

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on August 28, 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,

ABSENT: Rich Seiter

OTHERS: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer Consultant; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; Cathy Templar, Secretary; Councilman Mike Guinan, Town Board Liaison; Eric Harnischfeger, David Nankin, David Houch, Lee Wagar, Peter Battisti, Charlene Berry Pickering, Gerald Pickering, Scott Morrell, David & Kate Shuey, Jeff Morrell, Marie Barbi, William Whitbeck, Walt Baker, Dave & Gloria Schond, Kristin Moore, Steve Philippone

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

- Ken Curry re: Gullace Project
- Ruth Nellis re: Gullace Project
- Diane Bold re: Gullace Project

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Joe Logan, seconded by Al Gallina

RESOLVED that the minutes of July 10, 2018 be approved.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Absent at 7/10 meeting
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Absent

Approved 3 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention

On motion of Joe Logan, seconded by Heather Zollo

RESOLVED that the minutes of August 14, 2018 be approved.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Aye
Al Gallina	Absent at 8/14 meeting
Rich Seiter	Absent

Approved 3 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention

BOARDS & COMMITTEE UPDATES

Town Board – Councilman Guinan had nothing to report

Planning Board reported by Kim Kinsella

- 9/11/18 meeting
 - Decision on the Gullace Project consisting of 62 for-sale condominium townhomes.
 - Public Hearings
 - Dorchester Park – Section 2 – Soil Removal off of Bradhurst St.
 - Scout Reserve Subdivision off of Lane Rd – final step for 7 lots
 - Engebrecht, Jeff – lands surrounding 7980 Main Street Fishers to do grading to put in a second pond and increase size of existing pond

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.

RAETZ, RANDY

7160 Gillis Rd

Appl No 20-SP-18

Owner - Randy Raetz

Acres – 1.90

Zoned – Residential

SBL# 6.04-2-39.000

Applicant is requesting approval to demo existing garage and construct a 1416 sf pole barn to be constructed in the same location in back yard.

Mr. David Hauck from Irondequoit addressed the Board.

Mr. Raetz – Good evening. I represent Randy Raetz. The demolition has taken place. The old garage has been removed and we are ready for the new pole barn which will be delivered on September 21st with approval and a permit.

Chairman Santoro asked for public comment and there were none.

Ms. Zollo – What’s the purpose for the barn?

Mr. Hauck – They would like to purchase a couple of vintage cars and basically use it as storage at this point.

Ms. Zollo – Ok, just storage, no work in it.

Mr. Hauck – Put the lawnmower down there, rakes, shovels, cars that they don’t want to put on the road in the winter.

Ms. Zollo – OK thank you.

Mr. Logan – I have no problem with this.

Mr. Gallina had no questions.

Chairman Santoro – Will there be electric there? (None at this point, no) How about plumbing? (No) Is it going to be occupied by people? (No)

Mr. Logan – Climate control or heating or anything like that?

Mr. Hauck – No, just a plain pole barn. There was a question in regards to the driveway going down there. There is a slope and I had mentioned that I would bring some photos in so that you could see what they’ve done to it and submit them.

Chairman Santoro – We have a comment from the Town Historian and she has no objection to the demolition of your barn.

Mr. Hauck passed out photos of the area.

Chairman Santoro asked for any other comments and there were none. Chairman Santoro asked for a motion to close the public hearing. A motion was made by Joe Logan, seconded by Heather Zollo.

RESOLUTION

On motion made by Al Gallina, seconded by Joe Logan

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

1. A site plan application was received on July 24, 2018 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for Randy Raetz.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to demo existing garage and construct a 1408+/- sf pole barn with an average height of 14'6" in same location in back yard.
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 August 24, 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 Conservation Board reviewed the project on August 21, 2018 and had no concerns with what was presented.
7. The Town Historian reviewed the application on July 30, 2018 and had no objection to the demolition of existing barn.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on August 28, 2018 and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, Raetz Barn will not have a significant impact on the environment and that a negative declaration be prepared.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Randy Raetz entitled Raetz Barn, received by the Planning Board Secretary July 24, 2018, Planning Board Application No. 20-SP-18, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That the comments in a letter dated August 21, 2018 from the Code Enforcement Officer be addressed.
2. That a demolition permit be obtained from the Building Dept.
3. That a building permit be obtained from the Building Dept before construction begins.
4. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
5. Should an underground stream be encountered during construction, the Developer is to address the encroachment and impact to the underground stream to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

6. The building design plan shall be consistent with the architectural details and color received by the Planning Board July 24, 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	Absent

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Nays

HARNISCHFEGER, OTTO

309 Fishers Road

Appl No 21-SP-18

Owner – Otto Harnischfeger

Acres – 2.70

Zoned – Limited Development District

SBL #5.02-2-3.110

Applicant is requesting approval to construct a 1440 sf barn and is located in the Limited Development District.

Mr. Eric Harnischfeger addressed the Board.

Mr. Harnischfeger - Good evening. I'm representing my brother Otto tonight. He is requesting approval for a 40' x 30' cold storage shed. It will have a metal roof, black in color. The front will have cobblestone to about 4 ft up. The rest of the structure will be mineral board siding, darker gray with white trim and accents. There is no electric or plumbing in the structure and the purpose is to store lawn furniture, lawn mowers and bicycles and so forth.

Chairman Santoro asked for public comments and there were none. Chairman Santoro asked for a motion to close the public hearing. A motion was made by Joe Logan, seconded by Heather Zollo.

Ms. Zollo and Mr. Gallina had no comments.

Mr. Logan – I'm looking at the aerial and it seems the driveway off of the road keeps going past where you intend to put the barn, there was an existing building there and it goes to....

Mr. Harnischfeger – No it doesn't go beyond the circle drive.

Mr. Logan – Okay, it looks like it keeps going on to the other property behind your house.

Mr. Harnischfeger – There is no formal road there. The driveway itself, the stone driveway is circular and it leads right to the front of the house.

Mr. Logan – Okay, I was just curious because it looks like the road went by several properties. I have no problem with this. The building elevation that you show is a little different to what you described. You talked about cobblestone up 4 ft.

Mr. Harnischfeger referred to a picture of a barn that the Board members had in their packet.

Mr. Logan – I have nothing further.

Chairman Santoro referring to the picture that was in the packet – You have this marked out where the building will go?

Mr. Harnischfeger – Yes sir, there are posts there and you can see where the outline of the building will be.

Chairman Santoro – Will there be any trees taken down? (No sir). That’s all I have.

RESOLUTION

On motion made by Al Gallina, seconded by Heather Zollo

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

1. A site plan application was received on July 24, 2018 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for Otto Harnischfeger.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to construct a 1440+/- sf barn.
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 August 24, 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 Conservation Board reviewed the project on August 21, 2018 and has recommended silt fence be placed between the construction area and stream.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on August 28, 2018 and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, Otto Harnischfeger Barn will not have a significant impact on the environment and that a negative declaration be prepared.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Otto Harnischfeger entitled Otto Harnischfeger Barn, received by the Planning Board Secretary July 24, 2018, Planning Board Application No. 21-SP-18, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That the comments in a letter dated August 21, 2018 from the Code Enforcement Officer be addressed.
2. That a building permit be obtained from the Building Dept before construction begins.
3. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
4. Should an underground stream be encountered during construction, the Developer is to address the encroachment and impact to the underground stream to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
5. The building design plan shall be consistent with the architectural details received July 24, 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	Absent

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Nays

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

PIPER MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

860 High Street & 870 High St

Zoned Residential 1 w/C overlay

Owner – 860 Andrew Glasgow (20.40 acres) & 870 Glenn Piper (20.6 acres)

Applicant is proposing for sale townhouses (duplexes) and single family homes on the combination of both parcels. Applicant is presenting 3 options and appearing informally before the Board for direction and feedback.

Jeff Morrell addressed the Board along with Scott Morrell.

Mr. Jeff Morrell – I would like to draw your attention to Option 2 view in your packets that have been presented because that is the project that we're moving forward with. We had an excellent site walk with the Conservation Board just to confirm where the natural features were on the community and review topography, wetlands, etc., SEQR related elements.

In essence, the project consists of 2 parcels, a little over 20 acres for each parcel. Its 41 acres in total. It's originally the Glasgow residence and the Piper residence and they've owned the land for well over 20 years now. Their properties was originally farmed and in actual fact, where we laid out the community is actually where the property was originally farmed. So from a topography perspective, the contours and the layout of the community is all in the areas that are "flat" and from a natural feature perspective, there is a draw that goes basically right down the middle in between the two properties and that consists of the bulk of the open space that we're presenting. The project will certainly meet the 50% plus open space requirement.

So what we're proposing is actually two product offerings. The first is the single family residential community consisting of 14 homes in total plus the existing home on the property. The existing home can be shown in the large lot towards the front of High Street which would be Lot 14. We're maintaining that as a 2 acre plus parcel.

There are two existing homes on the property. This is the Glasgow residence and this is the Piper residence. (Mr. Morrell pointed these out on the overhead screen) This is why it's called Piper Meadows as a community. The project consists of this on a single family residential basis where we've laid these homes out that are already in the existing fully cleared area. Those lots have 100 ft of frontage, anywhere between .4 and .5 acres. The reason why we did a single family community here in addition to the market need was also to blend in with the existing single family residence that is a large colonial on this acreage and there's a barn to its immediate east.

The Piper residence sits here and this is actually a first floor master designed cap style home fronting High Street. What we've done here in the original area that was farmed (pointing out on the overhead screen), this was a large corn field that was in operation over 20 years ago, it has since filled in. We've basically followed suit with doing an empty nester community in this section consisting of 2 unit townhomes and the entire application would be under 278 Clustering Provision application.

So these 2 unit townhomes sit here, terminating into a cul-de-sac and the remaining part of the project is dedicated open space. As I mentioned with regards to the contours and elevations, this is all sitting on a flat area. This entire area is sitting on a plateau, flat area so there's very little grade change to take place within these two areas of development. Then we cross over from one to the next through a small drop here, about a 6 ft elevation change, where we come down and back up to entertain the empty nester homes.

We are proposing everything as the zoning suggests. It's a R1 zoning and a C density overlay so it's 41 units in total, less the 2 existing homes, so we're proposing 39 new homes in total.

Option 1 just to briefly mention was all in a single family residential component and we basically always believed that two markets in Victor are very strong. We have the high school immediately across the street so we know we have a strong single family residential market. Again, that was more in keeping with the existing home structure. We also have a number of empty nesters from our experience with Silverton Glenn that also would like to see the grandkids at the Friday night football game. So we think the project would be very popular.

As I said, we walked it with the Conservation Board, highlighted where the environmental features are. We completely removed our project from the environmentally sensitive areas specifically wetlands or steep slopes, we're not building on any of those components and we're doing the minimal amount of clearing. This entire area is already fully cleared and this existing area, as I mentioned, was previously farmed so the undergrowth there is less of mature nature.

So with that, we'd like to move forward with a formal application of Option 2 and are looking for any additional Board comments. The project has full access to sewer, water, gas & electric. It was placed in the C density overlay for a reason because it is in a corridor that supports both the infrastructure and the density. Again, we have access and multiple points of access of sewer routes, water and gas & electric are all right at the road.

With that I'm open to any additional comments and we'll take those into our application process.

Mr. Logan – I was looking at the cul-de-sac requirements and it looks like you've met those. It fits the site and it looks like you're trying to save as many trees as possible in a conservation area, so that's positive. Then the least impact on the grading around the property by following the plateaus. It's quite a few homes coming out in one entry, so I'll be interested to see how engineering shapes up for that, sight distances and all of that. It looks like its pretty good. You've got a stop sign on High St so I'd say it's not too much of a problem entering High St from this development. How many in total, 41?

Mr. Morrell – 41 including the 2 existing so 39 in total.

Mr. Logan – So you're less than 25 on a cul-de-sac for the doubles and the same with the small cul-de-sac on site. So I think you've come up with a pretty good fit for the density on the site.

Mr. Gallina – I certainly agree with all of Joe's comments. I think the one thing just knowing that that Lane and High St intersection is a very high traffic, problematic intersection that I certainly would like to have our traffic consultant weigh in on the implications to that conception. Other than that, no questions or comments.

Ms. Zollo – Is the entrance going to be where the existing driveway is now?

