

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on June 22, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

PRESENT: Ernie Santoro, Chairman; Joseph Logan, Vice-Chairman; Scott Harter; Al Gallina; Joe Limbeck

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer; Councilman Ed Kahovec, Suzy Mandrino, Confidential Secretary to the Town Supervisor; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; James Cretekos, Fred Rainaldi Jr., Walt Baker, Frank Affronti, Scott DeHollander, John Gerber, Lisa Boughton, Secretary

The meeting was opened, the Flag was saluted and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

On motion of Joe Logan, seconded by Scott Harter.

RESOLVED that the minutes of May 25, 2021 be approved.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Nays,

CORRESPONDENCE:

There were none.

BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Councilman Kahovec from the Town Board.

Councilman Kahovec – Next Monday at the Town Board meeting we are having a workshop at 6 pm regarding marijuana and cannabis because that will be coming up next as the state has okayed that and we will talk about dispensaries and what they mean and how that will affect Planning and Zoning and variety of other topics.

PLANNING BOARD reported by Lisa Boughton
Tuesday July 13, 2021

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- Frank Lill & Son Storage Yard, located at 785 Old Dutch Road, applicant is requesting approval to construct a 2-acre outdoor storage yard at the east end of the parcel for storage of piping and fittings.
- Guinan Major Subdivision, located at 6465 County Road 41, applicant is requesting **acknowledgement of a complete application** to subdivide the 112 acre parcel into two lots. Lot 1 will consist of 50 acres and Lot 2 will consist of 62 acres. This is the first step of a major subdivision and only acknowledgement of a completed application will be considered at this meeting.

The legal notice for the public hearings appeared in "The Daily Messenger" along with "Under Review" signs being posted on the subject parcels. Post Cards were mailed to property owners within a minimum of 500 ft from location for the initial public hearing date of each application. For applications carried over please refer to the Planning and Building Office.

REAPPROVAL

WOODS AT VALENTOWN RE APPROVAL

16-SP-2021

High Point Drive

Zoned – Planned Development District

Tax Map # 1.07-1-5.000

Owner – Woods at Valentown, LLC

Applicant is requesting re-approval to construct 288 for rent apartments within 12 buildings on 56.87 acres. The project will consist of underground parking and the buildings will be 3 stories for a maximum height of 48 feet. They received Planning Board approval on April 23, 2019.

James Cretkos of BME Associates and Fred Rainaldi Jr. of Woods at Valentown LLC

Mr. Cretkos – We are here to ask for reapproval for the Woods of Valentown because it has lapsed since we were here. You granted approval for the project on April 23, 2019 and then as of April 23, 2020 it was expired. I did not that in the letter of Intent that the plans were signed by the Chairman on June 19, 2020 so it was already after that one year period where we would have been required to pull a building permit for the project. Couple of reasons led to what was going on. If you recall back in the March and April of 2019 meetings we were in the process of coordinating between the Victor Fire Dept. and the water authority as well as the Department of Health on some of the backflow and pumping configurations that we needed to supply water to sections 2, 3, and 4 of the project site. That actually lapsed whole year of time going back and forth. We had to get the Health Dept. involved and forced the

hand on the water authority. The water authority was trying to include extra requirements above and beyond what was allowable in the state. Once we got that situated we were able to get the approvals and that is why we had not routed mylars to be signed until shortly before the date. That was right at the beginning of Covid as well. To get the plans signed here there was a little bit of back and forth and were coordinating with Kim Kinsella on that.

Mr. Logan – James you said what was allowable by the state or what was required by the state?

Mr. Cretkos – So basically the water authority was saying that we could not have a private pump station located behind the backflow device and had to be a bunch of different measures of security and a ton of things that they were putting all these requirements on the Health Department was “no, none of that is true and you just need to do what the local town Fire Department wants you to meet” It’s a private system and can do whatever they need to do for it. We were not trying to fight with the water authority we wanted to create something that was workable and usable between all entities of the town and the owner and the water authority that in case of emergency it has backups and security measures and that. It had to do with the number of apartment units being up onto of the hill. Once we worked thru that exactly and what we were going to do and the plan and procedure they were allowed to give us the approvals. We still need to go back to finalize details of the pumps but the approval in place for that and is in place for Section 1 and a typical RPZ backflow configuration.

