



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

AUGUST 17, 2016

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

Devan M. Helfer

Jamie L. Slocum

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

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Alaimo Enterprises, Ltd.
Location: Generally, south of Janes Road, between Long Pond Road and Kirk Road
Request: Final plat approval for the Legends West subdivision, Section 8, consisting of 7 lots on approximately 3.076 acres
Zoning District: R1-12 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.02-1-1.21

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

Richard Giraulo, LaDieu Associates, presented the application.

Mr. Giraulo: I am here for another section of the Legends West subdivision. This remaining section is a cul-de-sac which will be known as Shelby Circle. We have seven lots, will connect two stub streets and complete the loop. I have received comments from the Town's engineers, have made the changes to the plans, and I'm ready to resubmit. All the services are available on-site.

Mr. Copey: As a final plat, this was not subject to review by Monroe County. We have no comments from staff.

Mr. Gauthier: We sent a letter with comments on July 26, 2016. There are no major issues, and there are details regarding lot grading and drainage. I believe that Mr. Giraulo is OK with these comments.

Mr. Giraulo: Yes. I have added those to the plans.

Mr. Fisher: Normally, most of the decisions are made at the time of preliminary plat. Now we are saying that this section is consistent with that, and that any details have been reviewed.

Motion by Mr. Selke , seconded by Mr. Sofia:

WHEREAS, Alaimo Enterprises, Ltd. (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Planning Board (the "Planning Board") of the Town of Greece (the "Town") for approval of a final plat (the "Proposal"), as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Meeting"), relative to property generally south of Janes Road, between Long Pond Road and Kirk 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 Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

- NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the development of the Legends West subdivision was classified as a Type I action.
2. In accordance with SEQRA, the Town Board (the "Town Board") of the Town was designated as the lead agency for the environmental review of the development of the Legends West subdivision, which was part of a larger development proposal (the "Legends Project").
 3. The Town Board fully considered the alternatives, impacts, and mitigation measures that were identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (the "FEIS") that was prepared for the Legends Project when the Applicant requested a rezoning from an industrial zoning classification to a single-family residential zoning classification (the "Legends Rezoning").
 4. On November 9, 1989, in accordance with SEQRA, the Town Board issued a Findings Statement (the "1989 SEQRA Findings Statement"), and then passed a resolution to approve the Legends Rezoning (the "Legends Rezoning Approval"). In the 1989 SEQRA Findings Statement, the Town Board concluded that, in summary, the development of the Legends West subdivision would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The findings of the 1989 SEQRA Findings Statement are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth, as findings of the Planning Board in its decision on the Proposal.
 5. The Planning Board has carefully considered environmental information that was prepared by the Applicant's representatives or the Town's staff, which included but was not limited to: a written description of the Proposal; conceptual site plans; aerial photographs; Part 1 of an Environmental Assessment Form (the "EAF"); and supplemental information about the Proposal (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
 6. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered additional information that was submitted by the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to: oral or written descriptions of the Proposal; maps and other drawings of the Proposal; and various oral or written comments that may have resulted from meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant's representatives.
 7. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Town's own staff.
 8. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from owners of nearby properties or other interested parties, and all other relevant comments submitted to the Planning Board as of August 17, 2016.
 9. The Proposal is consistent with the GEIS, the 1989 SEQRA Findings Statement, and the Legends Rezoning Approval.
 10. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
 11. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

12. 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.
13. The Planning Board carefully considered the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the FEIS and in all supplemental maps, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews.
14. The 1989 SEQRA Findings Statement weighed and balanced relevant environmental impacts with social, economic, and other considerations.
15. 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.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the Planning Board's own initial concerns and all issues and comments submitted 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 and that, therefore, SEQRA and the 1989 Findings Statement require no further action relative to the Proposal by the Planning Board.

