



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JUNE 21, 2017

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

Michael H. Sofia

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Jamie L. Slocum

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Anthony Colaruotolo
Location: 190 Stonewood Avenue
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 060.59-2-33.1
Request: Minor subdivision approval for the Colaruotolo subdivision, consisting of 2 lots on approximately 0.642 acres
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Residential)

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

Anthony Colaruotolo, property owner; and Lawrence Heininger, P.E., Marques & Associates, P.C., presented the application.

Mr. Colaruotolo: I purchased the property in 1987. At that time it was approved for a two-family home. I converted the home to a double but never did anything more with the property. I did not pay much attention but the property was rezoned to what it is now. I have the parcel of land adjacent to the home and I would like it split off and use it as a single-family home.

Mr. Heininger: I add that his sister now lives in the existing house. The intention is that, when the lot subdivision is approved, he will transfer it to his brother. The biggest comment was that we would have to widen the lot from 70 feet to 72.1 feet to meet the minimum width established by the neighborhood average. It also was indicated that the front setback was deeper than it needed to be. That is a concept view of the house, which can be adjusted. Comments from the Town's engineering staff were to add the lateral detail. Also, the sewer should be televised to verify the viability of the existing storm and sanitary laterals, and if they were not, we had to go to the main in the middle of the road.

Mr. Copey: The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee reviewed the project, and had no comments. There were no comments from the Town's Building Department or the Fire Marshal. The plan that they submitted this evening appears to address comments from a zoning perspective. Thank you for the clarification on the two-family use.

Mr. Gauthier: Public Works had no significant comments other than what was mentioned.

Mr. Copey: This property previously was zoned multiple-family and commercial.

Mr. Schiano: What are your plans for this property?

Mr. Colaruotolo: A single-family home.

Mr. Selke: Have you sold this lot? The driveway looks wide. Will it be cut off?

Mr. Colaruotolo: The property will stay within the family. Yes, some of the driveway will be cut.

Mr. Selke: I'm concerned about the drainage.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

Mr. Gauthier: This a conceptual depiction of a house; there might be some adjustments.

Mr. Heininger: There will be a gradual slope. We will saw cut the driveway and put in a turnaround, and we comply with the setback requirements.

Mr. Gauthier: It's a good site design.

Mr. Geisler: What is the maximum lot coverage?

Mr. Copey: You can go up to 25% of the lot. For single-family residences, it's the same everywhere in town.

Mr. Heininger: I guess that we are looking for site plan approval, but first we have to file a subdivision map to make the lot transferable.

Mr. Fisher: This is a conceptual plan and what is specifically brought in will have to be approved by our staff.

Mr. Copey: The Board also is being asked to approve the site plan, so if there are questions, now is the time.

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

WHEREAS, Anthony Colaruotolo (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor subdivision, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 190 Stonewood Avenue (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 Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

7. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to approve the application, 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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

- 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 plat.
 3. The width of Lot 2 shall be increased to 72.1 feet to comply with the minimum lot width established by the neighborhood average, as required in Table I of the town's Zoning Ordinance.
 4. The Town's *2001 Community Master Plan Update* (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to New York State Town Law, Section 277, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for Lot 2 in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
 5. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
 6. 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.
 7. Subject to approval by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and Engineering staff.
 8. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
 9. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
 10. 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
June 21, 2017

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: DVL1, LLC
Location: Generally, southeast corner of Latta Road and Long Pond Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-4-1, 045.03-4-2, 045.03-4-3, 045.03-4-4, 045.03-4-17.11 & 045.03-4-20.111
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed medical office building (one story, 15,000± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 15.2 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Ms. Burke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the July 6, 2017, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
July 6, 2017, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

2. Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems of Allentown, Inc. (d.b.a. Verizon Wireless)
- Location: 1510 Maiden Lane
- Mon. Co. Tax No.: 059.19-3-1.1
- Request: Site plan approval for a proposed cellular service telecommunications facility, consisting of a freestanding antenna tower (119 feet-high, including lightning rod) and related antenna(s), accessory antenna structures, and access driveway, on approximately 0.13 acres
- Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)

Ms. Burke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the July 19, 2017, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
July 19, 2017, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

New Business

1. Applicant: Greece OB/GYN, LLP
Location: 2337 Ridgeway Avenue
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.14-2-21
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed medical office building (one story; 6500± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.2 acres
Zoning District: BP-2 (Professional Office)

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

James Cretekos, P.E. and Doug Eldred, P.E., BME Associates, P.C.; and Dr. Earlando Thomas and Connie Ullman, Greece OB/GYN, LLP, presented the application.

Mr. Cretekos: The property is a 1.2-acre lot. There are some fully matured trees, with some existing brush located to the southern property line. The property drains generally from the road to the south off-site into a state-regulated wetland. We know that there is a 100-foot-wide state wetland buffer that extends into our property approximately 65 feet. Currently, we show a plan that has a building of 7750± square feet. Since the time that the application was submitted, the medical group now anticipates the building to be 6,500± square feet. They will be reducing the footprint of the building. It will fit within the confines of the site and building footprint that we originally submitted, and the architecture still will be consistent with the elevations that we originally submitted. The elevations are detailed on the plans, with colors listed. There will be some cobblestone features added to the north and west side; this will help break up the roofline and the areas that will be visible to the public traveling on Ridgeway Avenue, as well as patients visiting the site. The mechanicals will be housed on the roof; there is a recessed flat area which is screened from view. Vehicular access to and from Ridgeway Avenue will be provided through Reed Eye Associates to the west. We are proposing to make a connection into the parking lot and utilize the existing access onto Ridgeway Avenue. There will be an access easement on the property. The plans show 61 parking spaces, which include 3 handicapped accessible spaces; the code requires 39 spaces. With the reduction in the building size, we will be looking at potentially reducing the number of parking spaces; however, the applicant anticipates the need for close to the number of spaces that we have provided. At this time, we are proposing to reduce the number of parking spaces to the minimum required by the zoning code, and land bank the remaining number so that they can be constructed in the future if they are needed. There are no variances needed. Drainage will be consistent with the existing drainage pattern. The storm water runoff will be collected and conveyed southward, then enter a storm water management area that has been designed to meet Town requirements for quality and quantity before discharge. Comments that have been received have been addressed, except for the sidewalk jog near the access point. The reason for it is that we have a 20-foot parking setback that has been set there, and to have an elevated one- to two-foot grass strip we have proposed a jog in the sidewalk. The other comment is about the sanitary sewer. Currently, we are proposing to make the connection to an existing manhole to the west, and extend the line to the east. There is a maple tree that is located just inside our property line. We have selected a location for where we have terminated the sewer based on our efforts to save the tree. If we went with a different alignment, there is a chance that the tree would die due to the excavations. The other request would have it run the sewer at a flat, low-percent slope; this would force us to have

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

deeper exactions, which may damage the tree further. We would prefer to save the tree, and I believe that Wehner Mower would prefer that, too, but if it had to come down we would do it.

Mr. Copey: The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee reviewed the project, and they had a number of comments. One comment is that County Department of Public Health approval is required for the extension of the sanitary sewer; there also are several details from the County Department of Transportation. Our Fire Marshal asked that the fire department connection be shown on the west side of the building. There was no comment from our Building Department, and the zoning staff asked for confirmation that the building complies with the previously granted setback variance. This site previously was the subject of a historic resources evaluation; we have all the paperwork, and any issues were resolved.

Mr. Gauthier: Most of the public works and engineering comments are technical, and as long as you don't have issues with our comments, we can give an endorsement. Your proposed number of parking spaces is significantly above the code minimum, but the business has past experience with its parking needs, so I'm sure that you know what you need. We recommend that you limit your parking to what you could foreseeably need above the code minimum. We don't like to see more pavement than a business needs. The jog in the sidewalk represents a health and safety issue at night when snow is being plowed; we try to eliminate jogs whenever we can. We will not ask the Board to make removal of the jog a condition of approval, but it could cause some difficulty; we can talk about adjusting it. We can work with all those things. The sanitary sewer has to be extended to the edge of the property. The sewer does not need to follow a straight line and can dodge around the tree, but we will work to find a way to get it to the property line.

Larry Wehner, 2323 Ridgeway Avenue: I live at the house to the east, and just wanted to know if the trees were going to be saved. They provide shade and some separation. Also, the parking lot lines up to my deck and living room and bathroom, so I'm not happy about having it there. If you could reduce the parking, I would like to have it reduced in the front.

Mr. Selke: Will all the trash go into a dumpster or totes?

Mr. Cretekos: We are proposing to do a hedgerow, four to six feet high; this will help at the edge of the parking and will screen your deck area. The dumpster will be to the southwest on the property. We might trim some of the trees, but we don't plan to remove them.

Mr. Sofia: Will you be banking some of the parking spaces now?

Mr. Cretekos: They would like to provide the minimum allowed by code at this time but land bank others so that if the need arose, they would be able to construct them. We have not decided where to bank yet, but were thinking about doing it in the rear of the site.

Mr. Fisher: In the front might be the ones to bank, as the neighbor is impacted by them.

Mr. Eldred: We talked quite a bit to the doctors and they did feel that they needed more than the code allows. We are reducing the size of the building, and could land bank four parking spaces near Wehner Mower and maybe some in the rear. It is important to have parking near the door, but they have agreed to reduce here to have more separation.

Mr. Fisher: I can see keeping them near the door.

Mr. Eldred: We will discuss it and see what works best.

Mr. Gauthier: If you absolutely needed more parking spaces, say 40, rather than banking 15 or 20, if you could reduce what would be the total authorized to be built, you could reduce the storm water runoff management issue.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

Mr. Eldred: When we first started talking, it was an important issue to have this many parking spaces. They will be adding another doctor to the practice. They are willing to reduce the number of parking spaces paved initially, but to give up some of them permanently would be difficult.

Mr. Gauthier: They would not be giving them up permanently. Additional parking spaces could be added via a minor improvement plan. The intent of the Board is to reduce the number of excess parking spaces, without hurting the growth of this medical practice.

Mr. Copey: We will need to discuss which spaces will be taken out.

Mr. Sofia: How many employees?

Ms. Ullman: I am the business manager for the practice. We have five health care providers with 18 employees. We do other tests there, and husbands would come too, sometimes separately. We don't want them to pull in and have nowhere to park.

Mr. Selke: Where would employees park?

Mr. Geisler: Is there more than one entrance? Why are they reducing the building but keeping this many parking spaces?

Mr. Eldred: Employees would park in the rear. The practice still has the same need for parking, based on the number of patients. The reduction in the building size is a result of making the project work financially.

Mr. Sofia: If you removed all the spaces along the sidewalk, most of those that remained would be in the front, but would reduce the number and have more greenspace.

Mr. Eldred: I would like them land banked rather eliminated.

Dr. Thomas: We are happy that you are entertaining our request this evening. What you are discussing is what we have been trying to figure out—the number of parking spaces that is adequate to accommodate our patients. Sometimes we have patients that can't walk very far. I appreciate the neighbor's comments. I did not know that we were right on your rear yard; we are sensitive to that sort of issue. From what we calculated based on 15 employees and five doctors, we would be struggling with just 30 spaces. We do a lot of in-office procedures. We want to grow. We have been in the community for 40 years and take pride in that and want to continue that service here. We are not only gynecologists; we also do robotic surgeries. Very few practices do that, and this is what we are bringing here and we should be proud. I appreciate you working with us, but we want to be reasonable, with the trees and green space I think 50 parking spaces would work for us, and bank the rest for when we need it.

Mr. Fisher: That's where the banking would provide the flexibility. We want you to serve your patients. You want parking spaces that are close to your door. It sounds like you are aware of the difficulty to be able to forecast exactly what the need may be. So, banking will be the best way.

Mr. Schiano: May I suggest banking the ends, both corners, and maybe five on each side?

Mr. Selke: How do you handle medical waste?

Ms. Ullman: We have a company that comes for medical waste. We have some deliveries during the day in the rear; they would be small trucks.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

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

WHEREAS, Greece OB/GYN, LLP (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 2337 Ridgeway Avenue (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 Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Sofia then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to approve the application, 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 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
June 21, 2017

5. 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 tan color family) with white trim and asphalt roof (in the brown color family). Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.
6. 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.
7. An easement or agreement for the proposed cross-access shall be provided, subject to approval by the Planning Board Attorney and shall be shown on the plan.
8. 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.
9. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
10. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.
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.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

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

16. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
17. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
18. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
19. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
20. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall extend the sanitary sewer eastward along the entire Ridgeway Avenue frontage, subject to approval by the Commissioner of Public Works.
21. As offered by the Applicant, at least 10 parking space shall be banked, pursuant to the provisions of Section 211-44 of the town's zoning ordinance. Spaces to be banked shall come from the east and west ends of the front parking lot, subject to approval by the Planning Board Clerk.
22. Subject to approval of a wetland buffer permit.

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
June 21, 2017

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

ADJOURNMENT: 8:15 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