



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MARCH 3, 2021

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

Michael H. Sofia

Richard C. Antelli

Jamie L. Anthony

Christine R. Burke

John Geisler

William E. Selke

Michelle Betters, Planning Board Secretary

John T. Caterino, Planning Board Clerk

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

Absent

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

Policy of Decorum

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Alex Sigismondi
Location: 79 Elmgrove Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.04-1-16
Request: Minor subdivision approval of the A&L Subdivision consisting of three lots on approximately 9.98 acres
Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)

Mr. Geisler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the April 7, 2021 meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
APRIL 7, 2021 MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

New Business

1. Applicant: Fallmarc Development, LLC
Location: Peck Road west of North Greece Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 058.01-1-001
Request: Preliminary and final plat approval for the Stonewood Estates subdivision, a cluster development subdivision pursuant to the requirements of Section 211-64 of the Zoning Ordinance, consisting of 13 Lots on approximately 21.7 acres
Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)

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

Richard Giraulo, Landtech Surveying and Planning presented the application.

Mr. Giraulo: I am pleased to be presenting the Stonewood Estates development for Fallmarc Development LLC for the property located at the northwest corner of Peck and North Greece Roads. The proposal is for a single-family residential development under section 278 of NYS Town Law which allows the Planning Board to modify zoning regulations.

The site is currently zoned R1-44 which has the largest required lot size in the Town of Greece. The site area is only 21.7 acres and severely restricted by Town of Greece floodplain and federal wetlands associated with two tributaries to Smith Creek that cross the property on the north and east sides. A conventional layout plan has been provided for your review that showed the floodplain and wetland areas. All lots have been laid out in accordance with the R1-44 zoning requirements. The plan showed that 13 lots could be development on the property under the current zoning regulations while respecting the environmental features on the property.

Fallmarc Development is proposing to develop the property in close conformance to the required setback limits and lot sizes with a few adjustments to better fit in with the environmental features on the site. The intent is to develop the site in a manner similar to the Stonewood Manor project by this developer located on the south side of Peck Road, just to the west of this project. That property was also developed under section 278 of NYS Town Law. Just like Stonewood Manor, this project is requesting an adjustment of the front setback from 70' to 50', the lot width from 150' to 120', the side setback from 20' to 10' and the rear setback from 70' to 50' for only lot #1. The minimum lot size of 31,760 sf is also requested for lots 11 and 12. All other requirements of the R1-44 zoning are being met. The front setback adjustment will allow for greater usable rear yard area since nearly all of the lots contain floodplain area in the rear yards.

The proposed project site shares its north property line with Chatham Estates. The Chatham Estates project was also developed under section 278 of NYS Town Law. Within Chatham Estates are lots as narrow as 105' wide and lot areas of around only 29,000 sf. The common property line contains a tributary to Smith Creek and associated floodplain and federal wetlands. The environmental area in Chatham Estates was placed within a conservation easement to preserve its character. The same treatment is proposed with this project. A conservation easement is proposed along the north and east sides of the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

property as shown in the darker green color and will contain the federal wetlands and Town floodplain areas. The area to be preserved is about 9.17 acres of the 21.7 acre parcel and will add to the existing preserved area within Chatham Estates. This will ensure that the natural and scenic qualities of the property within Stonewood Estates will be preserved.

A review of the existing lot sizes surrounding the project on North Greece and Peck Roads reveals that all but a few of the properties are smaller in size than what is being proposed. As discussed, the proposed project will match or exceed the current residential character of the neighboring properties and as a result, not have a negative impact on those properties.

Access to the property will occur from Peck Road between existing houses at #44 and 50 Peck Road. This will be a dedicated Town right of way and road system. Following discussions today with Mr. Don Bowers, the Town Fire Marshal, and the roadway width will be reduced to the standard 20' wide with accommodations made at the fire hydrant locations for additional paving. Mr. Bowers will be providing further direction on the exact accommodations once he has coordinated with the fire chief and other involved parties. We look forward to working this out with the Fire Marshal.

The access drive location between existing houses causes some challenges. First, the access width is only 60' wide with the right of way lines being within a few feet of existing driveways and a garage at 44 Peck Road. The other challenge relates to the grade differences between the garages at 44 and 50 Peck Road. The garage at 44 Peck Road is about 4.5' lower than the garage at 50 Peck Road. In order to better balance the grade differences for the new road construction we have proposed eliminating the sidewalk adjacent to 44 Peck Road. If the sidewalk were to be constructed in this area, a retaining wall would be required at the ROW line and become the responsibility of the Town of Greece. By eliminating the sidewalk, a retaining wall would not be required since the grade can then slope to meet the existing grades at the property line.

I am in receipt of a letter from Gary and Sherri Rawls at 44 Peck Road that indicates their concerns with the proposed development. I also met with Mr. Rawls this afternoon to further discuss his concerns which chiefly focused on drainage and security. Mr. Rawls property is not only much lower than his neighbors to the west, but the house sits below the elevation of Peck Road. The house is also a split level construction with the lower floor near the garage floor elevation. In the past, this has resulted in flooding of the lower home level during heavy rains and quick snow melt. It is my opinion that with the road construction, the runoff entering the property at 44 Peck Road will be reduced since the roadway drainage will convey most of the 60' wide right of way runoff into the new storm sewer system. However, there will still be 17.5' of the tree lawn area that will need to drain towards the Rawls' property. We would like to request if the DPW can plow all snow on the entrance drive to the west where so will drain into the road system during melting and not impact the Rawls property. The developer will be working with the Rawls to improve drainage along their property line with better swales and greater pitch. The other significant concern raised by Mr. Rawls was security of his property, especially his shed. Although there was discussion about the installation of a chain link fence outside of the Town right of way, no final determination has been made.

We are looking for further direction from the Town regarding the entrance and sidewalk proposal.

The entrance drive also has the unique condition of two land locked parcels directly behind the Peck Road frontage lots. One is owned by Monroe County and the other by Richard Gunther. Monroe County has indicated their willingness to sell the lot to Fallmarc Development as indicated in the MCDRC review. The other lot is being pursued for purchase,

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

but is complicated by the passing of Mr. Gunther. We should know in the coming weeks of the final disposition of that property. In either case, accommodations have been made to provide the lots with availability to sanitary sewer and water supply. Separate residential site plans will be prepared for development of those lots should they be acquired by Fallmarc.

We have also reviewed and responded to comments from the Greece DPW, and other than the entrance sidewalk issue, believe these to be minor considerations that can be resolved with them.

Several questions were raised by the Town planning staff related to this project for which a response has been provided. Noteworthy those were questions about a project sign and the panhandle property between 749 and 755 North Greece Road. Any project sign would be located on one of the interior lots and would be the responsibility of the homeowner to maintain. Regarding the panhandle property, the developer has reached out to the owners on North Greece Road to determine any if there was any interest in the property. The homeowners at 755 North Greece Road are not interested in acquiring any of the property and the property at 749 is under a sales obligation. The developer will continue to explore with any future homeowner at 749 North Greece Road if there is interest in the property. Otherwise, the panhandle will be part of lot 8 as currently configured.

Utilities to serve the project are readily available nearby. Sanitary sewer have been extended from the Chatham Estates project onto the property and water main will be brought in from Peck Road. Both Monroe County Pure Waters and Water Authority have reviewed the plans and are prepared to sign off.

A storm water management facility will be constructed on lot 8 adjacent to the creek to manage storm water runoff. It will be a permanent wet pond, and will meet all Town and State storm water regulations. Storm water is also being managed with three infiltration areas in the rear yards. Those occur on lots 2, 3, 5, 6, 11 and 12. The lot owners will be responsible for the maintenance of the facilities which has been noted on the Final Plat. Easements to the Town are proposed around each facility to allow the Town to access the facility should any homeowner fail to meet their maintenance responsibilities and cause an issue with a neighboring property.

As part of the original site plans, we had proposed to relocate a portion of the Smith Creek Tributary in the rear of lots #8 and #9. Given the concerns raised by the Town DPW, we have elected to remove the creek relocation work from the plans.

Mr. Caterino: The application was reviewed by the Monroe County Planning and Development, most of their comments were regarding what county agencies would need to approve this application. They also eluded to potential selling a piece of property to the west. No comments from our building or zoning staff. Our Fire Marshal had regarding the roadway and a conflict with the town and state codes. Mr. Giraulo did mention those conversations are still on going and hopefully have that item resolved by next meeting. Planning comments were about some of the notes on the plans along extending the sidewalk along the eastern portion of the proposed road. Given some of the restraints this could be an area where the Town Board would issue a waiver. For this application the sidewalk should be shown on the plan until a waiver is granted. We did receive a letter from Mr. Rawls at 44 Peck Road.

Mr. Gauthier: I think we can resolve most of the comments they are technical in nature. Particularly concerned about the vertical constraints as well as the horizontal we are going to have at the entrance, in determining how to resolve those constraints. We'll have to talk to Department of Public Works management about putting a policy in place. It would be very

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

unusual for them to commit to plowing to the west of the entrance area. We also have to speak about the elevations to accommodate the existing structure. The will work with the applicant and the Fire Marshal about the width of the road.

Mr. Fisher: John will you read the letter from Mr. Rawls?

Mr. Caterino: I appreciate you taking the time. The following are concerns that we have with the access road that is currently being planned to be built along the western boundary of our lot at 44 Peck Road.

- Safety and Security - According to the plan that was provided to us, the road would run immediately along our lot line. That is immediately adjacent to our driveway, where vehicles are are parked, and our garden shed, where our garden tools and other items of value to us are stored. We have already had occasions where our cars were broken into. Having the street immediately adjacent to our driveway would provide convenient access to, and escape from, our property for anyone who has ill intent. There is also the concern that our grandchildren, the youngest of whom is three, could be playing in close proximity to traffic, because the plan does not show that any sort of sidewalk or other defined border would exist between our backyard and driveway and the new street. That is completely unacceptable.
- Drainage - Our lot is the lowest property on the block; so low, in fact, that there was barely enough pitch for us to connect to the sewer line when it was installed. We have had water problems since we moved in; it puddles at the bottom of our driveway, in front of our enclosed garage. Originally, the puddling would be so bad that the water would run into the garage, and ultimately into our mudroom and family room. We addressed this by having our driveway torn out and replaced, with the pitch to be away from the house and toward the drainage ditch that runs along the western property line. That ditch connects to the one along the northern boundary of our lot. We still get significant puddling in front of our garage, especially from heavy rainwater and melting snow coming from the street, but the water does eventually move away from the house. Will the drainage ditch along our western boundary be retained? And, if not, how will water move away from our property?
- Snow Removal - In line with the water concerns, how will snow be handled? Will there be plowing that piles snow along our western property line; snow that will eventually melt and move our way? That would only add to the issues that we have with water buildup and drainage.
- Curb Appeal - Having this street run along our property will hurt the curb appeal that our house has, thereby hurting its resale value. We know that the property owner has the right to want to develop his lot, but we have taken care of his lot since we bought our house 29 years ago. We alone cut the grass; we alone cut and remove broken tree limbs; we alone try to control the poison oak that grows throughout. It seems that the development plan is giving little to no regard to its impact on our property, and is not very considerate, not very neighborly, and not very fair.

As we discussed, please pass on these concerns to the Board and the developer for their consideration and proposed solutions. I am available as needed should there be any questions or additional information required. Stay well! And again, thank you! Regards, Gary and Sherri Rawls. 44 Peck Road.

Mr. Geisler: You mention the retaining wall on the east side to protect the property.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

Mr. Giraulo: So in order to continue the sidewalk along 44 Peck Road it will be several feet higher than the property so that was the reason for the retaining wall. But then the town would be responsible for it and didn't think they would want that, so I was proposing we cross the sidewalk to the west and simply have it on one side of the road. It's important to know there are no sidewalks on Peck Road.

Mr. Geisler: Mr. Gauthier have you considered the retaining wall?

Mr. Gauthier: I have not excluded it but we have to explore all options.

Mr. Fisher: We need to get additional information.

Mr. Selke: My concern is about the snow removal to the west, how do we maintain that? I thought maybe we could offer some landscaping to 44 Peck Road so snow could not be put there. Is it normal that you put a "Stop" sign to Peck Road? What responsibility of Lot 8 who purchases that lot, in regards to storm water.

Mr. Giraulo: There would be a "Stop" sign that would be put up by the Town of Greece. The pond is a retention pond and that is wet all the time. The pan handle on Lot 8, out to North Greece Road, the town has property management requirements as part of the code, so if there was some violation they could be sited. We are pursuing neighbors on either side, one has declined, there is a sales contract on the other side, and we'll see how that plays out.

Mr. Caterino: Will the conservation easement on lot 8 extend to North Greece Road?

Mr. Giraulo: It will end at rear of the existing houses on North Greece Road. We are looking for recommendation on the sidewalk.

Mr. Fisher: There are a few alternatives and expect Mr. Gauthier to come back to us to see if it's appropriate to eliminate it or not.

Mr. Giraulo: Would the Planning Board make a recommendation to the Town Board?

Mr. Fisher: We have to see the alternatives first. Work with staff and let us know at next meeting.

Mr. Sofia: I think the wall will have issues with maintenance, when the sidewalk plows go through, if it can be done without it, it would be better looking and without the sidewalk on Peck Road, it would make more sense. Just my thoughts.

Mr. Caterino: I would show the sidewalk in the meantime.

Mr. Giraulo: I'll show the wall as well.

Mr. Antelli made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the March 17, 2021 meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
MARCH 17, 2021 MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Sonbyrne Sales Inc.
Location: 2070 Ridgeway Avenue
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.15-2-1
Request: Site plan review of proposed Byrne Dairy retail store and fueling facility (4232± square feet) with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 2.05 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Mr. Antelli made a motion, seconded by Ms. Anthony, to continue the application to the April 21, 2021 meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
APRIL 21, 2021 MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

2. Applicant: Long Pond Realty
Location: 1 Saredon Place
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.18-1-38.21
Request: Site plan review for a proposed one-story addition (4,100± square feet) to an existing building with expanded parking area, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 3.86 acres.
Zoning District: BP (Professional Office)

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

John Caterino, Town of Greece presented the application.

Mr. Caterino: Since our last meeting we have not received any comments from any property owners. We also sent notification to the Town of Gates as required under the 239-nn requirements. Most of the conditions are standard for this type of development.

Mr. Antelli made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler:

WHEREAS, Long Pond Realty (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor subdivision, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 1 Saredon Place (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, 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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

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.

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

MOTION CARRIED

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

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. Any Town of Greece approval or permit for these premises does not relieve the applicant, developer, or owner of the premises from obtaining all other town, county, state, or federal government approvals or permits that are required for the premises. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
3. 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.
4. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition shall be the same on all sides of the proposed addition, and shall be visually compatible with the existing building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be in conformance with the existing building's elevations. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed addition, and shall be filed with the site plan.
5. 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.
6. 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. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the 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 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. Snow storage areas shall be identified on the site plan and landscape plan.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. If the project "disturbance" exceeds 1 Acre of total area, 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").

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

12. Should a NYSDEC stormwater permit be required, 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-0-20-001, 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.
13. 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.
14. Subject to approval by the Town’s Building Inspector, Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
15. The Applicant shall develop the Premises as it relates to accessibility, as required by the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Codes and subject to the approval of the Building Inspector.
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 agents, designees, and successors.
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.

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

New Business

None

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Vanara Properties, LLC
Location: 145 Bellwood Drive
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.04-1-8.11
Request: Relief of Condition #8 (Exterior Appearance) of the site plan approval granted by the Planning Board on May 18, 2016
Zoning District: BG (General Business) & EDIO (Economic Development and Innovation Overlay)

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

John Caterino, Town of Greece presented the application.

Mr. Caterino: In 2016 the Board approved the site for the proposed hotel with the exterior being a mixture of horizontal siding and a base of 8-foot of decorative stone. The other item was a gable style roof at the entrance and they are requesting a flat roof and remove move the stone, just continue the siding down to the ground elevation.

Mr. Jerry Goldman: As pointed out it was approved and reapproved last month. In our letter of intent was to change some exterior appearance. The appearance will be the same on all four sides. We do not have the stone we are maintaining the appearance of the tan color families. The wainscoting will not be visible when there are cars parked in front of the building. This hotel is tucked in and not visible from 390 expressway. That is the only change we have. The number of rooms have changed from 124 to 122 plus one exercise room. John pointed out the roof will be flat but a bit larger this will help with weather and does not block the lower rooms.

Mr. Fisher: It looks pretty nice.

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

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

**MOTION CARRIED
RELEIF GRANTED**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 3, 2021

ADJOURNMENT: 7:40 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