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

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Sofia, 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. 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 each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

- original building permit for each house. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
3. This subdivision section is located within an area in which the Town levies a sanitary sewer surcharge. A sanitary sewer entrance fee surcharge shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. In addition, a limited-term annual debt repayment charge shall be applied to each house constructed in this subdivision. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plat.
 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. 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 the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page of easement filing shall be referenced on final as-built record drawings provided to the Town.
 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 the Town's 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 designees, successors and assigns.
 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.

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile of Rochester, L.P. (d.b.a. Verizon Wireless)
Location: 2419 Latta Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.20-1-1.11
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed cellular service telecommunications facility, consisting of a freestanding antenna tower (128 feet-high, including lightning rod) and related antenna(s), accessory antenna structures, and access driveway, on approximately 0.23 acres
Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)

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

Thomas C. Greiner Jr., Esq., Nixon Peabody LLP, presented the application.

Mr. Fisher: There are two boards that are reviewing this application concurrently—the Board of Zoning Appeals and this Board. The Planning Board’s area of control relates to site plan. For this type of development proposal, I would say that the Board of Zoning Appeals has 80% of the responsibility and the Planning Board has about 20%.

Mr. Schiano: The only things that this Board should be looking at is the site plan, architectural features, landscaping screening, access, and those types of issues. Location is not for this board to discuss.

Mr. Fisher: The Board of Zoning Appeals has closed the public hearing and has reserved decision, so we cannot act on this application.

Mr. Greiner: Coming out of our last meeting, there were three issues; one was to give consideration to eliminating the 90-degree bend in the hypothetical subdivision road. We have shown that change, and two lots that were to the south of the cell tower were eliminated as well. Another question was if we could move the site to the west at all. You will recall that a resident asked to move it closer to Kirk Road. I referred to Exhibit E in the original application regarding the search ring. We did propose moving it west as far as we could from the original site. There is an exhibit that shows that the trees do thin out a lot there, which leads to a third issue: would we consider doing a camouflage structure, referred to as a “mono-pine.” We have photo simulations that show images from different sides. We would not propose doing a mono-pine west of that because the trees do thin out considerably; the landowner did also not want it moved to the east.

Mr. Copey: In a discussion that I had today with the Fire Marshal, the surface of the access road is up for discussion, but we will have it sorted out by our next meeting.

Mr. Greiner: If the Town wishes to have that paved, we would do that. Gravel seems to work well in other areas, but we will pave if required to.

Mr. Fisher: We are deferring it to the Fire Marshal from a safety aspect. We have expressed our opinions but it’s really a safety question there.

Mr. Gauthier: No comments.

Mr. Selke: Please clarify the safety issue.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

Mr. Fisher: From the standpoint of having the permeability and having something that is less intrusive, the gravel may meet those criteria. Since safety is our most important issue, we rely on the Fire Marshal to work with the fire departments, given the equipment that they use. One aspect is making it larger to maneuver the equipment. The cell towers have electric, fuel. We want to make sure that emergency responders can get to it quickly.

Robert McDonald, 123 Bridgewood Drive: What is the Board's level of control to maintain the trees? It is private land, so anytime that the owner wants to come in and tear down the trees, we will be looking at a bare tower.

Mr. Fisher: If you were to go through and construct a subdivision (for example) there is in this area a substantial amount of wetland; that area would preclude disturbance.

Mr. Gauthier: You ask a complex question. I don't want to sound wishy-washy but if this property owner has an agricultural exemption, he could do more; I understand that he does not.

Mr. McDonald: I believe that he does.

Mr. Gauthier: If he had that, he could clear the whole thing as part as an agricultural operation, but it is my understanding that that is not applicable. If he were a law-abiding citizen that was doing things by the book he would need to have a storm water pollution prevention plan ("SWPPP") and a site plan if he was clearing more than one acre. If he was clearing individual specimens of trees and if he was using the appropriate equipment and not disturbing the land, he could clear many individual specimens. If a person does not feel constrained by the rules, it's more difficult for us. Some developers that are not so law-abiding basically decide to ask for forgiveness rather than permission. So, can it be done? Sure, and by the time someone got out there to stop it, it might be gone.

