PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MINUTES

OCTOBER 09, 2014
As the Planning Board met at 6:30 PM local time Tuesday, October 9, 2014 in the Auditorium conference room to discuss, in a meeting open to the public, tabled matters and other business that was before it.

I. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Allyn Hetzke, Jr 
Bill Bastian 
Roseann Denoncourt 
Bob Kanauer 
Terry Tydings 

ABSENT: Doug McCord; Mark Valentine 

ALSO PRESENT: Zachary Nersinger, Town Planner 
Douglas Sangster, Planning Technician 
Katherine Kolich-Munson, Secretary 

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. The Board APPROVED the September 11, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

Vote: Moved by: Tydings Seconded by: Denoncourt 
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian – Absent Denoncourt- Aye Kanauer – Aye 
McCord - Absent Tydings - Aye 

Motion was carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Walt Baker, D.S.B Engineers, 2394 Ridgeway Avenue, Rochester, N.Y. 14626/ Vision Chrysler, Dodge, Jeep, Ram requests an informal discussion with the Board regarding an expansion to the vehicle display parking area with associated site improvements located at 920 Panorama Trail South on 6.53 +/- acres. The property is now or formerly owned by 920 Panorama Trail South LLC and is zoned GB. App. # 14P-0029 SBL#’s 139.09-1-60.21

- Mr. Walt Baker presented to the Board an overview of the concept plans for a parking expansion on the site. The property is approximately 6.5 acres and includes an area to the North/North East that is wooded and features slopes that descend down to Irondequoit Creek.
Mr. Baker showed the area on plans where they would like to increase their parking with an upper level vehicle display area. It would require a great deal of grading, excavating, and stabilization of the existing hillside. A decorative retaining wall is proposed to reinforce the soil.

The design of the retaining wall would attempt to match the block size and color of that which is constructed across the street from the site at the Agor Enterprises, located at 951 Panorama Trail South. For this site, the retaining wall is proposed to be installed at 10 feet above the current parking level to create the upper level parking area, then a second retaining wall 25 foot would be installed at the rear of the new parking area to stabilize the hillside. A total of approximately 35 feet of wall area is proposed in total vertical height.

The property is approximately 6.5 acres and they have used about 2.5 acres of the property for the business’s operational space, which leaves roughly 4 acres in green space on the property and that is well in excess of 35% of green space that is required by zoning for this project. For the parking expansion the applicant proposed to increase the lot coverage by about three-quarters (¾) of an acre, which will include the re-grading and construction of the retaining walls to address the elevation change.

Board Comments:

Chairman Hetzke asked the applicant to review the lot coverage and green space numbers once more for the Board. Mr. Baker responded that the total size the property is about 6.5 acres, and 4 acres of the site is currently green space. The proposed parking expansion would disturb three quarters of an acre of the current green space on the site.

Board member Denoncourt asked how many parking spaces are will there be in the yellow proposed area on the plans. Mr. Baker replied that they would like to get 100 spaces with the proposed expansion, but the current concept plan shows 96 new spaces.

Chairman Hetzke asked how much of the hillside will be taken away if there a 25 ft. back wall is proposed, and how close will the wall come to the peak of the hill? Mr. Baker replied that they will have to complete the full field topography before the data could be calculated. For reference, however, Mr. Baker noted the project that is under construction to the south east of this site where a 6 story hotel is installed and large part of the hillside was disturbed for that.

Chairman Hetzke asked what people could be viewing when from the park at the base of the hill on the side of Irondequoit Creek during construction and also when the project is complete. Also, after taking some of the green space out will there still be ample amount of trees standing. Mr. Baker replied that park visitors and residents will only see trees, even during construction. After the removal of some of the green space there is still sufficient amount of trees left, and little to none of the parking area would be able to be seen from the bottom of the hill near the creek. There is roughly 40 feet of land between the limit of disturbance and the crest of the hill that will help preserve the existing viewshed.

Board member Bastian asked what other areas or businesses in Penfield (or the County) have a 25 ft. high retaining wall that the Board could review in
Chairman Hetzke asked if there would be anything to break the wall up in regards to some type of vegetation; plants; any type of architectural pattern or color schemes, something that would break it up instead of just having a solid wall. Mr. Baker replied that they received comments from the Town that included a picture of a tiered type of retaining wall with planting beds in the stepped back area of the wall. The applicant has not expressed any issues with the idea of breaking up the wall by stepping it back in the design. Mr. Baker added that with regards to the site and previously approved plans for this site the applicant has spent the last week landscaping both sides of the entrance way and they have completed the pavement striping of the parking lot and fire lanes.

Board member Denoncourt asked the applicant how they would potentially step the wall back and how it would be landscaped. Mr. Baker replied that the suggested design would help to break up the retaining wall. Instead of 25 feet of solid wall, it could be stepped back half way up and they could use vines or some other landscaping features at the intermediate point.

Chairman Hetzke asked about the drainage and stormwater management and how it will be handled on site. Mr. Baker replied that currently there is a storm water system on the property, but this site was approved prior to having the on-site detention facilities that we see today. We could look at the type of material utilized, the surface that we are going to use verse the straight asphalt and try and create more of a pervious area. It is more of a sandy area and it does absorb the water rather well, but they are close to Irondequoit Creek so stormwater runoff will be carefully examined.

Chairman Hetzke cautioned the applicant the parking surface materials have to be carefully selected so that the lower retaining wall wouldn’t be under-mined from ground water infiltration. Mr. Baker agreed and replied that they have to look into it all to see what they could do with pervious versus impervious surfaces.

Board member Bastian asked what the thoughts were on the lighting for the proposed upper level parking area. He is concerned with the placement of any additional lighting on the site. Would the applicant install them on top of the 25 foot retaining wall or would they put them down lower? Maybe build them into the retaining wall so that they would be shine down on the cars, and then they could prevent having the hillside glowing with light that could be seen from all angles of the surrounding area, including the park to the north near Irondequoit Creek. Chairman Hetzke agreed, if the lighting was installed at a higher elevation the glare would be greater, regardless of the type of lighting used. Mr. Hetzke encouraged the applicant to be mindful of the location of any additional lighting. Mr. Mike Mcilwaine, General Manager of the Vision dealership, indicated that they recently upgraded their pole lighting to LED light systems and they probably will continue with the use of them for the expansion area. Further, they believe that the light emitted from their site would be less than the hotel
being built next to them that has similar parking lot size. Looking at the site from the park at the base of the hill, there is about a 50 foot cliff, along with the vegetation and wooded areas, that would help contain the site lighting. Pedestrians would have to be to pretty far away notice the lighting. Mr. Mcilwanine added that he was pretty sure that he does not have a light pole that is higher than 25 feet on site presently. Most likely the pole lighting would be installed on the parking surface of the upper parking area to avoid using the retaining wall for lighting needs.

- Board member Kanauer asked about the plans for any fencing or guard rails for the vehicles parked in the upper level area and some sort of safety barrier at the top of the 25 foot wall. He also recommended that a street view rendering from Panorama Trail South be created to help visualize the parking expansion. Mr. Baker replied that they are still reviewing the best choice for a guard rail and will look into fencing for the top of the retaining wall.

- Chairman Hetzke asked if all conditions from prior approvals have all been satisfied. Mr. Baker responded that all conditions or previous approvals have been installed and resolved.

- Chairman Hetzke spoke to applicant about his concern in getting emergency vehicles/fire truck in the area and asked if they will be able to accommodate the necessary turning radius of emergency vehicles. Mr. Baker replied that they were sure they could provide that in the site design. The proposed drive isle in the upper level parking area would be 20 feet wide.

Public Comments:
- There were no comments from the public regarding this application.

Discussion after PB meeting:
- The Board requests the following information be included within any future application for preliminary and final site plan approval:
  - Construction of the currently proposed retaining walls, with geo-grid and tie-back reinforcements for stabilization of soils would occur within the 50 foot buffer of the Steep Slope area of the cliff leading to Irondequoit Creek. This creates a significant concern to the northern section of the steep slope where parking is proposed. Therefore a full Geotechnical Report will be required with any future submission;
  - Proximity to the Steep Slopes will require the completion of the Part I EAF Long Form;
  - A full survey map with complete topo will be required;
  - The demolition or landscape plan shall identify the proposed tree clearing limit, including the areas necessary to install the geo-grid for the wall construction;
  - The landscape plan shall show compliance with tree preservation guidelines and will require a tree inventory study to be submitted;
  - A visual rendering model shall be provided to demonstrate the future look of the site from the view shed of the park to the north east and from the roadway at Panorama Trail; and,
- Article III-3-12, of the official Town Zoning EPOD Development Standards clearly states under the Steep Slope EPOD Development Permit Conditions that: “No permit to undertake a regulated activity within an Steep slope Protection District in the town of Penfield shall be issued by the authorized official or the appropriate board unless the applicant can adequately demonstrate that: Item #9 There is no reasonable alternative to the proposed regulated activity on that portion of the site not containing steep slopes.” The Board recommends that the applicant investigate an alternate parking expansion plan that reduces the amount of hill area that would be disturbed. Reducing the proposed limits of disturbance with less parking would help decrease the size of the retaining wall and would help protect the steep slopes. The applicant will ultimately be required to demonstrate in writing that all EPOD standards have been met.

- The applicant shall demonstrate how stormwater management will be achieved on the site without compromising the proposed retaining walls or existing environmental features. The NYSDOT will not accept any increase in the stormwater runoff rate to its storm system along Panorama Trail;

- The applicant shall submit a lighting plan for the proposed parking expansion area;

- Proper safety measures will be required for the upper parking area to prevent vehicles from driving or rolling onto the vehicles below;

- It will need to be demonstrated through the use of turning templates that emergency vehicles will have sufficient access to the proposed upper level;

- The Board is not supportive of a solid retaining wall design. The applicant will need to incorporate landscape breaks into an aesthetic design for the retaining wall. A picture was provided in the PRC Memo dated 10/03/14;

- Show areas for snow storage on the site plan;

- Provide a status update to the required site work for the previous application for the building expansion that was approved by this board in 2013.

- Upon submission of an application for Preliminary and Final approval, you should provide written responses to the above comments. Additionally, written responses to the factors of consideration for EPODs and Site Plan and found in Articles III-3-10 and IX-9-3 of Chapter 29, Town of Penfield Zoning Ordinance should also be submitted.

The Board discussed the application and directed staff to prepare and issue the sketch plan review response letter.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Kanauer
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian – Aye Denoncourt- Aye Kanauer – Aye
McCord - Absent Tydings - Aye

Motion was carried.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS:
1. The Board APPROVED the Meeting dates calendar for 2015.

   Vote:   Moved by:  Bastian  Seconded by:  Kanauer
   Chairperson:  Hetzke - Aye  Bastian – Aye  Denoncourt- Aye  Kanauer – Aye
                McCord - Absent  Tydings - Aye

   Motion was carried.

2. Mr. Nersinger provided an overview of applications submitted for the November public hearing meeting. These included the following projects:

   - 2124 Penfield Rd – Sketch Plan (Orthodontist)
   - 770 Panorama Trail – Preliminary Final (Range Rover Test Track)
   - 1185 Empire Blvd/Bayview Landing – Sketch Plan (town homes)

3. The Board voted and cancelled work session meeting on October 21, 2014, as there were no currently pending applications before them.

   Vote:   Moved by:  Bastian  Seconded by:  Kanauer
   Chairperson:  Hetzke - Aye  Bastian – Aye  Denoncourt- Aye  Kanauer – Aye
                McCord - Absent  Tydings - Aye

   Motion was carried.

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM, Thursday, October 09, 2014.

These minutes where adopted by the Planning Board on November 13, 2014.