

A Planning Board workshop for the Gullace Project was held on April 10, 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 AT THE TABLE: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer Consultant; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; Cathy Templar, Secretary; Jennifer Michniewicz, Traffic Consultant; Joe Picciotti, Town Attorney; Dante Gullace, Steve Gullace, Bob Cantwell, Michael Bogojevski, Alan Knauf

IN THE AUDIENCE: Kate Crowley, Conservation Board; David Nankin, Mike Guinan, Gerald Birmingham, Jeff Knapp, Ed Kahovec, Lee Wagar, Marsha Senges, Gene Pratt, Ken Curry, Jean Waitenberger, Dave Nellis, Ruth Nellis, Bob Schlueter, Nan Hooker, Tom Hooker, Dan Duprey, Dave Hahn, Luba Mason

The regular Planning Board meeting for April 10, 2018 was canceled due to no applications on the agenda. A Planning Board workshop was held in the main meeting room at the Victor Town Hall, 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York starting at 7:00pm for the purpose of discussing the Gullace Project. The workshop was open to the public.

Chairman Santoro made the announcement that this would be a workshop between the Planning Board, their consultants and the applicant. Although this is a public meeting, there will be no comments or questions entertained by the Board this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Heather Zollo, seconded by Joe Logan

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

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

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays

Mr. Pettee - One of the things that we wanted to do before we got started was to review the project history to recognize the past and where we are today. *Mr. Pettee read from the list that was handed out to each member at the table.*

- August 28, 2013 – Sketch plan proposing 120 apartments, clubhouse and pool which was accepted as a complete application by the Planning Board.

- April 30, 2014 – Site plan application was submitted for 100 apartments and clubhouse
- February 2015 – Concept plan was submitted for 71 for-sale townhouses
- June 23, 2015 – Planning Board issued a SEQR Negative Declaration. This was done at the time the Town and Village were considering an annexation. The Planning Board was lead agency for project.
- April 25, 2016 – Joint public hearing with the Town and Village Planning Boards on the petition of the annexation.
- May 9, 2016 – Town Board approved the annexation from the Town to the Village
- May 25, 2016 – Preliminary subdivision application submitted for 69 for-sale townhouses
- June 2017 – Site plan was submitted for 69 for-sale condominium townhouses
- February 20, 2018 – Updated site plan submitted for 67 units with duplexes on west side of Church St

With regards to SEQR, at that time it was for 71 for-sale townhomes in the Town of Victor and 17 single family homes in the Village of Victor. In comparison, we have before us 67 condominium townhouses. During the SEQR process, although the Planning Board identified environmental impacts, none of the impacts were found to be significant, therefore, the project was determined not to have a significant adverse environmental impact. As indicated in the *SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 3, Evaluation and Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts and Determination of Significance* there were several items identified that could have the potential to have it *moderate to large impacts*.

Impacts on Plants and Animals – *The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site. It was indicated that a moderate or large impact may occur.* There is some pretty detailed explanation as to what could happen and how the Planning Board determined that although there could be a moderate to large impact, it didn't seem to be an adverse environmental impact. One of the items stated was *the project site contains an isolated forested habitat that does not appear to be an integral part of a larger, more significant wildlife habitat. The Planning Board also finds that the project area does not appear to be a significant corridor that would provide connectivity between wildlife areas.*

One of the other items that the Planning Board contemplated with SEQR is the impact on transportation and it was found that it may have a moderate to large impact with regards to the projected traffic increase may exceed the capacity of the existing road network. So a thorough evaluation was done and it was outlined in the SEQR Negative Declaration attachment. As we go through the discussion tonight, if you are interested we can go through this.

Finally, Consistency with Community Character – There was also a potential for moderate to large impact may occur. It was found that *Therefore, while townhomes are larger in scale than single family homes, they are not so much larger than single family homes (such as big box store, an apartment complex, or a factory) or other typical townhomes to rise to the level of a significant adverse environmental impact.*

What I've just articulated is very cursory and is not a thorough in depth review of how the Planning Board came to issue the Negative Declaration but I just wanted to touch on this briefly. I think tonight we also wanted to give the applicant an opportunity to present any "new" information that they might have provided or found since the last time we met.

Mr. Bob Cantwell from BME Assoc. – Along with Mr. Cantwell was Dan Gullace, Steve Gullace, Alan Knauf and Mike Bogojevski. I'd like to thank the Board for considering meeting in a workshop setting. As Mr. Pettee indicated we met a couple of weeks ago and received a handful of comments (referring to the last Planning Board meeting agenda). We'd like to address some of those comments.

We received a comment from the Planning Board with regards to the elevations of the specific townhouse units. We received those elevations from the architect today and what they show is we have both 3 and 4 unit townhome elevations. When we show both entry, garage and driveway, garage entrances and we also show combinations of side entrances and front entrances configurations. For the duplexes on the west side of the property, those are all at this point, front load garages.

With the options that we distributed tonight, depending on the configuration and location of those footprints will determine whether there's an opportunity to do an end load garage. With the geometry and spacing of the relationships to a surrounding unit as well as grading as we transition across the site.

The second area we received comments on was in regards to the traffic and the speed study and the applicant's traffic consultant is in the process of completing that speed study. We spoke to them today and they indicated they would be completing that study this week and be able to do a summary of that study and submit to the town and the town's traffic consultant as well.

In addition to the speed study, there were comments about traffic calming. We did propose some traffic calming on Lynaugh and Church St. Those measures were reviewed by the County as well as the applicant's traffic consultant so we are looking for some input from the Planning Board relative to any of those measures. Again, just to reiterate the existing speeds on Lynaugh and Church St are an existing condition. It's my understanding that the Town Board will be requesting to consider lowering the speed limit upon those roads.

The third comment that was raised was in regards to connectivity between the town and village portion. We've gone back and forth on this a number of times over the various iterations of the plan. The current proposed plan which is the rendering in front of me does not include a vehicular connection between the two roads. That is something that the applicant feels is appropriate as the two different target markets, the single family being in the Village and the condominium-townhouses in the Town portion are two distinct product types within the community. Therefore, we have not shown a connection between the Town and the Village piece.

Another comment was regarding visitor parking. Again, we had requested and actually shown visitor parking on the plan. We had also requested the Planning Board's ability to land bank that parking as it's been done on other projects in the town, most recently the Silverton Glenn project. As we've indicated in the past, we feel there is adequate parking for visitors with the 2 car garages and at least 2 car driveway spaces. We are again requesting a land banked consideration for those visitor parking spaces.

We also met with the Fire Marshal on Thursday and feel that we can accommodate their concerns relative to geometry and turn around configurations within the framework of the existing roadways. We had a couple of minor turning movement templates that we'll need to provide to the Fire Marshal. But we feel we can accommodate the comments that had been raised since that time.

With that again, we have shown as Mr. Pettee indicated, the latest plan shows a total of 67 condominium-townhomes for the overall project and that includes 14 duplexes on the west side as well as the remaining townhomes on the east side which is made up of 3 and 4 unit blocks.

We did receive some feedback at the last meeting relative to the streetscape and the potential for increasing the number of side load garages. So we did a very quick sketch of the overall plan (referring to a new concept plan) where we have actually used a majority of 3 unit blocks of townhomes and again, that would be the elevations that I handed out showing the combination of either a front load or side load garages. I would just point out that we have not had an opportunity to look at geometry between the units, we have not looked at grading between the units to truly assess the viability of this configuration and we also need to work with the architect to further refine the actual design of the footprints themselves in particular where we have end load garages shown as far as the offsetting of the garages inside to the units themselves. Again, this does show a reduced number of units and I think the point is we are not necessarily moving from this plan (the 67 unit plan) this is just an option that we have developed with the 3 unit bldgs as an option to consider. With that, the other factor relates to marketability so we also have to assess the true marketability of units where they are sharing a driveway, which also needs to be looked at and considered as well.

The other part of the project plan that is modified from the previous plan is that we've actually pulled the cul-de-sac further to the north, shortened up the dimension of the cul-de-sac from what was previously shown. That also includes the cul-de-sac being proposed for dedication to the town so we eliminated the private road configuration. We feel the orientation of the units as opposed to the previous plan actually works better from that standpoint and the orientation to the road.

One of the things that we did talk to the Fire Marshal about is the geometry of the private road access and that there would need to be an easement granted over the course of that private road. The geometry of that cul-de-sac albeit private is very similar to what the town's dedicated cul-de-sac road dictates, so this complies with that.

As far as additional pedestrian connections to the park and things of that nature, we haven't gotten to the extent of showing the detail on the plan for that, however, it's certainly something that would be done down the road.

With regards to visitor parking, it's the same scenario where we would need to get a waiver, if you will, of on street visitor parking. We would also be requesting land bank parking as part of that plan.

Ms. Kinsella asked how many units are being shown on the new concept plan.

Mr. Cantwell – There are 62 units shown on this plan. Again, this is not what we're proposing, this is an option for discussion purposes.

Ms. Zollo – Did you say that none of this has really been engineered, you don't know the distances between the bldgs....

Mr. Cantwell – We've complied with the minimum dimensions between the bldgs. But we have not looked at grading, elevations relative to driveway slopes, things of that nature. Silverton Glenn has been compared to this project in terms of similarities relative to market sector appeal

and similar footprint orientation so we did take some photographs of Silverton Glenn. The majority of the units in Silverton Glenn have front load garages, that's for duplexes, triplexes and four-plex units. *Mr. Cantwell passed around the photos he just described.*

Mr. Pettee – Bob, I don't want to put you on the spot but I do have a question about the .68 acres that was previously anticipated to not be disturbed. I think it was a portion that was annexed into the Village and I think currently the colored rendering that you have in front of you and the one on the overhead screen, that .68 acres seems to be encumbered by an infiltration basin or a rain garden feature rather than remaining as it was.

Mr. Cantwell – It's a proposed stormwater management facility and nowadays the stormwater management facilities have to have habitat diversity and needs to be designed in order to accommodate not only stormwater management needs but also green infrastructure practices. So that's definitely being proposed. That location topographically works very well.

Mr. Pettee – Was it located elsewhere on the plan before?

Mr. Cantwell – It was previously located further to the west and upgrade a little bit in the middle of this area. Again, the elevations actually work very well in the proposed location.

Mr. Pettee – I think it was also mentioned that it was a common area for the condominium association? Would you explain that a little bit more.

Mr. Cantwell – It's part of the lands that were annexed so its separate from the town.

Mr. Pettee – For example this is the area that I was speaking of. It mentions common condominium association lands Area D.

Mr. Cantwell – The Village land was to be subdivided so that would allow for ownership and maintenance of that greenspace in order to be maintained by an entity. That could be done as part of the condominium association because all of the rest of the land in the village is intended to be subdivided and sold as individual plots.

Mr. Logan – Is the village okay with using that land for this purpose if they don't approve anything on the other parcel which is kind of the crux of the conversation we had at the last meeting.

Mr. Cantwell – We have not gone to the village since we went through the SEQR process and when the village actually declined to consider clustering for their portion of the project. At that time, this portion of the project was being preserved as a basis for clustering as a benefit of the village to preserve that. With that in mind, we could reasonably conclude that they have no interest of seeing that preserved as a benefit to the village other than it being greenspace.

Mr. Picciotti – Does that configuration allow higher density in the village without the clustering subdivision approval? The density might be less if they utilize it (inaudible).

Mr. Logan – That particular feature as part of the development in the town, you'd still be working on that parcel as part of the town development only to enhance that area. Is that correct?

Mr. Cantwell – That is part of the stormwater management area, yes and green infrastructure.

Mr. Picciotti – Would you explain the stormwater system that you have right now?

Mr. Cantwell – This pre-treatment area is being used to provide required stormwater management pretreatment before drainage is discharged into the stormwater detention area which is the blue area on the drawing. Again, that is required as part of DEC's requirements, the Town of Victor's requirements as well. As far as the way the drainage flows from the property, it flows southwest in this direction to northeast.

Mr. Logan's pointed it out on the overhead screen.

Ms. Zollo – What are the legal issues with having your stormwater management area in the village lands as part of a town project?

Mr. Knauf – If the village requires site plan approval or whatever, we'd need to get that. So that would have to be a condition of approval. We're still in the Town of Victor over there so we're not going outside the town. But we would need to get whatever approvals so that would have to be a condition of approval.

Mr. Picciotti – I'm not trying to put you on the spot Alan, one other issue that comes up and I appreciate your response on that being a condition of approval should this Board approve the project. Looking back at the Negative Declaration that was issued in 2015 is that it seemed to contemplate obviously a project that was going to be built in the village and the town and to the extent that there are certainly measures and Wes mentioned one of them and raised that issue with me this afternoon that are identified in the Negative Declaration as factors that the Board considered in determining that there wasn't a significant adverse impact. Have you looked at that in terms of what that would mean going forward in light of how the project has changed? It's an open ended question and at this point I don't know if there is an answer. But that is a question that comes up with this as you can imagine.

Mr. Knauf – We didn't go specifically through the Negative Declaration, we can do that. If anything, this project is smaller and less intense than the project that got the Negative Declaration so as you know, you'd have to have a substantial change that has a potential negative adverse impact. Basically, it's less intense and less impact but we can go through specifically and look and see if there are any particular aspects that might make a difference.

Mr. Picciotti – I'm not fishing for a significant adverse impact. My question was a little different to the extent that I understand the project is less dense than what was determined to not result in a significant adverse impact in 2015. My question is a little different in what I'd like you to think about is are there any aspects of that Negative Declaration that involve portions of this project now that may never be built or have been changed and how does that change, if at all, a

Negative Declaration. I don't know the answer to it, I just want to make sure we're focused on that.

Mr. Pettee – One of the ideas behind having the workshop tonight is to “set the table” to prepare the Planning Board to make a decision on the site plan. One of the things that you'll notice in regards to the handout is the density, the number of units proposed initially versus what is currently proposed on the table now of being 67 units versus 120. We know that the zoning district that this project is located in is Multiple Dwelling and the parcel size is 17.13 acres. It would seem that the zoning would allow for 10 units per acre for this zoning district. We just wanted to bring that up to you and also talk about potentially some of the items you might consider as conditions for approval if you were so inclined to approve this project. We can talk about those and part of that may be traffic calming measures and that might be one of the topics for condition.

Ms. Michniewicz – As part of the SEQR, they did the traffic studies in 2013 with the 120 apartments. They did a traffic study combined with the village and town portion. They had 120 apartments and 23 single family homes that were going to generate 112 trips. The reduction in 2015 to 71 townhomes and 17 single family homes dropped it down to 67 trips. As a part of SEQR if you're below 100 trips per hour, it's not considered a significant traffic impact. Had this been presented at that time with the trips that are currently projected in the 2015 study, it might not have met that threshold.

That being said, they still went through the exercise and analyzed the Level of Service (LOS), they looked at Lynaugh, CR 9 and Lane Rd intersections, Main with Church and Main with Lynaugh as well as the 3 site intersections. With the exception of the 2, Main St/Route 96 intersections, the LOS was acceptable and then the Main St ones were diminished mostly because of the existing traffic on the Route 96 corridor.

The traffic study also looked at accidents and speeds and that's where we are now where you have on Church the transition from 55 mph down to 25 mph and on Lynaugh from 50 to 30 and that speed zone, there is the 85th percentile speed of 15 to 20 mph over what's assigned in the village. As part of this, we asked them to look at traffic calming measures that was in the traffic study and there were several things that were proposed. The things that seemed most applicable in this area, we suggested the speed radar signs to notify if you're over the speed limit. Other enhancements such as landscaping or signage or lighting at the entry ways. When we talk about landscape buffers, we can talk about some of those traffic calming benefits. If you have more landscaping closer to the road, it gives a narrowing effect. One of the other things that we suggested is on Church St, there's a very clear sign about when you're entering a speed zone and the speed signs are up to date with the current manual uniform traffic control devices (MUTCD) whereas on Lynaugh they are not. So we suggested upgrading Lynaugh.

The applicant's suggestions; they planned on putting in the intersection warning signs, things like the “T”, the “+” Cross to give you advance notice. They have also weighed in on the radar speed sign. They offered to put it in but noted that it was a pre-existing condition.

Ontario County looked at CR9 and they note that the radar speed signs seem to be affected in the short term but in the long term if there is no police enforcement, then they really don't add any benefit. The radar speed signs, I'm not sure if they would provide any benefit in the long term but adding the enhancements perhaps; lighting or narrowing through landscaping, I think would be a good traffic calming measure.

As Bob mentioned, we're still waiting on the additional information from their consultant as far as the speed study and the additional traffic study information. Any questions?

Mr. Pettee – Kim suggested that we focus on the traffic. Anything that you'd like to see on the traffic calming. I think we can also blend into this some of the landscape buffering. Jennifer mentioned to me earlier today that landscaping along roadways will sometimes give the appearance of a narrowing roadway, naturally giving people the cue to slow down. So I think landscaping in that regard in addition to what's required by code for adjoining properties, etc., some buffering could be required as part of the condition of approval.

Mr. Gallina – In general, I am certainly a proponent of traffic calming measures. I know that from day 1 the local residents had indicated concerns about speed in that corridor. While the applicant certainly isn't causing it, I certainly think that anything we could do to enhance the safety not only for the existing residents but the new residents. I think it would be a positive for the entire area and whether that is streetscaping, lighting or signage. Again, I'll defer to the traffic experts on what's the most affective.

Mr. Logan – I think in the future the Town of Victor's traffic plan, the roundabout will go a long way to mitigating the speed on CR9. Certainly, the town would have good justification for reducing the speed limit between that intersection and the village so that will also help. I'll echo Al's comments on the balance of it but I don't think it's going to be a major challenge in the long run. I think the short term solutions with landscaping and possibly the speed monitoring signs, would be the best to add.

Chairman Santoro – Although the plan showing 62 units isn't the proposed plan, it certainly to me, looks a lot more acceptable than the one that you have before us right now showing 67 units.

Ms. Zollo – I will echo Ernie's comments about that plan. As far as the traffic calming, I think based on what Jennifer said, the radar signs are not necessarily affective over the long term. I think the approaching speed zone signs are, so that would definitely be something that I would support as well as the other things that Jennifer mentioned, the landscaping to give that narrowing effect.

Mr. Pettee – Something that the Town's Code Enforcement Officer brought up in their review several times and the most recent is March 2, 2018. This has to do with a landscape buffer. He mentions *the 10 ft wide buffer around the perimeter as required by Section 211-25B(4)(e)[1] appears to have changed.* This is in regards to the February submission. *The code requires a dense buffer with trees at least 6 ft in height to which the plans only indicate the caliper of the trees. It is the Planning Board's responsibility to review the landscaping plan for approval.* I think previously he mentioned that it is the Planning Board's responsibility to assure that whatever gets planted as a buffer meets the intent of what's stated in the code. If there is any inclination for the Planning Board to condition the approval that the landscape meet that particular requirement. I wanted to get your input on that.

Ms. Kinsella – I just wanted to add that one of the County Planning Board's comment from their March 14, 2018 meeting was the site plan showed limited setback and buffering from the

northern property line. Also, Bruce Zaretsky's comments from March 1, 2018 also commented about the landscaping plan that had been presented and gave some recommendations on that. So based on that, what is your feedback on the landscape buffering?

Mr. Gallina – Again, consistent with secondary concerns of the surrounding residents was the fact of the appearance of the surrounding community. I would certainly support maximizing the screening, certainly not making any allowances for anything less than the minimum requirements and certainly to get the Landscape Architect's opinion on whatever landscape plan is presented to make sure we are meeting at least the minimum requirements. If there was anything else the applicant could do to enhance the minimum requirements, it would be well received from my perspective.

Mr. Seiter – Are there sidewalks along the main road?

Mr. Logan pointed the sidewalks out on the overhead screen.

Mr. Logan – As far as landscaping goes, the existing foliage coverage on the village side, is that as dense as it is on the town side, east of CR9? The reason I was asking, if you look at the buffer that you're indicating on the border between the village and town parcels on the east side of CR9, who would have control over that buffer? *Mr. Logan pointed it out on the overhead screen.* My opinion is, after the houses are built in the village, they may want to have more control over that landscaping than the HOA for the condominiums as a buffer so I wouldn't necessarily think that if this is already dense, you don't have to really do many additional trees along here unless you're successful in constructing the supplemental development, then you'd have to provide that additional buffer on this area. I'm not saying that you don't have to do it on the town side but I'm not so concerned about that area of the project as I am along the street view and certainly along Lynaugh and maintain a buffer to the north. Certainly, on the west side you need to have those trees as well.

Chairman Santoro – This isn't about landscaping but what is the proposed square footage?

Mr. Cantwell – The townhouse units are approximately 1500 sf of living space. There are subtle differences between the end units sf and the inside unit on the 3 and 4 unit blocks but that's roughly what the configuration would be. Again, I would reiterate, we have to work with the architect on the final footprint that would be appropriate to meet what the market would dictate.

A question was asked if the 1500 sf included the basements. Mr. Cantwell stated it did not. Ms. Zollo asked if they were all single story and Mr. Cantwell stated they were.

Mr. Cantwell – The elevations you see are the actual units so it shows the single story elevations.

Ms. Zollo – I would agree that we would want to exceed the minimum requirements. We have a plan that shows quite a number of evergreens but I would defer to our Landscape Consultant, he knows what our desires are and will make sure we get a suitable plan to protect the existing residents.

Mr. Cantwell – The town’s landscape consultant did provide comments and we have not provided detailed plans because again, these plans were intended to get a read from the Planning Board and we have acknowledged on a number of occasions that we will be providing the required detail not just for landscaping materials but also everything from seeding around the site. Again, we acknowledge the fact that we will have to comply with minimum standards certainly and ultimately we’ll work with the town’s landscaping consultant for the ultimate landscape plan as well as what Jennifer had indicated for the entrance and frontage treatment as well.

Mr. Pettee – One of the other topics that we discussed at the last meeting was the land banked parking. We’ve got the locations highlighted on the plan in front of you. There is a certain percentage that is supposed to be paved versus what would be land banked. I believe I saw in the minutes that the Board was looking for 50% of those parking spaces to be paved. I just want to get your feedback on that, if you’re looking for 50% of them to be paved and the location of those paved areas.

Mr. Gallina – Relative to land banked parking, I was certainly one of the ones supporting 50% as a minimum to ensure there is adequate off street parking. Relative to location, I think that would have to be worked out through the final site plan approval process since we really haven’t had a chance to digest the draft 62 unit proposal.

Mr. Seiter – Would the land bank parking be a total for the entire project or proportioned east and west of the main road?

Mr. Cantwell – We have shown land banked parking on the dedicated road on the west side. We have not shown any specific to be paved parking on the west side with the plan, not that it couldn’t be done.

Mr. Logan- I’m agreeing with Al’s perspective on this and what he stated so I don’t have anything to add.

Chairman Santoro didn’t have anything else to add.

Ms. Zollo – I’ll concur with Al’s comments.

Mr. Pettee – Based on the February submission by the applicant, it eliminated the road connectivity with the potential village street. Even the concept plan they brought tonight has not shown that connectivity. I think if the Planning Board is fine with that, that’s okay. However, I think there was a request to have a pedestrian connection and wanted to get your input on a potential condition of what that should look like.

Mr. Gallina – It is a little bit of a difficult situation given the village is an unapproved application. Personally, I would like to see an allowance made for that in the event that the village proposal goes forward, that at that time, the village should be seeking the connectivity. The town plan that is submitted from the town perspective shouldn’t preclude that.

Mr. Seiter – I find the concept plan more appealing than what we've been looking at and I think with the cul-de-sac moved to the north, that would preclude the vehicular connectivity and we would be left with a footpath which would be desirable.

Mr. Logan – I think I heard Bob say that this wasn't a proposed plan but it's a concept for discussion. I think back to the reason that we ask for connectivity between developments and I don't personally believe that this rises to that need that you connect the two subdivisions because you've got connectivity between several outs between Lynaugh and CR9. One of the main purposes for connectivity is to provide multiple access points to a development even if there were a cul-de-sac at one point. You remember on Tuscany we left a stub in place for the next parcel north of there. That provided for connectivity to get back to Brownsville Rd through another subdivision if it should arise sometime in the future. In this case, it's such a short road I don't see a need to provide connectivity in that regard.

I believe my comment about the pedestrian connectivity is still something that I'd like to see to make sure we have access to the park from any of the developments proposed in the town if they are near parks. We have lots of sidewalks proposed here that connect one side to the other, up and down into the village, both sides of the road on CR9 which is good and one side of the road through the development. So I think we're pretty good there. I just want to make sure we get it as part of the project, to connect to the Harlan Fisher Park.

Chairman Santoro – I agree with Joe, I don't see a need for connectivity in this instance.

Ms. Zollo – I think pedestrian connectivity is a minimum. It's unfortunate that we don't have the village project moving forward bringing that connectivity. I think it's something that we should be striving for but with this new plan, there's no opportunity for that. But again, this is just a concept plan.

Mr. Cantwell – I don't think I have anything to add to that other than the fact to reiterate that as Mr. Logan had pointed out there are sidewalks being shown within the dedicated road right away on the eastern portion of the town, all the way through. The applicant is also committed to providing a sidewalk from the entrance in a southerly direction all the way down Church St and ultimately to connect to East Parkway and that's off site as well so in that way there is the connectivity between this site and along the east side of Church St.

Mr. Logan- If that parcel doesn't get developed in the Village, are you still prepared to put a sidewalk down towards the village on the east side of CR9 because you'll have a short distance of sidewalk doing nothing until you get down to Hillcrest.

Mr. Cantwell – Mr. Gullace just indicated that if it was a condition of the approval of the project then it would be accommodated.

Mr. Pettee – I don't have any other items to be discussed. One of the items was going to be the architecture but I know that you've got some new architectural renderings in front of you tonight. I had not anticipated that the applicant would bring a discussion piece and maybe they meant to have that as a discussion piece amongst themselves and not necessarily for the Planning Board, I'm not quite sure. So with the concept plan that hasn't been officially proposed and hasn't been

provided to the town for review, I'm wondering how that might play into this process going forward. I don't know if we're going to see that as a proposed site plan that replaces what was provided to us in February 2018.

Mr. Gallina – Without looking at the draft for discussion purposes, my comment when you handed out the architectural renderings was that, first of all they look good but in my mind assuming that we were looking at the latest proposal that most of these renderings weren't relevant because they were essentially all 4 unit, front load garages. However, as you began to share your draft talking points, my concept was fewer units, mix in more 3 units to break up some of the massing and maybe more end load garages which is exactly what you're proposing. So conceptual, I like the direction that you've moved to.

Mr. Logan – I'll echo Al's comments about the quality of the architecture. I think they are very nice looking buildings, they're not imposing vertically, massing is better with the concept that you've brought forward this evening. I want to step back to the sidewalk question, I think it may have been premature for me to ask for putting sidewalks on the east side of the road on the village parcel because there are no sidewalks south of there until you get to East Parkway. So even if we have you extend the sidewalk across the village parcel that you're proposing, there's nothing beyond that. You may want to take a look at your plan to assure that's corrected.

Mr. Cantwell – Actually, I know it's been a long time since we first submitted but at the time that we did propose both the town and the village piece, we were proposing to connect to East Parkway and that is shown on the plan.

Ms. Zollo – I actually had in my notes what Al said. I was looking at the elevations that we got and saying that there was no place for the side load garages unless we reduced the number of units to provide for that. If this is the direction that you are going, that certainly improves things. What is the height of the bldgs?

Mr. Cantwell – To the peak approximately 30 ft.

Mr. Picciotti – I was just mentioning to Kim and Wes, the concept plan is out here and some of the Board members have weighed in on it but it seems to me we ought to get a straw poll which is unofficial but to get an input from each of the members and I think perhaps only a couple have actually weighed in to the extent of all of the caveats of the concept plan, we know there's plenty. What is the reaction to this from each of our members?

Mr. Gallina – As I previously stated, I think smaller units and adding a richer mix of end loading garages is certainly a positive development. The count went from 67 to 62 is certainly a favorable proposal from my perspective.

Mr. Seiter – I agree, I think the concept plan you have here is much more appealing than what we've been looking at.

Mr. Logan – I'll echo those comments. We requested that there be duplexes on the west side, you did what was asked and I think that's great. On the east side, reducing the massing is also

preferable. I like the cul-de-sac that I believe is town dedicated so there is a lot less demand on the residents for maintenance on the road system in that concept as well. It's a less costly HOA I believe with that type of concept as well. Overall, I would support where you are going with this.

Chairman Santoro – We know that it's just a concept plan but I think you've heard what we have to say and in past meetings too. That 1 four unit doesn't bother me where it is, it's out of the way, nobody is going to see it from the west side of the project. That's my feeling.

Ms. Zollo – I think I just expressed my views a few minutes ago.

Ms. Templar – So what I'm hearing is everyone is in favor of this concept plan.

Mr. Pettee – I don't have anything further. It sounds like we might be waiting for the applicant to make the next move in providing fully engineered plans perhaps for what they've provided on February 20th or what we have in front of us tonight. At that point, the Town Engineer would review anything that is provided to the town that you want us to look at and we would provide comments on that.

Mr. Knauf – On the traffic calming, is that something that we would fund and then the County would install them. We can't just go and put up signs on the public road, can we?

Mr. Picciotti stated he would look into that and get back to Mr. Knauf.

Ms. Zollo – Do you have any idea at this point as far as your grading plan, how much cut and fill you're going to have to do? I recall some of the residents on the west side of the project discussing the steep slopes and their concern about how far you're going to have to go into that hill over there. Do you have any answers for us about that? (No) No rough number, cubic yards? (No)

Mr. Picciotti – I would say on that Heather, that's something that we ought to be able to have a pretty affective condition in place in terms of the Conservation Board weighing in and of course the Town Engineer in terms of what would be acceptable to us.

Chairman Santoro asked for any additional questions or comments from the group and there were none. Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion was made by Joe Logan seconded by Al Gallina RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Cathy Templar, Secretary