Mr. Fisher: The eastern half between Bridgewood and this site is designated wetland.

Mr. McDonald: I think that you answered by question. My understanding is that the wetland comes around the sweep of the creek that flows under Bridgewood Drive.

Mr. Gauthier: There is a wetland and floodplain.

Mr. McDonald: I saw the mess that the landowner had, and that answers my question as to the control you have. To put this on Town land you have the control, and that is part of my main concern. My whole argument is that the primary damage that this will do is to the aesthetics of the well-established, long term neighborhood, which is why I asked to put this antenna tower in Basil Marella Park.

Mary Roberts, 147 Bridgewood Drive: I'm speaking from the assumption that this will approved. I will say right up front, I hate it; I really don't want a cell tower. I would ask or request, or maybe beg, that you put up something other than an ugly tower. It's ugly, it's steel, it's yucky. Can we not make it visually beautiful, not to bring our spirits down but lift us up? I have this Lego tree here to show you. I see the tree when I'm driving on Interstate Route 490 toward Eastview Mall. It makes me smile and it would bring beauty to the area. Mr. Gaborski's property used to be beautiful. I know that you can do this. Today I heard about the benefits of a belly laugh; it lifts spirits, it gets rid of pain. If you look it up, a merry heart does well like medicine, and that is the truth. If I look out my window and see this silly tree I will smile. It will lift my spirits. Why not take a stand to make it look beautiful? Do you have the authority to make it look like that?

Mr. Copey: One must consider whether this situation warrants that. The two examples that I can think of a tower like that are next to a state highway. Under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") environmental review requirements, the viewshed from a public highway has a high importance because thousands and thousands of people drive by

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

that location every day. All the other cell towers in Town that are visible from nearby residents are not the of the Lego tree variety. What precedent would that set? The Board would have to take that into consideration.

Mr. Selke: I tried to visualize it if you were far away and this thing was sticking up; it will be seen.

Mr. Schiano: It was offered.

Ms. Roberts: I care about our Town. Consider our feelings; we want to see pretty. I know that it's silly but it makes you smile. Please consider that.

Arthur Daughton, 52 Goethals Drive: I did not hear you Mr. Schiano, but we are here for site plan and landscaping; I don't see that. If the discussion in the past was about landscaping, where is the plan? I've been to enough of these meetings, and there are visuals.

Mr. Fisher: We talked about having a fence and evergreen vegetation, given the fact that the longer they have to grow if there is development.

Mr. Daughton: I love this town, I built my house here. Don't you think that we should see something? Since the last meeting I did a site tour and I took photos that I will put on my site.

Mr. Copey: Let's keep it about this application.

Mr. Daughton: So I guess we don't see any visuals.

Mr. Selke: We have not seen it yet; they will be back before this Board.

Mr. Fisher: That is why we cannot act. It gives us the opportunity to be sure when we are in a position where we have all the information that we require.

Mr. Daughton: Don't shove it down their throat.

Mr. Fisher: That is why the federal government has stepped in and put in enabling legislation that permits things that may not otherwise be permitted in order to be able to allow deployment of this public utility.

Mr. Schiano: The Town discussed telecommunication last night, too, at the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

Mr. Fisher: It's important for people to have input.

Mr. Greiner: We had agreed to provide landscaping and are waiting on the Board of Zoning Appeals for a location to put it. We also did offer that if this Board did require a mono-pine, we would do it. That would be in the same longitude as in our original submission. I think that putting further to the west would not make sense, but certainly the original longitude and 50 feet to the north would work, but it's up to the Board.

Mr. Fisher: My experience with the "Franken-tree" along Interstate Route 490 is that it stands out. If you had a pine forest, maybe, but if you have something that is so unlike any other vegetation it's just going to draw attention to it rather than blend in, especially during the time of year when you don't have leaves on the deciduous trees.