Mr. Morrell – That's a great question. It is very, very similar to where the existing driveway is at this position but what we've done is that driveway fads a little bit to the right to come in here, we're basically following the contours a little bit to the left because we know that we want to come in off of the dedicated street into the driveway. So yes, to the entrance point but the road follows just a little bit off of it as proposed.

Ms. Zollo – Okay so it's not exactly where the driveway is but close.

Mr. Morrell – But very close, correct. I think the entry point, just for a reference point, I believe it's almost on it at the entry point.

Mr. Logan – You don't expect any utility issues with that driveway being where it is, you just leave them in the ground. Do they follow the driveway on that house?

Mr. Morrell – The utilities are all to the far right and actually the current parcel is on a septic system so we'd be disconnecting that septic system and putting in public sewer access to the facility. So as a company, we basically are under contract. The Glasgow family has been a long time resident of Victor. Actually, I spoke to them 20 years ago when we were doing Quail Ridge. Their children have moved to the Denver area so that is where they will reside. So we're going to basically repurpose the home and update it and include it for sale. Then the Piper residence, Dr. Piper is staying in residence so we've carved out a 2 acre parcel for him.

Mr. Logan – His driveway stays the same, is that correct?

Mr. Morrell – Exactly the same. There would be no change at all other than striking a new boundary line. He owns the parcel that goes from here to here so we'd be basically coming to the back of him and striking a 2 acre parcel for the Piper residents.

Ms. Zollo – I would like to hear what our Fire Marshal has to say about the access just because even though you've drawn 2 cul-de-sacs it's really one entrance off of High Street and with that many residences I think it might be difficult, that's why we have that number on a cul-de-sac. So I would definitely like to hear what the Fire Marshal has to say about access to those properties. That's all I have right now.

Chairman Santoro – These are going to be for sale, right?

Mr. Morrell – 100% for sale, yes.

Chairman Santoro – Is there going to be an HOA?

Mr. Morrell – There will be yes. In an instance like this, we would actually be creating 2 HOAs. One a De Minimis CPS 6 filing to cover the open space elements on a single family residential side. Then a full filing for the townhome units with the Attorney General's office because of the common shared wall, roofs, etc.

Chairman Santoro – Do you have any particular styling at this time?

Mr. Morrell – The styling of the colonials are relatively typical or basically it's a New England style colonial that we'd be constructing. What we can submit to the Board because the 2 unit townhomes, the nice thing about that is it's a much smaller unit in total and it's going to be Arts & Crafts in its styling.

Chairman Santoro – What’s the approximate square footage of the single family homes?

Mr. Morrell – The single family residential would range approximately 2400 sf to about 3,000 sf averaging about 2800 sf in total. The home on the property at the moment is about 3800 sf, so it’s a very large colonial. So our expectation is that would be approximately the range.

Chairman Santoro – How about the duplexes?

Mr. Morrell – The duplexes would be between 1700 sf and 1850 sf as an end unit. They would all be first floor master design homes.

Chairman Santoro – Just one floor?

Mr. Morrell – All single story, correct.

Chairman Santoro – Any basements?

Mr. Morrell – Full basements.

Chairman Santoro – The single family homes, one story or two?

Mr. Morrell – The single families would be 2 story colonials.

Mr. Logan – Sidewalks, since you are near the school, we would expect to see sidewalks on this development plan tie into the sidewalks on High Street.

Mr. Morrell – Absolutely, there’s not a project that we’ve constructed where we don’t make the community highly walkable. We would anticipate sidewalks throughout the community. We also anticipate a trail network in the open space.

Ms. Zollo – The sidewalks are on the other side of High St, correct? (They are) So you’re not going to run sidewalks on the opposite side too, are you?

Mr. Morrell – No we weren’t planning that, these would be all internal sidewalks through the community.

Mr. Gallina – It might be good to contemplate some type of safe pedestrian crossing there.

Ms. Zollo – Yes, I’m just visualizing this in the morning and what a nightmare. I don’t know if you drive that road in the morning, but as Al said, that four way stop is difficult and traffic gets backed up all the way to the Thruway underpass and beyond to the school entrance. So having a crosswalk would make it really fun!

Mr. Logan – Wes is there a speed limit reduction application that we should be looking at at some point with this stretch of road?

Mr. Pettee – I think maybe there's potential for something like that. We can look into that along with Jennifer (Michniewicz) from Clark Patterson Lee. It's certainly something to talk about.

I do have a couple of things to ask. It looks like this would be a major subdivision. Would this be done in phases, like a preliminary overall and then maybe submitting a final subdivision plans in two different phases or is it all one?

Mr. Morrell – No, it would be done as a phased project. We would begin with a single family residential as the first phase and then do the townhomes as a second phase.

Mr. Pettee – Also, it looks like there is a dashed line maybe for some sort of a drive on the south lot line of the Piper residence. It almost looks like it would intersect with your proposed roadway.

Mr. Morrell – That's right. We fully understand High Street. We know High Street, we've constructed on High Street a number of times. What we did, just to make sure from a code compliance perspective or even from a future proofing perspective, we made sure that we reserved a 60 ft right of way in this position. Should the town ever need any type of secondary access or entry position because of the total number of homes, we don't anticipate, especially since we're doing empty nesters as well which is off beat distributor traffic and it's a much lower profile. Actually 60% or more is that product type. We don't anticipate our ADTs to be of a significance to warrant that but we wanted to make sure from a planning perspective, we would at least have a reserved right of way and a secondary position.

Mr. Pettee – With regards to sanitary sewers, this looks like this portion of the town actually drains to the Village's wastewater treatment plant. So as Town Engineer, we don't have a lot of information about the Village's system, so we might require some coordination with the Village wastewater treatment plant and their folks. It looks like the sewer would drain down the hill on Lane Rd towards Route 96, eventually get pumped across the road to a pump station across from Victor Chevrolet and then pumped to the Village.

Mr. Morrell – Our engineer, I'm sure, through the preliminary process would be reviewing capacity issues, etc.

Mr. Logan – So on the note of the alternative access, the one that you're holding in reserve, it looks like there is a lot of road that is connecting one side to the other, across the ravine. You could probably eliminate all of that and just have two entrances to your development, one entrance to the doubles and the other entrance to the singles.

Mr. Morrell – That would be correct and we would be accepting of that as well if that were a design issue. I think it was more a function of balancing the curb cuts and access points on High St, given our traffic counts, with the needs of the town. So if you directed us from a planning and engineering perspective to have that as a single entry point, I would be more than happy to consider it.

Mr. Logan – I guess I'd like to look at the impact differences between the two. You could make that more of a curvilinear road with the cul-de-sac on the one side. It looks like you have less

than 25 single family homes on that one side. So taking away that connection and just steering off of the road, I don't know if the Pipers would object to that. Have you discussed that possibility with them that there could be a road there?

Mr. Morrell – We have and a matter of fact, the purpose of that right of way was to insure that the discussion took place with the land owner and current residents.

Mr. Logan – Honestly, I would personally prefer seeing that option than having that long connector piece in between. It would reduce the number of cars coming in and out of a particular single point entry for that site plus emergency wise, it seems to me it would be cleaner with fewer houses along, especially fewer cars along the one drive and less risk of a problem blocking entry/exit from an emergency in front of that development. So I would say, as you're coming forward let's at least look at both of those as we're studying this.

Mr. Morrell – Okay, we can present that as a new Option 1 and 2 and demonstrate the pluses/minuses to both of those approaches.

Mr. Logan – I think I'd like to see that, I don't know how everybody else feels. It looks like it would be a good viable alternative and one that might benefit the development. You wouldn't have the crossing of the ravine, I'll call it that, it wasn't that deep you said. So it would keep it more open for a conservation easement, it could flow up that way to the road rather than cutting it off. I'd like to see that continuity through that area if possible to retain that.

Chairman Santoro – Do you have a price point yet?

Mr. Morrell – We don't. So I would be guessing at this point. On the colonials, I would anticipate those would be \$350,000 on up. On the duplexes, I would anticipate in the low \$300,000.

Chairman Santoro asked for any other comments/questions from the Board and there were none. Chairman Santoro asked the public for comments.

Mr. Pete Battisti from 915 High Street – I live across the street and one of my biggest concerns is the traffic. None of you live on High Street, you don't have to sit in your driveway and watch the traffic go by. This is going to generate more traffic and that doesn't take into account Fishers Ridge and anything else going up there. The road is only so big. That's my concern.

Chairman Santoro – We'll have our traffic consultant look at that.

Mr. Battisti – The other thing is the four way stop, that's a joke. It's a four way "suggestion"! You need a traffic signal there. First of all I don't know what's being taught in Driver's Ed but when I was taught, you stopped at the stop sign and the next person goes in line. It's just a tap and go right now. So it's dangerous, that's all I'm saying.

Chairman Santoro – Thank you, anyone else?

Ms. Marie Barbi from 869 High Street, directly across from this proposed development. I too would like to speak on the traffic issue. I can wait 20 minutes in my driveway in the morning, at night after a basketball game, after a concert, it's a safety issue. The speed limit on High St; if the traffic isn't bad, people are speeding down the street as they use it, as you all know, connecting easier from 96 to Eastview. Secondly, a question regarding the wild life. I know they had said that Conservation reviewed it but there is an awful large amount of deer population in that area. Again, to me it certainly would impact that. There are 8 to 12 deer every night eating at that home, we call it the "buffet".

Secondly, I'm concerned but maybe not justifiably so about the water and the sewer and the drainage and rain and flooding. Living across the street, sometimes water backs up from one of the ponds that is on the other side of our home. As you face our home, we have a pond on the right and a pond on the left coming from the back area where the wetlands are. We can get overflow water creeping up to our property from the pond on the left.

Chairman Santoro – In regards to the pond, our Town Engineer will do a study on that.

Ms. Barbi – Thank you. The last question, I was wondering if there was going to be any multiple dwelling, like a clubhouse or anything included in that.

Chairman Santoro – I don't see anything on the drawing.

Ms. Barbi – Okay, thank you

Chairman Santoro – Anybody else?

Mr. Bill Whitbeck – I also live at 869 High St. I'm not going to beat a dead horse, the traffic there is terrible at that intersection. Three times a day, in the morning as you said, 3:00 the traffic backs up from that stop sign, past our house. Then as Marie said, at 10:00/9:30 after events, again, past our house. The Ontario County Sheriff's do sit in our driveway with radar occasionally, but as she said, unless it's a busy day, it's Indianapolis 500, people cutting through. I think you've done a nice job in the presentation, I would want to know possibly if you've ever considered....do these properties back up to 96?

Chairman Santoro – Well, there is a large drop off there behind Victor Chevrolet.

Mr. Whitbeck – We don't know what's going on with Fishers Ridge but if they could ever go to 96 and put a light in because again, the traffic from Lane Road and that light is still there. I'm just bringing it up if they came in from 96.

Chairman Santoro – I don't think they can do that.

Mr. Whitbeck – I'm just asking because like I say, I think you've done a nice job. I like what I see but the traffic there from that stop sign is so bad.

Chairman Santoro – Anyone else?

Ms. Kate Brennan-Shuey from 7135 Marshal Trail which is several houses down and down a private drive. I don't know where in this process we are right now in terms of the size of the parcels but I would like to personally see a parcel of land that is much larger than .4 or .5 acres. We have kept to 2 acres for a lot of our parcels in the area and I think it's a good idea to stay with that idea. I don't know, again, where in the process I am on this.

Chairman Santoro – Well this is the first time we've seen it. This is the initial discussion.

Ms. Brennan-Shuey – Alright, great. So that's my feeling on that. I agree with the traffic problems, that people go too fast down in there and I would love to see an evaluation too of the speed limit. There is a flashing light down a ways, closer to my street but I don't think it's enforced very well for people to slow down in that area. So those are my concerns.

Chairman Santoro – I think he said those lots are going to be 100 ft wide and how deep?

Mr. Morrell's statement was inaudible.

Chairman Santoro – So that's about one-half an acre?

Mr. Morrell statement was inaudible.

Ms. Zollo – And how large are the parcels for the duplexes?

Mr. Morrell – So the single family residentials are approximately 100 ft wide and approximately 180 ft deep, roughly .4 of an acres. The 100 ft wide is obviously to accommodate the ability to side load garages and have a more attractive front elevation. The 2 unit townhomes are approximately 100 ft wide in total and approximately 80 ft deep and that includes the 20 ft behind the lot as a small patio area.

Just in response to the prior neighbor, obviously the purpose and objective is to preserve large blocks of open space. You can actually see in Option 1, even though it's not noted, this entire project is single family residential community with the same number of units as Option 2. This portion remains exactly as is in this second schematic but you can see the reduction in the road length as well as the disturbance of the environmental areas with the same number of units. This cul-de-sac would actually extend to here with a larger lot configuration with the same number of homes. So this is just a small example of the impact of the clustering that is provided by doing the 2 unit townhomes.

Chairman Santoro – Thank you.

Ms. Charlene Barry-Pickering from 7251 Lane Road – My first question of this Board, did the conservation easement which I believe was on this parcel, has it expired?

Chairman Santoro – They don't expire.

Mr. Morrell – Yes, one has expired and one is in the process of expiring.

Ms. Kinsella – It's a term conservation easement, it's not a conservation easement that was placed by the Planning Board, it was through the assessment to have a break with the assessment for their taxes.

Chairman Santoro – If we approve an easement, it's permanent as far as permanent can be. But this is a different kind.

Mr. Morrell – The issue that you are speaking about is a tax abatement program which has termed out and what we would be putting on the property in open space configuration would be a permanent conservation easement and open space for all open space lands.

Ms. Barry-Pickering – So one has termed out and the second is about to term out?

Mr. Morrell – One is termed out and the second one is to be termed out. Third, I'll respond to the phasing and timing of the project. The Glasgow's are not moving until the later part of next year so we would not be closing on this project until the end of 2019 and really looking to do development in the 2020/2021 time frame.

Ms. Barry-Pickering – My second would be to echo what we've already heard about, the traffic and the speed on High St. I was happy to hear Mr. Logan talk about sidewalks for this area. It's critical for health and wellness of our residents. Thirdly and I'm sure this is down the road, the lighting pollution. My property backs up to this on the Lane Rd side so I am of course very interested in the lighting protection. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro – Anyone else? I thank you all.

The discussion ended at this point.

DUNBAR HILL SUBDIVISION

Lane Road

Zoned - Residential

Owner – RB Land Company LLC

Acres – 4.70

SBL # 15.00-1-51.300

Applicant has submitted a revised plan for a 4 lot single family residential clustered subdivision and is requesting direction from the Board.

Walt Baker from DSB Engineers & Architects addressed the Board

Mr. Baker – With me tonight is the owner of the property Mr. Steve Philippone. As the Board may recall, we've been in front of you before for the same property, for the 4 lot subdivision with a dedicated road but there were some issues with the corner lot being 200 ft x 200 ft due to the fact that it was a corner lot and the difficulty with the width of the property wouldn't accommodate those two frontage lots and a 60 ft dedicated right of way.

So we went back and had discussions with the Town Staff and took a look at the plan that we're presenting now. It's still 4 lots, however, they meet the criteria for the 200 ft frontage and then two flag lots. The Town Code has a definition for flag lots, however, there isn't anything numerated in the residential district for flag lots so according to the Code Enforcement Officer we needed to come in front of the Planning Board basically, calling it a clustered development in order to have the two flag lots. We do have the flag lots meeting the minimum 20 ft width for the flag and obviously, that would be private drives. The two lots in the back, the dash line that you see on there is the 50% conservation line which is required for the project. The dash line that I mention goes around the back which requires half of the property at 50% conservation easement.

We have met with the Conservation Board. As the Board will recall, there's a pond on the adjacent properties and there is an area here that has been flagged and delineated as wetland and we're preserving that as we did in the previous application.

So tonight we're here for a discussion and direction on the approval for a cluster for the the 4 lots.

Ms. Zollo – I don't have any questions.

Mr. Logan – I'm just looking at the aerial around that. I don't know if it's a coincidence that you guys are coming in when there's a 41 lot subdivision coming in across High St.

Mr. Baker – No coincidence at all. We thought we'd be done by now.

Mr. Logan – So the folks that live across from that will also be living behind this particular one. I expect they would have something to say as well. This development is fortunate to be on Lane Road, although, it can get busy but not like High Street, you have that 4 way stop. I don't have too much difficulty with what you're proposing now versus what came before. I always get curious about this two driveway situations where you have one guy plowing his driveway off to one side and the other one....there's not much room between them and that's the problem that I'm having. Is there only 5 ft or less between the two pavement sections?

Mr. Baker – Roughly it's about 8 ft.

Mr. Logan - That just seems awfully close. Even if you go with a 10 ft driveway, you've got 5 ft on either side, maybe you'll have 10 ft between the two. Is that enough for snow storage or you'd be putting it on the other lots next to that. Was there a consideration to making this a common driveway between the two and then peeling off?

Mr. Baker – Then you get into an association and I don't think Steven wants to do that. To share a driveway sometimes you run into issues of not wanting to maintain it.

Mr. Logan – I would be interested to hear Wes’ comments about the proximity of those two driveways or maybe even Code Enforcement Officer Al Benedict, whether we should look to spread them out a little bit more.

Mr. Baker – That’s a possibility, we do have ample area as you can see Lot 4 is 45,000 sf so we could widen out the driveway. The code said 20 ft minimum so that’s where the 20 ft came from.

Mr. Logan – That’s the only thing that I saw when I started to look at this. It seemed like the two driveways were crammed right next to each other and doesn’t seem to have a lot of room between them. Even if you looked at it as one of the drives that had an island in between the in/out in a larger subdivision, you could actually landscape between the two.

I guess I would say that the concept is fine, it just looks like the driveways are very close together. There could be some landscaping opportunities between the two if not, provide snow storage.

Mr. Philippone’s comments were inaudible due to not being at the microphone but stated they could make more room between the drives and put in some landscaping.

Mr. Logan – Yes, that’s my thought on that. Otherwise it looks like

Ms. Zollo -I’d like to hear what our engineers have to say about that many curb cuts, with the curb cuts across the street and the sight distances and so on.

Mr. Pettee – I don’t have any immediate reactions but that’s something that I can take back to my office and bring some formal comments back in the format of a letter.

Ms. Zollo – Then there’s always the possibility of 3 homes instead of 4 and that would eliminate Joe’s concern about the driveways.

Mr. Gallina – Just a question back to some of the debate that we were having the last time the applicant was before us on whether or not this qualified as a major subdivision, minor subdivision, an off shoot of a different subdivision. Have we got any kind of rendering on the status of that debate which would be a question that I’d like an answer to.

Then the second question was the question that Al Benedict raises around whether or not a variance is required to allow for less than 100 ft of road frontage. It appears as though we are looking to deviate from that strictly to allow 4 houses on the property versus that we’re really trying to preserve some high environmental quality area of the site. I just question whether or not that that is really an appropriate application for deviating from the 100 ft frontage. I think that’s it for now.

Chairman Santoro asked for any other questions or comments from the Board and there were none. Chairman Santoro asked for public comment even though this was not a public hearing and there wasn’t any.

Mr. Steve Philippone from Redstone Builders – We received some correspondence by email that we had the support of the Code Enforcement Officer with this plan and suggested that we pursue this as a cluster versus getting a zoning variance. So to me that seemed to be his support for this proposal.

Chairman Santoro – He did do that, he did say that.

Mr. Philippone – Ok, thank you.

Chairman Santoro – There is no resolution tonight. If you're going to move forward this is what it would have to be. I don't know what the vote will be but that's the only way it would go through, as a cluster.

Mr. Gallina – Assuming, again, that 4 houses is what the applicant wants to continue to pursue.

Mr. Baker – I guess we have direction. We're going to pursue the 4 lots. The minimum lot size for this zoning is 33,000 sf and we have 4.8 acres with 1 acre zoning because we have water and sewer available.

Chairman Santoro – Let's see if we can spread those driveways apart a little bit.

Mr. Baker – I think we can do that.

Mr. Gallina – The only thing and I guess I'm wordsmithing, but I wouldn't necessarily indicate that that's direction as much as you've heard the feedback from the Board. So you can interpret as you see appropriate.

Mr. Baker – Alright thanks.

The discussion ended at this point.

Motion was made by Joe Logan seconded by Heather Zollo RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Cathy Templar, Secretary

