



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MAY 8, 2019

Work Session Began: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Began: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Community Conference Room, Greece Town Hall

Present

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Richard C. Antelli

Christine R. Burke

John Geisler

William E. Selke

Jamie L. Slocum

Michael H. Sofia

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Michelle Betters, Planning Board Secretary

John T. Caterino, Planning Board Clerk

Absent

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

Policy of Decorum

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: DMK Development – Greece, LLC
Location: 3230 Latta Road
Request: Minor subdivision approval for DMK Subdivision, a re-subdivision of Lot 1 of the Latta Road Subdivision, consisting of 2 lots on approximately 12.14 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No. 045.03-1-13.1

For a synopsis of the discussion relative to this request, see the minutes of this meeting relative to the request for site plan approval by applicant DMK Development-Greece, LLC.

Ms. Geisler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to continue the application to the May 22, 2019, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
MAY 22, 2019, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

2. Applicant: Roc W. Billotti
Location: 84 North Greece Road
Request: Minor subdivision for the Little Roc Subdivision being a re-subdivision of Lot R-4 of the Danielle Estates subdivision to form Lots AR-4A and AR-4B on approximately 1.86 acres
Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 025.04-3-7.3, 025.04-3-7.411, 025.04-3-7.412

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

Roc Billotti, owner, presented the application

Mr. Billotti: I'm the owner, I want to put the lots back to the two lots that were there.

Mr. Caterino: The project was reviewed by the Monroe County Development and Review Committee, the only comment was that its close proximity to an agriculture district and that what is proposed does not interfere with agricultural operations. He is just adjusting lot lines on a previously approved subdivision. Our Fire Marshal had comments on the house that would be built on the lot, to make sure it complies with fire hydrant distances. There are no comments from zoning.

Mr. Gauthier: No comments.

Mr. Selke: You don't own the house. It will be three lots? Who owns the pile of stone there, I have concerns about that.

Mr. Billotti: I don't own the house, the stone is for the driveway.

Mr. Geisler then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke:

WHEREAS, Roc W. Billotti (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 84 North Greece Road (the "Premises"); and

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

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA").
2. The environmental review of the entire subdivision was completed pursuant to and in conformity with the requirements of 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") when the preliminary plat was approved by the Planning Board
3. The final plat is consistent with the preliminary plat.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

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

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

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Giesler then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, 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. 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.
3. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued.
4. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town.
5. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures and the Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
6. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Town Engineer.
7. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
8. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
9. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

3. Applicant: Steve Ferrarese
Location: Immediately west of Old Country Road (south)
Request: Revised preliminary plat approval for Copperfield Ridge Subdivision on approximately 12.29 acres
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Existing)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.01-2-8.11

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

David Matt, Schultz Associates, presented the application

Mr. Matt: This site did have an overall preliminary approval many years ago, the north part of Old Country Road was built around 1999, Greymere Road about 2004, the south of Old Country Road about 2009/ 2010. The applicant has purchased the remaining parcel that has been vacant ever since. The owners are proposing Lots 1 and 2 off the south stub road, put a full emergency turnaround, build a house for them and their family on Lot 2 and as part of that they would be willing to sell off the remaining balance of the land to a developer. They have talked to some developers that would loop Greymere Road to Old Country Road. The original plan was to have three hammer heads with two or three lots off the stub roads. We were told that would not work, but there might be some entertainment of one stub road and a connection of the other two. One big question we received from all the departments was how we connect the roads with the existing addressing. Researching the town and county there are north and south roads with different names and they meet in the middle. Black Duck Trail and Lianne Drive, are examples of this. I have contacted emergency communications and are waiting for an answer. I think this is better than trying to ask the existing home owners to change their addresses. Regarding the stub road out to Flynn Road, the owners plan is to keep it with the remaining lands. The existing overall plan has about 1200 feet of road and about 22 lots. Rearranging it to this plan reduces the lots to under 650 feet of roads and 14 lots.

Mr. Fisher: That's great for the developer but what about the homeowners.

Mr. Matt: The existing homeowners, it was originally going to be a looped road, they can still drive out to Old Country Road like they do now. My impression is for the folks who live there want it to remain a dead end road, and we are proposing only 16 lots.

Mr. Caterino: Our staff has reviewed and all state that it does not align with the original preliminary plat. Our Fire Marshal did check with the fire district and they agreed with his comment that it should comply with the original plan.

Mr. Gauthier: Most of our comments are technical in detail, it goes back to more a planning concern issue, in that what the expectation of the people that bought, would reasonably be, would be that the rest of development be built out. If there was a stub where they thought there was going to be connectivity, we are concerned with how that would be mitigated, the fact that the expectations are not being realized. Additional, from our standpoint, we like connectivity. Having our snow plows going backward is where accidents happen, if we have two dead ends and a cul-de-sac it would be wash, if we had our arms twisted and have two of the three connected, maybe we could deal with something else, but having it so our trucks never back up is what we support.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Mr. Fisher: My understanding was that the applicants went to the Director of Development Services and he counseled against doing this because it didn't provide with what was in the approved preliminary plat. The applicant went to the Planning Board staff and they counseled against doing it because it does not provide the current owners with what they would expect when they have the approved preliminary. When it's originally approved it's designed so there is connectivity, when the emergency vehicles can locate premises it's logical. So I really find that what I see here is great for the developer but you don't have the connectivity and you have more consistency in the original plan.

Mr. Bob Murphy, 901 Old Country Road: This road was numbered with the original plan in mind, we're 901 and it would go down to 842, would our section of road have to be Greymere Road? That would lead to considerable expense and inconvenience. I see that the south is for the owners and their family but lot 2 seems like a mystery. I can't object because it would be nice to have something done but this only benefits the developer. I would like to the original plan go through.

Mr. Caterino: Originally Old Country was to continue south, at the intersection of Birch and Old Country Road it would loop around north to Old Country and Greymere Road would "T" with Old Country. That's the approved preliminary plat.

Mr. Fisher: Old Country Road is all chopped up, so if you can think of the fire department make sense of where are you as to compare to a loop, as what you would expect it to be.

Ms. Linda Cahill, 37 Greymere Road: When we first built we liked the open land and woods, the delivery folks have a hard time trying to find folks. This builder sold to another builder and built a tiny house, they are wonderful people but we don't want a bunch of tiny houses around us. Through a third party we had found out that the owner was going to build two houses and then leave the rest of the land, we were thrilled, it's quiet and love the dead end street. We are not crazy about it being developed. We are concerned if it were developed it would take a long time and don't want people just pilfering through. If it does go through we want Old Country to connect to Old Country.

Ms. Marie Delesandra, 53 Greymere Road: Think all the questions you have asked are correct and we all have the expectation that land would be developed and I think the original plan is what should happen as opposed to this proposed plan. I'm concerned with lot one, we were concerned with the address, I would request we stick with the original plan.

Mr. Rosanne Homzie, 751 Old Country Road: I would be directly impacted by this, when we bought this house we knew what the original plan would be and we hope the board honor our expectations.

Ms. Betty Tudisco, 733 Old Country Road: I think our biggest concern, is the houses in that area are reasonably priced and we do live next to the smaller house that was built, we would like to see that the houses are similar in price and design.

Ms. Laurie Ferrarese, 215 Crystal Creek Drive: We are the ones who bought the property, we have lived here for 28 years. We were looking for property where my husband can have a three car garage, we also wanted to build a house for my parents because they getting elderly. Our original proposal was trying to keep three cul-de-sac and would have not impacted as many neighbors. That being said, the Town wanted to keep with the original plan. I did want to say we were trying to keep green space, there is wet land and you cannot build, when they go to connect they will have a difficult time with the lots. The original proposal was from 1988 and wanted to keep green space, if this does not work we'll have to move, so were trying to make this work.

Mr. Phil Schultz, 759 Old Country Road: I have no problem with this being changed, from a selfish standpoint I would rather have two houses at the end of my street than an entire

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

neighborhood. As a former law enforcement professional the police and fire department will have no problem getting to the houses.

Mr. Fisher: That's not what they are saying.

Mr. Schultz: That's my opinion, I have never see a DPW truck knock anything over. We are not here to dispute the size of houses, have the lot sizes changed?

Mr. Sofia: It appears they are the same.

Mr. Schultz: It's a nice neighborhood, the address change would be an inconvenience. If we're going to develop it lets develop it, it is really that big of difference to go from one to two streets, is it that big of a difference?

Mr. Fisher: It is, that's not how we design subdivisions, and we want to make it better not worse. There would be confusion.

Mr. Schultz: How long has it been like that, they just want to make a change, I've said my peace?

Ms. Delesandro: This is not logical, to change now does not make sense.

Mr. Steve Ferarese, 215 Crystal Creek Drive: My wife and I purchased the property, Lot 1, the intension it build a single family home with a little bit bigger garage, the reason the lot is so big is because there is federal wetland that is protected, iyou can't build there, I'll be paying taxes on but won't be able to do much with it, so it's not a such a big deal as everyone thinks. My wife tried to point out that we want to build house for us and for my in-laws so they are close, he is 81 years old and don't want them to be in a home, our house will be about 2100 square feet, my in-laws will be about a 1600 square foot home, they will certainly add value to the neighborhood. This parcel has been a dumping ground for years, this plan with the loop is a request from the town, to make a connection, I did talk to Gary Tajkowski, right before we bought the property, he did tell me about the original plan to connect the streets together, at that same meeting, he made the suggestion that if we would work with a builder, connect the middle streets and the outside street, which is what we have in this proposal right now, we could probably ask the town or the Planning Board and he felt it would probably be like they would allow us in his words to keep the hammerhead, we had a meeting after we bought the property, we brought another engineer, we originally requested three cul-de-sacs, we thought the neighbors would appreciate it, the folks obviously don't appreciate it they want a loop road through. At that time, at that meeting also agreed that the general consensus was that if you could find a developer that is willing to take the other portion and develop it, you could probably keep your hammerhead street.

Mr. Fisher: The people that make the decision are the folks on the Planning Board. The criteria is what your proposing is better than, not just for you, but should be better for the neighbors. What I have heard is that it is not better for the neighbors.

Mr. Ferarese: I have to ask the question, it confuses me, the situation now we have small turn arounds, we talk about safety, that does not get addressed if we don't do this, you talk about the future, when is the future, this has been 20 years will be another 20 years.

Mr. Fisher: You are saying there is a developer who is interested in developing property that's part of this subdivision that same developer might be interested in doing what was originally proposed.

Mr. Ferarese: He's not because of the amount of paved real estate that's invested in this for the number of houses. They have to be able to make money. They would be if we put in the smaller street in, mitigating two seems a lot better than not mitigating any. This is the proposal that we have, we have followed the advice of the informal meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Mr. Fisher: This proposal does not meet the criteria that I establish internally. I think it has to be that, what folks are saying is it's not logical, it may be less expensive but does not meet criteria.

Mr. Ferarese: Speaking of logic, my GPS often it will tell me continue on because the street names change, it happens everywhere.

Mr. Fisher: You're taking Old Country and breaking it up into different area.

Mr. Ferarasse: I respectfully disagree, the safety is not addressed with any other plan. This address 2/3 of the problem.

Mr. Geisler: Could you take over some of the lots to for yourself.

Mr. Ferarasse: We have asked, it's too expensive for them, the additional road is too expensive.

Ms. Schiefen: I appreciate that they have always been considerate with maintaining wetlands, but maybe a loop road would work here, I hope they get what you want because I think they are fine people but also understand my neighbors concerns.

Mr. Sofia: If we had seen it back then, I struggle with that I think it's unfair to change the plan for the people that are there, I thinks it's a great to have your folks there but it's unfair to the neighborhood.

Mr. Matt: Even if we connected all three they will all be affected.

Ms. Ferrase: They would not disagreed if there were two, two and two, the town requested we do this, we want to stay in Greece.

Mr. Ferarasse: Originally when we informally when to the town, there was three cul-de-sacs with 8 lots total, we had some conversations with the town and the concern was about the town plowing private cul-de-sacs

Mr. Gauthier: There is typically an easement to come on the private land, the cleanest thing is not to have them, but if we do, have them on dedicated property. A full cul-de-sac is as inefficient a thing as all the roadway you would be building on this, I have been a part of the informal meetings and have had conversations with our Commissioner, I don't drive the big trucks, I can't speak from personal experience, but my commissioners, and have been through several, but have told me that they get nervous because all the accidents that do occur tend to happen backing up. They like the roads connected. The initial proposal, was various forms of cul-de-sacs, the message that was given was DPW does not like them, they are hoping for connectivity. I don't think I have been part of a conversation that someone has said this will surely be approved. We hate this one the least, there we a lack of enthusiasm for deviating from the original preliminary. The hope was your desires could be met within the confines of the original preliminary. I don't believe Mr. Tajkowski ever gave you a promise and I was never in the room is that was said.

Mr. Sofia: Would they hate three cul-de-sacs?

Mr. Gauthier: If the board supported it, but the cost would be just as high.

Mr. Fisher: The weight is to the benefit of what currently exists as a preliminary, there might be other alternatives, I think the consensus is we ought to maintain the existing preliminary and not approve this change. I suggest we close the public hearing and reserve our decision till the next meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Mr. Selke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to close the public hearing and reserve decision for the May 22, 2019.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CLOSED AND RESERVED
UNITL MEETING OF MAY 22, 2019**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

SITE PLANS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: DMK Development – Greece, LLC
Location: 3230 Latta Road
Request: Site plan approval for construction of a proposed retail, Tractor Supply Company(one story; 19,097± square feet), with outside trailer/equipment display area, related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 6.11 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-1-13.1

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

Patrick Laber, Schultz Associates, presented the application

Mr. Laber: This lot is on Latta Road, it would be split down the middle to create two lots of about six acres. The development would be on Lot 2 closest to the existing plaza. It is owned by MuniPro now, DMK Development would be buying Lot 2 and Lot 1 would remain MuniPro's lot. The proposal is for a 19,097 square foot Tractor Supply store, 66 parking spaces are proposed, code requires an additional 30, we are showing those land banked along the east and west sides of the site. DMK Development provided a letter to back up why they feel they only need the 66 spaces based on past projects. There are various outdoor display areas, the main one being to the east which will be fenced. One access point will service both Lots 1 and 2 and possibly a strip of land the town owns to the east of us. The access across from the post office was determined the way to go after discussions with MuniPro, the Town and the New York State Department of Transportation in concept and this is what we were told to work with, we'll have more updates at our next meeting. There has been a traffic assessment done for this entrance and no improvements will be required to Latta Road. The site has access to major utilities, water in on the south side so we'll have to bore under the road and get a state permit for that. We are proposing a whole storm water system with pond that will be to the north of the wet land. Sanitary sewer will be pumped to the sewer the east of us and will be private up until the manhole. We are proposing a sanitary sewer easement from east to west across our property to Lot 1 and a cross access easement so that entrance can be used. The site will be fairly level all the way back until the rear of the building, so we will need about a four foot retaining wall so the building will be level and like I said the pond will be behind that. Light spill will be contained to the site, it's all LED. We have a landscaping plan included, one notable area is the berm along the east side of the fenced outdoor display area to buffer the view from plaza. It will be a few feet tall and have evergreens across it. The building itself will be of masonry construction, an awning all the way across the south side, it is broken up by some vertical changes in color to try and give more definition, the color is carried all the way around, there is an overhead door in the back for deliveries, also there is a movable truck dock, there will not be a fixed dock. We are showing aluminum tube fence along the south face, for the east and north, black vinyl coated chain link. We submitted sign plans to the zoning department and we have received