Mr. Greiner: My own feeling is, aesthetics are subjective; we all have our opinions. I understand that we are different on what looks good. It is really up to the Boards. If we all have our own opinions and something has to happen, you've been given the authority to figure it out.

Mr. Fisher: I think some antenna towers have been flagpoles, and it fits. It's important to us to see something that would be compatible if you were in that neighborhood, the least

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

impactful. For us to get a better idea of what the structure would look like might be helpful. My opinion is that, from what we have seen, the antenna tower would be so much more apparent if camouflaged as a tree, especially during the time the leaves are off the deciduous trees.

Mr. Sofia: I see everyone's point. In commercial areas, antennas are accepted. This is the lesser of two evils. The view from Latta is no so bad. Even when there are no leaves there still are other, taller trees.

Mr. Schiano: We need to see what the Board of Zoning Appeals decides.

Mr. Sofia: I like the mono-tree.

Mr. Selke: Are there other samples?

Mr. Greiner: There are some other samples that we can submit. I don't know if you would be able to see the whole thing once it was built, but we can send in a simulation of that. Typically, the camouflage branches don't extend all the way down the antenna tower because there are load issues.

Mr. Fisher: OK. Show us what it would look like.

Mr. Selke: How are they serviced?

Mr. Greiner: They use a cherry-picker to change or check the antennas.

Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the September 7, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO SEPTEMBER 7, 2016, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

2. Applicant: 4320 West Ridge Road, LLC
Location: 4320 West Ridge Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-1-3, 073.01-1-4, 073.01-1-5, 073.01-1-6, 073.01-1-7, 073.01-1-21, 073.01-2-63, 073.01-2-64.111, 073.01-2-64.12, 073.01-2-68.1 (part)
Request: Site plan approval for Phase I of the Hampton Ridge Center commercial development, consisting of a proposed retail building (one story; 156,159± square feet) and a gasoline dispensing station (1481± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading and landscaping on approximately 59.756 acres
Zoning District: BG (General Business)

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

Paul Colucci, The DiMarco Group, presented the application.

Mr. Colucci: Since our last meeting we have received a letter of intent from our anchor tenant. They have a concern in that they don't want to represent something that they might do until they are 100% certain about what they want to do at this site, because they don't want to present something to the Board and then have to pull back from that. We have had positive discussions with them. We are anticipating that they get through their internal approval process in the month of September. There are a couple of interim steps that may allow them to participate once they get through that. I'm hopeful that I can have their architect here with me. It also will allow me to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals to get two special use permits that are going to be required. We have concluded our traffic impact study; it was updated from 2009. It took into consideration the January 2016 traffic study that was done by Benderson Development Company for the Southwestern Commons project that was recently rezoned across the street. Our updated study recommends that, at full buildout, the driveway at Hampton Ridge opposite the Doan driveway be a full access signalized intersection. It would have a single lane in, two exiting lanes, and a right-turn lane. We are proposing a connection to the Shops at Hampton Ridge. At the existing driveway that currently serves Kohls department store, a signal will be warranted there, and also a right-out-only, limited access driveway on the very western portion of the Hampton Ridge property. All that is required at full buildout but we are going to do all of the New York State Department of Transportation ("NYSDOT") improvements in Phase 1, just to bundle it into one project. Also, our traffic study shows that there is a need for a right-turn lane for westbound turns into the site; it is shown on the map, and it is a deceleration lane. There also is a 390-foot-long left-turn lane for eastbound turns into the site. We also will work in there to widen the road so that there is protected left-turn lane on the south. Our traffic study will be reviewed by the NYSDOT and the Town; we will forward it to you. We are able to maintain all levels of service in all the surrounding intersections. I have some photos that show the buffer during the different seasons. We have offered and are willing to put in a 100-foot-wide buffer for the residents to the east. We are going to clear most of the site but will keep that buffer. We have an opportunity do some additional planting or buffering to the north if the Board is interested. The other photos show staging areas in some of our other projects. If there is a situation where there would be extended periods of timeout, we would look to work with the Board on what the conditions of that would be, whether we could vegetate some areas or whether stone would be acceptable. My goal is to stabilize the site as quickly as possible after we disturb the earth. Putting down vegetation

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

requires soil and planting something. We prefer to stabilize in a pad-ready condition; that way, as tenants come we're able to move quickly to accommodate them.

