PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 13, 2016
The Planning Board held a meeting at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, October 13, 2016 in the Town Hall Auditorium to discuss, in a meeting open to the public, tabled matters and other business that was before it. The board then held a public hearing meeting at 7:00 PM to hear new applications.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

PRESENT: Allyn Hetzke, Jr.
Bill Bastian
Jim Burton
Bob Kanauer
Terry Tydings

ALSO PRESENT: Zachary Nersinger, Town Planner
Mark Valentine, Town Engineer
Michael O’Connor, Assistant Engineer
Douglas Sangster, Planning/Environmental Technician
Pete Weishaar, Planning Board Attorney
Alison Sublett, Board Secretary

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The board voted and APPROVED the draft meeting minutes for September 22, 2016.

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

Motion was carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATIONS:

1. Nixon Peabody LLP, 1300 Clinton Square, Rochester, NY 14604, on behalf of Verizon wireless, requests under Chapter 250 Articles VI-6.1, XII-12.2, and XIII-13.11 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and EPOD Permit approval to construct a wireless telecommunications facility with a 138 foot +/- monopole tower with associated site improvements on an 11.13 +/- acre parcel located at 1192 Shoecraft Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Thomas and Diane Gibson and zoned RR-1. Application #16P-0014, SBL #094.02-1-1.6.

Thomas Greiner, Nixon Peabody LLP, presented the application to the board. Also present were Mike Ritchie of Costich Engineering, Justin Lad of Verizon Wireless, and Brian Tempio of Tectonic Engineering.
• Mr. Greiner stated the purpose of the project was to address and signal coverage and capacity issue in the Shoecraft Road area.

• Mr. Greiner explained that after meeting with town staff earlier in the year a sketch plan application was reviewed and comments were received from the Board’s meeting in August. Following that meeting an application for preliminary/final review was submitted.

• Mr. Greiner noted that additional materials were submitted with the results of the second balloon fly that took place in the previous month of September.

• Mr. Greiner stated that Costich Engineering submitted revised site plans [today] in response to the PRC memo that received. He added, the County Planning comments did not include anything substantial citing that the project should be reviewed as a local matter.

• Mr. Greiner stated that answers to the Board’s comments and questions issued in its letter following the August 11 meeting were submitted with the September 2 application materials.

• Mr. Greiner displayed two propagation maps delineating the need for improved signal coverage around the site. He explained that signal interference creates capacity and coverage issues.

• Mr. Greiner stated the proposed 134 foot monopole tower would solve the capacity and coverage issue in the area.

• Mr. Greiner explained Verizon had a specific standard for signal strength and the surrounding towers currently don’t have enough strength to cover the identified problem area. A site selection analysis study was performed and a copy of the document was provided for the board as Exhibit G. An aerial map was provided showing other sites that were rejected in the selection study.

• Mr. Greiner explained that collocating with the existing tower on 1063 Plank Road, Schutt’s Apple Mill, would only cover about half the area desired.

• Landscape buffering was proposed for the proposed tower pad.

• Mr. Greiner listed security measures submitted with the application including six (6) foot fencing with barbed wire and silent alarms.

• Mr. Greiner stated the proposed equipment platform was the industry standard, and an enclosed shed is no preferred.

• Mr. Greiner stated diesel fuel generators were preferred over natural gas or propane fueled generators as the installation of a gas service line would be costly, and diesel tanks required less space than propane tanks. Typically each carrier had its own generator.

• Mr. Greiner reviewed for the board that the requested second balloon fly took place on September 17, 2016 in the morning hours, with one balloon placed at the proposed location and the second placed 400 +/- feet further to the east.

• Mr. Greiner stated an area variance application was submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Board Comments:
• Board member Bastian asked if a study was conducted regarding impacts to neighboring property values where cellular antennas were installed. Mr. Greiner answered a study was not conducted with that application; however, information was available for other areas where cellular towers had been installed. He stated there were no material evidence for
adverse effects on property values in comparing sales histories in those areas before and after the cellular towers were installed. Chairman Hetzke requested the applicant submit copies of the studies referenced.

