PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 13, 2014
As the Planning Board met at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, November 13, 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
Doug McCord
Terry Tydings

ABSENT: 

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Valentine, Planning Department Head
Zach Nersinger, Town Planner
Douglas Sangster, Planning Technician
Peter Weishaar, Planning Board Attorney
Katherine Kolich-Munson, Secretary

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. The Board APPROVED the October 9, 2014 draft meeting minutes as written.

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

Motion was carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Passero Associates, 242 West Main Street, Suite 100, Rochester, N.Y. 14614 /Midlakes Management, LLC, requests an informal discussion with the Board regarding the construction of 33 townhomes with associated site improvements on 32.67 +/- acres. The parcels are located at 1185 Empire Blvd., 1211 Empire Blvd., and 41 Woodhaven Drive. The properties are owned by Howitt-Bayview, LLC, and are zoned LLD and R-1-20. Appl # 14P-0032. SBL# 108.05-2-8.5, 108.05-2-8.33, and 108.10-1-1.111.

Applicant Presentation:
- Mr. Jess Sudol, of Passero Associates behalf of Dr. Howitt of Midlakes Management, LLC presented to the Board. The applicant is proposing to
develop 33 townhome units with no stacked living. The site is located on
the south side of Empire Boulevard across from the Basils Restaurant, and
to the east of Wilbur Tract Road. The site work would include
improvements of approximately 1,000 feet to Wilbur Tract Road and 1,200
feet to Pecora Road for the proposed townhomes. The property is currently
zoned both LaSalle Landing District (LLD) and R-1-20. Single family
development is permitted within the R-1-20 zoning district.

- The applicant is requesting to use Town Law 278 for a cluster subdivision,
and requests the support of the Board to move ahead with the planning
process. Dr. Howitt executed a similar townhouse development in Chili on
Paul Road.

- Since meeting with the Town Board in 2013 for a concept plan that included
36 apartment units and 33 townhomes, the applicant has decided to move
forward with only the townhouse development in the R-1-20 zoned portion
of the site at this time. This reduces that impact of development compared
to the original proposal from 2013.

- Demographics of the anticipated residents/tenants for these units will be
young professionals along with seniors and empty nesters. Therefore they
do not anticipate a large increase in traffic at peak hours or creating any
burdens on the school district.

- The applicant had previously conducted a traffic study when both
townhouses and apartment were being proposed to the Town Board, and the
results then showed that there would not be a significant impact to traffic
on Empire Boulevard that would warrant modifications or improvements to
the roadway. The applicant will provide a copy of the report to the Town.

- New York State DOT issued a letter regarding the traffic concerns on
Empire Boulevard. The applicant will provide a copy of the letter to the
Town.

- To access the site from Empire Boulevard, a private roadway would be
installed along Wilbur Tract Road and Pecora Road that will be maintained
by the developer, and therefore would not create any additional
infrastructure for the Town to maintain.

- The applicant presented this application for a proposed development to
gauge the Town’s thoughts, as well as residents, to see if there is a positive
reaction before moving forward. As this project progresses, more detailed
information will be provided in regards to building materials, lighting, and
landscaping, etc.

Board Comments:
- Chairman Hetzke asked the applicant if they had any drawings of the
proposed building elevations. The applicant only had a small printed copy
available but plans to bring full scale renderings at a future meeting date
when complete. The applicant described that the townhomes would be a
mix two and three unit structures. Each unit will be two floors and an
attached garage.
Chairman Hetzke asked about the traffic study that was done. The applicant explained it was previously completed based on a proposal for 36 apartment units and for 33 townhomes. Since the new revised proposal has been scaled back to only include the 33 townhomes, a new traffic study was not performed since the findings would show less of an impact to Empire Boulevard. Previous reports can be provided for the Town’s reference.