Some of the other things we were waiting for to start the project was pump station 18 improvements. We obviously could not build a significant portion of our project until those had been completed. That delayed us with the initial stages. March of 2020 with Covid happening the market fluctuations went haywire, material prices have been fluctuating up and down and I know the Rainaldis want to have some high end architectural features in these buildings and a lot of the material cost of the stone and the wood, steel and with the prices going up we want to make sure the project is deliverable as we promised to the Board. With that too they have switched their focus to complete building 300 which has been well under way. There is no plans to deviate to the office park and the focus and the urgency changed a little bit. That is why we are looking to get reapproved. We would be looking to wrap up a lot of the back house stuff later this year and look to start construction in the year 2022 spring summer season.

I do not know if we are allowed to request a one year approval instead of having to come back in December and possibly again in March for the 3 month extensions. We would be happy to do that if there is not a mechanism in place to do that. I would be happy to get into the engineering details again if you have questions on that. We are basically going to send in the same mylars to have them redacted with same signatures of all agencies. We are proposing no changes to what you had approved in 2019. Fred will be happy to answer any questions building related.

Chairman Santoro – Pretty straight forward to me.

The Board had no objections.

RESOLUTION

Motion made by Scott Harter, seconded by Joe Limbeck.

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

1. Site Plan approval was granted by the Planning Board on April 23, 2019 for Woods at Valentown Site Plan, to construct twelve apartment buildings consisting of 288 for-rent apartment units, one clubhouse and associated amenities as depicted in the set of site plan drawings by BME Associates dated December 2018, last revised March 6, 2019, where development would be conducted within a project area of approximately 56.87-acres (the "Action").
2. In response to concerns expressed by the neighboring residential property owner to the southwest of Section 4, the Applicant has included an additional nine (9) White Fir evergreen trees that are intended to screen vehicle headlights from the existing residence, as was presented at the March 12, 2019 Planning Board meeting.
3. James Cretokos of BME Associates is requesting re-approval of the project on behalf of Woods at Valentown, LLC.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the request of James Cretokos of BME Associates, on behalf of Woods at Valentown, LLC, 205 St. Paul Street, Suite 210, Rochester, NY, for re-approval of site plan entitled Woods at Valentown, drawn by BME Associates, dated December 2018, last revised April 9, 2020, received by the Planning Board June 2, 2021, Planning Board Application No. 16-SP-2021, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

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

Ongoing conditions:

1. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standard Land Development, including Section 4.
2. Two-year maintenance bonds shall be provided by the Developer to the town for all improvements to be offered to the Town for dedication. Maintenance Bonds shall be

written by a surety licensed to do business in New York State and they shall be in the amount of ten percent (10%) of the final construction cost, as determined by the Engineer for the Town.

3. 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.
4. That a pre-construction meeting shall be held prior to the start of construction.
5. The building design plan shall be consistent with the architectural/landscape details as shown on the elevations and details drawn by Hanlon Architects and dated December 26, 2019 as discussed at the March 26, 2019 Planning Board meeting.
6. That no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for any building until such time that at least one of the following is met:
 - a. That an updated sanitary sewer conveyance system evaluation is performed by the Town Engineer, and the Town Engineer confirms in writing that the sanitary sewer conveyance system could accommodate anticipated flows for buildings where a Certificate of Occupancy is being sought, if said Certificate of Occupancy is sought prior to the completion and operation of the Town's 2018 Sanitary Conveyance Improvements Project (also known as the Auburn Trail Sanitary Sewer Project).
 - b. That upon written confirmation from the Town Engineer, the 2018 Sanitary Conveyance Improvements Project is on-line and operating, and that such confirmation indicates that sewer flows from the Woods at Valentown Project can be accommodated.

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

Chairman Santoro – James made a comment about a year approval versus 6 months.

Mr. Cretkos – Like I said we are planning on starting in the 2022 season so 6 months from now would put us into December. We would be happy to come back and ask for a 3 month extension.

Mr. Logan – Do we want to address that in this document so that they do not have to come back to the Board?

Chairman Santoro – Can we do it? My question and I do not know the answer.

Mr. Logan – Can we put a provision in that they could be ascertain by our Town Attorney?

Mr. Cretekos – We could meet you half way and come in for a six month extension in December.

Chairman Santoro – I do not know if we can do that.

Mr. Cretekos – If you guys will make it as easy as this was I will not have any issues coming back.

Mr. Logan – I wanted to make sure we addressed his remark. If we do not need to then fine.

Mr. Rainaldi - Ernie, I do not dislike your idea if there it is cop esthetic with law that it be determined that a council after this meeting if you deem appropriate would be a great piece of mind in light of everything that 12 months to get our affairs in order to start this project.

Chairman Santoro – Here is what we can do. We can have Kim get in touch with Town Attorney and see if this can be done. If it can be done what does the Board think about extending it a year?

Mr. Logan – I think the general consensus that this is a reasonable thing to do. I see nodding of heads. We can write in a provision if the Town Attorney agrees we put that into the resolution. If it not approved it is not approved and you come back in 6 months.

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

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed.

WILLOW RISE TOWNHOMES

McMahon Road
Tax Map # 28.36-2-1.000
Owner – Bella Estates LLC

07-FS-2021

Zoned – Multiple Dwelling

Applicant is requesting re-approval to create 45 residential townhomes on approximately 6.4 acres. Access drive known as Banjo Run is accessed from Erica Trail located in Ballerina Subdivision. They received Planning Board approval on September 22, 2020.

Walt Baker of DSB Engineers and Frank Affronti of Bella Estates LLC

Mr. Baker – We are here tonight for reapproval of the 45 townhomes. The Board is familiar with this site and started it how many years ago with apartment's project and converted to townhomes for sale. Obviously with the past events of the past year or so with the Covid situation and trying to get approvals we finally received our approval from NYS DEC. Things got a little slowed down with everyone's department and the Health Department. We exceeded the time period.

Chairman Santoro – As you have heard it has happened to others.

Mr. Logan – We have experienced it also with my firm.

Mr. Baker – Monroe County Health Department was not taking plans and were only taking pdf. They gave us approvals on projects and would only give us a little and would not sign the mylars. DEC I do have the official approval letter from them. We are working with the NYS Health Department to get that cleaned up and water authority will be ready sign once the Health department is ready.

Chairman Santoro – DO you want to have the same provision?

Mr. Baker – I read thru the draft. If we could. It might not hurt or we will be back in December as well.

Mr. Logan – What is your anticipated schedule?

Mr. Baker – We want to start as soon as possible. The engineers estimate has been submitted. BSP-5 is just chasing down the agencies.

Mr. Logan – The provision may be mute but I do not have an objection adding it in as well. I should say that this is an extraordinary event. I would not want to make this a habit. Getting past Covid and material shortages and whatever else that delays.

Mr. Limbeck – To Joe's point about this being a unique event. These are already prior submitted and approved and not being modified or altered at all. I do not think we are setting any precedent that we need to worry about.

RESOLUTION

Motion made by Joe Logan, seconded by Al Gallina.