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

comments from all departments in the town. We just receive comments from engineering and traffic advisory and will be responding to them shortly. We did receive comments from the county, they mention a creek that does not exist anymore so water heads away from the site instead of north through the site.

Mr. Caterino: We did receive comments from the Monroe County Development and Review Committee, they commented on the creek and general questions for a project of this type. New York State Department of Transportation commented about what permits would be needed for work in the right-of-way. Planning commented on the architectural look of the building, fencing, and the landscaping used. Our Traffic Advisory Committee did review and suggested moving the entrance to line up with the common property line between Lot 1 and 2, at the time of review they were not aware of discussions had already begun with the DOT regarding the placement of the entrance to line up with the post office entrance. There were no comments from our building department or Fire Marshal.

Mr. Gauthier: Most of our comments were relatively minor and I think we can work them out. I want to comment on the traffic, typically I trust the comments from our Traffic Advisory Committee because there is a group that is very knowledgeable, they made their comments in a vacuum without an awareness of the discussions made by various parties along with the DOT, this is a rare instance in with the Board not put too much weight on the body. I believe what they said was true in an idealize world without having other constraints but there are constraints that were not in play when they met. The comments we have can be addressed.

Mr. Edward Gartz, 230 Orchard Creek: Those that don't know I'm running for Town Council, I have lived and worked in the Town of Greece since the first Ice Age. MuniPro is a company owned by the Town, so when they talk about land being used by Miniport or being sold they mean us, we are selling the land. We're using up town owned land, our property, Monroe Tractor, great business, I worked with them before, I bought stuff from them before, but I'm here to tell you, we don't want it there. Many, many many people have commented to me, when I'm out walking the town, we don't want to use town land to participate in, us, people of the town, putting stuff on our property, that could go in Ridge Road in one of the many abandoned properties or many places around. We have a whole town of underused properties and abandoned buildings, why would in the Sam hell do we want to have, why do we want to use town property? That's nuts and we don't want it, so there really is not much to say about the building or how they are going to put it up. We do know that this in part of a nature corridor, if you take a look at the over site from the top down, you see how this connect to this land, and all the deer run through there, why would we want to take that all down? We have pictures of what it used to look like over there across the road from Wegmans, before we could not see it, the senior homes, I want to let you know, you might want to put your money on Bill Murphy, he's my opponent, because should I get elected into that position, I'm going to fight like hell to get this rescinded. I want to the people at Monroe Tractor that I greatly respect and like their business to know I'm going to fight against them. I hope these people do will do everything they can to elect another town representative, other than the one that sat there and OK'd this. Because they should have never to Ok'd this. I have to tell you the people right here, shame on you for sitting there and letting this travesty to go on. God Bless you.

Mr. Fisher: The Planning Board responds to the rules that have been established and in this particular case we look based on what the zoning is for the land, and that determines whether they meet that criteria and can go on the property.

Mr. Gartz: We understand that, but in this particular case, we want the Planning Board to take back to the people that voted this in, that we don't want it, and are pissed.

Mr. Gene Rozenski, 160 Drumcliff Way: I have some concerns, the increase traffic, we have a dangerous intersection already, Latta and Long Pond, let's just bring more traffic in, the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

second is the light pollution, we want to look at the stars and we won't be able to. The noise pollution on top of it, is another concern, the commercial sprawl in what was a residential area is disgusting. Latta and Long Pond Road is becoming too commercial and is losing the original character that I enjoyed so much when I moved here 35 years ago. In the decrease in the wildlife habitat, we're losing it, enough, I have nothing against Tractor Supply but we have plenty of retail property available. One quick search on Google and I showed at least 36 vacant properties or available space. Sam club, Sears, Southwest Commons, 145 acres on Ridge Road that can be developed. The Walgreens on Ridge Road, lets join it to the Community Center, there are a lot of things you can do, you can add a nature walk, athletic fields, expand that vision we had when the Town Hall the community center went there. Have a community garden, dog park, Greece has no dog park, I believe these ideas would serve the people of Greece much better than an addition of another retail business in this area, especially when there are so many vacant or underused choices available. Keep Greece green and reduce the commercial sprawl.

Kate Schiefen, 751 Old Country Road: I want to bring to this groups attention, both on Latta Road, west of Flynn, and Flynn Road there are low gross tonnage bridges, if there is going to be increased commercialization of Latta Road, it would be ridiculous for us as tax payers not to expect there must be investment in the roads beyond that. If it happens I think this Board needs to address the fact that infrastructure needs to be supported otherwise Latta and Long Pond Roads are the only way for the heavy weight trucks that serve the commercial properties to enter and exit. I think it would be premature to continually develop that section of road.

Teresa Scherer, 129 Oak Bridge Way: I love living in Greece, I actually grew up in the city, my parents moved here and I moved with them. I like the rural setting, if I wanted to get to a commercialize area I'd go to Ridge Road. Now were building another Wendy's, there are three of them within a five mile radius. The property behind Aldi used to be nice with all the trees, I don't feel this property will fit with the scheme of what's on Latta Road, and it belongs on Ridge Road. I could give you three ideas for properties on Ridge Road that are vacant and would work for your clients. The rural settings have been really nice but now we see them in our yards and that never happened before because they were in their habitat now it's being disrupted by all the development. If I wanted to live in a commercialized area I would move to Henrietta. I think I read on line that Bill Reilich wanted to keep Greece beautiful, this is not beautiful at all. I took a ride down by the ponds and could not believe all the cattails and the weeds, I drive on the parkway and can't see the ponds. Instead of building something like this we need to keep Greece beautiful, maybe on Ridge Road and south of here but not north. I think this needs to be denied and keep it as a green space.

Rosanne Homzie, 751 Old Country Road: I have lived here all my life, and have watch Greece grow, this store does not belong here, not for this year or next year, but when it closes and leaves, nothing is forever. We are going to end up with another store that is going to be vacant and highly visible on Latta Road. Which really has always been residential. Will you be putting another light in? As you know that intersection is already deadly. So increased traffic, the wildlife disrupted, that's part of why we live in Greece, if I wanted to live on Ridge Road I would have bought a house on Ridge Road, with all due respect I hope this project does not go through and think this a horrible plan.

Betty Tudisco, 733 Old Country Road: I have a question regarding why this store is here, it a tractor supply and does not seem like a right fit for this area. There are a lot of deer and beautiful to watch them. It's a nice area and we just keep building and building. I agree with everything everyone has said, I understand development has to happen but it has to be something better.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Jim Leary, 25 Clearwater Circle: I'm trying to understand there is an outside display area, the speed limit is 45 miles area, why would you do that, and what are they going to see? Now come a year later when business is not so good, they will ask the town for more signage. I don't think it's the right location, they have not mentioned the hours of operation, how many employees, deliveries, what about the removable ramp, will that disrupt the neighbors? I have a problem with that. Did not say anything about jobs, will they have mechanic, will they test tractors there, and what about a dumpster, what time will they come? Do you want to live near a commercial building, I don't think so.

Mr. Laber: Hours would be Monday to Saturday 8 AM to 9 PM, Sunday 8 AM to 7 PM, the dumpster is located at the North West corner, I can get times. There is a fenced area on the side and front, there will be mulch.

Mr. Fisher: I would object to the display in the front area near the parking lot, it provides a distraction and kind of a cluttering of that parking lot. The display should be for folks who visit the store.

Mr. Selke: We would want buffering and landscaping near the road anyway.

Mr. Fisher: And avoid things that would distract them especially at 45 miles an hour.

Mr. Laber: Some items listed, lawn tractors, lawn mowers, snow blowers, some of it is seasonal, pens for animals, wood cutting equipment. I don't have the number of employees.

Mr. Fisher: Think some of those items could be located behind something other than a chain link fence.

Arthur Daughton, 146 Fisherman's Cove: I been a Greece resident since 1982. My family still lives in Greece. Back in September 2014, when the resolution was made from residential to restricted business, I don't understand why this application refers to only 3230.

Mr. Fisher: This is the only property being considered.

Mr. Daughton: Does the tractor people own this now?

Mr. Gauthier: MuniPro is a separate legal entity that is owned by the Town, it is not the Town it is a separate legal entity. It's a wholly owned public corporation.

Mr. Daughton: Does that land belong to the people in the community? Or does it belong to all of us.

Mr. Fisher: It's owned by MuniPro.

Mr. Daughton: The tractor place is huge, right now the noise from DPW in the winter, you can hear the radio from the trucks, buffering is a key part. The way the trees are located now, there is a lot of buffering. That is before you put anything else there, if they can hear the radios, what's it going to sound like when this goes in? One meeting mention a tree committee in relation to this property?

Mr. Caterino: We are waiting to hear from them.

Mr. Daughton: So if they subdivide the lots and that allows them to chop trees down without any permission.

Mr. Fisher: The reason we refer this to the tree council is to find out if there are any significant species, our recommendations to the tree council is to how we might change this site to be able to adapt to the particular vegetation that is on site.

Mr. Daughton: The environmental umbrella in this town is very important not just for me but for my grandkids. This is you know, I don't think this should go there, there are so many empty buildings why would we want to do this? Why would be destroy the wildlife. When the people on Clearwater bought their houses, this was public land and now five people have

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

changed it. I would seriously consider not allowing this, turn this into a park. Make it part of the campus. It would be dangerous to move equipment in and out of here too.

John Salter, 165 Clearwater Circle: My back yard is backing up to all this, they mention this is going to be developed but what about the other parcel. You are ignoring the future problem for this neighborhood. It will be hard with one entrance, it's dangerous. The noise from DPW is all the time, and I hear from the police station too. When I bought 30 years ago I knew this was going to be the center of Greece, and that was it, now we have the library, the community center, the police station. They are great and glad they are there but you cannot have commercial, industrial here. This is going to be loud and busy. I'm not asking to deny it I'm begging you too, think of the safety of the people who live here. How many empty spaces, that's wasting tax money that's hurting us.

Joe Bruno, 73 Clearwater Circle: During the winter I will be able to see this monstrosity, the best way I can describe the one in Brockport as I drive by is, it's unsightly, particularly the outdoor display, the store is 19,000 square feet and the outdoor storage is over 21,000 square feet. I have a couple questions, does Greece have a green space plan?

Mr. Caterino: Greece has a forestry plan and parks and recreation plan. Both documents together form the open space the Town has. The Town has over 3,000 acres of open space, that's owned by the town, the county, and the state. Work done by the Planning Board also places open space under conservation easement so that you will see that in newer subdivisions. We have a handful of properties owned by local land trusts which they own the property, but they have conservation easement over it where development cannot happen. So it's not one unified document that represents all the open green space it's a few different things together that result in the amount of green space we have.

Mr. Bruno: Why is there isn't a plan so resident can see it or what's available, so we can suggest instead of springing it on us. It seems, no disrespect, it's see you're not being fully transparent. So we can view and understand and then provide input.

Mr. Caterino: We do have a document in place that does resemble that, our parks and recreation master plan that was done in 2016, we surveyed all parks and open space, that is available at any time or call and ask for the maps of parks or pieces of land and who owns them.

Mr. Bruno: Is there maps that show protected land?

Mr. Caterino: We can pull together maps of the land trusts, and we can provide locations.

Mr. Selke: This has been advertised for a long period of time. Some of this is school district property. What's the total MuniPro acreage?

Mr. Caterino: I don't have the specific acreage they own, but the location where Applebee's, Compson Square, some in the vicinity by the canal, so it is scattered around. School district property does count as open space as well.

Mr. Bruno: What will happen to parcel one? To be selfish my property value will go down because of this.

Mr. Caterino: We do not have any current proposal for that parcel but you would be notified like you were on this one.

Mr. Bruno: I was not notified when it was rezoned.

Mr. Caterino: That was not done by the Planning Board. There was public meeting. The Planning Board does not have the authority to tell developers where to go, the zoning district is what allows for the specific use. If they were interested in a site on Ridge Road it would be up to them to reach out to those property owners. There was some concern about traffic,

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

the town does have an independent third party that could review if the Planning Board deems that necessary. Comments regarding lighting, town code does stipulate that lighting on the site has to be contained.

Mr. Bill Cybulski, 157 Clearwater Circle: One reason I bought my house was because of the woods if I wanted a building in my back yard I would move to Henrietta. What about the vacant Tops, the parking lot is so bad in that plaza, would you want this in your back yard?

Ms. Robin Bates, 162 Kuhn Road: I like Tractor Supply, I've shopped there but the size, and a few years ago there was moratorium of building new retail structures until we filled empty spaces. Something this size would be great in Sam's plaza. If you tear down all the green space where will all the wildlife go? We need to figure out how to start the moratorium again.

Ms. Karen Natale Atkins, 173 Clearwater Circle: I'm a lifetime resident and I back up to the wood area, this center as it has grown is very nice. All the facilities are nice, and in the booklet we get in the mail is nice, I don't think this project fits here. It does not make sense, there should be more publicity about it, and we do hear banging from the town all night long.

Ms. Pat Herbst, 177 Spring Tree Lane: We have some lovely farms and would hate to see them go out of business because of this project.

Ms. Lisa Wilcox, 293 Old Meadow Drive: I'm a lifelong resident, I love the wildlife, and did the town approach Tractor Supply?

Mr. Gauthier: The parcel was for sale and as far as this Board is concerned when an applicant comes in we have to take the application. If something horrendous comes and they comply with the requirements of the application and pay the fee, we have to entertain the application. There was a time when a drug store came in and someone said we don't; need another drugstore there's one across the street, well yes but they fill in the application and we evaluate the project, it was a permitted use, weather is was a smart business decision that is not in our preview.

Ms. Wilcox: But you don't have to approve it.

Mr. Gauthier: The reasons for disapproving it have to be relative to a site plan approval measure, we have to approve based on the application and their willingness to comply with our rules. So how it came to be that these to put this here is completely outside of our review.

Ms. Wilcox: We like to have more transparency. We don't see the benefit of this being here. I hope you do good by all.

Mr. Selke: We want to hear you too and we have to work with the rules.

Mr. Manny Bruno, 172 Torrey Pine: Can we find out what it sold for? To have this land sold to Tractor supply seems short sighted. I agree what many have said, I'm concerned with the traffic. There is a reason why people live in a certain area.

Mr. Gartz: The people who are representing us, who put this up for sale, or the people we would not want to sell it are the ones who sold it. In regards to that you don't have anything to do with land outside of here, the plazas and such, the Town of Greece only has to do with the stuff we own. One could say that's true the fact of the matter is, if we had people that were creative in our town, what could be done is you could get the owners of those places up there together with buyers, to try and fill some of these empty spaces. We really don't have a plan on what we own and what we will ever allow to go up for sale, the only thing you can control is what you own, so we don't have a plan that says what we own, so it will be transparent.

Mr. Daughton: The store is open seven days a week. When this came in front of the Town we all objected against the rezoning, it's a shame this Board gets stuck with making decisions

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

where other decision are poorly made. These people are here pleading to stop the rezoning and now they are here again.

Mr. Rozewski: A project of this size is too large for this area, who is MuniPro, who is it and what is the purpose?

Mr. Selke: MuniPro owns the land, it leases some of the property, and the income comes in and reduces your taxes.

Mr. Fisher: One purpose here is to gather information and get some answers that you have asked.

Mr. Leary: After listening to all the comments is there someone here that represents MuniPro? Does anyone convey our comments to the seller?

Mr. Fisher: We will have notes that will reflect the comments that have been made, for the Town and the applicant. That will be available on website.

Ms. Rachelle Giordano, 125 Clearwater Circle: Did they buy the parcel already?

Mr. Geisler: Is the site going to be at grade level?

Mr. Laber: The building will be raised up two to three feet the back will be four feet.

Mr. Geisler: Where is the fencing proposed to be?

Mr. Laber: South, east and north

Mr. Geisler: I don't see any windows on the building, except the doors on the front. So there is only a vertical element?

Mr. Laber: Correct.

Mr. Geisler: Is there a signal light proposed?

Mr. Laber: The traffic assessment shows it is not warranted. SRF did the study.

Mr. Selke: Any traffic coming from the west, I'm concerned with safety, there could be stacking. What are the expected visit to your site? What are the size of trucks?

Mr. Geisler: You said 66 spaces, where are they banking the parking? How much parking in the front and how many banked?

Mr. Laber: 66 spaces in the front, 30 banked.

Mr. Geisler: There is no light consideration? Without a light I can see some problems.

Mr. Selke: He has a good point if it lines up with the post office.

Mr. Laber: I can have them look at it more.

Mr. Selke: What items will you be selling and where will they be displayed.

Mr. Laber: They have listed in the fence area, feeding equipment, pens, fencing and posts,

Mr. Selke: Anything motorized? That's where the noise comes from, will there be repairs done there? Mr. Geisler pointed out the building is bland that's needs something added, where will the dumpsters be located? The roof mounted units need to be shielded.

Mr. Laber: I have provided photos and don't appear to be visible, if you need something more let us know.

Mr. Selke: What is the height of the building?

Mr. Laber: 20 feet, about 23 to the peak.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Mr. Selke: When we talk about buffering, can all the trees be maintained. Can you buffer out along the property line?

Mr. Geisler: In terms of removing trees is there a body that controls that? What can we do to mitigate that?

Mr. Caterino: This application has been forwarded to the town tree council and they can pick out if certain trees should be kept on site because they provide useful buffering. Once they provide their comments we can provide those to the board.

Mr. Selke: Just to be clear there is no other applicant for the other lot.

Mr. Laber: No

Mr. Selke: How much is outdoor storage?

Mr. Laber: 21,000 square feet.

Mr. Antelli: Will you have bagged mulch or will this be piles? What are the hours for selling of propane, I know those machines are loud. Will you have an onsite manager, if there is a problem, the neighbors can contact them to resolve the issue.

Mr. Selke: You do need safety stop signs.

Mr. Laber: Ok

Mr. Sofia: When is the special use permit granted for this site?

Mr. Caterino: A retail use is permitted.

Mr. Sofia: So some restrictions and concerns that we have, that would be our stipulations, that would not fall under special use. I would be opposed to the permanent display close to the road. I would be very concerned with a lot of the outdoor display, even close to the building, I know to the east is commercial, but heavy residential to the west, so we have to be sensitive to that. The items and equipment that is proposed to be displayed is not stuff that is everyday use for this residential area. I would limit the outdoor space. We don't know what will happen to parcel two, so a right turning lane is a potential possibility, it's a fast, hazardous road, so slowed down traffic is a liability. I would like to see a third party traffic study would be a request. We would ask the applicant to provide. That is a third party unbiased that we request the applicant to pay for and provide us to review the traffic study. They would take in future development, especially since that driveway would be used for the future development. We would want to talk more about hours of operation, outdoor displays, mechanical work, and delivery times so it does not bother neighbors. The landscaping plan that I see needs a tremendous amount of landscaping, it has room for improvement.