- Board member Bastian asked if collocation combined with a smaller tower in a different location would provide the desired coverage to the area. Mr. Greiner explained a single site solution was preferable provide adequate signal strength and minimize interference from other towers.
- Justin Lad explained how signal interference can occur between cell towers.
- Chairman Hetzke asked how far south the proposed tower could be located and still provide complete coverage to the area. Mr. Lad informed the board that locating the tower further south would not cover the target objective. He elaborated that the tower would have to be taller in order to cover the target objective if it were located further south.
- Chairman Hetzke asked if the antennas on the tower were directional. Mr. Lad explained the individual antennas broadcasted a 65 degree beam horizontally and seven (7) to ten (10) degrees horizontally and multiple antennas were mounted on a tower concentrating on areas with the highest density to meet demands.
- Mr. Greiner added the application materials cited nearby properties that were considered for this project.
- Board member Tydings asked if the tower could be shorter and still provide the desired service. Mr. Lad explained the antenna height was an important factor in order for the signal beams to reach their target objectives. If the tower was too low the signal would be interrupted by structures or competing signals, and if the tower were too high it could create adverse effects to the network by creating noise and interference for shorter towers. Thus the objective was to have towers of similar height in an area; the existing towers in the area were all about 130 feet. Mr. Greiner added the propagation test for a 110 foot cellular tower in this area showed noticeable losses to coverage.
- Board member Kanauer asked when the proposed back-up generators would be tested. Mr. Greiner believed they would be tested once a week, typically Tuesdays, around 10:00 AM for an hour in duration.
- Board member Kanauer asked what color the tower and antennas would be. Mr. Greiner answered the cellular tower was galvanized steel that was gray and the antennas were typically off-white to deflect heat from sunlight but could be painted a different color. He referenced other towers that were painted blue and were more noticeable than the typical gray colored ones.

Public Comments:
Susan Richardson of 1194 Shoecraft Road expressed concerns for the proposed project.
- Ms. Richardson asked why couldn’t the towers at Schutt’s Apple Mill (1063 Plank Road) and the Webster Town Hall (1000 Ridge Road) be used to achieve the coverage goal?
- Ms. Richardson stated the construction of the proposed tower would place it within approximately one (1) mile of existing towers. She questioned if this will be a common standard for future cellular tower placements?
- Ms. Richardson stated cellular telephone coverage was adequate for the area in question and not a safety issue. She added the applicant was seeking to increase 4G LTE coverage for the area and they were promoting for their network in order to make money.
Ms. Richardson desired to have more attractive towers if they will be placed a mile apart in the rural and suburban areas of Penfield. She questioned what does Verizon plan for this area in the future?

Ms. Richardson asked if the Schutt’s Apple Mill tower was not being considered because there is not enough room on the tower and could the tower be extended.

Ms. Richardson stated concerns for with impacts to her property values.

Ms. Richardson stated the proposed location of the tower would be closer to her house than to the house on 1192 Shoecraft Road.

Ms. Richardson stated Verizon had approached her about placing the tower on her property but negotiations were ceased. Other area property owners were approached including a church and The Villas at East Hampton, but those owners also declined.

Ms. Richardson asked the board to require the proposed tower be located further to the rear of the property and require the tower be made more attractive.

Ms. Richardson expressed concerns regarding noise from generators testing.


Ms. Richardson cited the Penfield Town Code Chapter 250-XIII-13.2 regarding Conditional Use Permits.

Ms. Richardson cited articles regarding studies of impacts to property values associated with cellular towers, new technologies that may cause current cellular technology to become obsolete, and policies adopted by Phoenix, Arizona that required new cellular structures to be disguised. She submitted reference documents for the board’s review.

Ms. Richardson also submitted photographs and a Larson Camouflage catalog.

**Applicant Responses:**

Mr. Lad responded to Ms. Richardson question of locating two towers north and south of the site by explaining that introducing another transmitter to that area would create interference to the network causing loss of coverage.

Chairman Hetzke asked which area was the priority for coverage issues. Mr. Lad indicated on the existing coverage map the areas of residential development. Mr. Greiner added both sites [Schutt’s Apple Mill and Webster Town Hall] were considered as single sites but did not provide adequate coverage. A two-site solution would compound the existing problem so a dominant single site needed to be placed at the center of the target area.

Mr. Lad responded to Ms. Richardson question about the distance between towers being a mile apart. He explained cellular towers may in the future need to be placed approximately every mile in order to achieve the desired coverage in the area. As technology advanced the 3G cellular phones will be phased out and there will be increased data demand for 4G devices. Cell spacing was a critical aspect of radio frequency design for the long-term solution.

Mr. Greiner responded to Ms. Richardson’s comments regarding Verizon seeking to make a profit by explaining that the applicant was looking to make money, however Verizon did not seek to waste money. The purpose of the project is to achieve the best coverage but to also solve a long standing problem of exhaustion for the existing towers from increased user demand.
• Mr. Greiner explained that context was essential when disguising cellular tower as the façade would have to be appropriate for the area. Flagpole-type disguised towers and other similarly disguised towers would not be feasible as flush-mounted antennas would not provide adequate coverage.

• Mr. Greiner stated he would confirm the generator testing duration times for the board.

• Mr. Greiner stated they had applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the setback variance.

• Mr. Greiner stated the language for minimum visual intrusion was in the Town ordinance and is subjective to each individual use.