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

1. Final Subdivision approval was granted by the Planning Board on September 22, 2020 for Willow Rise Townhomes Final Subdivision, to develop a clustered subdivision pursuant to NYS Town Law Section 278 and Article V of Chapter 184 of the Town of Victor Subdivision Regulations, which would create 45 residential townhomes within fifteen (15) buildings on approximately 6.4-acres (the "Project"), as fully detailed in the most recent subdivision plan drawings by DSB Engineers and Architects, P.C., last revised September 3, 2020.
2. The Project will be accessed via a private road constructed to Town of Victor Standards
3. The Town of Victor Code Enforcement Officer, provided a comment letter dated August 25, 2020, stating the conservation easement in this location is site specific. This conservation easement is interrupted by the right of way of Banjo Run as it continues on 6441 Erica Trail. The conservation easement language does not allow the construction of a fence in the conservation easement.
4. Pursuant to Section 27-8J of the Town Code, a recreation fee for each lot, or in the event of a multiple dwelling, a recreation for each family unit, in lieu of park land shall be paid to the Town before issuance of a building permit.
5. Walt Baker of D.S.B Engineers & Architects, P. C is requesting re-approval of the project on Behalf of Bella Estates, LLC.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the request of Walt Baker, D.S.B Engineers & Architects, 2394 Ridgeway Avenue, Suite 201, Rochester, NY, on behalf of Bella Estates, LLC, for re-approval of Major Subdivision entitled Willow Rise Townhomes, drawn by DSB Engineers, dated May, 2020 received by the Planning Board July 1, 2020, last revised September 3, 2020, received by the Planning Board June 7, 2021, Planning Board Application No. 07-FS-2021, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

Conditions to be addressed prior to the chairman's signature on the site 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 shall submit two (2) copies of electronic files to the Town. Copies of electronic files shall be forwarded to the Town Engineer to confirm that the data on the electronic files is the same as the approved subdivision plans.
3. That Section 4 Standard Approval Conditions for all Subdivisions (Major & Minor) of the Design and Constructions be met.

4. That the comments in a letter dated August 25, 2020 LaBella Associates be addressed.
5. That the comments from Zaretsky and Associates be addressed.

Ongoing conditions:

1. That the major subdivision comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standard Land Development, including Section 4.
2. Two-year maintenance bonds shall be provided by the Developer to the town for all improvements to be offered to the Town for dedication. Maintenance Bonds shall be written by a surety licensed to do business in New York State and they shall be in the amount of ten percent (10%) of the final construction cost, as determined by the Engineer for the Town.
3. 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).
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. That a pre-construction meeting shall be held prior to the start of construction.

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

Mr. Logan – With that amendment.

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

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

SCOUT PATH

03-PS-2021

Aldridge Road

Zoned – Residential 2

Tax Map # 16.00-1-2.120

Owner – DeHollander Design, Inc.

Applicant is requesting approval to subdivide the 8.84 acre parcel into five building lots ranging in size from .813 acres to 5.09 acres. The home locations will be accessed via two shared common driveways. Sketch plan was acknowledged on February 25, 2020.

Scott DeHollander of DeHollander Design

Mr. DeHollander – In formality here when I walked in I was surprised my neighbor from Dryer Road Scott Reinhart is here and I think he had an update from the trails committee. If it is ok he can come up.

Chairman Santoro – He can speak when you're done.

Mr. DeHollander – I am happy to be here tonight total about the Scout Path project. AS Ernie mentioned we were here 18 months ago and we completed the sketch plan process at that times. We have about 8.8 avers to work with here. If you recall at the sketch plan we went thru a process of evaluating the feasibility of a clustered subdivision and as part of that process we spent a meeting or to laying out a dedicated road and what the configuration of what the project could look like as a dedicated road project and yielded about 9 lots. I think there was good consensus at the time that while it was a doable project that it did not really meet the basis of design goals that we had for the project which were more of a minimal large lot configuration that utilized the existing infrastructure along Aldridge Road specifically the desirable sanitary sewer connection that exists there.

We are located in a R2 zoning with a C overlay which yields a 1 acre aggregate lot yield. At the 8.8 acres we are talking about a potential 8 lot subdivision. We have settled comfortably here with his configuration of 5 lots. The site is unique in that it is still a rural area but has the full utilities of sanitary sewer, water, gas and electric. Our approach here is to really respect that larger lot development that already exists in the area. As I mentioned to make use of what is accessible and existing infrastructure along Aldridge Road.

We have met with the Conservation Board thru a Zoom meeting a few weeks ago. We reviewed the configuration of the conservation easement and revisited the unique configuration where we are wrapping the conservation easement between the lots 1 and 2 and 5 and 4 to preserve the neutral tree buffer that exists today. I think that is evident as well by the conservation easements configuration to not only preserve the mature wooded areas but

also the steeper slopes that exists there. We have received the comments from the reviewing agencies and in particular the Town Engineer comments and Code comments. There are a bulk of technical issues that we will be working thru with those folks but I think there are three real foundational of design issues that we would talk about tonight and those revolve around the clustered subdivision and the driveway spacing that we are able to obtain with this configuration and the intermittent channel that aligns along the east boundary of the property.

It would be my hope that tonight can obtain some consensus on those three points that we can move forward with resolving the technical issues as I mentioned.

Chairman Santoro – We have some comments from LaBella.

Mr. Pettee – Do you want to open it to take comments from the public first?

Chairman Santoro – I think we all need to hear what you have to say first.

Mr. Pettee – ok we will do that. Labella did issue a letter dated June 21 and we do have some comments. Most of them are technical in nature. The second comment we made was in regards to the Access Management chapter of the Town Code which we have discussed in previous meetings on other projects. This is another example of where a waiver is being requested because of Section 55-6 paragraph D would seem to require 440 feet of separation distance between driveways. Given the existing zoning regulations for the R2 zoning district with minimal lot frontage being 100 feet it sometimes is difficult to achieve this 440 foot separation when you are out there on the more rural or even suburban residential streets. I do not really do not see an issue with that given some of the past practice that we have seen here at the Planning Board.

The riverine wetland we did note that there is an intermittent creek identified on the NWI mapper and those I guess are regulated by the US Army Corp of Engineers and there is a stormwater management facility adjacent to the intermittent creek and we want to be sure that the Army Corp of Engineers would not have an issue with the proximity of the stormwater management facility and be sure that they are not any permitting requirements that would need to be achieved prior to the development of the project.

With regard to the conservation easement I can point out our comment was more along the lines for the west side of the existing project parcel. There is a 10 foot wide conservation easement here along the boundary and it is fine and helps account for the 50% open space requirement that the town has. Is that the best placement for the easement, would you rather see the square footage in this area go to the back of one of the other lots. There are setback requirements for each zoning district and the side setback requirement here is 15 feet. Wondering if that is the best location for a conservation easement. Might be fine especially if the Conservation Board has already weighed in.

As far as Planning goes one of the notes for the common driveway detail and I am sure Mr. DeHollander has seen our comment is that the surface of the common driveway would not

need to be paved with asphalt until it serves greater than two homes and we noted the western most common driveway will serve no more than two homes. I do not know if the Planning Board has as desire to require paving at a certain time for that driveway or that Scott may have a proposal to modify the note. Otherwise things are pretty technical in nature and we still need to get thru the environmental review with SEQRA. The applicant did provide a long form EAF which is nice and provides a lot of information and we can get thru that at a later time.

Chairman Santoro – Scott old your name but did you want to discuss this one?

Mr. Reinhart – I am here for Victor Hiking Trail.

Chairman Santoro – Ok we will go to the Board.

Mr. Gallina – No questions.

Mr. Logan – I do have a question Scott about the grading plan and it looks a little optimistic but in terms of the amount of area you are disturbing for each potential home. These layout are probably generic. What stood out for me is where you have the stormwater collection system. It creates this small lot for this one house. You have all this property way uphill and I looked at could we slide it uphill and no it is a pretty big hill going up the rest of the way. Is there enough room for this house and property given that the stormwater detention pond is right next to the house? Could you address that?

Mr. DeHollander – That is 0.8 acre lot and we are dealing with zoning that would allow 25,000 sq. feet and we are at 140% of the requirement. I was careful when I was doing the layout to be sensitive to what was going to be built there and I think it is a function of the right type of house. This is not going to support a ranch that is 80 feet wide this is going to be the right type of house who wants to have that kind of amenity in their side yard. The intent is to present it that way and, I am speaking for Gerber to, there are people who are looking for that type of situation with minimum lot maintenance but maximum natural feature. That kind of fits into that category for us. It isn't something we will push on the wrong person. Your point about grading is well taken because at Scout Reserve across the street the approach to the lot layouts with the generic footprint since we do not know the architecture until people come forward with what they want to build. It is a bit optimistic and I think the experience from across the street is that particular where we are extending a lot of the utilities deep into the site more disruption occurs. We will work with that thru our erosion control plan to make sure that we are not tipping over any thresholds. We are far under the thresholds for 5 acre disturbance. The 5 acre stormwater threshold for permanent water quality components. Our detention pond here is required by the design criteria. It is an attenuating style pond and does not provide a water quality component so the intent is to have a dry bottom. Our soils are such that we do not have the hydric soils that we have across the street and we will potentially look at techniques we can work with in the bottom of the pond. I think there is enough infiltration that the pond will be reasonably dry and provide some useful area over time.

MR. Logan – Is that piece on that lot, the stormwater detention pond, do they own it or is this something the town gets ownership of to maintain?

Ms. Kinsella – The town will not take it or maintain it. It will have an easement on it that will run with the property.

Mr. Logan – Who maintains that?

Mr. DeHollander – Similar to the Scout Reserve project we will form an HOA for the entirety of the project and the maintenance of the pond will be part of the HOA.

Mr. Logan – All five homes will be responsible for the cost of the maintenance of that pond?

Mr. DeHollander – And the stormwater review it has been requested that we provide that maintenance agreement. We provided one for Scout Reserve and it's familiar and we will follow the process there.

Mr. Logan – There is guidelines for those owners for the HOA that to when and what they need to do and that sort of thing?

Mr. DeHollander – It is really clear.

Mr. Logan – I wanted to make sure it is crystal clear. It collects silt over time it will need to be cleaned out, correct?

Mr. DeHollander – Yes that is the perspective that the agreement really follows. It isn't so much like the conservation easement really restricts the use. There is restriction that you can build a shed in the middle of pond but the agreement really calls out the steps for inspection and the vices are still working in perpetuity as maintenance removal of accumulated sediment.

Mr. Logan – Does the town Code Enforcement inspect it or is it the responsibility of the HOA to evaluate it annual.

Ms. Kinsella – There is a provision in there for it to be evaluated. Our stormwater manager will send out a letter about the pond.

Mr. Harter – I wondered if you could give me some clarification on the shading on the drawing of what the darker shading means and the lighter shade. Is the lighter shading conservation easement and the darker shading is drainage easement?

Mr. DeHollander – Drainage easement that is right and also the lighter shading is exclusively conservation easement but the darker shading could be either an access and maintenance

easement for the shared access over both of the driveways and the utility extensions or a stormwater easement.

Mr. Harter – Is the conservation easement overlapping the drainage easement on the pond area?

Mr. DeHollander – It is.

Mr. Harter – That is ok with the Conservation Board?

Mr. DeHollander – We could review it again if it is not clear to them. It is not a point that I really went over in a lot of detail. I would be happy to ask for that clarification.

Mr. Harter – I did not know if you had a protocol for that. I think based on the sketch you presented awhile back I think you have complied with what we asked of you last time in terms of the access. I think we have some conversations to be had concerning the access guidelines and potential revisions. I think you have done what we asked you to do in terms of consolidating the lots and making only two access points versus more. You contrasted this with a single access publicly dedicated road. I think you have taken our comments to heart from what we had before and reflects a good design. Admittedly things are a little compact but I think that is what you are looking for from a marketing perspective and a clustering provision you are minimizing the structure. I think generally the plan is ok.

