



*William D. Reilich*  
*Supervisor*

# **TOWN OF GREECE**

## **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 7, 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  
Christine R. Burke  
Richard C. Antelli  
John Geisler  
Jamie L. Slocum  
William E. Selke  
Michael H. Sofia

Scott R. Copey, Planner  
John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer  
Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney  
Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

### **Absent**

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

### **Announcements**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Old Business**

1. Applicant: Munipro, Inc.  
Location: Generally, north of 106 Gates-Greece Town Line Road  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 088.04-4-63, 089.03-5-4.112  
Request: Approval for the resubdivision of Lots R-3A and R-3C of the South Pointe Landing Resubdivision, consisting of 4 lots on approximately 188.35 acres  
Zoning District: FOI (Flexible Office/Industrial)

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

Scott Copey, Planner, Town of Greece, presented the application

Mr. Copey: I'll explain the map, and have highlighted the different parcels. The parcel to be conveyed to Addison Precision Manufacturing is 30 acres in size. Of those 30 acres, approximately 23 acres belong to Munipro, Inc. today, and 7 acres belong to the Town today. The Town will convey its 7± acres to Munipro, which will, in turn, sell 30 acres to Addison.

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

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2018, the Planning Board issued a negative declaration following the coordinated review of a site plan proposed by APM Holdings on these same Premises, indicating that there would be no significant adverse environmental impact. This subdivision is secondary to, precipitated by, and necessary for construction of the APM Holdings proposal approved by the Planning Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, the SEQRA Regulations require no further environmental review by the Planning Board.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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**

---

**Ms. Burke then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Slocum, 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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

2. Subject to approval by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and Engineering staff.
3. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
4. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
5. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
February 8, 2018

**New Business**

None

**SITE PLANS**

**Old Business**

1. Applicant: Village Crossing, LLC  
Location: 3455 & 3471 Mount Read Boulevard  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 075.05-2-8, 075.05-2-9  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed mixed-use retail and office building (two stories; 47,380± total square feet—23,240 square feet on ground floor, 24,140 square feet on second floor), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 3.35 acres  
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

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

Peter Vars, P.E., BME Associates; Bryan Powers, P.E., Village Crossing, LLC; and Donald Riley, Vice President Marketing & Development, Mark IV Enterprises, presented the application.

Mr. Vars: We are here to update on the progress that we have made since we were here three weeks ago. Last evening, we were before the Zoning Board of Appeals, and they granted four variances: one was for lot coverage; a reduction in parking; another was for a driveway to be 16 feet to 19.9 feet off the south property line; and the last variance was for a closed-construction, board-on-board fence that would be constructed along the south property line. It is proposed to be eight feet tall and to be installed on a two-foot-high berm. Also it will be extended where it starts from the front setback line, the first 25 feet is considered the front yard, and a variance was granted for that as well. Some comments were about the lighting. The proposed lighting along the south property line will contain shields so that there will be no spillage off the property. We have modified the pedestrian walk, providing connection to the new Burger King and to the sidewalk on Mount Read Boulevard. The last issue was the Paddy Hill Creek floodplain. The site plan has been modified at the west end, and we have agreed on an elevation of that with staff—it is on the plan—and we have moved all development out of the floodplain.

Mr. Copey: Most of the changes that have been made are reflected on the drawings. We have a letter from the Monroe County Department of Transportation ("MCDOT") in which it is pointed out that, as part of this approval, Mark IV is required to finish the pedestrian improvements at the intersection of Mount Read Boulevard and the Tops plaza driveway; the staff's recommended conditions of approval include that. The applicants also are requesting approval for a resubdivision to rearrange the property lines. My understanding is that they are ready to go with that map; it would be an administrative approval. We also are requesting a cross access and shared parking agreement which would encompass the whole business center. In addition, I had a discussion with Mr. Roy Laforce, who is a neighbor to the west of the site; he has some concerns about site lighting, site drainage, and impact on the wetlands. One item is the existing lighting on the Tops site, which we will handle separately.

Mr. Gauthier: The concerns that we had about drainage and floodplain have been addressed.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Arthur Daughton, 52 Goethals Drive: I'd like to know his concern. One thing that came up was major erosion from Tops runoff, which is part of the bigger issue, with the flooding down at the lake, and it's where the volume of water goes. We don't use protection. They erode, and I can say that because I have walked them and I have photo of it. What is going to be done because this sits in the floodplain too and if the erosion is being created, you can see it for yourself, then what's going to happen? I would suggest some sort of mitigation. I called the county about the traffic. Two previous projects got turned down. And who owns the traffic signal?

Mr. Copey: Which traffic signal? Mark IV has maintenance responsibility.

Mr. Riley: In 1988 and 1989, there were some applications. It could have been that the Town did not even entertain those applications at all. Since 1988, Wegmans supermarket has expanded, and the MCDOT has done repeated traffic studies; they have shared those with you as you have approved those expansions. Mark IV paid for the installation of the traffic signal, as does Wegmans and every major developer. We are obliged to maintain and operate them to the MCDOT's direction and standards. When it comes to drainage, Tops was built exactly the way it was required to be built, maintaining its underground systems. The suggestion that Tops is eroding Paddy Hill Creek is not supported. We believe that some of the flows that are eroding the creek come from as far as Eastman Kodak Company's Eastman Business Park. There are some drainage issues that the Town is working on with Kodak. Our project has to reduce the rate of flow that currently exists by thirty percent, so we are not going to be adding; we will be reducing what goes into the creek. Mr. LaForce communicated with me about the lighting. I went to Tops plaza tonight and saw that there are 4 lights out of 30 that need a shielded lens; we're going to get those shielded. There are two that face Maiden Lane, and we're going to get those taken care of. Those are peripheral issues, but they are important to us. Mr. Daughton keeps asking about who takes care of the traffic. The MCDOT will direct us, and we have to do a crosswalk. Mark IV pays for that traffic signalization. Even though they benefit the developer, they also benefit the public, and are well in excess of \$100,000 to build and maintain. The signals are installed to the MCDOT's specifications and requirements and modifications.

Mr. Copey: Regarding the lights in Tops plaza, are you saying that Mark IV will fix them?

Mr. Riley: Yes, we're going to get them done; it's our tenant.

Mr. Copey: The reason that I ask is that we were going to go to our code compliance staff. I'm not saying that to push you, but I would much rather deal with the property owner.

Mr. Riley: Be my guest, I welcome your help. We have heard over the last meetings about where the trash and papers come from, and identified what comes from where. We take our responsibility seriously. If Tops is unresponsive to an appearance ticket or going to court, if they don't respond, we'll get it done.

Mr. Copey: I would ask of you to help me get in touch with the right person.

Mr. Riley: I will.

Mr. Gauthier: I would like to comment on what Mr. Daughton said. This project is not being built in the floodplain, and there is no element of this current project that will be in the floodplain. The original concept touched the floodplain, but no longer, and it will reduce the contribution of flow leaving the site and entering the creek.

Roy LaForce, 136 True Hickory Drive: I want to thank Mr. Riley and the Board for working on the lighting issue. That has always been an issue and Tops has not fixed the problem. I would like to echo the erosion. Forty years ago when I moved into my home, when a McDonald's was proposed to go in the area, the engineer said that you can't put any more

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

flow there into the creek. Now we have massive erosion. I could jump across the creek when I moved in; now it's about 20 feet wide.

Mr. Fisher: The Town has recognized that when we have upstream development it can cause issues downstream. That's why we required that when new development comes in they have to reduce the rate of flow that enters a tributary.

Mr. Gauthier: This particular stream has its headwaters in Eastman Business Park. Eastman Kodak Company has been a good friend to this community, but it was not a big fan of storm water management. When Eastman Business Park developed years ago (as Kodak Park), there were no storm water management facilities built concurrent with all the development upstream of Corona Road and the other streets in the Koda Vista neighborhood. From 1975 until 2005, the Town had a regulation that made you mitigate storm water runoff at the same level of runoff pre-development; that requirement was not enforced uniformly in some areas. That's the cause of erosion. As Eastman Business Park redevelops, we have an opportunity to improve storm water conditions there. We're trying to do there what we are doing on this site; we'll get there. This project is a good example of a project that is made for storm water by following our current regulations. This Board has been very supportive of that.

Mr. LaForce: Another concern that I have is the ash trees. The roots are exposed and that just means more erosion.

Mr. Sofia: I think that the applicant has done a nice job responding to our comments.

Mr. Fisher: The biggest issue was the elimination of the drive-up service facility for an ATM, with the illumination from the lights; lighting for that kind of use is very bright. The applicant's recognition of that and making the change and working with the residents to be able to find a solution to mitigate that, not only the light but people cutting through, is very beneficial to what it could have been.

Mr. Selke: They have done a lot to mitigate some of our issues.

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

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. On June 21, 2016, the Town Board approved the rezoning of the Premises to BR (Restricted Business). The rezoning and development of the Premises were classified 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"), and were the subject of a coordinated environmental review, for which the Town Board was the 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/Project Sponsor 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.
2. In its role as the lead agency, the Town Board exercised due diligence in identifying and notifying involved agencies, including the Planning Board, and pursuant to the SEQRA Regulations, Section 617.6(b)(3)(iii), the lead agency's negative declaration is binding on all involved agencies.
3. The Planning Board has considered the lead agency's negative declaration, and has reviewed additional detailed information related to traffic, buffering, utilities, drainage, and other relevant issues.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

4. The Planning Board finds the Proposal to be consistent with the project reviewed by the Town Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that SEQRA requires no further environmental review by the Planning Board.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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. Sofia then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Selke, 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. Addresses for each building shall be added to the plan, subject to approval by the Fire Marshal.
3. Subject to approval of a subdivision which modifies property lines to accommodate the proposed development in conformance with state and local codes.
4. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, and pursuant to a March 16, 2017, letter to the Planning Board from the Monroe County Department of Transportation, the applicant shall complete the remaining work associated with the privately owned traffic signal at the Mount Read Boulevard entrance to the site, specifically the pedestrian crossing for sidewalks on the east side of the intersection (ESL Federal Credit Union entrance). Details and assurances for completion of such work shall be subject to approval by the Monroe County Department of Transportation.
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 or Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

7. 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.
8. 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 horizontal siding (in a variety of colors as shown on elevations presented to the Planning Board), brick (in the tan color family) with light-colored trim and asphalt and metal roof (in the grey and reddish color families). 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.
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. Snow storage areas shall be identified on the plan.
11. A cross access and shared parking agreement shall be provided for the Business Center.
12. 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.
13. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
14. 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.
15. Water mains and hydrants shall be installed and be in proper operating conditions prior to the commencement of any aboveground construction.
16. 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.
17. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management facilities. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
18. 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.
19. 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.



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

20. 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.

21. 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 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.
22. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
23. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
24. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
25. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
February 8, 2018

2. Applicant: New Mark Development Company, Inc.  
Location: 3507 Mount Read Boulevard  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 075.05-2-3.11/COM  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed freestanding restaurant (one story; 2,900± square feet) with drive-up service facility, and with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 2.61 acres  
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

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

Bryan Powers, P.E., Village Crossing, LLC; Donald Riley, Vice President Marketing & Development, Mark IV Enterprises; and Peter Vars, P.E., BME Associates, presented the application.

Mr. Powers: The site plan includes a 2900-square-foot restaurant. As a follow-up from our last meeting, you will recall that we talked about rotating the orientation of this building so that the front faces Mount Read Boulevard and the rear faces Tops plaza. The drive-up lane has not changed. We have reconfigured the pedestrian access to meet up with the front door. We have continued the sidewalk to the end of the landscaped median; that allows a secondary public access into the plaza, mirroring what exists now. There is a sidewalk connection to the Village Crossing site. By rotating the restaurant, we have drastically improved the pedestrian access all around. At our last meeting, we reviewed the design of a four-foot-high aluminum fence with brick columns that will front the Mount Read Boulevard side; it is shown on the plans. There is landscaping along Mount Read Boulevard that will be disrupted, but it will be replaced. I have a rendering that shows the four sides of the building, and another with landscaping. The flat awnings have been changed to a sloped awning, and an awning has been added to the rear door. Fake windows have been added to the drive-up window side. We have continued the red LED band along the top, and we also show a board-on-board fence to hide the activity in the rear. There is brick veneer along the bottom of the building.

Mr. Fisher: One element that is missing are windows on the back side.

Mr. Powers: Even with the fence?

Mr. Fisher: It adds to the simulation. You can work with our staff on that; they know what were interested in.

Mr. Powers: Rochester Gas & Electric has certain offset requirements. We will work with the Town's staff. To wrap up, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted our variance requests.

Mr. Copey: No new comments. Just a question about the height of 18 feet. Is that the same with the changes?

Mr. Powers: Yes. With the light band it shields the rooftop units.

Henry Stewart, 3400 Mount Read Boulevard: At the last meeting, I was asked by Mr. Copey to send an e-mail regarding some traffic patterns; I hope that that was received. I'm not sure whether anyone else reviewed it.

Mr. Copey: I received it yesterday afternoon. Separate from this application, I will take up that conversation with the Monroe County Department of Transportation ("MCDOT").

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Mr. Stewart: Thank you, and I ask that the contents of that e-mail be made part of the record of these proceedings.

Mr. Schiano: Did you send them to the Board?

Mr. Copey: At the last meeting Mr. Stewart brought up some existing concerns about the intersection relating to drainage and traffic. We had discussed having him send those comments to me separately so that I could take them up with the MCDOT. The concerns are not really part of this application, and I think that Mr. Stewart is asking that we include the text as part of this application.

Mr. Schiano: It's not part of this application.

Mr. Stewart: Well I can read it to you if it's not deemed relevant. I guess that it would be made relevant by me showing up at this meeting.

Mr. Copey: I want to follow up with those concerns. I just don't want to saddle this project with those issues.

Mr. Stewart: We just want to make sure, as many times before, because we take the time to show up, we adjust our schedules, I thought it would be part of the record and if it's not part of the record to some degree, that's fine. I was asked to do so and would be happy to read it into the record and frankly if it's not part of the record I would not have spent the time, so do you want me to read it into the record?

Mr. Copey: Absolutely.

Mr. Stewart:

"Hi, Scott.

"I hope that you are doing very well.

"You had asked on the record that I send you an e-mail noting certain roadway and traffic concerns on Mt. Read Boulevard, particularly as they may be pertinent to proposed projects under consideration.

"Here are some bullet points, as you requested:

" Much traffic congestion at the light at ESL and Tops, particularly as there may be as many as 30 to 60 cars engaged at the ESL facility at any given time;

"\*Thus, continually, numerous accidents witnessed at that light, as cars are turning across oncoming and far-too-fast-moving traffic;

"\*Thus, a need for reduced speed limits there and nearby;

"\*Notably, we were ticketed by an abusive police officer for going too slowly, 'driving 10 to 15 mph down Mt. Read Boulevard,' simply because we needed to proceed northerly very slowly to turn into our own tight driveway, located just south of the light at 3500 Mt. Read;

"\*That driveway has long been tight, but it was made for tighter by inadequate planning, engineering and construction as new sidewalks were installed on the east side of Mt. Read a few years ago, and it is further compromised by the impacts of the manner in which snow-plowing occurs on Mt. Read;

"\*Similarly, difficulty in crossing and/or entering and/or exiting traffic patterns to enter and/or leave our driveway, particularly due to the speeds of traffic and even more aggravated by aspects of too much congestion, flow, stoppage, inattention and proximity at the light; and, also,

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

"\*Ponding at, below and near the light, particularly due to questionable planning, engineering and/or construction, due to relative heights of pavement on Mt. Read and at the joinder with ESL's driveway entry point, such that rain water collects and stays, and ice forms in cold weather conditions, making the area prone to further chances of accidents and/or incidents.

"As I mentioned, the latter aspect has been noted to many individuals purporting to represent Monroe County, the Town of Greece, ESL, etc., even in person and at the site, and without fair response or attention. Thus, I find it objectionable that anyone from any highway, transportation or engineering department would have signed off on this location, as indicated, without appropriate consideration in such regards.

"I hope that you and your department, the applicants and the various boards will take all of the foregoing points into fair and appropriate consideration in these respects.

"Thank you very much for your courtesy, interest and attention in these regards.

"Sincerely,

"Henry S. Stewart"

Mr. Stewart: So, perhaps you can see that certain words in that letter matter, and I was asked to send that e-mail so I can tell you that it is troubling that when we show up to these meetings that maybe the procedure is not so clear, that I'm faced to recite it having put in writing, having believed that it would be part of some purpose, so you can go home. It's important to us. We live this every day and you folks can go home, and you seem to care but we experience this every day. Commerce goes on, we want to be cooperative, but I would ask these Boards to have some appreciation for where the general public comes from. I speak with some frustration.

Mr. Copey: May I interrupt? I think that you may have misunderstood what the intention was. I asked you sent those comments to me in writing so that I could follow up on them apart from this meeting. You sent those to me at 1:30 and you seem to be insulted as though we are ignoring you. I asked you to send those to me so that I could pay special, specific attention to them outside of this venue. I want you to understand that.

Mr. Stewart: I believe you.

Mr. Fisher: I think the best way is what you just did. It's nice to have them in an e-mail, but if you have something regarding this or something else, come tell us.

Mr. Stewart: I thank you for that. I appreciate that Mr. Copey asked and appreciate his intentions but I thought that the Board would want to hear. It is so important, living this day to day, and it does make a difference. There was mention of shrubbery along Mount Read Boulevard. Are we correct in hearing that, in addition to the shrubbery, there will be a fence? Also, please note that if there is something that will diminish the noise of the flag, that that be done.

Mr. Schiano: Yes.

Mr. Stewart: I appreciate that Mr. Copey said he would seek to take up the traffic issue with other aspects of government. I just hope you care to hear us because it's sincerely felt.

Mr. Daughton: Thank you for the comments you made to Mr. Stewart. Your transparency it's what I live by. Is there a freestanding sign?

Mr. Powers: Just a sign on the building.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Mr. Geisler: This will be an attractive project; they did a nice job.

Mr. Sofia: I'll echo Mr. Geisler's comments. The little things that were done make a big difference. I agree with Mr. Fisher's comments about the false window, but I'm concerned that you won't see it with the fence there. I'm not opposed to lowering the fence; our staff knows what we like to see.

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

WHEREAS, New Mark Development Company, Inc. (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 3507 Mount Read Boulevard (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 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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

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.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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 Mr. Geisler, 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. Addresses for each building 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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

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 building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be E.I.F.S. (in the tan and brown color families) and brick (in the tan color family), with orange trim as presented to the Planning Board this evening. 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 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 plan.
9. A cross access and shared parking agreement shall be provided for the Business Center.
10. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
11. 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.
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 building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management facilities. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
14. 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.
15. 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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

16. 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.

17. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and 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 agents, designees, and successors.
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.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
February 8, 2018

3. Applicant: APM Holdings, LLC  
Location: Generally, north of 106 Gates-Greece Town Line Road  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 088.04-4-63, 089.03-5-4.112  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed manufacturing building (84,000± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 30 acres  
Zoning District: FOI (Flexible Office/Industrial)

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

Robert Winans, P.E., DDS Engineers, LLC, presented the application.

Mr. Winans: The building and site meet all zoning requirements. Our application was tabled at the January 3, 2018, meeting to let the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") process run its course. We are back to see whether there are more questions. We have worked with the Town's staff and have addressed their concerns. There were minor technical revisions to the plans. We have a rendering that shows materials and colors of the building.

Mr. Fisher: This a Type I action under SEQRA, and we designated ourselves as lead agency for the purpose of environmental review. We sent letters to all interested agencies and we were required to give those agencies 30 days to be able to respond with any concerns or comments.

Mr. Copey: We have received a handful of comments that agree that the Planning Board should be lead agency, and also some comments from some agencies. After 30 days with no objections, the Planning Board becomes lead agency. Some comments from the Town of Gates, which has some questions about the access layout and requested that they have a signature line on the plan, which we already intended to do; we have a draft resolution that has that requirement. The Town of Gates is responsible for this portion of Gates Greece Town Line Road in terms of maintained the road and issuing highway-related approvals. I received two comments from the Town of Gates, which asked whether the turning radius for the driveway was sufficient, and asked whether drainage improvements would be covered by our storm water maintenance agreement; they are covered. We received comments from the Town's Traffic Advisory Committee; they had no concerns about the projected traffic volume but asked that we coordinate with the Town of Gates. I want to follow up on the details of a few items: the dumpster enclosure; screening for the reduced pressure zone ("RPZ") structure out front; and screening for the heating, ventilation and air conditioning ("HVAC") equipment. I received a call from the son of the owner of the house in front of this site, at 106 Gates Greece Town Line Road. He wanted to know how the project would impact the property value. I told him that that is not something that the Planning Board can get involved with; he did not have any other concerns.

Mr. Gauthier: All the major technical details of the engineering aspects have been worked out. One detail that we have is kind of unusual because it involves the storm water detention basin that will be on Town-owned land. The storm water maintenance agreement will have to have some sort of sunset clause that says that when the Town uses the property for storm water management, the responsibility will pass from your client to the Town; that might occur in a short time or in several years. We support your having your storm water management facility on Town property because it ultimately benefits the Town's storm water management efforts. We have to make sure that, until the Town begins to use the site for its own storm water management purposes, it's included in the storm water agreement. It wouldn't be

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

reasonable to extend the agreement beyond the time that the Town begins to use the site to expand that facility as a regional storm water management facility. I think that that was understood but that needs to be separate from the other facility's storm water agreement with appropriate language.

Mr. Sofia: Can we do something with the RPZ? I highly dislike it. Can it be put underground? You pull in the driveway and it takes forever to buffer it.

Mr. Fisher: Maybe we could make it green.

Mr. Sofia: Is it possible to move it to the north?

Mr. Winans: We are governed by the requirements of the Monroe County Water Authority. We have pushed it about 60 feet. We have no problem making it green.

Mr. Selke: If you look at the Gardens at Town Center, that RPZ has turned out very well. Will you do some landscaping?

Mr. Winans: Yes.

Mr. Sofia: This a good project. Thanks for coming to Greece.

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

WHEREAS, Addison Precision Manufacturing (the "Applicant/Project Sponsor") has submitted a request to the Planning Board (the "Planning Board") of the Town of Greece (the "Town"), Monroe County, New York, for overall site plan approval for the proposed manufacturing building (84,000± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 30 acres (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, upon review of the Application, the Planning Board has determined that the Project 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 Project constitutes a Type 1 action under SEQRA; and

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

1. The Project is located on property in the Town of Greece (Monroe County tax account numbers 088.04-4-63 and 089.03-5-4.112) located immediately north of Gates-Greece Town Line Road, between Long Pond Road and Elmgrove Road.
2. 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 Project constitutes a Type I action under SEQRA.
3. The Planning Board considered the Project at a regular meeting on January 3, 2018.
4. On January 3, 2018, in accordance with SEQRA, the Planning Board passed a resolution declaring its intent to become Lead Agency in the coordinated environmental review of the Project, directing the Planning Board staff to provide notice of such intent to all involved and interested agencies.
5. The Planning Board has carefully considered environmental information that was prepared by the Applicant's representatives, which included but was not limited to: oral and written descriptions of the Project; site development plans; a summary of project related traffic; a drainage report; an Engineering Report; and Part 1 of an

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Environmental Assessment Form (the "EAF") (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").

6. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered additional information submitted by the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to: supplemental or revised maps, drawings, architectural elevations, descriptions, analyses, and reports; and various oral or written comments that may have resulted from meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant's representatives.
7. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and oral or written comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to: the Monroe County Department of Transportation (the "MCDOT"); the Town of Greece Traffic Advisory Committee; the Town of Gates; the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development; and the Town's own staff.
8. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from owners of nearby properties or other interested parties, and all other relevant comments submitted to the Planning Board.
9. The Planning Board has carefully considered the Environmental Analysis, which examined the potential effects of the Project on the following principal relevant issues: vehicular traffic impacts and storm water management. A summary of the analyses of these issues and the Planning Board's reasoned elaboration supporting its determination of environmental significance follows.
  - a. Vehicular traffic impacts: The Project is located immediately north of Gates-Greece Town Line Road (local road), between Long Pond Road and Elmgrove Road. Neither the New York State Department of Transportation nor the MCDOT has jurisdiction over Gates-Greece Town Line Road. Nevertheless, the Applicant consulted with the MCDOT in September of 2017 as a courtesy, given the proximity to Long Pond Road (Monroe County Route 136). The MCDOT did not express any concerns and did not request further information. A curb cut for the proposed 30-foot-wide driveway entrance will be located 2,000 feet west of Long Pond Road. Information related to traffic generated by the proposed use, including expected volumes and frequency of employee, vendor, and delivery trips, has been reviewed by the Town of Greece Traffic Advisory Committee and Town of Gates Director of Public Works, who both agreed that the project have minimal traffic impacts. The site plan will be subject to approval by the Town of Gates.
  - b. Impact on Land: Average depth to groundwater on the site is 2.2 feet. The proposed first floor elevation of the building will be generally 2-3 feet above existing grade, placing the floor 4-5 feet above groundwater. Potential interaction with groundwater will be limited to the construction phase. Impervious surfaces resulting from development will drain to a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("SPDES")-compliant storm water management facility.
  - c. Impact on Flooding: The Project will occur in an area designated by the Town for future flexible office and industrial development. Storm water management facilities proposed to be constructed for this Project will be located and

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

configured in a way that will facilitate expansion and availability of use for future similar projects, and are consistent with the Town's ongoing efforts to minimize downstream flooding potential. Standard construction procedures will be followed to control storm water runoff, erosion, and sedimentation during construction in accordance with all applicable regulations.

- d. Impact to Historic Resources: The project is located on property which adjoins New York State Canal Corporation lands. The Erie Canal was nominated by the National Park Service for listing in 2014 and is considered a "National Heritage Corridor." The project is located roughly 1000 feet from the Erie Canal and on the opposite side from the Canalway Trail, so immediate visual impact should be minimal. Additionally, the project is consistent with the Town's long-term plans for the canal corridor area as expressed in its draft Local Waterfront Revitalization Program ("LWRP"), Northampton Landing Study, and 2001 Master Plan.
10. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Project.
  11. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
  12. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
  13. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Project upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
  14. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Project and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis and all additional relevant information submitted.
  15. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
  16. The Planning Board has made a reasoned elaboration of the rationale for arriving at its determination of environmental significance and the Town Board's determination is supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
  17. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental impacts revealed in the environmental review process will be avoided or minimized by Project elements that are integral to the design or by the Applicant's voluntary incorporation of Project design modifications that were identified as practicable.

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 Project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration,

And be it further

RESOLVED that this determination constitutes the Planning Board's analysis of Part 2 and Part 3 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form, and constitutes the Board's reasoned elaboration of why the Project, with the design elements proposed by the Applicant, will not have a significant adverse environmental impact.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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 Mr. Geisler, 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. Gates-Greece Town Line Road is a local road with jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility shared by the Town of Gates and the Town of Greece. This approval is subject to approval by the Town of Gates as it relates to access and highway improvements. A signature line for the Town of Gates shall be added to the site plans.
3. Addresses for each building shall be added to the plan.
4. A 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk and a sidewalk easement to the Town of Greece shall be provided along the frontage of the Premises. If the Town Board grants a waiver of the sidewalk requirement, the date of such waiver shall be added to the 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 or Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
7. 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.
8. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition 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 split-faced

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

block (in the brown color family) and metal siding (in the tan color family), with light colored window trim and blue accent as shown on elevations provided by the Applicant. 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.

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 locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
11. 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.
12. Water mains and hydrants shall be installed and be in proper operating conditions prior to the commencement of any aboveground construction.
13. Suitable access roads and temporary street signs shall be installed and maintained so as to provide continuous access to fire department and other emergency vehicles prior to the commencement of any aboveground construction.
14. 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.
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 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.

16. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management pond. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
17. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall enter into a vehicular cross-access and shared parking agreement, the terms of which shall be subject to approval by the Town Attorney.
18. 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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

19. 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.
20. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
21. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
22. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
23. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
24. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the proposed water service backflow enclosure (RPZ) shall be painted green and screened with landscaping, subject to approval by the Planning Board Clerk.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
February 8, 2018

**New Business**

1. Applicant: Carrols, LLC  
Location: 45 Greece Center Drive  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-4-20.111  
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed freestanding restaurant (one story; 2,811± square feet) with drive-up service facility, and with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.18 acres  
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

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

Robert Blood, ALA, Lauer-Manguso & Associates Architects; and Jeff Saeger, LLD Enterprises, presented the application.

Mr. Blood: This is proposed for the first outparcel, facing Latta Road, with 61 seats. It's Burger King's garden grill prototype. We show elevations which indicate the materials on the building.

Mr. Fisher: Having glass panels on all four sides would be appropriate. All four sides should be as similar as possible.

Mr. Blood: The rear of the building has the trash enclosure and cold storage in this corner of the building; it takes up more than half, but I think that we can do some spandrel glass. The biggest difference that you will see is the area where there is a restricted turn in from the new access road.

Mr. Fisher: I think that you have made some good changes, removing the parking which could have caused problems.

Mr. Blood: There are "Stop" signs so you have a more orderly progression. All the parking is associated with two-way lanes of traffic.

Mr. Geisler: Where is the front? Can you show us renderings? Are the awnings flat?

Mr. Blood: The main façade faces west. Yes, the awnings are flat.

Mr. Sofia: Mr. Chairman, are you talking about putting false windows on the south side? It looks pretty bland there. Are we okay on the drive-through side?

Mr. Fisher: Yes, even some color difference or continuation of the red band would be helpful. Something to break up the two large, blank areas.

Mr. Sofia: I would like to see something else added. I like the awnings. Do they have lights in the awnings?

Mr. Blood: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Geisler: Is the elevation the same as to the roadway? What about a landscape plan?

Mr. Blood: Yes. And there is a landscape area that separates the pedestrian walkway and follows the entire perimeter of the site.

Ms. Betters: Are the trees to the north large or will lower plantings be added to shield headlights for the neighbors across the street?



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Mr. Blood: There are larger trees, and we will make every attempt to save them.

Mr. Sofia: I don't think that there are any residents across the street.

Mr. Blood: We could put something smaller in here to supplement.

Mr. Fisher: I think that the changes that you made at the entrance are a substantial improvement; they allow for stacking to occur as you have shown. From the applicant's standpoint, you can access the site immediately. It's also done in such a way that it will prevent people from cutting through for the bank because it's one way.

Mr. Sofia: Does that pose an issue for customers utilizing that to get to the bank? I know that it will take a while to develop, but this has the potential to have a traffic signal at Latta Road.

Mr. Fisher: You could have people come through there to the bank because they are bypassing the busy part, which is the drive-through. If you had people exiting, would be very close to the intersection. It's important that it's recognizable as a one-way driveway.

Mr. Blood: We figured that we would control this entrance by adding a crosswalk to further give a visual clue, plus "Stop" signs and "Do Not Enter" signs.

Mr. Geisler: It looks like there could be a back-up of traffic out onto Latta Road.

Mr. Fisher: It looks to be six car lengths there. Originally, they had parking right up to that entrance point into the site, and you could have someone backing up into the incoming traffic; therefore there could be a back-up.

Mr. Sofia: Is that site entrance at the northeast corner of the site a must-have? I don't recall a project in which we have allowed that. If someone pulled in and did not know where to go they would stop, which would create a problem. I don't see the need for that entrance. If someone wanted to go to Burger King, it would take another 30 seconds to get to the entrance near the southwest corner of the site.

Mr. Seager: Aldi has the exact same thing. It does not get much use, and I don't think that this will get much use, either. I believe that most of the customer traffic will come from the Long Pond Road entrance to the overall site, at the traffic signal that also serves Wegmans.

Mr. Sofia: I can think of only the same one near Tompkins Bank. If you don't think that this access will get much use, then why have it? You wouldn't have to change the internal traffic flow if it were eliminated.

Mr. Blood: Most of the dine-in customers will use this.

Mr. Sofia: Do you want to drive other traffic through that parcel?

Mr. Seager: Because the existing entrance for M&T Bank will be closed as part of this project and they no longer will have their own access point, they want to see some easier access to their site.

Mr. Sofia: I think that the normal person recognizes the larger artery and follows that to M&T bank, although I'm sure that there will be some that will want to sneak through the Burger King site to get to the bank.

Mr. Blood: The necessity for them to have this access is that the stores underperform if they don't have quick access. I know that it's not your concern, but it's theirs. With this access open, it makes more sense for Burger King.

Mr. Sofia: Personally, I prefer not to see it open. It will cause more questionable driving habits than reasonably should be expected.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

Mr. Geisler: What happens when the other development comes in? They will want something, too.

Mr. Seagar: If you were entering the overall site from Latta Road and saw that traffic was backing up, you have the option of going straight.

Mr. Sofa: Not necessarily, because that is only one way in.

Mr. Copey: Part of me thinks it's better if you don't stop.

Mr. Seager: It's nice to designate it with the "Stop" bar.

Mr. Selke: What are the hours of operation? What about deliveries? The site is tight. What about snow storage? I think more "Stop" signs could be added as you go toward Aldi.

Mr. Blood: The hours open to the public would be 6:00 AM to 12:00 midnight. Deliveries would be during early morning hours, 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM.

Mr. Copey: We received comments from the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Review Committee. They noted that any work in the state or county highway will need a permit. For the Board's information, the highway permit for the main access driveway is either issued or very close to being issued, and that includes the closure of the M&T bank access to Latta Road. With some back and forth, they have defined better the north-south roadway with some curbing. Our recommendation is to keep open the northern cross access between M&T bank and Burger King. The Fire Marshal stated that they need sprinklers. They also might need some variances for signage.

Mr. Gauthier: We had a few details that have been generally addressed, but we still are waiting for all responses. One issue to discuss is water quality. You will have to demonstrate that that component has been addressed satisfactorily.

Mr. Blood: That was included in the engineering design report.

Mr. Gauthier: I need to see the narrative; I will take another look.

Mr. Fisher: To be clear, coming in from the north, there is no "Stop" sign?

Mr. Blood: No, it is down further before the parking spaces.

Mr. Copey: Why not eliminate the second crosswalk? Is it needed? I feel like the concern would be the back-up of traffic on Latta Road.

Mr. Sofia: No one is going to use it.

Mr. Blood: Our thought was that it is intended for the people parking here to use the sidewalk.

Mr. Copey: Maybe we don't need to stop there?

Mr. Gauthier: Human nature is that, if there are two "Stop" signs, people tend not to stop at both. I think that a driver would stop if there was someone is in the middle of the intersection.

Mr. Selke: I would like to see the first "Stop" sign eliminated.

Mr. Sofia: I don't see the necessary of that entrance. It's causing too many questions here.

Mr. Fisher: It seems that there is a question about the entrance. We have to keep the sidewalk because there will be a traffic signal at some point.

Mr. Gauthier: We could look to guidance from our Traffic Advisory Committee.

Mr. Seager: The client wants as much access as possible. They will prove to you that if they close that access, the store's revenue won't do as well. A lot of people will stop in to Burger King if they see as they drive by that it's easy to get into. We certainly will look at that.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

**Mr. Geisler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to continue the application to the February 21, 2018, meeting, as requested by the applicant.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
FEBRUARY 21, 2018, MEETING**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

**SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS**

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

1. Applicant: Ridgeway Properties I, LLC  
Location: 1349-1401 Ridgeway Avenue & 50 McLoughlin Road Extension  
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.04-1-3.2, 090.09-1-16, 090.09-1-17, 090.09-1-19, 090.09-1-20, 090.09-1-21  
Request: Extension of site plan approval for a proposed eco-industrial park (5± buildings, 2,000,000± square feet at full buildout), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 124 acres originally approved February 8, 2017.  
Zoning District: IG (General Industrial) & BP-1 (Office)

**Motion by Mr. Antelli, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to grant two 90-day extensions of the preliminary and final plat re-approval of the subdivision, previously approved on February 8, 2017.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Antelli</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>Geisler</b>	<b>Yes</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  
TWO 90-DAY EXTENSIONS GRANTED**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
February 8, 2018

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:24 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