



*William D. Reilich*  
*Supervisor*

# **TOWN OF GREECE**

## **PLANNING BOARD**

### **MINUTES**

**JUNE 22, 2016**

**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

Rick Antelli

Christine R. Burke

William E. Selke

Jamie L. Slocum

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**

Devan Helfer

#### **Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda**

#### **Announcements**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Old Business**

1. Applicant: Morgan Ridgecrest, LLC  
Location: 1946 West Ridge Road  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.15-11-27, 074.16-2-22  
Request: Approval of a minor subdivision of two lots to create four lots on approximately 9.21 acres  
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

**Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Ms. Slocum, to continue the application to the July 6, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED  
APPLICATION CONTINUED  
TO JULY 6, 2016, MEETING**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**New Business**

1. Applicant: Crosstown Construction, Inc.  
Location: Generally, east of North Greece Road between Cedar Creek Trail and Guinevere Drive  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 058.04-3-55.111  
Request: Preliminary and final plat re-approval for the English Oaks subdivision, consisting of 15 lots on approximately 6.5 acres  
Zoning District: R1-12 (Single-Family Residential)

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

Peter G. Vars P.E., Vice President & Project Manager, BME Associates, P.C.; and Rudy Neufeld, Crosstown Construction, Inc., presented the application.

Mr. Neufeld: We are applying for re-approval of the English Oaks subdivision. The details of this project have not changed. We are trying to keep and maintain the buffer that is there. The subdivision comes off Guinevere Drive; North Greece Road is to the west. It will be a cul-de-sac with 14 patio home lots. They will be smaller homes on a smaller lot; they will have basements. Our other similar projects have been very successful in other towns. There is a segment of population that is looking for houses with basements, but are not ready for a townhome yet; they still want some space. The houses will be about 1400 to 1700 square foot. They will be priced from \$180,000 to \$190,000.

Mr. Copey: This project was approved in 2007, reapproved in 2010 and once again in 2011, but the plat never was filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. It is essentially the same project, with one change: the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") floodplain mapping. One of the staff's recommended conditions of approval reflects the newer FEMA regulations and how we apply those regulations. No comments from our Fire Marshal, zoning or building departments.

Mr. Gauthier: For the most part, the Engineering/DPW comments are technical details. There are comments that reflect lessons learned from when this subdivision previously was approved; those are relatively minor. We had discussion regarding our street lights and how they will be handled. I have reached out to the BME office to explain that this is in somewhat of a state of flux and the intent of the administration is not to cause any significant additional costs due to the change in ownership of the street lights from Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation to the Town. The biggest change is the FEMA change, and that is detailed in our comment letter.

Lori Laloggia, 199 Cedar Creek Trail: Have you ever walked that property? How are they going to fit all that into there? You have 13 homes, a street and something that looks like a body of water. I don't understand how you will cram all that in there without it looking like a disgusting mess in the middle of our neighborhood, which none of us want; that's why we are here.

Mr. Fisher: The lot size and the placement of a house on the lot are controlled by our zoning ordinance. The houses can't be moved any further forward, and they can't be any closer to the rear, based on the zoning requirements. The developer has to meet those requirements, and there are no variances, so those are the rules that we follow.

Ms. Laloggia: What about a creek? Will it cut into our property? Is it already there?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

Mr. Gauthier: The creek is not going to cut into your property. The developer will not encroach on the creek, and there will be no filling of the creek; it is in a FEMA floodplain. As a condition of approval the developer will have to clear some of the saplings that are there and stabilize the creek bank; as a result, it actually will be better in terms of the current flow.

Mr. Fisher: One requirement of any development is that it have no negative drainage impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The developer proposes a design to prevent that, and it's reviewed by our engineer to be sure that it meets all requirements.

Ms. Laloggia: What if they don't? What if my now dry basement has a pool of water in it?

Mr. Gauthier: They will not be the cause of the problem.

Mr. Fisher: We have to rely on our staff's technical expertise to be able to evaluate the situation and be sure that that does not occur.

Don Dohr, 1093 Guinevere Drive: Will the sidewalks and streetlights match what we have now?

Mr. Vars: Yes. They will extended and will be a continuous loop. Regarding the lights, we will be sure to comply with the Town's new policy.

Mr. Selke: The Town now owns the street lights?

Mr. Gauthier: Yes. The new lights will look the same as the existing ones.

Mr. Dohr: We have a similar development close to us, so I'm curious about snow removal. It will be tight in there. Has any thought been given to that?

Mr. Gauthier: It has been considered and meets our specifications.

David Gross, 1010 Guinevere Drive: I'm not happy that I was notified just two days ago. Putting in a cul-de-sac is a much better idea than what was proposed before. I'm adamantly opposed to having a connection to North Greece Road. We have a problem where people use our neighborhood as a loop, and they drive way too fast. We have people at the end of my street that punch their gas and are going about 40 mph when they hit my house. I'd like to see something done now that more cars will be added to our neighborhood. Who is responsible for the construction filth? That is clay back there, and my house will turn into a red pit of mud when those trucks are going up and down the street.

Mr. Gauthier: We have storm water permit rules that require us to enforce the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") storm water regulations. The developer has a permit that he acquired when the original plan was approved. We will be meeting with the developer regarding the pre-construction process. We don't tolerate mud leaving the site. There are strict requirements to keep mud on the site; those requirements are on the map that is signed, and they will be enforced. The developer will be required to control mud and dust. You will see on the site measures that now are required but weren't when your house was built.

Mr. Gross: I keep hearing 15 lots; I see 14.

Mr. Vars: There are 14 proposed homes. The other lot fronts North Greece Road, to the west. That was conveyed sometime in the 2000s; the subdivision map will catch up to the deed transaction.

Ralph Sufra, 181 Cedar Creek Trail: Between Lots 4 and 5, I assume that there is runoff and it is right behind my house. If I look out by my back yard, this project is right behind my house. Will the drainage run into the retention pond, and will the Town maintain it?

Mr. Gauthier: There will be individual property owners of each lot. Mowing and landscaping is going to be the responsibility of each homeowner. The management and integrity of the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

storm water management facility will be the Town's responsibility. We will make sure that it is functional; aesthetics will be up to each property owner. If they want cattails, they can have them; if they want to mow it, they can. We have a permit from the NYSDEC that requires us to oversee construction and oversee and certify that the storm water facilities operate as designed; that is the Town's responsibility. If the storm water management facility does not function, let us know.

Mr. Sufra: I'm trying to avoid having that. There will be mosquitoes and snakes; it will smell.

Mr. Gauthier: The developer has no choice; he has to comply with the NYSDEC requirements. We have some flexibility on how it's situated to minimize the impact on adjoining neighbors, but once it's demonstrated that it functions and meets the approved design, it's there. The builder wants to sell these homes, and he will make them as attractive as possibly can.

Mr. Sufra: Once the builder sells them he's out of the picture.

Mr. Gauthier: If you're investing this kind of money into a house, you're going to take care of it.

Mr. Sufra: What will happen to the creek? Will it stay there, will it be filled?

Mr. Gauthier: The builder will not encroach on the creek and it will not be filled in; the creek will remain.

Mr. Sufra: I complained to the Town because of the yard slope; it is caving in and I have to fill it in. I'm assuming that it will happen to the other side of the creek too.

Mr. Gauthier: The creek will stay there; it's a natural body of water. We have encouraged the developer to clear it to the extent that he can and stabilize the banks. If there were a blockage in the creek, the Town will have an easement to let us get back there to unblock it. In terms of the creek changing, it's going to do what it does. Living next to a creek, you're dealing with a natural body of water that will behave that way.

Michael Maffett, 1090 Guinevere Drive: With 14 houses, 15 lots, it sounds to me as though there would be room in there to put an access to North Greece Road.

Mr. Fisher: Not with a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Maffett: Not with the maps we received, which shows the cul-de-sac. The small map shows an access.

Mr. Fisher: There is not a stub road in this subdivision, leading to a future development off-site; it will end in a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Moffatt: This will be a solid property. There will be nothing paved over?

Mr. Copey: That map shows the whole parcel. That will be cut in half, and the east half will have the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Fisher: That has been a question, and this will preclude that from happening.

Mr. Maffett: We bought that house for two reasons: we were at a dead end and the green space. Well, goodbye to that. Those trees, those deer, those foxes, goodbye. How long will the process take?

Mr. Neufeld: It will start in three or four months. We plan to do some clearing in the late fall or early winter. Some fill has to be brought in; that will take us through the winter, so late winter early spring is when we will start construction. I would like to address the neighbors. I have worked with Crosstown Construction for over 30 years; they take very seriously the relationship with our neighbor. Once this project is approved, you will get a letter from us

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

introducing our members with phone numbers, my cell number. Most days I will be there on site and you can always get a hold of me.

Mr. Fisher: How long for you to reach full build-out?

Mr. Neufeld: About 12 to 16 months.

Mr. Selke: Will there be landscaping or will that be up to the individual homeowner?

Mr. Neufeld: That will be up to the homeowner. We will provide the entrance with a monument and landscaping.

Michael Davis, 993 Guinevere Drive: We purchased the house because it was a dead end. Could the project be relocated to the western half? Leave the trees and the dead end. I know there is not much we can do. I don't want it. I have four children and know every car that comes down the street. I work in the field and don't want the dirt and the trucks going down the street.

Mr. Fisher: When your subdivision first was approved, it was with a stub street here because we expected that the street would be continued. From the standpoint of design possibilities, this is probably the best for you because it still will not be connected to another street.

Mr. Sofia: There is no other stub road. The overall plan for the whole subdivision showed that it would look this way 10 years ago.

Mr. Sufra: How much higher will this development be, compared to ours?

Mr. Vars: I'm not sure what the elevations of the homes on Cedar Creek are, but I do know that they are a minimum two feet above the floodplain elevation; it is the same on our project.

Mr. Sufra: Right now, I don't have flood insurance.

Mr. Gauthier: They will not affect what the floodplain elevation is; they will reduce it slightly.

Mr. Sufra: What about the pond?

Mr. Gauthier: That will not have an impact on you being in or out of a FEMA floodplain. That's not to say it's not a good idea for people in the vicinity of a floodplain to have flood insurance, but there is no mandatory requirement for you to have flood insurance before or after this project.

Mr. Fisher: There is a flood control fixture present that should slightly reduce the likelihood of you being affected by opening the land.

Mr. Sufra: I don't like having the runoff behind my house. Those houses are too big for the lots.

Mr. Schiano: They meet all the zoning requirements; there are no variances. If they did need variances, they would have to come before the Town's Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Vars: The lots have been laid out so that we have a minimum of 16 feet between houses, 40 feet of setback in the rear, and 40 feet of front setback. The plans show about a 2000-square-foot home. The storm water management plan is in compliance with the Town and NYSDEC standards. The basic principal is to collect the storm water runoff and do not let it leave the site uncontrolled. You take it to the area of Larkin Creek, which is the existing drainage pattern here. The northwest corner is the low area of the development; the pond has been sized to the volume of runoff expected. The key is holding the water on-site and then controlling the discharge off-site. We cannot alter the floodplain, and we have to show that this design will not affect it. We do know that the rate of flow after construction will be lower than it is now.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

Mr. Gauthier: We go through a meticulous review of the as-built drawings of the pond to make sure that it is constructed to achieve what the storm water runoff calculations said that it should do. We can assure the public that it will work as designed or they change it to meet our satisfaction.

Mr. Laloggia: Are we going to get documentation of the pond?

Mr. Vars: The permit has been issued and is in place.

Mr. Gauthier: You can see it anytime you want.

Mr. and Mrs. James Granville, 269 Cedar Creek Trail: I have photos of the creek when it overflows. We're at the end of Lot 8.

Mr. Gauthier: It behaves as it's indicated.

Mr. Granville: The land has been eroded. The creek is full of growth. When are you going to clean it up? What's going on? Put concrete walls in, or something.

Ms. Granville: I just want to show them so that this does not happen in the new development. The creek gets stagnant. Also, will there be a buffer around the development?

Mr. Gauthier: Between the homes and the creek, they want to leave as much existing vegetation as possible. There are tradeoffs—there has to be clearing for the development and for proper drainage flow, but buffering needs to be kept.

Mr. Fisher: For this property, clearing out some obstacles should allow the creek to flow better now and should reduce the problem with backups.

Nicole and Matt Camiolo: On your website, the Town of Greece is named a 2015 Tree City USA, and we find that preserving the natural beauty of the town was not taken into consideration.

Mr. Schiano: This is private property. We can't stop the owner from developing his property in accordance with the regulations.

Mr. Camiolo: Can they choose to change and take down more trees? I hope that they keep as many trees as possible and I hope that there won't be more water.

Mr. Fisher: A wooded lot helps to sell it; clearcutting would be less desirable from a sales standpoint.

Jennifer Polfleit, 217 Cedar Creek Trail: I appreciate that Crosstown will try to keep the trees, and I hope that you can keep some of the buffer. Let's hope you can live up to being available. I had e-mailed Gary Tajkowski in 2014 because I saw that the property was for sale. I learned that Clearsite Development has some design challenges with encroachment into wetland. How will Crosstown handle that differently?

Mr. Fisher: I'm not sure what issues Clearsite had but this is the same as what was approved in 2007.

Mr. Gauthier: This is the same design as what was approved; it has not changed. In 2008, FEMA remapped the boundaries of the floodplain; it was a challenge to design around the floodplain in 2007, but they overcame it then. The main challenge now is just implementing the impacts of the 2008 FEMA remapping.

Ms. Polfleit: Do you oversee the site?

Mr. Gauthier: Yes. The Town has inspectors out there, and if there is a problem I will be out there.

Ms. Laloggia: What has changed?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

Mr. Gauthier: The FEMA had remapped the boundaries of the floodplain.

Mr. Schiano: Has anything changed? Does this plan have any problems with drainage now?

Mr. Gauthier: There are no remaining drainage or wetland problems with this project.

Mr. Vars: The economy tanked and that is why the project did not move forward. The economy has improved and now we believe that the market exists for this housing, and we are choosing to move forward with the project now.

Michael Rinaldi: I kind of like the idea, one way in one way out. The houses are going for \$180,000, which will raise my property value. You're not putting in apartments, which would add many cars and more people. I've been here for 20 years; it's a good neighborhood. The pond is nice, we fish and ice skated there. I think that it's a nice project and a lot better than what I thought we would get.

Mr. Selke: I appreciate the neighbors coming out tonight. We have to follow rules and we can make it the best that it can be. Our engineers give us good information, and we have to trust them as professionals. What are the construction hours? Could you explain the buffer?

Mr. Vars: The hours will comply with code—weekdays, 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The clearing is shown on the map, but we will be sure to provide positive drainage. We have to follow the proper grading and clearing rules.

Mr. Fisher: I would like to echo what Mr. Selke had said. For this process to work, you are there all year and know what the conditions are. It's important to know who to call if an issue arose.

**Mr. Selke made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Slocum:**

WHEREAS Crosstown Construction, Inc. (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a preliminary and final plat, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property generally, east of North Greece Road between Cedar Creek Trail and Guinevere Drive (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application 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 "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest 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.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

5. The Planning Board has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that 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 carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other 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 SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal 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 careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the Applicant's voluntary incorporation of features and measures in the design of the Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, 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.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Sofia, 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 said dispute.
2. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plat.
3. The addresses of the lots in this subdivision shall be added to the plat.
4. The developer/contractor is responsible for removal and disposal of brush, trees, and debris from any lot clearing. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat. (Infill Only)
5. 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 this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address said current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to Section 277 of the New York State Town Law, payment of the town's recreation fee shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
6. This subdivision section is located within the town's Sanitary Trunk Sewer Overlay Area. A sanitary sewer entrance fee surcharge shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. In addition, a limited-term annual debt repayment charge shall be applied to each house constructed in this subdivision. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plat.
7. Portions of Lot(s) 4-11 are located in flood zone "AE" as identified on the 2008 Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Foundation-only permits may be obtained for construction of foundations to be located outside of the "AE" flood zone on these lots. Prior to the issuance of a full building permit or a framing permit, a Non-FIRM, Town of Greece elevation certification in relation to the NGVD Datum of 1929, or other approved Datum, may be required by the Building Inspector to verify compliance with flood plain requirements. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat, along with a reference to such note within each of the affected lots.
8. No placement of fill or commencement of excavation activities within the 100-year floodplain limits (FIRM flood zone) shall be permitted. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat, along with a reference to such note within each of the affected lots.
9. As may be directed by the town's Commissioner of Public Works, the plans shall identify and area to be improved and stabilized so that town vehicles can access the proposed pond. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

10. Drainage easements shall be provided over the proposed storm water management pond, and any streams, wetlands, or flood zone areas on the site. Said easements shall be shown on the plat, site plan, utility, and grading sheets. The final boundaries and terms of such easements shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney, and the Commissioner of Public Works.
11. Upon completion of construction of the storm water pond, the Applicant shall provide certification that the pond was constructed as designed and approved. Said certification shall be provided in the form of an as-built topographic survey with pertinent utility structures shown, prepared by a New York State Licensed Land Surveyor. No final approval signatures shall be placed on the site plan unless and until the Applicant has submitted to the town a financial guarantee (such as a letter of credit, certified check, or other acceptable instrument), in an amount approved by the town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney, that is sufficient to properly construct the proposed pond, and to provide the aforementioned certification. No release of said financial guarantee shall be made unless and until the improvements and certification are completed to the satisfaction of the town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney.
12. No site work shall commence unless and until a pre-grading and/or pre-construction meeting has taken place involving the Town Departments of Public Works, Engineering, and/or Technical Services. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
13. No pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled unless and until a Notice Of Intent (NOI) has been filed with NYSDEC.

Throughout the life of the storm water permit (from the filing of the Notice Of Intent to the Notice Of Termination), the developer shall fully comply with all aspects of the NYSDEC General Permit No. GP-02-01, particularly subsections Part III.D.4 through III.D.7 which describe:

- periodic inspections of the construction site by a qualified professional,
- maintenance of a site log,
- stabilization requirements, and
- maintenance of sediment traps and ponds during construction.

The site log shall be made available to Town inspection staff upon request.

14. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
15. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any heirs, successors, trustees, or assigns.
16. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
17. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding authority.
18. Subject to approval by the town's engineering staff and Commissioner of Public Works.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**SITE PLANS**

**Old Business**

1. Applicant: Morgan Ridgecrest, LLC  
Location: 1946-1960 West Ridge Road  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.15-11-27, 074.16-02-22  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed restaurant (one story; 3,000± square feet) with drive-up service window, and demolition/reconstruction of 6,250± square feet of existing building space, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 9.2 acres  
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

**Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Ms. Slocum, to continue the application to the July 6, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED  
APPLICATION CONTINUED  
TO JULY 6, 2016, MEETING**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

1. Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile of Rochester, L.P. (d.b.a. Verizon Wireless)  
Location: 2419 Latta Road  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.20-1-1.11  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed cellular service telecommunications facility, consisting of a freestanding antenna tower (128 feet-high, including lightning rod) and related antenna(s), accessory antenna structures, and access driveway, on approximately 0.23 acres  
Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)

**Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the July 6, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED  
APPLICATION CONTINUED  
TO JULY 6, 2016, MEETING**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**New Business**

1. Applicant: Rochester's Cornerstone Group, Ltd.  
Location: 3 GBC Parkway  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.14-2-5.2  
Request: Site plan approval for the Cornerstone Pointe Apartments, which is Phase 2 of a senior citizen apartment development (2 stories; 67,550± square feet; 66 dwelling units) with related parking, utilities, grading and landscaping on approximately 4.4 acres  
Zoning District: RMS (Multiple-Family Residential – Senior Citizen)

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

Roger W. Brandt, Jr., President, Rochester's Cornerstone Group, Ltd.; Eric Schaaf, Marathon Engineering; and Timothy N. Zigarowicz, A.I.A., SWBR Architects, presented the application.

Mr. Brandt: We are here to request approval for Phase II of Long Pond Senior Housing. It has gone as expect and we are at 100% occupancy and have a waiting list of almost 100 persons. It's worked out very well. This project has 66 units, and we are seeking approval that will be very similar to Phase I. There is a PACE program through ElderONE, a service of Rochester Regional Health, which will provide some support services for seniors to enable them to age in place. There are two differences between the then-future Phase 2 that we showed to the Board when we obtained approval for Phase 1, and our current proposal for Phase 2: one is the garage has been removed, and we will put some landscaping there instead; the other is the building needs five additional feet on south side to accommodate the drainage. The major site improvements already are in. We are working with the state for funding, and we would like to finish it up so that we can complete the funding. The rents are about \$700 for one bedroom and about \$840 for two bedrooms. This is below market rate, and this is the route we want to go.

Mr. Schaaf: Last night, we were in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals, and received our variances. This is Phase 2 of the overall project and is very close to what was shown as part of the overall layout. The architectural appearance of Phase 2 will match the appearance of Phase 1.

Mr. Copey: Little or no comment. As Mr. Schaaf noted, they received variances last night. This is Phase 2, so the heavy lifting of approvals and site construction already are done. Phase I turned out very nice.

Cindy Muxworthy, 1 GBC Parkway, Apt. 208: I lived at the apartments to the north on Demeter Drive. I came to a number of meetings. I had three concerns: one was the lighting, on which they have done a wonderful job; next was the drainage, and they have put in the moat, which serves its purpose and has done a good job; the third is that we need a traffic signal on Mitchell Road. I moved in in December and in January a Greece Police car T-boned me. Action needs to be taken. It's worse in the winter. They go so fast northbound on Mitchell Road to Long Pond Road. It's a very big concern. With Phase 2, you will have more cars and will have more accidents. They have done a nice job on the street but at the entrance you might want to put in a speed bump. But I urge that a traffic signal be installed.

Mr. Fisher: There was a traffic study done; it is a county road.

Mr. Selke: Can we check with the county?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

Mr. Copey: We can check with them. There may be other solutions that can be used.

Mr. Selke: Phase 1 looks very nice; it's no wonder that you have a waiting list. What trees will be use on the east?

Mr. Schaaf: Pine trees on the end; in the center will be deciduous.

**Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Ms.**

WHEREAS, Rochester's Cornerstone Group, Ltd. (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 3 GBC Parkway(the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

WHEREAS, the subject property was rezoned from R1-12 (Single-family Residential) to RMS (Multiple-family Residential – Senior Citizen) by the Town Board on August 16, 2011. As an Unlisted action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), the rezoning was the subject of a coordinated environmental review, for which the Town Board was Lead Agency and the Planning Board was an Involved Agency. Following the review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form and supplemental information provided by the Applicant and other interested or involved parties, the Town Board issued a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA, indicating that there would be no significant adverse environmental impact; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has considered the Lead Agency's Negative Declaration, and reviewed additional detailed information related to traffic, buffering, drainage, utilities, and architecture.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Planning Board finds the proposed site plan to be consistent with the project reviewed by the Town Board; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in its role as Lead Agency, the Town Board did exercise due diligence in identifying and notifying involved agencies, and pursuant to the SEQRA Regulations, Section 617.6(b)(3)(iii), the Lead Agency's Negative Declaration is binding on all involved agencies, and that SEQRA requires no further environmental review.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED**

---

**Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Helfer, 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. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plan.
3. Addresses or address ranges for each building 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 New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for review and approval by the Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan.
7. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition building shall be the same on all sides of the proposed building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be vinyl siding (in the tan/brown color family) with a mix of horizontal vinyl siding, with asphalt roof (in the brown color family). Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.
8. Details or catalogue cuts of the proposed light fixtures and standards shall be added to the plan.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

9. 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.
10. 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 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. The Planning Board consents to an alternate method of payment of such fee, if established by the Town Board. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
11. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
12. 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.
13. 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.
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. No pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled unless and until a Notice of Intent (NOI) has been filed with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (the "NYSDEC").

Throughout the life of the storm water permit (from the filing of the Notice Of Intent to the Notice Of Termination), the developer shall fully comply with all aspects of the NYSDEC General Permit No. GP-02-01, particularly subsections Part III.D.4 through III.D.7 which describe:

- periodic inspections of the construction site by a qualified professional,
- maintenance of a site log,
- stabilization requirements, and
- maintenance of sediment traps and ponds during construction.

The site log shall be made available to Town inspection staff upon request.

16. Upon completion of construction of the storm water management pond, the Applicant shall provide certification that such pond was constructed as designed and approved. Such certification shall be provided in the form of an as-built topographic survey with pertinent utility structures shown, prepared by a New York State Licensed Land

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

Surveyor. No final approval signatures shall be placed on the site plan unless and until the Applicant has submitted to the Town a financial guarantee (such as a letter of credit, certified check, or other acceptable instrument), in an amount approved by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney, that is sufficient to properly construct the proposed pond, and to provide the aforementioned certification. No release of such financial guarantee shall be made unless and until the improvements and certification are completed to the satisfaction of the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney.

17. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, the Commissioner of Public Works, and the Town's engineering staff.
18. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
19. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
20. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
21. The Planning Board staff is hereby directed to contact the Monroe County Department of Transportation about the traffic safety concerns expressed this evening regarding the intersection of Mitchell Road and Walker Street.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Helfer</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Slocum</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Fisher</b>	<b>Yes</b>		

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
June 22, 2016

**SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS**

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:00 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