Mr. Limbeck – I have few comments on the comments from the Conservation Board actually. First is the attractiveness of the required conservation markers on the 4 x 4 post with the markers on top. We dealt with that on the Board a few years ago and I cannot think of the subdivision but we allowed boulders or something as an alternative to the post. Those are much more visually pleasing. I think a virtual marker is out of the question. The point of the marker is to delineate to what you can and cannot do or where you can or cannot work. You might want to discuss the possibility of using boulders or something. They are much more attractive. I have some concerns about motorized vehicles. We are using the conservation easements around the intermittent stream and around the retention pond and to protect steep slopes. ATV will rip all that stuff up. Allowing the motorized vehicles in that area, I would look for something that is more restrictive. I cannot think of what I would consider acceptable if I am thinking about protecting a steep slope. Snowmobilers maybe less so but you still need to create a trail thru it all. It seems that a motorized vehicle would be too restrictive. A foot path may give you some recreational flexibility there and be more appropriate for the rural area and character of it and again with the water and the slopes. Those would be some things I would ask you to take a look at.

Mr. DeHollander – Can I just follow up with a question? The previous project we did had a combination of conservation easement and open space easement. Would it be acceptable to maybe look at heavier restrictions over the areas that are sensitive say slopes over 15% and within 50 feet of the intermittent stream? Leave open the possibility for super passive use of motorized vehicles in the open space. We talked thru this with the Conservation Board there

would be some renewable lease for that use on the recreational vehicles meaning if it becomes a problem or a nuisance there is a mechanism to remove it.

Mr. Limbeck – I think all things can be considered certainly. Who would monitor? Would the HOA monitor the renewable?

Mr. DeHollander – I think ultimately we would look for the Conservation Board themselves to be able to be the agency that would renew the special condition of the motorized vehicles in the open space only easement area. It could definitely be part of our HOA restrictions to.

Mr. Limbeck – If you are having different levels or distances on different types of easements that is a whole ton more markers too.

Mr. DeHollander – A follow up thought on the virtual. It was a brainstorm and I do not think it was intended that the virtual markers would be the exclusive type of marker. It is the intermediate markers. The ones that are every 200 feet between turns in the easement that sort of stack up as being unsightly. I think the corners should have some documentation in the field. If there was a mechanism that wasn't assigned I think the boulders are a good idea for intermediates as well. A step further back from that would be this virtual marker idea where I can find a manhole in the middle of the medical center on my cell phone. It is that type of accuracy that is available with some apps that could solve some of the problems of the signs and the signs not lasting forever.

Chairman Santoro – The problem with virtual is someone has to take their phone or computer out to find it. If there is a boulder out there then there is no doubt that is what it is.

Mr. Pettee – I did have a bit of a question and we have touched on it. The content of the conservation easement. I did not know if what was depicted in the light shading maybe was going to be considered as open space where it would be allowed for the property owner to mow. It looks like it is going to preserve some trees so maybe mowing and clearing would not be allowed. There seems like there is some discussion on whether to allow motorized vehicles in the conservation easement.

Mr. Limbeck – What Scott just mentioned there with maybe a layered approach with mostly restrictive on the steep slopes and around the water and then I know in the past we have had some of the management where we allow the long grasses to be cut twice a year and there are various ways you can word the conservation easements to accomplish both the town and Scott's goals. That is probably what we would look for when it comes back as how you would manage that.

Mr. DeHollander – Definitely do not want any clear cutting of any of the wooded areas that is a primary goal of whatever type of easement we come up with if it is open space it will still be protecting the trees' that are there in that easement but it is the use. If I have 5 acres I want to run around on my 4 wheeler where can I do it and that is really what I want to work

out. There are folks that do it and do it respectfully and we want to have that conversation up front so we know what we can offer.

Chairman Santoro – I recall one a few years ago where the homeowner took a chainsaw to the markers and made them flush to the ground.

Mr. DeHollander – We do not want to do that.

Chairman Santoro – Any other comments?

John Grazios of Gerber Homes

Mr. Grazios – I work with Scott and he runs a lot of designs by us and we do review house pad sizes and clearing areas and are working closer together to come up with a project that is both desirable to conservation and clients we are working with. Scott has done a good job on this one. We reviewed the lot 5 home size and based on a lot of our clients that are looking to have a rural setting and a .8 acre lot with detention facility isn't objectionable.

Chairman Santoro – The other Scott want to come up and speak.

Scott Reinhart on Dryer Road

Mr. Reinhart – My wife and I have lived on Dryer Road five years. This is my second Planning meeting and the first one was right before we built the house and I came here to introduce myself and get used to my face. I will be here at all the meetings. Not here as a threat. I am here to advocate for the trails. I used to be a school principal and I retired and been here five years and was looking for something to get involved in. When I was school principal and was lucky enough to principal of nationally recognized middle school in a nationally recognized district. As part of that I got to travel a lot and evaluate schools and present at a lot of conferences and learned how to recognize quality. When I wanted to decide what groups I wanted to be part of here it was hard to pick here in Victor because you have a lot of quality here. This town has good bones. I got involved with Victor Hiking Trails because one of the things that stood right out to me here is the collection of trails you have her. It is 65 miles right now and we just installed a new trail over the weekend and the grand opening will be in the fall. It is over by Village on the Park. Beautiful grove of trees. My involvement with Victor Hiking Trails is there trail master. They asked me if I wanted to be trail master and I had no idea what a trail master was or does. I got involved with being the trail master whose main job is to create new trails. What I found out is that no one wanted that job because I am the one that has to contact property owners and ask them if we can put a trail thru their property and that is something that is difficult to do. Private property owners aren't too bad it is the developers who are more difficult. When I say difficult they are polite and they are nice but honestly they do not have anything in it except we want to build houses and sell them. The trails can be worried about by the people buy the houses. The problem is that once the houses are built it is much more difficult to take care of the trails.

As part of my job I read over the masterplan for the town and the master plan for parks and rec. That parks rec master plan is quite a document. The master plan says there should be a trail within a mile of every point in Victor. It also says that all the trails should be connected. That as the trail master of Victor of the Victor Hiking Trails I see that as a decade's long project and a vision for the future. Part of the job I know what it was like to deal with one task after another. The hard part is to clinging and hanging on and enacting the visions. The vision for the town of Victor is to have a network of trails that anybody can take anywhere they want to. I would like to see kids be able to get to school without having to ride a bus. I wouldn't want my kid crossing 96. We can connect this town. What I am asking of you is just to keep it in mind. Victor Hiking Trails is a remarkable organization. They have an incredible large group of people who are very dedicated. Not many towns have volunteers like that. These trails had more people using it than all last year. These trails are busy trails that are an asset to the community. If I was a developer I would want to tell that aspect of it and say this is a town you can live in and walk or ride anywhere where you want to go. That is a selling point. We have lots of other towns that call upon people like Chauncy Young and say how you maintain your trails so well.

Where we are right now is that we have met with Jack Marren, we are going to be meeting with the Town Board and going to be talking with how Victor Hiking Trails that is an asset that is free can help the Town of Victor make this vision a reality. All I ask of you is to keep it in mind. I will be here at the meetings and if there is something you want to talk about after the meeting or have me as a liaison from the group transfer back to our group I would be more than happy to do it. We are going to keep moving forward till we can make this vision a reality. I think it is a win win for everyone.

WILKINS RV OF VICTOR SITE DEVELOPMENT

09-SP-2021

REMOVED UNTIL JULY 13 MEETING

7447 State Route 96

Zoned – Commercial/Light Industrial

Tax Map # 15.00-2-19.111

Owner – BLW Properties of Victor, LLC

Applicant is requesting approval to demolish the existing 13,318 sf showroom and construct a new 18,560 sf showroom that will be attached to the existing service building. The existing two entrance will be removed and a new consolidated entrance will be installed.

Motion was made by Al Gallina seconded by Joe Limbeck RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM

Lisa Boughton, Secretary