Mr. Fisher: Is that the kind of thing that's documented in a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP")?

Mr. Gauthier: Yes. The current regulations make it quite a challenge because we don't know what's coming in terms of phasing. If all storm water facilities are put in initially, the risk is minimal to close out the permit, but they have to be multiple permits. On the other hand, if they are confident that they can come in and fill up all the tenant space in a reasonable amount of time, you go with one permit and go with a partial completion. This site has an open inactive permit. After they finish the first phase, they can go with only a partially completed project for two years and then they have to close it. There is a lot of projection involved. Knowing that the next permit rules that come out will be stricter than the one available today, it will be more constraining.

Mr. Fisher: If we were to do that, how would we document what our plan is?

Mr. Copey: We have the phasing plan, the sheets in the site plan set.

Mr. Fisher: If it's something on which we are in agreement with the developer, then that would be part of Phase 1. This would be how things are done with the presumption of timing, but it may be modified based on whether you are able to execute your plan. So what is the mechanism used to document our agreement with the developer?

Mr. Gauthier: We are not going to be approving everything. There is going to be approval of Phase 1; that will be dark lines on the drawing, with grayed-out areas showing future intent. If I were in the developer's position, I would write a SWPPP for the whole project. The developer has to come back to the Board for approval of the grayed-out area.

Mr. Schiano: We are doing a lot of speculation.

Mr. Gauthier: All that the Board is being asked to approve is the darkened areas; those will be coordinated with the SWPPP.

Mr. Colucci: With a project this size, we will do all the infrastructure at one time. Your concern is what won't be done. We are proposing to manage that in a fashion similar to our other projects. It would be curbed and landscaped on the periphery of the site; the rest would be stone, graded and neat. We would put up a split-rail fence to keep traffic out of undeveloped areas.

Mr. Selke: Why not grass?

Mr. Colucci: Timing. If we thought that it would be a lengthy interval before Phase 2 began, we might vegetate that area.

Mr. Selke: So you think that it will be fast.

Mr. Colucci: Yes. I would not want to vegetate an area and then rip out the vegetation.

Mr. Copey: We don't want the stone to turn to weeds.

Mr. Colucci: We want to maintain a first class facility.

Mr. Gauthier: I'm pleased with what I have heard so far.

David Zambuto, 70 Black Duck Trail: In the 100-foot-wide vegetated buffer, the area next to my house is not vegetated as much. Will they fill that in from their side?

Mr. Colucci: There is a thin area in the tree line. We could work on getting something in there, and it may be beneficial to put something in the northern part because we have moved the main building in Phase 1 further south.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

Mr. Fisher: It helps to see what it looks like overall. The traffic improvements should make that dramatically better.

Motion by Ms. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the September 21, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO SEPTEMBER 21, 2016, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

New Business

None

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Atlantic Funding & Real Estate, LLC
Location: 400 Bellwood Drive (in Canal Ponds Business Park)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.04-1-13.11 & 089.04-1-14.12
Request: Extension of site plan approval for a proposed hotel (4 stories; 120± rooms; 60,000± total square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 2.3 acres previously approved on October 7, 2015.
Zoning District: BG (General Business)

Mr. Antelli then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to grant two 90-day extensions to the site plan approval previously approved on October 7, 2015.

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

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2016

ADJOURNMENT: 8:40 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman