



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

APRIL 8, 2015

Work Session Began: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Began: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Community Conference Room, Greece Town Hall

Present

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Richard C. Antelli

Daniel P. Barletta, DDS

Christine R. Burke

Devan K. Helfer

William E. Selke

Michael H. Sofia

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Arek Enterprises, Inc.
Location: 100 Dobson Road
Request: Site plan approval for the proposed Dobson Townhomes, consisting of six dwelling units (attached; two stories each unit), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 0.47 acres
Zoning District: DMU (Dewey Avenue Mixed Use)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 060.070-01-021

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Greg McMahon, P.E., McMahon LaRue Associates, PC, presented the application:

Mr. McMahon: At the last meeting, there were several comments regarding the plan. The Board tabled the application so that we could appear before the Board of Zoning Appeals; those variances were granted last night. One of the things that were addressed is a solid fence along the northern property line; a couple of the neighbors requested that. We relocated the dumpster location adjacent to the parking lot, toward the west side of the property. There will be no steps into the unit. Although they will be handicapped-accessible units, they are not what you would call handicapped units because there are bedrooms on the second floor. We adjusted our parking setback, from seven feet to ten feet. We added a bicycle rack. The decorative fence was moved back, based on comments from the Town's Engineering staff to provide for more snow storage; we also added a piece of the pillar and fence to the easterly portion to make it look uniform. We have other comments from engineering, and will work through those issues.

Mr. Copey: I'll refer the Board to the minutes of the last meeting regarding comments from other departments.

Mr. Gauthier: The comments are relatively minor; the only thing that might be of concern is the condition of the existing sewer laterals. As long as we understand each other that, if the laterals are found not to meet the Town's requirements, something will have to be done with them; they could have been there for a while.

Mr. McMahon: The contractor can televise them; if there are issues with them, we can handle them at that time.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

Mr. Copey: There was some discussion about the visual treatment along the east property line, being the boundary between the DMU zoning district and the single-family residential zoning district, possibly extending the decorative fence a little way down the east property line.

Mr. Selke: Does the owner of the first house to the east own the parcels that are between this site and that house? Could they be joined together and become a residential building lot?

Mr. Copey: Yes.

Mr. Selke: I can foresee residents of this new building sitting outdoors on the patio. With the existing trees on the land to the east, there is enough screening now, but it could be an issue in the future. What is the height of the new fence on the north side?

Mr. McMahon: It will be eight feet; we will let the builder decide what to use, vinyl or board on board. We discussed lighting and what will be in the parking lot. The lighting is shown on the plans.

Mr. Selke: What about the front door lighting?

Mr. McMahon: The lights will be up under the canopy of the entranceway. The walkway is covered by the lighting from the parking lot.

Mr. Selke: There were some issues that were brought up by the neighbors about traffic. This project will be a good addition to the area, and will take care of the trash that lands there in that lot. The building looks very attractive.

Mr. Fisher: Have we come to a consensus on the treatment along the east property line?

Mr. Sofia: What are you trying to shield that side from? What if you added another side to the fence that's already proposed for the south side of each patio, on the east side, like an "L" shape?

Mr. Selke: That would be a cost saving; that's a good suggestion.

Mr. McMahon: We are okay with the "L"-shaped fence around the patio; those are typically six feet high.

Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Mr. Barletta:

WHEREAS Arek Enterprises, Inc(the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 100 Dobon Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQR Regulations") (collectively, "SEQR"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQR.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, One Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest and citizens were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

4. The Planning Board has carefully considered Part 1 of an Environmental Assessment Form (the "EAF") and supplemental environmental information that was submitted by the Applicant's representatives or the Town's staff, which may have included but was not limited to: descriptions; maps; drawings; analyses; reports; reviews; and aerial photographs (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board has also included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered additional information and various oral or written comments that may have resulted from meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has also included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board has also included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from owners of nearby properties or other interested parties, and all other relevant comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQR.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal and the Project upon the environment, as set forth in SEQR.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the Project and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a reasoned elaboration of the rationale for arriving at its determination of environmental significance and the Planning Board's determination is supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental impacts revealed in the environmental review process will be avoided or minimized by the Applicant's voluntary incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQR, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Barletta, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
3. Addresses for each dwelling unit shall be added to the plan.
4. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
5. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
7. The Town's 2001 Community Master Plan Update (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of these apartments will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this apartment development provides no suitable park

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to the New York State Town Law, Section 274-a, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for each dwelling unit in this apartment development, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each dwelling unit. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.

8. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
9. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
10. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
11. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management pond. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
12. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
13. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk.
14. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
15. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Deputy Commissioner of Public Works for Engineering.
16. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
17. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include designees, successors and assigns.
18. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
19. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall add fencing around each patio, six feet high, in an "L"-shaped form enclosing the south and east sides.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

2. Applicant: Crescent Beach Restaurant and Hotel, LLC
Location: 1372, 1384 & 1390 Edgemere Drive
Request: Site plan approval for the following changes to the site of an existing restaurant: addition of concrete patio on the north and east sides; revised parking lot layout; removal of an accessory structure (one-car garage); and related utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 2.6 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 035.09-1-21, 035.09-1-22, 035.09-1-23

Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the April 22, 2015, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO APRIL 22, 2015, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Sanco Builders, LLC
Location: 981 Latta Road
Request: Concept plan review of proposed changes to the Legends at Latta subdivision, consisting of 28 lots (27 new houses; one existing house) on approximately 10.8 acres
Zoning District: R1-8 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 046.19-3-20

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Richard Giraulo, LaDieu Associates, presented the application:

Mr. Giraulo: We are back before you on a project that was approved last year; it was approved with three fewer lots. The developer has asked to add more lots to make it a viable project. We still comply with the zoning code: we have a minimum lot front line of 40 feet, which is at the center of the road; the lot width meets the 60 feet minimum at the setback for the houses; and we have a minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet. We have picked up three lots from the previous plans. The original lots were 65 feet wide, and we reduced the widths to 60 feet and we set a few back off the private road; they still are nice, viable lots. The three lots that face Latta Road will remain the same. It is really a minor change from the original plan.

Mr. Fisher: Originally, one critical thing was the impact that the development would have on the historical Fleming house and property; that remains unchanged. It took some involvement from the State Historic Preservation Office and our Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Giraulo: Correct.

Mr. Selke: I think that it is a win-win situation. I could not find anything that was negative.

Mr. Giraulo: It's hard to tell what has changed. We had some really big lots before, so now it fits better with the neighborhood.

Mr. Fisher: One suggestion would be to move the driveways on Lots 15 and 16 to the east so there are less busy activity near the existing neighbors.

Mr. Giraulo: We moved those because all the laterals are right there, so they don't end up in the driveways.

Mr. Copey: What about a section of fencing?

Mr. Giraulo: That's a great idea.

Mr. Gauthier: One challenge that drove us crazy was getting grading that was reasonable; that challenge will fall to you. We will work together to get that to function.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

Mr. Barletta: The old plans show the driveways on Lots 15 and 16 to the east.

Mr. Gauthier: It's going to be busy anywhere you put them, really.

Mr. Sofia: What size are the homes?

Mr. Giraulo: They are on the smaller side. One challenge was that the original lots were so big that the houses would look out of scale for the neighborhood, and they would not sell. They needed to be smaller homes on smaller lots.

Mr. Barletta: The old plan shows everything draining to the west. If you put driveways there, it would be difficult to have the water flow.

Mr. Gauthier: We could tip the driveways, it's easiest to direct the water if it's paved. The challenge will be in between the pavements; they are going to be closer together and a little steeper than before. You will need slightly larger facilities. This will be our first entirely residential application of green infrastructure in the Town.

Mr. Selke: What do you mean by first?

Mr. Gauthier: The storm water management code from 2010 became effective, and we have gone five years because they had such broad loophole to get through. This will be the first time in this community that we are going to have to be compliant with the green infrastructure standards.

Mr. Barletta: Do the storage ponds have to be bigger?

Mr. Gauthier: Infinitesimally bigger; you're not going to notice it.

Mr. Fisher: I think that the Planning Board is comfortable with the change, but you should consider our comments about buffering for the existing lots to the west.

Mr. Copey: Is this going to be done in one phase?

Mr. Giraulo: The developer wants to do it in two phases; that's part of the challenge. We would like to get approval for the preliminary plat and the final plat of the first phase.

Mr. Barletta: Any changes with the historical site?

Mr. Copey: No. It has local landmark designation. It's a volunteer program; it relates to the structure itself.

Mr. Selke: Will these lots be part of a homeowners association?

Mr. Giraulo: Yes, but each homeowner will be in control of his/her own property; I don't think that there will be a lot of restrictions.

CONCEPT PLAN REVIEWED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

2. Applicant: Heritage Christian Services
Location: 1680 Stone Road
Request: Concept plan review of a proposed child daycare center and school-age child care facility (one story; 10,000± square feet), with related utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 1.75 acres
Zoning District: RMH (Multiple-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 075.13-4-12

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

John Stapleton, Marathon Engineering; and Dan Stewart, Director of Facilities for Heritage Christian Services, presented the application:

Mr. Stapleton: We are here to request concept review for a daycare facility. We believe that we will need variances for number of parking spaces and for the setback of our building. We also may need a variance for the distance of our access onto Stone Road to the property line. We have oriented the building 30 degrees to Stone Road; we may look at fronting it more toward Stone Road and trying to keep the recreation area in the rear. There are no wetlands or floodplains, historic or archaeological sites, or endangered species associated with this project. Our proposal is to construct a 10,000± square-foot, single-story daycare building. It will have before- and after-school programs. Our access will be off both Stoneridge Drive and Stone Road. We have talked with the Monroe County Department of Transportation ("MCDOT"), and they think that it would be feasible to provide that access off Stone Road. We are looking at about 120 children with a staff of 20; it requires 50 spaces for the occupancy, 73 per fire code; we are requesting 75 spaces. We are including a drop-off and pick-up area for parents to drop off and pick up children attending school. We also would like to provide some type of hard surface for children to play on, in addition to a rear recreation area that will be fenced. There is a wooded area to the west, near Paddy Hill Creek, and we might like to do a nature trail there, if possible. The hours of operation would be from 6:00 a.m. to about 7:00 p.m.; no nights or weekends. We have all utilities available to the site, we are looking at a storm water management facility adjacent to the creek, and we have some area in the front as well for some infiltration. We will be providing site lights for the site; they will be on timers and will dim during the night.

Mr. Stewart: Heritage Christian Services started 30-plus years ago, four families together that wanted something different for their kids. Today, we have over 75 homes, certified programs, and another 10 homes that do not have the intensity or staff that our certified sites have. We operate over 22 day programs, a lot of partnerships with the community. We are regional; our area extends to Buffalo and Grand Island. Five years ago, we built the Peter's Family Life Center in Henrietta, and three years ago we got into our first experiment with child care. We built Expressive Beginning Child Care, and had 115 children; we have had full occupancy since then and have been very successful. Our intension is to do the same thing here; it will be a market-rate child care center. We do serve children with disabilities, but this facility is not targeted and or marketed toward that group.

Mr. Stapleton: We did receive comments from Town staff; the zoning staff made us aware of potential variances.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

Mr. Sofia: You mentioned asphalt. Is that in addition to what we are looking at on the drawing?

Mr. Stapleton: The idea was to validate our need for more parking than what is required. This could be used during peak usage but also used for play area. Also, at various times we have events such as graduation; this week at our existing facility, we are having an Easter egg hunt, which will need additional parking.

Mr. Stewart: We might have up to six to eight events per year when we would need more parking.

Mr. Sofia: So that area would be used as a children's play area when it's not used for parking? I'm assuming that the rear fenced area will have some play equipment.

Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Sofia: So this is ample for now; you will need a game plan for events.

Mr. Stapleton: We want to be good neighbors but we don't want to suffer the expense of building for an event that occurs only four times out of the year. On the other hand, we don't want folks parking where they should not be. We could talk to the Ridge Road Fire District about using the parking area at the fire house across Stoneridge Drive.

Mr. Stewart: If necessary, we could run shuttle back and forth between here and Stoneridge Plaza.

Mr. Sofia: It's a great, original idea, and I think that it will do well. I like the way that the building is angled and facing the corner of Stone Road and Stoneridge Drive, rather than facing only one street or the other, and having access to both streets.

Mr. Singleton: We need both driveways for the school buses to get in and out of the site.

Mr. Barletta: We have the parking lot over here, but you have a potential for a child wandering off and over to the pond.

Mr. Stapleton: The ponds do end up being an attractive nuisance so, yes, we will have to look at making provisions for safety.

Mr. Gauthier: You mentioned that the site has no floodpl

in. Have you determined that for sure? There is no Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") floodplain, but every stream has a floodplain. I think it would be a good idea to delineate that floodplain. The Town does not allow development or filling in a floodplain.

Mr. Stapleton: We will work with you to get that accomplished.

Mr. Fisher: You mentioned 120 children. What does the 228 on the plan represent?

Mr. Stapleton: We were looking at justifying the parking.

Mr. Fisher: I think that the drawing has to show the number of parking spaces required by the zoning ordinance, which is a lower number. When you get above what is the minimum requirement, it becomes more necessary to bring a stronger case to justify the extra parking.

Mr. Selke: I think that this a great project. However, I'm concerned about safety and the children in close proximity to the densely developed apartment area to the south and southeast. I like the dual use of the parking area for recreation. I'm assuming that you are planting some more trees? I just want to make sure that the landscaping is used to screen

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

and shield from the neighbors. Make sure that the lighting is sufficient, for safety issues. I think that the facility would serve the community well.

Mr. Barletta: On the plans, it shows "future" for part of the building. Do we have to look at that differently?

Mr. Copey: It's good to show it now.

Mr. Sofia: What do you really think that you need for parking?

Mr. Stewart: At peak, and per code, about 50. We are a not-for-profit organization, and therefore don't have an unlimited source of money. I would hate to have to get the money at a later date to add parking; it would be a challenge.

Mr. Fisher: Is there a way to do it so that it does not impact drainage?

Mr. Gauthier: There is, but it has to be installed at the developmental phase for that, and we are not comfortable or sure of the durability.

Mr. Fisher: If you had something like that, that you were not going to use all the time, if it was substantial enough to use as a play area, but if you weren't parking there all the time, you would not get the same issues. Perhaps pavement that allows water to infiltrate and allow for temporary parking; that might help mitigate the storm water runoff.

Mr. Gauthier: If you could work with us on that, we could reciprocate by giving you more space to meet your needs, if less of the parking area was completely imperious surface.

Mr. Stapleton: We have been doing very well with green infrastructure practices with bio-swales and bio-retention areas. We have found that if you treat it well for quality, it will allow you to reduce the pond size. Maybe for that area, we could get a more pervious surface; if not, we can work with you and come up with another solution.

Mr. Fisher: The other element to making it a play area is that parking is one of those things that have an impact on the neighbors. That is the parking area that you really don't want to use if you don't have to. The bottom line is, I think that we will find something that meets both our needs.

CONCEPT PLAN REVIEWED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

3. Applicant: Anthony Curatalo, Jr.
Location: 1360 Manitou Road
Request: Extension of minor subdivision approval for the Curatalo subdivision, consisting of 2 lots on approximately 2.1 acres, previously approved on October 17, 2012, with extensions granted on October 16, 2013 and March 19, 2014
Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 058.01-2-42

Motion by Ms. Helfer, seconded by Ms. Burke, to grant two 90-day extensions of the minor subdivision approval previously approved on October 17, 2012, and extensions granted on October 16, 2013, March 19, 2014 and October 8, 2014.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
TWO 90-DAY EXTENSIONS GRANTED**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

4. Applicant: Atlantic Funding and Realty, LLC
Location: Generally, south and southwest of the intersection of Pinewild Drive and Bellwood Drive, in the Canal Ponds Business Park
Request: Extension of site plan approval for a proposed flexible-use office building (one story; 22,220± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, and Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) determination of consistency, on approximately 22.7 acres
Zoning District: BG (General Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.04-1-14.11 & 089.04-1-14.12

Motion by Ms. Helfer, seconded by Ms. Burke, to a one-year extension of the site plan approval previously granted on April 2, 2014.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
EXTENSION GRANTED FOR ONE YEAR**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 8, 2015

CODE ENFORCEMENT

ADJOURNMENT: 8:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman