



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

NOVEMBER 8, 2018

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

Christine R. Burke

John Geisler

Jamie L. Slocum

Michael H. Sofia

William E. Selke

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Absent

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Maiden Meadows LLC
Location: 1826 & 1850 Maiden Lane
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 059.03-5-41, 42 & 059.03-5-38.1
Request: Preliminary plat approval for the Maiden Meadows subdivision, consisting of 75 lots (including 72 one- and two-story townhomes and 2 existing houses and a common area) on approximately 15.45 acres
Zoning District: RML (Multi-Family Residential)

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

Richard Giraulo and John Sciarabba, L.S., LandTech Surveying and Planning, PLLC; and Robert Laviano, Maiden Meadows LLC , presented the application.

Mr. Giraulo: Thank you for having us. This project has been in the works since about 2011, and so we are happy to get to this point. The project is about 15.54 acres in size. It includes part of the rear of the Greece United Methodist Church property. We have purchased some of their land, and it is part of this project. In December of last year the Town Board rezoned this property to a multi-family zoning; a SEQRA review was done at that time. The site will have 72 units that will be multi-family. There are two existing houses that will remain and those will be sold; they were rezoned with the project. A homeowners association will be formed to maintain common facilities, including roadway, storm drainage system, and the grounds—lawn, snow—so owners can have carefree living. The property will be subdivided; they will be lots for sale. We expect to attract young folks, and they tend to want more carefree living. This will give them the opportunity to do that and stay within the town they grew up in. The lots that we will create run about 2000 to 3200 square feet in size; we left more space in the rear. There will be a common property; that will be part of the HOA. The concern was raised where that property had a value and if the taxes were not paid it would go back to the Town. The Town has handled that by the Assessor assigning a value of \$0.00 to the common land; there are no taxes to pay on that lot, so there is no property tax default that might cause the Town to end up with that common lot. The intent is to file this as one subdivision section, but we would phase the development of the lots. The project is made up of various size buildings; there will be one-story ranch units on the ends of the blocks of townhouses, and two-story units in the center. There are four-, five-, and six-unit blocks of townhouses, so there is a mix. Although this is the first time you're seeing this, we have been working with the Town and we have met with the neighbors to come up with the plan you see. This plan shows the ends of buildings facing the neighbors so that they don't see the mass of the block of townhouses (as they would if they were looking at the rear). We also angled the layout to avoid a large wall of building. We expect the unit size to be 1300 to 1600 square feet, with a starting price of \$180,000. There will be a private roadway system that will serve the residents. The units have two-car garages with every unit and parking for two cars, so every unit has space for four cars. We also have parking lots around the units

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

to provide for visitor parking. We have a total of about 323 parking spaces on-site. A traffic assessment was done to see how much traffic this project would generate, what impact it would have on Maiden Lane. The results showed that no improvements to Maiden Lane were required for this project. The sight distances are greater than 500 feet, and there is enough separation from other roads, so it should be a safe intersection. With a for-sale-type project, we do have to have some public facilities. The water main has to be dedicated to the Monroe County Water Authority, and the sanitary sewer will be taken over by the Town of Greece. We will provide easements for them and will include the roadway and the area around the facility itself. The sanitary sewer is being brought into the project from Round Pond Lane. We have obtained an easement from 383 Round Pond Lane, which allows us to come into the project, install the sanitary sewer, and service it. This works well because the site slopes from south to north and really west to east, and the sewer fill follow the grade. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") has very stringent storm water regulations now. Not only do they require us to manage storm events from a one-year storm to a 100-year storm, they also require us to provide water quality; for that, we essentially have to clean up the storm water and get it back into the ground. The whole intent is to get the water back into the ground. In that regard we were doing a bunch of things on the site to do that. One of the best is an infiltration basin, or dry pond. In dry times, it will look like a lawn, and it will fill up on rain events and the intent is the water is cleaned and soaks into the ground. I have created infiltration areas for this project which follow the periphery of the site. The largest is at the northwest corner, and this will take the storm sewer runoff as well as any sheet flow into this facility and allow it to percolate into the soil. We have performed soil testing on the site and found the percolation rate to be between 15 inches to 80 inches per hour. It's really sandy soil; that's a good thing and we can manage our storm water more quickly. We did the design based on a percolation rate of five inches per hour; we also looked at it as if there were no infiltration. We did a test with no infiltration; they still fill up even on a 100-year event, and all we have is a slight overflow. Another feature is that all of the facilities are on the periphery. With the flow from south to north, if this first facility fills up, it will overflow into the next facility to the north and so on, so before anyone is flooded out this will continue around and make it into Round Pond Creek. As an additional measure of protection, I ran storm sewers, which will take storm water runoff to a pipe system and to a larger facility. I have a plan that shows landscaping for the site. We are adding evergreen buffering, especially at the ends of the drives, so we can create a visual barrier. We will be retaining some existing trees, although not as much as I would like. With the rezoning, we thought we could preserve more in this area, but because of the storm system I'm going to have to take down some more trees. The grading down here actually runs toward the neighbors on Blue Grass. There is no existing storm sewer system near the rear yards of the neighbors on Blue Grass Lane; there is no exit for the storm water. Water that drains to the north and in the rear yards of Round Pond Lane, they will have better storm water management. With our improvements here, we will cut off any possibility of our site draining onto the neighbors, and in fact I will be taking the rear yard drainage from the neighbors into my facilities, so that should really improve their drainage in those areas. I will go over some issue from the Town's engineering staff. Round Pond Creek runs through part of our project, with a Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") flood zone that is associated with it. There are existing drainage and flooding easements but they are smaller than the flood zone, so we will be increasing the extent of those easements and include the flood zone along Round Pond Creek. There was a study done by the Town on this creek; the belief is that the elevations and the width were underestimated. I don't think that this will impact our project. There was a comment about the easement width, so we are going to protect it with concrete encasement where it is narrow. There will be no grading done in the flood zone. These units will have full basements; people like having basements, and we need the fill. The site is being raised several feet, so the excavation will help with that. There also was a concern about some of the basement elevations being below the floodplain by several feet; however, we are

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

outside the floodplain. This project will be phased and will take years to develop. We'll start in the front (south end) and will work our way back (northward). We have to install sanitary sewers and storm water management facilities fairly early in the project, so there will be work done in some of these northern areas during the first phase.

Mr. Selke: If you're going to do this in phases, are the trees coming down by each phase, or are you going to take down the trees in one shot?

Mr. Giraulo: That still is under discussion. I don't think that we are opposed to phasing that work; I have to clear pathways for utilities. We could clear in part or phase that if the Town is concerned about that.

Mr. Selke: If the trees are gone, how is it going to look? If it will take a couple of years to complete, the neighbors should understand what will happen during that time.

Mr. Giraulo: The renderings are accurate because this unit has been built elsewhere. The exterior will be vinyl siding, earth tone colors with white trim, lower stone watermark, and gables to break up the roofline. There will be patios with sliding doors out the back, with fencing between for privacy. I took photos to see about buffering for the neighbors, one unique piece is that some of the Blue Grass Lane residents have acquired part of a strip of land that creates a buffer. Some of the photos show some trees with ivy, and there are some parts with some scrub; there also are some areas with some nicer trees that can be saved. Some of the Blue Grass properties have evergreens along the property line, which creates a buffer already. A lot of the areas show just a tree with some ivy; it does not provide much of a buffer, but it's what is there. I think that this a good way to show what's there and to understand what the neighbors have and what we can do to help buffer that. Our building setbacks meet the zoning code, currently a little over 50 feet from the building to the property line. We have about 170 feet from our buildings to existing houses. Some of the neighbors' lots are over 200 feet deep, so they have big rear yards; when you get to Round Pond Lane, you have standard 80-foot x 150-foot lots. Some of this property was farm, so there are no woods to preserve.

Mr. Copey: Mr. Giraulo, I appreciate the detail in what it looks like. There is not a whole lot to work with in proximity to that property line. There are trees and clusters of vegetation that are worth saving. Our discussion really was about pushing back some and leaving some more room along the site's east property line so that some of that vegetation could remain and be augmented with additional buffer, as they are proposing now. This creates not only a buffer but maintains some aspect of what is there now. There will be a change but the goal is to try to minimize that. This project was rezoned back in December 2017. I have to check, but I think that the Planning Board will have to do its own State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") determination. We have not received comments from the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee, but we are expecting those soon. We have to talk about approving one section and filling in phases. We had a technical review from our department, about moving some buildings around and comments about notes. The Building Department wanted to make sure that all units were Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") accessible. The Fire Marshal had comments about the emergency access route; I think that we have sorted that out. There is an easement not only over the proposed access road but over the church parking lot and out to Maiden Lane. We received a letter from a neighbor at 92 Running Brook Lane; she had concerns about traffic and character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Selke: Will the Town's Tree Council look at this property? I'm also concerned about filling the existing open gaps in the views of the neighbors; that will help their visual buffer.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Giraulo gave a good overview of the engineering concerns. A lot of what remains to be done are details that we can hash out. The drainage still is something that we

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

are trying to feel comfortable with. Regarding the buffer along Round Pond Creek, FEMA studied this creek in 1992 and reanalyzed it for their 2008 study. In 2008, they actually decreased the width of the floodplain and they made a mistake. The Town hired a consulting engineer, who found that there is 40% inflow into the Town's large Deschel Drive storm water management facility (which is about 2.5 miles upstream) than there was when the facility was created about 40 years ago; as a result, there is significantly more flow being discharged from that facility during extreme storm events. For that reason, we recommended a buffer be put in place to keep out of the floodplain to avoid the consequences of building in an area that could be subject to flooding, even if FEMA says that it isn't that type of area. It's going to be wider and higher than what was studied. That is an important comment and a recommendation. When a large site like this is cleared—and 95 times out of 100, the full extent of the clearing that is to take place on a site is done at the beginning of the project — if something different were done here it would be a more expensive way of doing it. It would be extraordinary if clearing took place only when and where utilities and homes are being built at that time. Just to do mass clearing and grading is a significant portion of the cost. If the Board is interested in restricting that in some way, we'll have to take a look at it; it would be unusual to bring the heavy equipment back multiple times.

Mr. Selke: My concern is how it is left. Have you talked to the developer about that?

Mr. Gauthier: They have indicated that they have not made a decision.

Mr. Fisher: What we can do is determine what areas that won't be cleared ever, so that vegetation is not touched in those areas, rather than try to regulate clearing in the interior of the site, where there won't be much that we can do. The critical areas are adjacent to the homes, especially where it does not look like there will be much retained. So to get around that cost would be to identify areas where vegetation will not be removed before or after construction, where you would be retaining that existing buffering.

Mr. Geisler: I've seen this creek overflow. During the high rain in 2017, that water was overflowing, and I'm sure that the banks were overflowing considerably. I'm wondering why it does not show on the map.

Mr. Gauthier: The FEMA floodplain does show on your map. The problem is that we are reaching the 100-year flood level on a much more frequent basis. The storm in 2017 was a less than a 10-year event. Based on our consultant's information, the floodplain is four or five feet wider than what the FEMA floodplain study indicated. It would be prudent to stay five to ten feet away from the FEMA line that's there.

Betsy Dewey, 71 Blue Grass Lane: There was specific mention of our property, and we are the ones who purchased the additional strip of land between our home and this site. Our property line is one of the closest to the second proposed building. It's just 50 feet where the rest are more than that. I spoke of this back in 2017, many of my neighbors signed a petition, called several times to find out when this was coming back to the Town Board for a decision. When it came back it, was put on the Town Board agenda at the very last minute, and we felt a little marginalized by the Town government. Because our house is one of the closest to the project, I would like to see what the buffering will be; maybe fencing could be added. If trees will be planted, I would want them to be planted as soon as possible. There currently is an area where drainage backs up; I have some photos for the record. You can see the amount of water that is on the property.

Mr. Gauthier: Can you explain the drainage area? Is it supposed to be there?

Ms. Dewey: I'm not sure.

Mr. Gauthier: I'll take a look.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

Ms. Dewey: In the spring, our sump pump runs all the time; if that failed, we would have water in our basement.

Mr. Gauthier: This developer is required to make sure that the development of his property doesn't cause any off-site problem, and in general make it somewhat better. He is not required to go onto your property and fix your existing problem. If runoff from his site currently is draining onto your property, it will not be doing that in the future.

Mr. Dewey: I would like this Board to consider moving that second building—we are the closest to that one—to give us some more distance from it.

Mr. Fisher: I had the same concern about the distance there, not that the house is closer but the storm water management facilities; that precludes the separation that we like to see. Buffering is an issue, so if we look maybe having a greater distance, not only for the house but for the facility, that will be put in place so that we are able to retain existing vegetation or provide more to act as a buffer. I think that is something that we will be pursuing. So, look at shifting all the buildings or moving individual buildings.

Mr. Selke: What's your opinion on the position of the buildings?

Ms. Dewey: It's an improvement over the first plan.

Mr. Fisher: With the driveways, you need to keep the vegetation there.

Ms. Dewey: Can you explain the easements that were granted from Round Pond Lane? What transpired, was it financial?

Mr. Schiano: That's not relevant to this Board's decision. You may ask why they need an easement. All of your questions have been good so far; this helps the Board hear what it needs to hear.

Ms. Dewey: To confirm, these units are for sale, not lease? There is a concern that if these don't sell they will be leased; we want to make sure.

Mr. Schiano: This Board preclude that.

Ms. Fisher: They are proposing to subdivide the property into individual lots for each townhouse unit, so that they can sell individual units.

Mr. Selke: The homeowners association will have a lot to do with making sure things that things look the same. Grass will be cut and maintained in a common way.

Ms. Dewey: I understand that; I'm just raising the concern—homeowners versus renters—and the neighbors are concerned.

Mr. Schiano: What about the fence you mentioned? Did you talk to your neighbors?

Ms. Dewey: Some neighbors do have chain-link fence. Some of the trees that are there are bare at the bottom. To maintain privacy, maybe a fence.

Mr. Fisher: Our preference is natural buffering.

Mr. Giraulo: I would like to understand if the neighbors would like the vegetation saved or new added?

Mr. Fisher: I would prefer to have vegetation saved then supplement with new vegetation, and each property is different.

Mr. Sofia: We have done that in the past. Our staff is knowledgeable in how to achieve that.

Doug Worboys, 1048 Long Pond Road: I have had only one ice jam in 30 years, and I have seen the creek overflow one time in 30 years. My concern is that the pond at the north end will become overgrown with vegetation.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

Mr. Fisher: To properly be effective in meeting the NYSDEC's storm water management requirements, some of the vegetation that has to be put in does not appeal visually to some people.

John Gagnon, 145 Blue Grass Lane: My first question is if it going to be in phases, if it's cleared, I prefer to keep as much vegetation as possible and add in where we have to. We live near the north end of this site, and we will be staring at a vacant space for years. What happens if the first phase does not sell out and if this will be a multi-age group of residents, with kids? What does this project offer for children? I'm disappointed that all the green space is disappearing, and we are not in favor of the project.

Debbie Steene, 101 Blue Grass Lane: My concern is the storm water and drainage issue. Every spring, a one third of my yard is filled with water. At one point, the Town installed a new drainage pipe and said that the property was graded toward our property.

Mr. Sofia: Anything that is pitched toward your property will get pitched toward the new drainage system. They might not get all the existing storm water runoff from your site, but they will not add to it.

Mr. Schiano: It won't make your property worse, and it might make it better.

Mr. Gauthier: They are going to make their property lower; the property will be lower than yours. They will help your drainage even though they don't have to help your drainage. It won't happen overnight; it's a process.

Mary Vogler, 111 Blue Grass Lane: The water is supposed to run back to a trough, to a pipe that does not work.

Mr. Copey: It seems like there is an existing drainage issue, and sounds like it might not be related to this project. If one of our engineers went out to look at your property, would it be alright to go into your rear yard?

Ms. Vogler: That's fine.

Harold Hefke, 95 Running Brook Lane: My wife and I have been very happy living here in Brookview subdivision; we enjoy it. We started looking for that type of housing and that is the housing that we really needed. A question is, are you going to be able to get a bus in there if it's multi-family? I also recommend that the ponds be part of the homeowners association's responsibilities.

Arthur Daughton, 146 Fisherman's Cove: Are they committed to saving some of the trees? I think that the setback should be 70 feet for these neighbors. I want to get that on the record.

Ms. Dewey: I would be happy to meet with the developer to identify trees that should be kept.

Mr. Fisher: The Town has a Tree Council, and we'll refer it to them to help identify those trees and get recommendations.

Mr. Giraulo: We don't expect to get many young families. We think that the market is senior citizens and young millennials without kids. A firetruck and a bus can enter this project. Regarding the drainage, yes, there is a part of the site that does drain into that low spot, and so our site will be changed to drain that low spot; we won't add any more water. I did not hear confirmation about saving the low vegetation.

Mr. Fisher: Our intent is to save the existing vegetation and supplement it; it should be done on a lot-by-lot basis. We also will get a recommendation from the Tree Council. We want to provide buffering. This Board's preference is to leave what's there and to supplement it, and guarantee what the final product will be like.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

Mr. Sofia: We have done it successfully in other locations, and it can be done with this project—leave as much existing vegetation as possible, and fill in the voids. There can be a fence at the end of each driveway, with landscaping.

Mr. Fisher: We value your input, and want to gather as much information as we can.

Mr. Giraulo: There was a question about the pond that will go in first, and if the project stopped, would the work be finished or left undone? The Town requires financial guarantees to ensure the satisfactory completion of facilities that are to be dedicated to the Town. If the project stopped, the rest of property would be left vacant until development resumed.

Mr. Geisler: Was it considered to take down the existing houses and put some of the townhouses there?

Mr. Giraulo: With the setbacks required by the zoning district, you could not fit them in there.

Mr. Selke: Have you provided for snow storage areas? Will you have lighting on the streets or on the houses? I'm impressed that you have extra parking. Will the buildings be uniform?

Mr. Giraulo: There will be individual lights on posts.

Mr. Laviano: They will have a uniform look, with earth tones.

Ms. Slocum: I'm not sure if this is an exact look but as a potential buyer there is a lot of asphalt in the front. If it could be broken up somehow that would look more appealing. Maybe a sidewalk or grass area. It looks like a sea of garage doors.

Mr. Laviano: I welcome your comments; to integrate some green space would be better.

Mr. Sofia: How about deed restrictions?

Mr. Laviano: Typically, restrictions and requirements are installed through the homeowner association bylaws; they typically address things such as what is allowed in the driveway, color changes, etc.

Mr. Sciarabba: The buffer area between our site and the east property line, is there a distance that you can give us to work with?

Mr. Copey: 70 feet.

Mr. Sciarabba: Maybe we can move the road to the west and shift the buildings. Does the Planning Board take care of that?

Mr. Schiano: That would require an application for an area variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals; the Planning Board could offer a recommendation

Mr. Fisher: Work with our staff; that sounds like it would be beneficial.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

Mr. Selke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the November 28, 2018, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
NOVEMBER 28, 2018, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Reid Petroleum Corporation
Location: 3561 Latta Road & 638 North Greece Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 044.04-1-01, 044.04-1-12
Request: Site plan for proposed convenience store, restaurant, and fuel sales (4,200± square feet), including drive-up service lanes and window, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.38 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Ms. Burke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the November 28, 2018, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
NOVEMBER 28, 2018, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

1. Applicant: MUY! Hamburger Partners, LLC
Location: 3190 Latta Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-1-4.111
Request: Site plan for proposed Wendy's restaurant (2,700± square feet), with related drive-up service lanes and window, parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.14 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

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

Mike Neikirk, Civil Engineer for MUY! Hamburger Partners, LLC; Mr. Moll, Director of Development for MUY! Hamburger Partners, LLC; and Ken Bracker, R.A., Bracker Associates, presented the application.

Mr. Bracker: We are happy to be back tonight. Earlier this month we sent updated plans for the archecture. We have added spandrel glass similar to the front and I think that we have addressed what you wanted.

Mr. Fisher: Yes, that is what we are looking for.

Mr. Bracker: This plan shows that we have added bike storage and snow storage.

Mr. Neikirk: Last time we were here we took your comments and moved the building 15 feet north. We have moved the entrance road south as requested, and eliminated 15 parking spaces.

Mr. Copey: We asked them to give us a current count of the parking spaces in the business center and they do comply with the overall requirements for the business center. We have reviewed the location of the building, and they were responsive to our comments; the revised plan reflects that. They fixed the concern about the main entrance road; they cut back the curb line.

Mr. Gauthier: The Town's Traffic Advisory Committee ("TAC") took a look at the new plan, and they looked very favorably on this plan. They did have some concerns but their overall response was that this was an improvement. They want to be sure that you are comfortable with the new number of parking spaces?

Mr. Neikirk: Yes, corporate is and the owner is, too.

Mr. Copey: I want to thank you and corporate and thank engineering and the TAC. The new curb cut looked too close to Latta Road, but our expert told us that it is fine, and it's better than what it was.

Arthur Daughton, 146 Fisherman's Cove: Can I can conclude that the setback on the south is equal to the rest of the buildings? How did the two block buildings end up there? Will the architecture work there?

Mr. Copey: It's comparable to both existing buildings.

Mr. Fisher: At the last meeting, we mentioned that it should match. It's a nice looking building, and the consensus of the Board was that it would work.

Mr. Geisler: Are they removing trees on the east side?

Mr. Neikirk: We are adding new on our site but the rest will remain. We have not updated the landscape plan since the new design.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

Mr. Fisher: The landscaping is nice, and we would ask you to continue the landscaping that's there, especially in the area in the north; further north, you have taken out a lane, so continue what exists there.

Mr. Selke: Will these plants survive the winter?

Mr. Neikirk: That's your requirement. We have snow storage marked but will coordinate with the landscaper.

Mr. Selke: You will need "Stop" signs added to the plan. How many Wendy's do you have where handicapped persons have to cross the traffic? Can you add a sign?

Mr. Neikirk: The design does meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Moll: We have 315 Wendy's; we are experienced in building restaurants. Putting parking near a building is problematic.

Mr. Fisher: When we look at a similar circumstance, they put a sign there, telling people where they are going to cross.

Mr. Schiano: Some sort of "Yield to Pedestrians" sign.

Mr. Selke: What about lighting? Do your employees park further away? Is the outdoor seating protected?

Mr. Neikirk: We can add a sign off to the side. We will be adding new lighting for our site, and parking lot lighting. We do ask employees to park further away. There is a gate around the outdoor seating.

Mr. Geisler: Are the entrance signs laminated?

Mr. Neikirk: There are no entrance signs.

Mr. Sofia made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Selke:

WHEREAS, MUY! Hamburger Partners, LLC (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 3190 Latta Road (the "Premises"); and

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,

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").

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 Transportation, 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, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, 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. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed building shall be generally the same on all sides of the proposed building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be fiber cement wall panels (in the tan/brown, red, and grey color families) and metal panel fascia (in the grey color family), with grey trim. 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.
7. 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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

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.

8. The special use permit that was granted by the Town Board and the date on which it was granted shall be added to the plan.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
12. 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.
13. 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 comply fully with all aspects of the NYSDEC General Permit No. GP-0-15-002, particularly Part IV, which describes:

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

The periodic inspection reports shall be provided to the Town's Engineering staff within 24 hours of inspections.

14. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
15. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
16. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
17. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
18. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall provide an appropriate crosswalk, including vertical traffic control element such as signage, in the vicinity of the handicapped parking spaces.
19. As offered and agreed by the applicant, the existing landscaping scheme shall be continued around the north end of the site.
20. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, "Stop" signs shall be provided at both driveway exits.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
November 8, 2018

New Business

None

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

ADJOURNMENT: 9:35 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