Board member McCord asked what is being proposed for the land located at the northwest limits of the project area, identified as lots 27-34 on the conventional plan, and to the east at lot 26. The applicant replied that land located on the bluff that is shown as lots 27-34 on the conventional plan will remain as open space or could possibly be donated to the Monroe County Parks. The applicant has no intention on building in this area as it is not zoned for R-1-20 development. Lot 26 will be utilized for storm water management area. It is located at the bottom of the hill and there are wetlands surrounding it as a buffer.

Board member Kanauer asked the applicant to describe the plans for the access easement area located to the south that connects to Woodhaven Drive. The applicant responded that they propose to extend the pavement to the property line to maintain the emergency access function of the easement for emergency response crews and vehicles.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Ralph Meleo, 43 Woodhaven Drive, spoke of his concern with the access road located adjacent to his property to the east. He is in favor of the project, but does not want to see traffic generated through the access road as a result of development. He understands the need for emergency vehicles to access area, but he cannot recall any events in the past that forced emergency service crews to use the access area. Further, he does not want to see asphalt installed over the existing road.
  - Chairman Hetzke briefly explained the need for the emergency excess in the event that access was cut off to the area from Parkview Drive and residents either needed to have a way or emergency crew needed access to the area.

- Mr. Vernon Loveless, 19 Old Westfall Drive, asked if the homes will be built on slabs or have basements underneath it.
  - The applicant said that the structures would be built on concrete slabs.
  - Mr. Loveless added that the previous developer of this site also proposed building on slabs but at that time they had some issues with "unsurely" things that were found while test drilling.

- Mr. Saj Lawrence, 483 Wilbur Track Road, stated for the Board that he is the owner of the property adjacent to project site where the wetlands are located. He would like to know how close the proposed townhomes will be located from his nearest property line.
  - Chairman Hetzke explained that there are setback limits to be met in the Town Code and if they are proposed to be closer then allowed by the Code, the applicant will need to see the zoning board for variance
setback. For the R-1-20 zoning district, the side setbacks are 10 feet from the property line.

- Mr. Lawrence stated that the homes on Old Westfall Drive (at the top of sloped area looking up from the project site) are on septic systems and has observed that most of the systems leach down towards the proposed project site, where the topography slopes down to the wetlands. Mr. Lawrence asked for the board’s and the town’s opinion.
  - Mr. Nersinger informed Mr. Lawrence, that Town has approved the installation of a sanitary sewer system along Parkview Drive that residents will be tie in to that will lessen the impact of existing septic systems. Construction is scheduled to begin for 2015

- Mr. Lawrence would like to know if the applicant has confirmed that they have the necessary stability in the soils to for the proposed development.
- Mr. Lawrence spoke of viewing the previous plans, which involved more development on the property and wanted to know what the applicant will do with the land now.
  - The applicant responded that there are no plans to build in that area at this time (the LLD zoning district, previously proposed for the 36 apartment units).

- Mr. Lawrence then asked if plans could be developed at a later time. The applicant replied that yes there is a chance that plans could be developed at a later time. Currently they are only focused on construction of the townhome development.

Applicant’s follow up responses:

- Mr. Sudol took some time to reply to the comments from the public that was in attendance for the meeting.
- With regards to Mr. Meleo’s comments about the access easement area to the south that provides emergency access to the Woodhaven Drive, they can explore alternative road surface materials that would eliminate the need for asphalt. He suggested the use of pervious pavers or other alternatives that could handle the load of emergency vehicles. Further, the roadway would be blocked off from traffic with a chain or some a crash gate.
- With regards to the Mr. Loveless’s comments about drilling for test pits, Mr. Sudol stated that Dr. Howitt and his company have performed several test pits bores on the property prior to making application for sketch plan review. He assured the Board and the audience that his client would not have moved forward with the project without doing the necessary site research to prove that development would be feasible option.
- With regards to Mr. Lawrence’s comments about the proximity of the structures the property line adjacent to his property, Mr. Sudol explained that the location of the structures would be set at a greater distance than the 10 foot side setback limit. Concept plans show them around 30 feet off the property line currently.
The Board discussed this application after the public meeting:

Following the Planning Board’s public information meeting on November 13, 2014, the board offers the following comments:

- The Board is supportive of the project and the use of Town Law 278. It would like to see an updated conventional plan showing zoning compliant development for the units at the end of Old Westfall Road at the time of a preliminary/final application.

- The Planning Board will ultimately need a decision from the Town Board that they are supportive of moving those units from the LaSalle’s Landing District, to the R-1-20 district under the purview of the Planning Board. The property known as 1185 Empire Boulevard will then be donated for parkland to Monroe County as a condition of subdivision/site plan approval.

- The town and Planning Boards support the donation of the property located at 1185 Empire Boulevard to the Monroe County Park system. The applicant is encouraged to initiate discussions with the County Parks Department prior to submitting a preliminary and final application.

- The board continues to have concerns regarding the safety of the ingress and egress at Empire Boulevard. The applicant should continue discussions with the NYSDOT and the Town Engineer regarding the mitigation of traffic impacts along this corridor. Should this application move forward to a preliminary/final application a traffic consultant may be retained by the Town to assist it with the review of the potential impacts that may be generated by this development. The cost for such assistance, if necessary, shall be borne by the applicant.

- A full drainage report documenting compliance with the Phase 2 Stormwater Regulations for water quality and quantity will be required for a preliminary and final application submission.

- All potential impacts to the wetland areas must be identified and mitigation provided. A wetland delineation for all state and federally designated wetlands will be required.

- A cultural resource survey will need to accompany any future application.

- A steep slope protection and preservation plan will be required as part of any future submission to detail how these areas will be designed to ensure proper protection.

- Details regarding the sanitary sewer design should be addressed including; anticipated flows and the required contribution to the pump station upgrade fund.
• This site located in a very visible location and the buildings will be visible from all directions. The board will require four-sided architectural treatments. Color and material samples should be submitted for review. The applicant should be familiar with the Planning Board Design Guidelines for the board's expectations prior to your next submittal. A landscape plan should also be prepared for the project.

• It has been stated in previous submissions that some data has been collected on the soils on the site. Please provide a geotechnical report on the property, addressing the following:
  - Boring logs and test hole results and locations should be provided, identifying what types of materials are present.
  - Recommendations for structural foundations and underground utility installations should be provided for the entire site, including known fill areas.
  - Structural stability of steep slope areas should be demonstrated, where structures are close to or within the Steep Slope Environmental Protection Overlay District (EPOD).
  - Results of any Environmental Site Assessments should be provided.
  - Water quality impacts to groundwater on the site from septic systems on Old Westfall Road are to be included in your engineer's report.

• There are four EPODs on the property; Steep Slope, Wetlands, Floodplain and Woodland. All EPOD limits shall be delineated and shown on any future submissions. The Factors of consideration for EPODS shall also be submitted for review with any future applications.

• The board is also supportive of maintaining the emergency access to Woodhaven Drive. This is not only for the good of your future residents, but in the event of an emergency on Parkview Drive, it would provide an evacuation route for otherwise stranded residents of that long, dead-ended road system south of the project site. The Board is supportive of investigating alternative roadway material options in-lieu of asphalt provided that it is maintained and plowed by the future homeowners association on a regular basis.

• The applicant should be aware that previous discussions with RG&E have indicated very limited gas resources in this area of the town. RG&E is currently looking into upgrades to their system along Empire Boulevard and they are encouraged to speak with their staff as soon as possible to ensure your proposed project is included in their design calculations. There may be some costs associated with the design of the expanded main and the applicant should discuss this with RG&E as well.

• A formal cross-access easement will need to be created to allow continued access for the existing residents on Wilbur Tract Road. Upgrades to Wilbur Tract Road within the property limits will also be required. Board member
McCord recommends using a grass friendly polycarbonate material that would be porous by design and support the load of emergency vehicles and equipment. A company by the name of Presto makes a product called Geoblock. This could be a suitable alternative to asphalt construction.

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

Vote: Moved by: McCord Seconded by: Bastian
McCord - Aye Tydings - Aye

Motion was carried.

2. Timothy Hens, 7319 Quinlan Road, LeRoy, N.Y. 14482 / Dr. Rahul Renjen requests an informal discussion with the Board regarding the construction of a 3,275 +/- sq. ft. orthodontist office with associated site improvements located at 2124 Penfield Road on 0.53 +/- acres. The property is now or formerly owned by Gordon Griffin, and is zoned BN-R. Appl# 14P-0033 SBL#'s 139.08-1-6.

Applicant Presentation:
- Tim Hens on behalf of Mr. Rahul Renjen, 2124 Penfield Road, presented to the board.
- The property is on the northwest corner lot of Penfield Road and Harris Whalen Park Road.
- Property is about half of an acre in total area.
- The applicant is proposing to construct a private rear access drive to enter the site off of Harris Whalen Park Road per the requirements of the previous town board rezoning of the properties along Penfield Road to BN-R.
- The proposed business to be established on this site will be a professional orthodontist office and will fit in with the character of neighborhood. Other medical offices have been recently approved in the town near the project site on Penfield Road.

Board Comments:
- Chairman Hetzke asked the applicant to confirm the design of the atrium area, which appears to be a two story atrium but used as open space in the entryway to the building. The applicant replied that the atrium would be a large open space for the customer entryway on their way to the reception area.
- Chairman Hetzke about the variances that will be requested for setbacks from the property boundaries. The applicant reviewed the front and side setbacks that will be requested and stated that an application will be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals with the variances listed in detail.
• Chairman Hetzke asked about the type of lighting will be used on site for parking and the building? The applicant is proposing wall mounted fixtures on building and two pole lights in the parking area, all of which will use LED lighting.

• Chairman Hetzke asked if that number of spaces shown on the submitted plans meets the needs of the business operations. The applicant replied that the code requires more than parking spaces than what are actually needed for staff and customers. The plans show 16 parking spaces plus 1 handicap space for a total of 17 spaces.

• Board member McCord asked the applicant if they had reviewed the comments from the Project Review Committee. The applicant replied that they have reviewed the memo, and indicated that they had a positive response to all comments that issued.
  - One comments mentioned the need for a grading plan that includes plans for stormwater treatment. Mr. Hens stated that future plans will show stormwater treatment details that will contain all the stormwater runoff on site with the possible use of porous pavement in the parking lot, and two drainage swales; one along Penfield Road and the other along Harris Whalen Park. Other options will be explored if the cost of the porous pavement is too great for this project.

• Board member McCord asked the applicant to confirm the extent of the parking lot limits, which appear to be up to the western property line. Revised plans will be required to show details of the adjacent properties and how the proposed site work will impact their property. The applicant replied that they will be contacting the neighbor to the west for a grading release since the proposed parking area would be constructed up to the limits of the property boundary.

• Board member McCord also asked if any landscaping would be installed to buffer the parking area from the rear access drive. The applicant replied that they will work with the town to accommodate any requests.

• The board noted on the site plan that a 5 foot sidewalk with landscaped area between that and the building facing the parking area. A 7 foot sidewalk will be required per the Town Code. The board recommended that the applicant could revise the site plan to move the building to the east to accommodate the 7 foot sidewalk and then request a larger setback variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The applicant replied that they will take that into consideration.

• Board member Denoncourt asked what the proposed square footage of the building is and how many exam rooms are being included in the designs. The applicant responded that there is approximately 3275 sq. ft. and will provide six exam rooms.

• Chairman Hetzke asked how many employees will be working under normal operations. Dr. Renjen replied that three staff members including himself to start out, but that number could possibly increase to four or five
at a later time. He expressed that parking will not be an issue for staff and customers.

- Board member Kanauer asked what the hours of operation will be. Dr. Renjen replied that days of operation will be Monday through Friday, and the hours will be during business hours. He added that he may occasionally have late evening appointments to accommodate some parents, but nothing beyond 7:00 PM. He may also open on Saturdays as the business first opens.

- Board member Bastian asked where the snow storage will be located on site. Mr. Hens replied they will store the snow at the south end of the parking lot because of the open space available in the grass area.

- Board member Bastian asked where the trash totes will be located on site. The applicant replied that a small storage area adjacent to the building for trash totes is shown at the southwest corner of the building and they are partially enclosed.

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

The Board discussed this application after the public meeting:
Following a discussion at its November 13, 2014 public meeting and subsequent discussion at its work session the same evening, the board offers the following comments:

- The board is supportive of the proposed use on the site and finds the proposed building architecturally attractive.

- The board would like confirmation on the proposed number of physicians, support staff, administrative employees and patients for the site to quantify the parking demand. Any details that can be provided regarding expected occupant load turn over will be helpful in analyzing the parking needs for the site. Also include a description of anticipates business hours for a typical work week.

- The board requests the following information be included within a future application:
  - Provide a photometric plan to demonstrate any proposed exterior lighting including but not limited to any new parking lot fixtures. The board suggests considering using LED light fixtures;
  - Demonstrate where snow storage areas will be located or details as to how snow will be removed if necessary;
  - The board suggests adding some window treatments to atrium structure to break up the vast use of siding materials facing Penfield Road;
  - Provide sample building colors and materials for the board’s consideration;
  - Include a full landscape plan with planting schedule upon resubmission of a Preliminary/Final application;
  - Show turnout section at the southern limit of the parking area for vehicles to safely back out of parking stalls;
- Provide details on land banked parking if proposed on the revised site plans. Site data should include statistics for both constructed and land banked parking figures. The Planning Board is supportive of 2 to 3 land banked spaces to help provided some additional green space. A variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals will be necessary if the number of requested parking stalls is lower than that which is required by Code, but the Planning Board is supportive of this variance;
- Revise the dumpster enclosure area so that the totes are not visible from east bound traffic and pedestrians on Penfield Road;
- The board is also supportive of relocating the building structure 2’ feet closer to Harris Whalen Park Drive in order to allow for the seven (7) foot sidewalk along the parking area per the Town Code. Site data and requested variances shall be updated to reflect these modifications;
- Provide a sidewalk connection from the building to Penfield Road;
- Provided crosswalk details that will span across the required private rear access drive entrance to allow for safe pedestrian travel to Harris Hill Elementary School and the park. The board is supportive of alternative materials to asphalt accentuate the walkway to commuters entering and existing the site by automobile;
- Provide copies of grading release letters from adjacent property owner(s);
- Submission of revised plans shall include property lines and details of adjacent parcels 100 feet off the boundaries of the site;
- Provide details for proposed signage;
- Add a note providing details of any variances previously granted on the property;
- Provide detailed stormwater management design and details to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

- A formal cross-access easement will be expected over the proposed rear access drive to allow future connections along this common drive to properties to the both the east and the west.
- A 7’ wide sidewalk easement over the new sidewalks will also be required.

The board directed staff to prepare and issue a letter of support to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

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

Motion was carried.

The board discussed the application directed staff to prepare and issue the sketch plan review response letter.
3. Walt Baker, DSB Engineers & Architects, PC, 2394 Ridgeway Avenue, #201, Rochester, NY 14626 /Piehler Jaguar-Land Rover, requests under Articles III-3-10 and IX-9-2 of the Code for Preliminary and Final Site Plan and EPOD permit approval for the construction of a 3,000 +/- sq. ft. off-road test track for vehicle demonstrations located with associated improvements at 770 Panorama Trail South on 3.78 +/- acres. The property is now or formerly owned by Vision Two, LLC, and is zoned GB. Appl# 14P-0031 SBL#138.08-1-47.

Applicant Presentation:

- Mr. Walt Baker, 770 Panorama Trail, Piehler Jaguar/Land Rover, presented the application to the board.
- The proposed vehicle demonstration test track will be constructed at the corner of the pavement area to the northwest corner. By doing so, this will cause a decrease of 13 vehicle spaces.
- The reduction in parking will bring the total number of spaces on the site down to 124, which is still greater than the 84 spaces that are required by code.
- The asphalt pavement will be removed to the stone base for excavation. The stone base will remain and the test track will be constructed on top of that base with more select stone and fill.
- The applicant indicated to the board that a similar test track was constructed in the BMW of Rochester dealership on East Henrietta Road. The test track for this site will feature the same overall design and materials but it will be smaller in size.
- To use the test track customers will accompany a trained sales person who will be conducting the driving through the obstacles. In the evening hours, the area will be blocked from vehicle access with vehicles on the lot.
- The applicant proposes to keep the existing lighting that is already installed on the site. No additional lighting is anticipated to be installed.
- No new landscaping is currently proposed for the test track area. Much of the site is wooded and landscaped presently. The applicant was willing to accommodate some small shrubs and perhaps have some low growing plants that would not block the visibility of the test track for vehicle display area.
- The test track is about 10 feet high with a split rail fence around it. The length of track has been shortened to 45 feet compared to the model that was used in Henrietta due to site restrictions.

Board Comments:
• Chairman Hetzke suggested that maybe some low growing shrubs be planted to soften the look of the test track. Perhaps maybe some plants could be located on the sloped areas of the test track. He also suggested that up-lighting should be considered to illuminate the test track to enhance the appearance.

• Board member Tydings asked if they were using the same company as the Henrietta did to build there test track. Applicant replied that the company will be contracted to construct this test track.

• Board member McCord asked when the project was to begin. The applicant responded that they would like to begin construction as soon as possible.

Public Comments:
• There were no comments from the public for this application.

The Board discussed this application after the public hearing:
• The board was supportive of additional plantings, such as small shrubs and long grasses around the test track area.

• The board was also supportive of the use of up lighting around the test track area to enhance the structure.

• Board member McCord asked Mr. Baker if they planned to plant grass over the areas where pavement was removed but was not needed for the test track. Mr. Baker replied that they will plant grass in the unused areas around the test track.

• The site landscaping around the off-road test track will require the review and approval of the Town's Landscaping Consultant.

• Any additional lighting will require approval from the Town Engineer.

The board AUTHORIZED the Planning Board Chair to sign the Part II EAF.

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

Motion was carried.

The board discussed the application and it was APPROVED with conditions.

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

Motion was carried.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS:
1. Mr. Valentine reviewed with the board a request for a modification to a previously approved site plan located at 1867 Empire Boulevard, known as Qdoba. The board passed an approval resolution on January 9, 2014. Representatives of the project have requested the board’s approval of a new prototype design for the building architecture that would involve significant changes to the building façade that differ from the designs the board previously approved. However, since receiving the original approval from the board, Qdoba’s corporate division has expressed a need to begin rebranding the look of their restaurants that will set them apart from their competitors, Chipotle and Moe’s.

- Qdoba is requesting changes to the entrance ways, patio space, rooflines, color schemes, additional signage, and building materials that would include glass surfaces, wood and metal.
- Mr. Valentine explained that any new signage will require approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Mr. Valentine referenced the Planning Board Design Guidelines with regards to the proposed changes.
- Board member Kanauer asked if the footprint was the same.
  - Mr. Valentine stated that the building footprint has not changed.
- Board member McCord asked what material will be used for the vertical slats shown on the building. The proposed material would be wood and a large “Q” would be painted for a visual effect. The “Q” as shown on the revised architecture plans would require approval from the ZBA.
  - Board member McCord believes the slats are impractical for our area/climate in regards to holding up to weather.
- Board member Kanauer questioned the use of garage door as a convertible wall that could be opened in the summer months. Board member Bastian asked if that would be an entry/exit way.
  - It would appear that its use would be dependent on weather conditions. It is likely that it would only be used opened in the summer to provide a more setting for customers.
  - Board member Denoncourt noted that a similar design was used at the restaurant known as Hose 22.
- Staff provided the originally approved building designs to compare to the proposed plans.
- The Chairman invited the representative from Qdoba to speak on behalf of the project. Mr. Ray Trotta, design manager for the project, indicated that Qdoba went through extensive research with an architecture studies to develop this prototype design with a Southwestern /California influence for the appearance.
- Board members Bastian and McCord agreed, that the original design is much liked, but also understood the need for a company to have their own unique look.
- Board member Kanauer likes the original design as well. He believes the original look has more appeal. He was wondering if they could take some of the elements of the new design and apply them to the original to keep the
materials similar. The original plans are much more substantial and richer looking.

- Board member Denoncourt feels the original building looks very “corporate.” However, she added that royal blue tile that is shown in the revised plans is not appropriate for that corner. Another color choice may be more appropriate for that location.

- Chairman Hetzke agreed with Denoncourt’s thoughts. He suggested that a different blue color be used for the tile, or perhaps the same desired look could be achieved with a lighting system.

- Mr. Trotta presented two alternative color choices for the tile surface. He added that they can generate new renderings with the alternative color choices for the board’s review at the next available work session meeting.

- Board members added that the wood slats would be impractical for our climate, the aluminum garage door that appears more as a service station door is not desirable.

- Chairman Hetzke asked the board members if they would like to see something different or just something in between. The board members agreed that the blue brick was too bold and does not really fit in and it would be a good thing to change.

- The board did not approve the revised building architecture and façade changes associated with the new prototype designs.

- The board affirmed that the originally approved plans are more in kind with the town of Penfield.

- The board offered to review revised architectural plans at a later meeting if Qdoba cares to resubmit with alternative color schemes and exterior surface materials.

The board directed staff to send a letter with the concerns noted.

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

Motion was carried.

2. 1787 & 1801 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road, Grossman’s – Mr. Larry Grossman, owner of the lands under review, requests approval from the Planning Board for the resubdivision of property lines.

- Mr. Valentine explained Mr. Grossman’s request to resubdivide his lands to allocate area more even across his residential property and his business property.

- The plans show an existing building will be relocated to meet setback requirements on the 1787 property.

- According to Ag & Markets Law, the properties are compliant in their respective uses.
The Board APPROVED the request and authorized the Planning Board Chair to sign the mylar.

Vote: Moved by: Denoncourt Seconded by: Bastian
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian – Aye Denoncourt- Aye Kanauer - Aye
McCord - Aye Tydings - Aye
Motion was carried.

3. 2641 & 2671 Penfield Road, John Schillaci - Requests approval from the Planning Board for the resubdivision of properties to move lot lines. Mr. Schillaci, 2671 Penfield Road, had made a purchasing offer for 20.0 +/- acres of vacant land from Paul Hoevenaar, 2641 Penfield Road, and would like to merge the property into his lands.

The Board APPROVED the request and authorized the Planning Board Chair to sign the mylar.

Vote: Moved by: Denoncourt Seconded by: McCord
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian – Aye Denoncourt- Aye Kanauer - Aye
McCord - Aye Tydings - Aye
Motion was carried.

4. 1374 & 1376 Hogan Road – Ed Summerhays, on behalf the project known as the Colombo Resubdivision, requests an extension from the board to the previously approved plans dated August 1, 2014. The board originally approved the plan on August 8, 2014.

The Board APPROVED the request and authorized the Planning Board Chair to sign the mylar.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Kanauer
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian – Aye Denoncourt- Aye Kanauer - Aye
McCord - Aye Tydings - Aye
Motion was carried.

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned at 9:46 PM, Thursday, November 13, 2014.

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on December 11, 2014.