



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 2, 2022

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

Jamie L. Anthony

John Geisler

William E. Selke

Michael H. Sofia

John T. Caterino, Clerk of the Planning Board

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

Janelle Castellana, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Christine R. Burke

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

Chairman Fisher and the Planning Board congratulate board member William E. "Bill" Selke on receiving the 2021 Willie W. Lightfoot Youth Advocate of the Year Award by the Monroe County Legislature.

Policy of Decorum

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Adam Geiger
Location: 330 N. Greece Rd
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 033.04-2-52
Request: Site plan approval for a one-story addition (6,925± square feet) to an existing building with expanded parking area, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 0.94± acres.
Zoning District: IL (Light Industrial)

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

Patrick Laber, Schultz Associates presented the application:

Mr. Caterino: We have not received any additional comments. Mr. Laber has provided us with a plan showing what area of the property will be used for outdoor storage of materials.

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

WHEREAS, Adam Geiger (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a preliminary plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 330 N. Greece Rd (the "Premises"); and

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

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Transportation, the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, and the Town's own staff.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

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	Absent
	Geisler	Yes	Anthony	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

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

NOW, THEREFORE....

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,

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

- state, or federal government approvals or permits that are required for the premises. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
3. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
 4. 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.
 5. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
 6. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition shall be generally the same on all sides of the proposed addition. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be metal (in the beige/light tan color family) and a metal roof (in the green color family). Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed addition, and shall be filed with the site plan.
 7. As offered and agreed to by the Applicant, the outdoor storage of materials should be permitted only in the areas delineated on the site plan. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
 8. In addition to landscaping depicted on the approved plan, the Applicant shall provide additional evergreen trees and/or woody shrubs along the northside of the property to fill in gaps and provide uniform buffering for the benefit of nearby residents, in the instance that vegetation is removed from the panhandle of 340 North Greece Road. The final number, species, and location of such trees shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board Clerk.
 9. The project "disturbance" shall not exceed 1 Acre of total area, otherwise the current approval(s) would be nullified.
 10. 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.
 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. Furthermore, the Building Inspector shall approve field changes to the approved plan as it relates to Accessibility/ADA Compliance.
 12. Subject to approval by the Town's, Building Inspector, Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
 13. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
 14. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
 15. 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
February 2, 2022

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

MOTION CARRIED
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

New Business

1. Applicant: Matthews Hyundai
Location: 3975 West Ridge Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-3-44
Request: Minor improvement plan approval for proposed one-story additions (2,900± square feet) to an existing building with parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 5.34± acres.
Zoning District: BG (General Business)

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

Laura Cassalia, CHA consulting, presented the application:

Ms. Cassalia: The purpose of this project is to update the dealership with the current brand standards and so part of that is to do a renovation of the exterior building. There will also be interior renovations which involve rearranging offices, service area, customer waiting area, employee area and updating the fixtures. Part of that involves the expansion of the showroom, and the addition of the service drive on the site. There is no proposed change to the operation of the facility, the hours and number of staff remain the same. Just updates to the building. This site is zoned BG (General Business) and motor vehicle dealerships are allowed in this district with a special use permit. As I understand, there is currently a special use permit on this site. Property is about 5.3 acres. On the west side of building is the addition to the showroom and addition to the service drive area. There are two smaller additions off the back for storage. With the addition and existing building, the proposed building footprint would increase about 22,500 square feet. We still meet all the lot requirements, no issues with setbacks. With parking requirements, we still need to comply with motor vehicle dealership requirement plus the motor vehicle service station requirements. The existing site has about 240 parking spots. We are rearranging the parking, so we will have 210 parking spaces; looking at about 130 display vehicles and meeting all the requirements, we would be required to have 204 parking spaces so we have plenty with a few to spare. Adding grass islands to the parking lot, no significant changes to the drainage and very minimal grading just around these additions. The disturbance is about 15,000 square feet, which is well under the one acre of disturbance. Lighting will remain the same in the parking lot and landscape in the front will remain the same. We are proposing a vehicle display pad in the front and a new free-standing sign with no changes to the driveways.

Mr. Caterino: Because this is a Minor Improvement Plan (MIP) it is not required to be reviewed by Monroe County Planning and Development. In terms of Town staff comments: our Fire Marshal's comments were regarding areas of the property for "No Parking" signs to be installed. Building Department comments were regarding ADA and accessibility of the site. Planning comments are regarding the vehicle display area and getting a detail on that; whether it is elevated or on an angle or with landscaping. Adding in some additional landscaping on the frontage between the two (2) entrances. The ADA space all the way to the western part of the building and try to relocate that to the front of the building. Comments regarding the history of the property - previous operators have used the property to the west and east for vehicle storage. We want Matthews to understand that any approvals this Board grants is for the use of strictly this property only and not encroach on those properties.

Mr. Gauthier: I sent an email earlier today with my concerns. Disturbance with repaving, I would like reassurance that the sub base remains in place when doing the repaving. Areas to the south and east consist of floodplain, floodway constraints and drainage easement. Those

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

need to be generally avoided unless other arrangements have been made. Please show all those features on each drawing. As stated, were seeing in historic images cars being parked a significant distance from pavement, some on property, some off site and our approvals are regarding this site.

Mr. Selke: Where is the display pad going to be located? Will there be any updated landscaping? There is a dumpster in the back of the building that doesn't look like it is being used, maybe you could use it for tire storage. There is also a big grey storage container- is that going to stay there?

Ms. Cassalia: The owner is aware of the parking that was off the property and off the pavement and they have assured that will not be happening and will not be an issue anymore. The display pad which is stamped concrete, is in the front, in line with the existing parking. A new monument sign will be next to it and will be included in the drawings. As far as the dumpsters and storage container, I will check with the owner on the use. Regarding the floodplain and the drainage easement, I don't believe it will be impacted at all. We are not doing any changes or any encroachment into those. We are well away from both.

Mr. Geisler: I heard the architect mention possibly relocating the handicap parking, where was that, the upper right hand corner of the front of the building?

Ms. Cassalia: Right now there is two (2) handicap parking spaces in front of the building, pretty much existing, we did add one more to the west of the service addition. We can look to more move it to the front but we thought this was an appropriate location because there are entrances on this side of the building so if you have a customer or employee who is working in the back area or for service and they are coming to pick up their car, this would be the shortest route for them to come across the parking lot into the store because this is where the service pick up/payment area is. We can certainly look at it, but we felt this was more important to have one here for that area, and then two up front for the showroom.

Mr. Geisler: Could it also be on the south side of the addition area? Close to the building?

Ms. Cassalia: We can look at what the shortest path would be. When cars come for service, they will drive right through these two bays and drop the cars off, so we were trying to make the shortest distance for any handicap person to get to the door.

Mr. Geisler: Any closer proximity would be desirable.

Mr. Fisher: I thought the change to the appearance and the addition to the showroom really enhances the view from the road and I think you made a good step there. It looks like your also making changes on the inside, should improve the operation, and the welcoming of the building. Since we have some additional information needed and to allow for staff and applicant to work together to resolve, I suggest we continue to the next meeting.

Mr. Antelli made a motion, seconded by Mr. Sofia, to continue the application to the February 16, 2022 meeting, as requested by the applicant.

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

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
FEBRUARY 16, 2022 MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

New Business

2. Applicant: Indus Hospitality Group
Location: 4 Elmgrove Road, 3813 West Ridge Road, and 3821 West Ridge Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.04-2-1, 073.04-2-4, and 073.04-2-3
Request: Concept plan review for the construction of a one-story drive-thru establishment (1,400± square feet) with parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 0.59± acres.
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Rebecca Spurr, BME associates, presented the concept plan

Ms. Spurr: The applicant is looking to develop a new Dunkin store. This would be a new drive thru and mobile order only pick up. This is a new Dunkin prototype and we believe the first in the county, definitely the town. The building will be 1400 square feet with no seating proposed inside the store. The project is located at the southeast corner of West Ridge Road which is a state road and Elmgrove Rd which is a county road. The project consists of three (3) tax parcels, we will consolidate them into a single tax parcel for a total of .6 acres. All are zoned BR (Business Restricted) and the site plan is layed out to comply with all those requirements: the setbacks; any buffering, and we do comply with those. The project will have to entrances/exits: one from West Ridge Road and one from Elmgrove Road. As the site is layed out today - both are shown as full service enter and exits. We will be coordinating with the state and the county DOT as well as the town's traffic advisory committee to review the access points, as well as traffic generation and circulation. Site plan shows the drive thru circulation and queuing area; we have bypass lanes shown and we will be revising them to 13 feet, I believe that is the minimum for the fire marshal. We show 11 angled parking spaces and an ADA accessible space, these are for the mobile order pick-ups as well as employees and visitors. Final site plan will include additional directional signage as well as pedestrian circulation. The menu board will be located at the south of the building. That will allow for people that come in Elmgrove Road to be able to see the menu board and either enter the que if available or circle around the building. There will be a preview board as well and that tends to help speed up the que. As far as utilities, we do have public water and sewer. We have water on the east side of Elmgrove and south side of West Ridge Road and we can tie into either location. In terms of sewer, there is an existing manhole on the McDonald's parcel, about 350 feet away and that is where we are currently looking at tying into. For stormwater management, we will be under an acre here and we will include the report and comply with the Town of Greece standards as well as the regional guidelines. We provided elevations for review, the building is about 17 feet high at the top of the parapet. The final drawings will include lighting, photometrics, landscaping, elevation planning and around the exterior. We met with DRC to receive some input, we talked about special use permit but because there is no seating, we didn't think we would need.

Mr. Fisher: We will not be providing any action tonight

Mr. Sofia: I was concerned with the amount of parking spaces, but I did not understand it to be to go only. I also see a walk up window up front so I think you will need some proper signage for cross traffic for people walking up to that window. My concern is car stacking...is 12 enough? Other examples on Ridge Road and they are backed up into the road. I am concerned about the traffic heading West, they will be sitting in a turning lane. I am assuming

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

the traffic heading out onto Ridge Road should be right only, trying to go left will not be a good idea. So that person will have to circle the building, go to Elmgrove, is that feasible? That is a busy intersection, putting this additional traffic in there, you have to be cautious. Stacking is a concern. Can we look at other examples as to the stacking?

Mr. Geisler: Is the existing building going to be demolished?

Ms. Spurr: The existing building will be demolished

Mr. Selke: On Elmgrove, people have to cross, it's a pretty busy intersection. People are turning left onto Ridge Road, heading west, that lane stacks up. How are people going to cross there without backing up traffic? Same as Mr. Sofia pointed out the turning right onto Ridge Road, some cars want to move in there, now they block the left turning lane. I think you have to look at right in, right out here to make a lot of sense with the traffic. I know this is a take-out type of thing and I have seen a lot of people eating or sitting doing work in their car, they might stack up. The traffic flow as pointed out off of the main roads is a major concern. Heavy duty intersection with a lot of speeding going on there.

Mr. Geisler: Have they considered a one way in, one way out? Traffic does concern me.

Mr. Fisher: Have it reviewed by the traffic advisory board to get their idea for the effect and what might be done to mitigate it.

Mr. Selke: What will the appearance of the building look like? Is there a theme for takeout only? Where would you put your main signage? Where do you expect your main traffic to come in?

Ms. Spurr: Standard Dunkin colors/signage. Western face of the building so you can get from Elmgrove, as well as Ridge. Maybe a directional sign at Elmgrove.

Mr. Caterino: In terms of the appearance of the building, I understand Dunkin has their own brand, the orange and pink font lettering, but maybe the applicant should look to the other buildings to the east and west. I think their facade are lighter colors like tan, beige, and white. Maybe try to include those in there to provide continuity to the corner.

Mr. Fisher: We have provided some input and traffic is by far the biggest concern.

CONCEPT REVIEWED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 2, 2022

ADJOURNMENT: 7:45 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