• Mr. Greiner stated the proposed tower was considered a public utility and impacts to property values were difficult to calculate as this was subjective.

• Mr. Greiner stated Verizon had not made inquiries regarding collocating other wireless communication providers on the proposed cell tower, nor had any providers approached Verizon about collocating.

• Mr. Greiner stated they could consider disguising the tower but cautioned that context as well as feasibility would have to be reviewed.

• Mr. Greiner stated the need for improved cellular coverage was not projected to become obsolete in the near future but the Letter of Credit for the project would be address the removal the tower at the end of its use.

• Mr. Greiner stated the second balloon fly included three balloons at each location. The bottom balloon was set at the proposed height of the 134 foot tower and the balloons above it were placed as reference points to viewers.

Following a discussion at the public meeting and subsequent discussion in a work session, the Penfield Planning Board offered the following comments:

• Provide responses regarding the applicant’s review of alternate locations on the site for the telecommunication tower other than the proposed location approximately 600 feet from the front (western boundary) of the property.

• Provide responses regarding the applicant’s reasoning as to why the combination of collocating on existing towers, such as the one at Schutt’s Apple Mill on Plank Road, and constructing a shorter new tower was ruled out as a solution to Verizon’s capacity and coverage issues in the area. The applicant’s response shall include a copy of the 110 foot tower analysis that was referenced in the public hearing presentation.

• Provide the board with a copy of the referenced study (or studies) regarding impacts to property values pre and post construction of a new telecommunication towers.

• Provide the board with a minimum of six (6) successful examples of similar telecommunication towers that were designed with a camouflaged exterior.

• Provide additional information regarding the time duration of scheduled exercising tests of the backup generator. The Board also requested the applicant to submit specifications for a single backup generator sized to service multiple carriers on the tower.

• The Board is in receipt of several documents from Ms. Susan Richardson, residing at 1194 Shoecraft Road, following her public participation in the public hearing. Staff was instructed to add said documents to the project record for the Board’s review and consideration. The applicant also requested to receive a copy of the documents via e-mail from staff following the meeting.
• The Board is aware the applicant will require a formal review by the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals for Area Variances from Chapter 250 Article XIII-13.311-B-6(e)-1 of the Code to allow the construction of a telecommunication tower and accessory appurtenances with less setback.

The board voted and TABLED the application.

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

Motion was carried.

IV. TABLED APPLICATIONS:

1. Passero Associates, 242 West Main Street, Suite 100, Rochester, NY 14614 / Midlakes Management, LLC, requests under Chapter 250 Articles VI-6.1, XI-12.2 and XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan, Subdivision, and EPOD Permit approval under Town Law 278 for the construction of 33 townhomes with associated site improvements on 32.67 +/- acres. The parcels are located at 1185 Empire Boulevard, 1211 Empire Boulevard, and 41 Woodhaven Drive. The properties are now or formerly owned by Howitt-Bayview, LLC and are zoned LLD and R-1-20. Application #16P-0004. SBL # 108.05-2-8.5., 108.05-2-8.33, and 108.10-1-1.111.

• Mr. Nersinger informed the board that no new items had been submitted for the board’s review.

The board voted and CONTINUED TABLED the application pending the submission project materials from the applicant.

Vote: Moved by: Kanauer Seconded by: Tydings
Tydings - Aye

Motion was carried.

2. J. Lincoln Swedrock P.E., BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, NY 14450, on behalf of Oak & Apple LLC, requests under Chapter 250 Article XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a 2,674 +/- square foot farm cider mill with associated site improvements on a total of 26.97 +/- acres located at 1381 Sweets Corners Road, to be known as Oak and Apple Cidery. The property is now or formerly owned by Oak and Apple, LLC and zoned RA-2. Application #16P-0003, SBL # 125.01-1-10.4.
Mr. Nersinger informed board of updated site plans and responses to comments. The proposed water service was relocated out of the steep slope EPOD [Environmental Protection Overlay District]. Land banked parking had been removed from the plan, leaving the original thirteen (13) parking spots.

Board member Burton stated that on a previously submitted plan employee parking was delineated by the barn, the proposed number parking spots should not be confused with employees parking in the back by the barn.

Mr. Nersinger added the plan included a dumpster enclosure and location for the temporary storage of apple millings.

Mr. Nersinger stated the lighting cut sheets were provided; building fixtures and pole-mounted fixtures were dark-sky compliant. However, lighting under the trees placed along the entrance drive was not dark-sky compliant.

Mr. Valentine added that although the up-lighting proposed under the trees along the entrance drive were not dark-sky compliant by nature, they would not be considered bright or invasive. Chairman Hetzke agreed as the board’s main concerns was for neighboring properties receiving unwelcome glare or bright lights shining into their windows and stated the up-lights were an elegant touch that would be attractive.