Mr. Laber: Understood

Mr. Fisher: The proposed banked parking should never go in, the more you develop the more you have to compensate, a lot of it happens to be in area we are looking to buffer. I would also like to highlight what Mr. Sofia said about no displays out front, it's a distraction. I think the throat of the entrance should be increased so you have stacking, when someone comes in they don't have to immediately make a quick right turn. I also thinks this is a building that is visible and out normal requirements that if you have visible building you have the same architectural elements on all sides. I have taken a look at the Tractor Supply in Brockport and in Ontario, I have to agree with the comments they don't look that good. In Brockport, there is a Country Max, there is shows an outside area with wrought iron, columns, it has to be dressed up, chain link does not cut it. I has to be dressed up to match the quality of the buildings in the area. I also agree that we need to minimize the displays and what is happening out front and put those in the area that is fenced in. There also has to be substantial buffering on both sides much beyond here. When we hear from the tree council

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

we can ask for the kind of plantings that would provide immediate as well as continues buffering to the east and to the residential to the west. I think there is a lot of work to be done as to what they will doing and to make sure it is consistent with the restricted business use.

Mr. Geisler made a motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to continue the application to the May 22, 2019, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
MAY 22, 2019, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: APM Holdings, LLC
Location: 104 Gates-Greece Town Line Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.03-5-4.4
Request: Minor improvement plan for a proposed accessory building (5,300± square feet), with related parking/loading area, 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.

Cade Krueger, DDS Engineers, presented the application

Mr. Cade: We are here to tonight seeking approval for minor site improvements to the recently constructed facility and associated parking and loading areas for Addison Precision Manufacturing. The owner intends to construct a 5,300 square foot accessory structure on the north side of the existing facility that will include utility connections in addition they intend to add additional parking on the north side of the site and expand parking to the east. In conjunction with the site improvements the owners are proposing to install plantings at the front of the site. The applicant did purchase residential zoned property to the south and have demolished the house that was there. After discussion with staff the owners have removed the existing trees at the front but will be replacing them at a 2:1 ratio as well as preserving a substantial large tree in the center of property at the suggestion of the town. We have received town comments and have addressed all engineering concerns and don't see any issue with implementing those comments on the final plans.

Mr. Caterino: Our zoning staff and Fire Marshal had no comment. The Fire Marshal had questions regarding accessibility to the building since then the applicant has addressed those comments. In terms of the landscaping plan they will be adding addition Maple and Crab Apple trees to the Gates Greece Town Line Road frontage. This proposed building will be backing up to property that is zoned waterfront development that has been the town's long term goal to see that canal frontage developed. We should discuss if any landscaping should be done to dress up the back of the building that faces the waterfront.

Mr. Kreiger: Right now we are not proposing any, we are almost 200 feet from the lot line to the north and obviously we are not sure when development will take place. We would be open to planting arborvitaes if this Board thinks it's necessary.

Mr. Sofia: I think something of a spruce would be appropriate, arborvitaes just grow tall.

Mr. Selke: What has slowed the process?

Mr. Kreiger: They are concentrating working on the inside. They still have some work to do, I speak of a time frame for the contractor, but are actively working on it.

Mr. Caterino: Anything on the look of the building?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

Mr. Kreiger: Could not get anything for tonight's meeting but it will match the building.

Mr. Fisher: So some putting some spruce in along the new building, to be approve by staff and the façade will match the existing building.

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

WHEREAS, APM Holdings, LLC(the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 104 Gates Greece Town Line Road (the "Premises"); and

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

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the Applicant's voluntary incorporation of features and measures 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 Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Slocum then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
3. The developer/contractor is responsible for removal and disposal of brush, trees, and debris from any lot clearing. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
4. Approval is for only those items identified as "new" or "proposed" on the Minor Improvement Plan. Approval of this minor improvement plan does not supersede any other conditions imposed by the Town of Greece or any other agency. A note to this effect shall be added to the minor improvement plan.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

5. Any Town of Greece approval or permit for the 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 plan.
6. 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.
7. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition shall be the same / generally consistent on all sides of the proposed addition and shall be visually compatible with the existing building(s). As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall match the existing building.
8. The exterior colors and architectural style of the building shall remain as they are. The exterior materials shall remain as they are, except where changes are required by the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Codes. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the 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. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Building Inspector, Commissioner of Public Works, and Town Engineer.
11. 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.
12. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
13. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
14. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
15. As offered and approved by the applicant the site will require spruce plantings on the back (north side) of building subject to the approval Planning Board Clerk.

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

2. Applicant: Village Crossing, LLC
Location: 3455 & 3471 Mount Read Boulevard
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 075.05-2-8, 075.05-2-9
Request: Extension of 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, previously approved February 7, 2018
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Ms. Slocum, to grant two 90-day extensions of the preliminary and final plat re-approval of the subdivision, previously approved on February 7, 2018.

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

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

3. Applicant: Sanco Builders, LLC
Location: 981 Latta Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 046.19-3-20
Request: Extension of preliminary and final plat approval for the Legends at Latta subdivision, consisting of 28 lots (27 new houses; 1 existing house) on approximately 10.8 acres, previously approved by the Planning Board, October 3, 2018.
Zoning District: R1-8 (Single-Family Residential)

Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Ms. Slocum, to grant two 90-day extensions of the preliminary and final plat re-approval of the subdivision, previously approved on October 3, 2018.

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

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 8, 2019

ADJOURNMENT: 10:20 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