The application was referred to the Ontario County Planning Board under Section 239 of the General Municipal Law. On February 20, 2018 Ontario County Planning Board retained application as a Class 1 with comments.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Auction Direct, Site Plan entitled 6606/6608 State Route 96, received by the Planning Board January 2, 2018, revised site plan dated March 12, 2018 received March 12, 2018, Planning Board Application No. 1-SP-18, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

Conditions to be addressed prior to the chairman's signature on the site plan:

1. That comments from Code Enforcement Officer dated January 26, 2018 be addressed.

AND, BE IT FURTHER, RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's approval letter.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays,

LANE ROAD SUBDIVISION

Appl No 1-SK-18

Owner – RB Land Company LLC

Acres – 4.70

Zoned – Residential

SBL #15.00-1-51.300

DSB Engineers on behalf of Redstone Builders is requesting approval for a 4 lot single family residential subdivision on 4.89 acres located on Lane Road. The property is zoned Residential and is owned by RB Land Company LLC. This is the first step of a major subdivision and only acknowledgement of a completed application will be considered at this meeting.

Walt Baker with DSB Engineers addressed the Board.

Mr. Baker – With me tonight is Mr. Steven Philipponne, the owner of the property, with Redstone Builders. He brought a brochure highlighting what he has been doing pretty much his entire life. He generally develops and builds homes in the Penfield / Webster area. Now he has purchased this piece of property on Lane Road which is almost 200 feet away from High Street on the south side of Lane Road. We are proposing a four lot subdivision as is illustrated on our plan. I used an aerial photograph underneath to try and give you an idea of adjacent properties so that you can see what is going on with the adjacent properties.

As mentioned the property is zoned R-1 which with sanitary sewer and water mains it allows for lots to be 33,000 square feet and larger. We do have the four lots on a dedicated road with public sewers and public water. The one lot is 35,000 square feet. The other frontage lot on Lane Road is 36,000 square feet and the two lots in the cul-de-sac to the rear are 63,000 and 68,000 square feet, which is an acre and a half each. Based on the classification of the project, due to the fact that the Code Enforcement Officer referenced that this property was first subdivided back in 1992 with the adjacent properties on High Street, you can see there are three homes presently on High Street. This lot, is four or almost five acres that was leftover was lot number four of a four lot subdivision. So based on that, this project falls into what is classified as a major subdivision even though it's only a four lot subdivision. (Four lots are usually only a minor subdivision). The Code from 1977 requires this to be classified as a further subdivision of that land. We are in a classification of a major subdivision. A major subdivision requires 50% of this site to be open space. We did get comments from the Conservation Board. Steven has also met with the Conservation Board out at the site already. They walked the site actually when it

was relatively green and brown and no snow. The Conservation Board had a good look at the site.

The site does drop off from Lane Road to the rear of the site approximately 20 feet. I also submitted the surveyors map. Submitted in the packet there was a second sheet which actually shows the topography of the site. The surveyor has already done a topo of the site so you can see that the contours basically all fall toward the south and then they kind of wrap when you get down towards lot number three. It drains over towards an existing pond on the adjacent property and then it follows the discharge of the creek channel in that direction.

We also received a comment from Mr. Toomey. He lives at 873 High Street. He sent a letter to the Board referencing his concern about the pond on his property and wanting to make sure that we don't change the direction of the drainage of the site and decrease the flow that is presently going to his pond. He doesn't want the pond to dry out. As we are proposing it, basically everything sheds the same direction and we'll keep it going that way. With the cul-de-sac we'll just have a set of catch basins and the end of the cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac is basically 200 feet long, so it is a relatively short cul-de-sac. We're going to have catch basins at the rear and have the storm pipe collect that water and bring it down the common property line between lot two and lot three. That will follow the drainage patterns in the Conservation Easement and head off the way it is going today basically. Actually we'll probably have a little more drainage for him than he has presently.

Chairman Santoro asked which property was the Toomey property and he was shown on the overhead projection.

Mr. Baker – It's this pond right here. There is an area that the Conservation Board and Steve visited. There is actually a wet area which we are going to have delineated. The Conservation Board noted it and I believe LaBella, Wes' comments, also want it delineated.

Mr. Logan – Your aerial map with the overlay of the subdivision shows that lot owned by Douglas R. Guilfoil.

There was a discussion on who owns the lots surrounding the proposed subdivision lot because there are two ponds in the vicinity. Drainage from the proposed lot was discussed.

Mr. Baker – I think he (referring to Mr. Whitbeck's pond) gets more drainage from the School property than he does from the proposed subdivision property. I thought he had this pond here (referring to Mr. Guilfoil's site). The proposed lot contours wrap around and head towards this pond. (Mr. Guilfoil's pond). His drainage is primarily from the woods and the School property. Again, we're not going to change either of the drainage patterns.

Mr. Logan – It's headed towards the bigger pond to the south as you've shown it on your plan, as the end section from the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Baker – If you look at the second sheet we've submitted from our packet, the topography map.

Mr. Logan – That tends to go toward the left.

Mr. Baker – Yes, it kind of curves, that's the way the topo came out.

Mr. Logan – That goes to the smaller pond which is on the Guilfoil parcel.

Mr. Baker – That's what I know about it, it's heading toward the smaller pond because the surveyor gave me the information. Again, we won't change the drainage for either pond. In fact the smaller of the two will probably receive a little bit more because we are going to have the short cul-de-sac drainage adding to it.

We also received comments from the Town staff, Fire Marshall, the Village DPW, the Highway Department, and obviously LaBella. We do have two responses regarding the Code Enforcement Officer's comments. He referenced that lots 1-4 do not meet the required 200 feet depth of lot per Schedule II. If you look on our map, lot 4 is actually 200 feet off of Lane Road and lot 1 is over 200 feet off of Lane Road, so I'm a little concerned at how it was referenced other than if we have a driveway access. Do we need to turn those houses so we'd have driveways on Lane Road? We thought the access off of the interior would be safer than having two extra driveways on Lane Road. We'd prefer it. The lots meet the minimum lot size and they are greater than 200 feet in depth if you measure from Lane Road. The two in the cul-de-sac are pie shaped lots which well exceed the 200 feet in depth. I guess he was looking for the Board's understanding of that and clarification for us. He said an area variance is required. I don't see where an area variance is required if we have the 200 feet depth off of Lane Road, other than the fact that he was saying we have the houses oriented so they would be pointing toward the cul-de-sac. Does the driveway have to come off of Lane Road in order to satisfy his concern?

Mr. Logan – That's what the variance would be. You need to a variance to go off the cul-de-sac to give you relief from the 200 feet from where the driveway enters.

Mr. Baker – The lot itself is obviously greater than 200 feet in depth off a primary road which is Lane Road.

Mr. Logan – I guess I'd wonder what the motivation is for that 200 feet.

Mr. Baker – Exactly.

Mr. Logan – The Code puts it there for a reason, I just want to know what that reason is.

Mr. Baker – Yes, but I think this is a unique situation. It's obviously got two fronts and how do you classify it. Does it have two sides? We've run into that situation in other towns where you have a corner lot, which one is the front?

Mr. Logan – Where do the driveways come onto the dedicated road?

Mr. Baker – We thought it would be safer to have them from the new cul-de-sac.

Mr. Logan – I agree with that, but are you tying all four driveways into the circle?

Mr. Baker – Correct.

Mr. Logan – It looks like one house is facing just the leg of the lollipop, if you will, lot one.

Mr. Baker – Well, it would be off the new road.

Mr. Logan – But not into the circle.

Mr. Baker – It's hard to say what a homebuyer is going to want to do. Some people might say they want it oriented toward the center of the circle. We can assume anything and they are going to turn around. We place the house conceptually on a lot and then someone comes along and say they love the lot but I want it turned. We can speculate. I would say we could make a restriction to say it wouldn't be on Lane Road which would be the way to go. That way there would only be one access point. If in fact anyone were coming out on Lane Road it would be a better controlled situation instead of having driveways close to each other.

Mr. Logan – Are there any site distance issues where you come out onto Lane Road? Is it all straight?

Mr. Baker – There are no site distance issues, it's all flat until you get past High Street, then it drops off.

Mr. Logan – Still, that's not the issue.

Mr. Baker – No, not really. I think it's the interpretation of the depth of the lot.

Chairman Santoro – This meeting is just to acknowledge the receipt of a complete Sketch Plan application. It's not for approval of anything other than that. However, Brian Emelson is here and I think he might have some comments.

Brian Emelson, Director of Victor Parks and Recreation addressed the Board.

Mr. Emelson – Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I submitted a letter to Cathy Templar related to discussion regarding a potential five foot wide sidewalk adjacent to Lane Road on either side of the proposed dedicated road. It would connect to existing sidewalks in the future on High Street as well as a potential sidewalk we would connect into the School's Campus. Three years ago I managed the Safe Routes School Sidewalk Project which added 6.0 linear feet of sidewalk, primarily on the School Campus but also added a sidewalk on Lane Road itself connected to sidewalks that the Town Highway Department had previously built on Lane Road. The Town also, through the High Street Capital Improvement Project, funded and constructed the sidewalks from the corner of High Street and Lane Road down to the entrance to the School Campus on High Street. We have a current federally funded capital project known as the Victor Community Connectivity Project to connect a sidewalk from Taylor Rise on Lane Road down to Canterbury Trail. This section of sidewalk that I'm proposing as part of this project was actually part of our Safe Routes to School Sidewalk project. It didn't make the final project bid but it was identified in that project. This would be an opportunity for us to include

approximately 425 linear foot section of sidewalk in association with this project. It would also enable residents of the new subdivision to access the existing sidewalk system versus cutting through back yards. It is a cul-de-sac. It will get a lot of bicycle and pedestrian traffic in that area. School children especially.

Chairman Santoro – That’s what we are looking at (overhead) up there, right?

Mr. Emelson – Correct.

Mr. Pettee – So what we are looking at here was a figure that we submitted with the grant application. The sidewalk that was constructed for the Safe Routes to School, I believe it started somewhere in this area, came up across the bus garage property and I believe the access to the school might actually be on the other side of the road, not where this blue line is drawn.

Mr. Emelson – It is. It’s on that side of the road and it carries all the way down through the campus. We also made a connection between Latchmere Drive and then made a connection between the sidewalk on High Street up to the Junior/Senior High School.

Mr. Picciotti – Question, the sidewalk from Sagamore to the Campus entrance, that’s asphalt. Would you be replacing that? You would leave it as asphalt?

Mr. Emelson – Yes, it’s currently asphalt and it would remain asphalt. The School, in the process of negotiating with that project, wanted concrete on campus. We were able to do asphalt on the Lane Road section, but we’d request to have concrete since it would match the concrete sidewalk on High Street.

Mr. Logan – Brian, the right-of-way in front of this parcel in question is wider than it is where the School District property comes to Lane Road, it looks like? (Yes) So is that where you would be putting the sidewalk on that side? I thought the sketch earlier showed that it could be on either side. I know Kathy Boughton is here. The property on that side could have been used as a sidewalk too, correct or not?

Mr. Emelson – On the opposite side of the road? (Yes) We just didn’t want folks to have to cross.

Mr. Logan – That’s fine, that’s for safety. Currently this is the best opportunity you have to continue the sidewalk system.

Mr. Emelson – There is a gap in the existing system that we’d like to fill in the near term.

Mr. Logan – So if we can include that in this project, in front of...

Mr. Emelson –I think it would be beneficial for the community.

Mr. Logan – As long as we are clear on what your best recommendations are for this sidewalk system.

Ms. Zollo – So would this be asphalt or cement?

Mr. Emelson – We would request that it be concrete.

Mr. Logan – Lower long term maintenance, I think.

Chairman Santoro – You have a proposal here for the developer.

Mr. Emelson – We would be willing to look at this project as a community amenity. If the Planning Board so chooses they could waive the fee in lieu of park land for this four lot subdivision if the developer would be willing to agree to this condition.

We typically don't do that but we feel that it's important to close something that is within the existing system and we feel it would be a good value for the Town as well as the users.

Mr. Logan – This would be a good value. I agree.

Chairman Santoro – It's a \$1,500 per lot fee. So that would be \$6,000 benefit for the developer.

Mr. Emelson – The Planning Board is able to access a fee in lieu of park land which in the community is \$1,500 per home. We are willing to waive that recommendation potentially with this amenity being agreed to.

Mr. Philippone – Having done sidewalks in Penfield, the typical cost for installing sidewalks is about \$30 to \$35 a linear foot. So if you are requesting 425 feet of sidewalk, it's a pretty significant cost. It's a somewhat of a savings by waiving the park fee but there are still significant costs associated even with waiving the park fee.

Chairman Santoro – That's something we can discuss at a later date.

Mr. Philippone – Absolutely, I was not expecting to have that conversation.

Chairman Santoro – I thought that Brian was here and might as well bring it up.

Mr. Emelson – I'd like to come back at a later date and talk about bicycle and pedestrian activity in our community. We have a rich history for it and we are undergoing a parks and recreation master plan process. It'll take about 14 or 15 months from here on out. Sometime in the future I'd like to have a more formal discussion with this Board and get your take on it and tell you where we've been and where we would like to go.

Brian was thanked.

Ms. Crowley – I would like to acknowledge that we did walk the site on January 28, 2018. There was very little snow cover on the site. The southern portion of the site is wet and the larger pond that we are talking about is a freshwater emergent wetland. It is an NWI wetland and thus the need for it to be delineated.

Soils on the site are again, moderately well drained but we did see standing water throughout the site. In fact we had a conversation with Steve about the standing water. We are proposing a site specific conservation easement for the site that would include native grasses to be planted anywhere outside of the lawn area. That helps delineate the easement area from lawn space. We are suggesting that we allow trees and shrubs to be planted in the easement and that's part of the reason we chose the site specific; we would want that to be under the advice of an arborist given the hydrology present on the site. We are suggesting only a motorized vehicle to be in the easement for mowing twice a year to support the habitat that is there.

Chairman Santoro asked the public if there was anyone who wished to speak and there was not. He read the resolution.

RESOLUTION

On a motion by Al Gallina, seconded by Joe Logan

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A sketch plan application was received on February 6, 2018 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Major Subdivision entitled Lane Road 4 Lot Subdivision.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to subdivide 4.70 acres into 4 lots.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and was published in "The Daily Messenger" and whereby all property owners within 500' of the application were notified by U.S. Mail. An "Under Review" sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on March 13, 2018 at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The Conservation Board reviewed the sketch plan on February 6, 2018 and a site walk took place on January 28, 2018.
6. There was a Coordinated Fire Service sketch plan review and comments dated February 6, 2018 were received.
7. The Codes Dept reviewed the sketch plan and comments dated February 8, 2018 were received.
8. The Town of Victor Highway Dept reviewed the sketch plan and comments dated February 9, 2018 were received.
9. The Village DPW reviewed the sketch plan and comments dated February 19, 2018 were received.

10. The Director of Parks and Recreation reviewed the sketch plan and comments dated February 20, 2018 were received.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that regarding the sketch plan application of Redstone Builders, Major Subdivision entitled Lane Road Subdivision, drawn by D.S.B Engineers & Architects, dated January 19, 2018, received by the Planning Board February 6, 2018, Planning Board Application No. 1-SK-18, the Planning Board **acknowledges receipt of a complete sketch plat application;**

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary forward a copy of this resolution to the applicant.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays,

TABLED FROM 11/28 MEETING

SALSBURG SUBDIVISION

1169 Cork Rd

Appl No 8-MS-17

Owner – Fred Salsburg

Acres – 6.1 Zoned – Residential

SBL # 27.00-1-49.120

Mr. Salsburg is requesting approval to subdivide 6.099 acres into 3 lots. Lot 1 with existing house would consist of 1.633 acres, Lot 2 would consist of 3.114 acres and Lot 3 would consist of 1.352 acres. The property is zoned Residential.

Applicant is also including in this application a lot line adjustment with 1165 Cork Rd. This would consist of Parcel A and Parcel B both consisting of .039 acres being exchanged from one site to the other.

At the 11/28 Planning Board meeting the Board requested additional information and asked applicant to revise his subdivision plan and return for a decision.

Mr. Fred Salsburg addressed the Board.

Mr. Salsburg – I live in the one lot here and I split the other two off because I may have to refinance my house and I don't want it part of that. I don't plan on selling them but I do want to leave it in a clean condition when I make my exit. Whenever that might be.

Chairman Santoro – How are you doing on getting that issue that was discussed last time resolved?

Mr. Salsburg – There was a turn-around or a flat spot in the driveway that was farther than 300 feet, so I moved it down closer to the road. Now it's not more than 300 feet. I put in signature lines although Cathy said she's still short one for me. There was another change, what was it?

Ms. Templar – Taking Patricia's name off of it.

Mr. Salsburg – The lawyer said my deceased wife's name should not be on there or the other paperwork because she can't sign it. I think there was some other little thing, maybe not. I guess there wasn't any other change, just the signature and the pull over spot.

Chairman Santoro – There is an issue for the Board to consider and that's waiving the requirement for a common driveway to be paved.

Mr. Salsburg – I sent a letter with the reasons stating why it would be a good thing to waive it. I don't know how I made out with that letter but I gave it my best shot.

Mr. Logan – What would be the justification for not paving it other than cost?

Mr. Salsburg – It can meet the weight capacity specification without paving and it costs a lot more. I'd like to have it be up to the people who would use it. I have a stone driveway and I really don't care about paving mine. It's a personal opinion. I thought it was overly regulated for a little driveway going out to a house to force it to be paved.

Chairman Santoro – Does anyone have a problem with the waiver?

Ms. Zollo – There are no issues with grade or anything that would make a gravel driveway be a problem?

Mr. Salsburg – No, there is no hill where it would wash out.

Mr. Logan – Well, that's one of the main things.

Mr. Salsburg – That soil is so sandy you don't get much water running on it anyway.

Mr. Logan – Honestly, I own a house that has a gravel driveway on it, I'm sympathetic to that for sure.

Mr. Salsburg – The only thing I found is that it tracks into the house.

Mr. Logan – Yes, that it'll do, in the car, everything, all the stones.

Mr. Salsburg – As far as maintaining it, I had Dan Olstrom put in small stones when it was built by Randy Jones. Victor Excavating put in a larger stone and they were moving around. Dan Olstrom put in the little ones and that came out like concrete then.

Mr. Logan – It is a lot tighter that way. He did the same thing for my driveway.

Chairman Santoro – I had a stone driveway for 38 years, finally paved it. Any other comments for this project, if not we have a resolution.

Mr. Logan – He's satisfied everything we've asked him to do.

Mr. Salsburg – The other thing I was trying to think of was this Easement business. The reciprocal language which I had drawn up.

Ms. Kinsella – I just want to say that that is a condition of the approval which, once he submits it, will go to Cathy. It'll go to our Town attorney for them to review it. It's a condition of the approval, I don't think we need to hold you up any longer Fred.

Chairman Santoro asked the public if anyone wanted to speak, there was no one. By unanimous agreement the public hearing was closed and the Chairman read the resolution.

RESOLUTION

On a motion by Heather Zollo, seconded by Rich Seiter

WHEREAS the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. An application was received on October 12, 2017 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Minor Subdivision entitled Salsburg Subdivision.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to subdivide 6.099 acres into three lots consisting of a common driveway.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and was published in "The Daily Messenger" and whereby all property owners within 500' of the application were notified by U.S. Mail. An "Under Review" sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on November 28, 2017 at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The application was deemed to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to Section 8 of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations and a Short Environmental Assessment Form was prepared.
6. The application was referred to the Ontario County Planning Board under Section 239 of

the General Municipal Law.

7. On December 13, 2017, Ontario County Planning Board referred the application back to the referring agency as a Class AR1 with no formal recommendation to deny or approve single family residential subdivisions under 5 lots.
8. The Conservation Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on November 7, 2017 and finds no issue with the proposed subdivision.
9. On November 22, 2017, applicant received an area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow 2 lots with 0 feet of frontage.
10. On March 13, 2018, the Planning Board waived the requirement for a common driveway to be paved, 2.9.16.4 of the Design Construction Standards but shall meet or exceed HS-25 loading requirement.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on March 13, 2018 and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, Salsburg Subdivision, will not have a significant impact on the environment and that a negative declaration be prepared; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the application of Fredric Salsburg, 1169 Cork Road, Victor, New York, Minor Subdivision entitled Salsburg Subdivision, drawn by Freeland-Parrinello Land Surveyors, dated January 5, 2017, revised January 16, 2018 received by the Planning Board March 12, 2018 Planning Board Application No. 8-MS-17 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

Conditions that must be met prior to the Chairman signing the minor subdivision plan:

1. That no final signatures will be given on the plans until all legal and engineering fees have been paid as per Fee Reimbursement Local Law adopted November 25, 1996.
2. That before the Planning Board Chairman signs the approved film original(s), the developer should submit two (2) copies of electronic files to the Town. Copies shall be forwarded to the Town Engineer's office to confirm that the data on the electronic files are the same as the approved subdivision plans.
3. That Section 4 Standard Approval Conditions for all Subdivisions (Major & Minor) in the Design and Construction Standards be met.
4. That the comments in a letter dated November 17, 2017 from LaBella Associates be addressed.

5. That the comments in a letter dated November 22, 2017 from Codes be addressed.
6. That a reciprocal easement and a common maintenance agreement shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney.

Conditions that are on-going standard conditions that must be adhered to:

1. That the minor subdivision comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
2. That approved subdivision maps, including conservation easements, lot consolidations and lot line adjustments shall be submitted in digital format, Autocad 2002, or latest version, effective January 1, 2004 (per Town Board Resolution #193 of June 23, 2003).
3. That the common driveway will be constructed to meet or exceed HS-25 loading.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's approval letter.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays,

TABLED FROM THE 11/14/17 MTG

PARTY CITY

Eastgate Square

Owner – Main Street Fishers Eastgate-1 LLC

Acres – 24.20

Zoned – Planned Development District

SBL # 1.02-1-1.000

Kelly Spaulding, Construction Coordinator on behalf of Party City is requesting approval for window architectural elements to be installed on all windows at their Eastgate Square Plaza location. It was requested of the applicant at the 11/14 Planning Board meeting to return with an alternate window graphic design. The property is owned by Main Street Fishers Eastgate-1, LLC and is zoned a Planned Development District.

Suzanne Lawton the Store Manager of Party City addressed the Board.

Ms. Lawton – Good evening. Kelly was planning on coming out but she is now located in New Jersey and is no longer able to communicate. Hopefully, I can communicate the information she gave me which she provided to you. I'll answer any questions or roll them back up to the Party City folks.

Based on the conversations we had last time, I kind of jumped the gun with Kelly and I told her that I didn't feel like the middle set of graphics were going to fall in line with what we spoke about because it does show licensed merchandise or licensing which I know was a concern that was brought up. I had already taken that out of the conversation with her (Referring to Line A of her submission).

For some information that she provided me with, the bottom graphics (Line B) are what Party City uses in other Towns that have the same concerns that Victor does.

The company is actually looking to rebrand the window signage in the majority of its stores. We were hoping to have that available to us in February to present. They don't have it available so what she (or I) am presenting tonight is the bottom set of graphics (Line B). It is something Party City uses in other Towns that have similar concern as Victor.

Chairman Santoro – So what does everybody think?

Mr. Logan – It looks fine.

Chairman Santoro – It's OK with me too.

Ms. Zollo – If they rebrand, will this change then?

Ms. Lawton – If it rebrands, then that is something I can approach you with again. We were hoping to have it prepared but understanding that we need to make movement for the satisfaction of the Town, this is going to be the first step. Believe me I didn't want to incur the costs twice to replace these signs. If they do rebrand it is something that I will either opt out of or come and approach you and see if it is something that is a better fit.

Mr. Logan – A quick question about that. Your image shows a large purple backdrop with smaller photos. The one in the window currently are full sized images on those panels. Is it your intent to have that purple backdrop and then smaller images?

Ms. Lawton – Yes, because what we are covering is the back of fixtures. We have to have that cover there otherwise esthetically it would be much worse.

Mr. Logan – So you are basically matting the photos rather than having full size.

Ms. Lawton – Yes, she was under the impression that we needed to reduce the size of those graphics, not only change the graphics. That's how we can come to that middle ground of still being able to cover, esthetically, what the public doesn't want to see, and the pictures in my building, and reduce the size of the graphics overall.

Mr. Logan – That’s fine, thank you.

There were no other questions, Chairman Santoro read the resolution.

RESOLUTION

On a motion from Al Gallina, seconded by Heather Zollo,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A Site Plan application was received on October 10, 2017 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for Party City Window Architectural Feature.
2. Applicant is requesting approval for window graphics to be located in the store front windows. The window graphics do not advertise any products.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and was published in “The Daily Messenger” and whereby all property owners within 500’ of the application were notified by U.S. Mail. An “Under Review” sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on November 14, 2017 at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The Code Enforcement Officer reviewed the application and stated that the window mounted graphics are considered a non-business sign and/or an architectural feature.
6. The application was deemed to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to Section 8 of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations and a Short Environmental Assessment Form was prepared.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on March 13, 2018 and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, Party City Architectural Feature will not have a significant impact on the environment and that a negative declaration be prepared.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Site Plan application of Kelly Spaulding for a window Architectural Feature received by the Planning Board on October 10, 2017, revision received February 6, 2018, indicating Proposed Layout B, Planning Board Application No 36-SP-17, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That the window mounted graphics shall not advertise any business or products.
2. That the revised window mounted graphics be in place by May 15, 2018.

AND, BE IT FURTHER, RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's approval letter.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays

Mr. Logan had a question on one of the future dates for the Planning Board. There was a brief discussion on the meeting dates.

A motion was made by Joe Logan seconded by Al Gallina RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Cathy Templar, Secretary

Minutes typed by Debby Trillaud