Mr. Valentine pointed out that the Town Code did not require dark-sky compliant lighting; however, it was the industry standard at that time. Board member Burton explained lighting was a concern and agreed that the proposed landscape lighting was not high wattage and the emitted light would not travel beyond the tops of the trees and the applicant could add a dimming feature to the lights.

Mr. Valentine asked, with the exception of security lighting, if the board wanted to place conditions on the applicant regarding times permissible for exterior lighting. Board member Burton stated security lighting should not be regulated by the board. Board member Bastian asked if a dimmable feature had been requested and whether the landscape lighting would be on outside of operating hours. The board agreed to request details regarding the lighting control system. Chairman Hetzke added that the flat lensed lighting option was correct for the dark-sky compliant fixtures.

Mr. Nersinger reviewed a memo submitted from the Town Landscape Consultant. One question form the Consultant was if additional landscaping was proposed around the cidery building aside from the ornamental grasses depicted near the porch and entrance area in the 3D renderings. The board discussed this matter and had no concerns regarding landscaping around the proposed cidery.

Mr. Valentine asked if the proposed apple trees and entrance drive trees would be considered adequate to meet the street tree policy. The Town required two trees for a residential lot or one very 75 feet along the road to create a canopy. The policy was intended to restore existing canopy loss which in this case did not apply as there were few trees on the property at that time. The board agreed the applicant has fulfilled any requirements for additional tree plantings for the Town’s policy.

Mr. Nersinger explained that the previously proposed pond for irrigation that was presented in the Sketch Plan application had since been removed from the site plans submitted with the Preliminary/Final application and the public water service was proposed service the property.
• Mr. Nersinger reviewed for the board the updated second floor plans compared to the previously submitted floor plan. The revised plans include a scaled back kitchen and more office-like setting. The full bathroom would be required for workers who need to clean up after working in the orchards.

• Mr. Valentine stated a memo with comments from the Town’s Architectural Consultant was submitted for the Board’s review and consideration. He explained the Consultant’s comments were intended as recommendations to the board and while his comments were specific to the design of the building and some site plan recommendations it was up to the board to decide how to address those comments with the applicant.

• Chairman Hetzke asked that physical samples of the proposed exterior be provided by the applicant for the board’s review.

• Board member Bastian stated the architectural consultant making a recommendation regarding the location of the parking was unusual. Board member Burton agreed this was a significant change and not typical of the architectural comments.

• The board agreed that it was appropriate to give the applicant the opportunity to respond to the Consultant’s comments in writing for the Board’s review at a future meeting.

• Mr. Nersinger informed the board that staff had researched hours of operation for tasting rooms and similar uses in the area based on public comments that were submitted. Most of the tasting room hours consistent with the submitted comments but there were some discrepancies. Some businesses had special events and activities, including seasonal events, with extended hours for the tasting rooms. The staff’s search was extended to include other businesses with similar uses to the proposed project. The board felt the proposed hours of operation this application were appropriate.

• Mr. Valentine informed the board that staff was awaiting comments from the Town’s Planning Consultant regarding SEQR [State Environmental Quality Review] and asked if the board would like to request the applicant to submit a long environmental assessment form. The board agreed to request the submission of a Full Environmental Assessment Form by the applicant.

• Mr. Valentine reviewed for the board the Farmstead Area Plan that delineated the areas of disturbances and development. The proposed plan avoided disturbances to the EPODs on the property. The structures and parking had been located in compliance with the required 150 foot setback from all property lines. He stated the board is responsible for making a recommendation to the Town Board as to the best location of the farmstead area if the application is approved.

• Board member Burton stated the proposed site was the only viable location for the proposed farmstead with regards to the topography of the site. Mr. Burton believed the delineated farmstead area was larger than necessary. The board agreed to request a re-delineate farmstead area on the plans that shall be limited to the proposed locations of the structures only.

• Mr. Valentine reviewed for the board the site plans submitted October 6, 2016 that included gravel drives and parking, locations of dumpster and spoils. The board had no additional concerns for the site plans as shown.

• Board member Kanauer asked if the applicant submitted any plans for sidewalks or pedestrian paths. Mr. Valentine explained for the board that the Town Board was responsible for administering the Town sidewalk policy and reviewing sidewalk waiver
requests. He added that the Town Board typically acknowledges if requests are proposed in rural areas versus more densely populated areas of the town.

- The board discussed the possibility of recommending sidewalks on the proposed site based on public comments about pedestrian traffic. It was mentioned that no sidewalks currently exist in the area. The board held the discussion of this topic pending further review.

- Mr. Valentine reviewed for the board the area of proposed disturbance, 4.06 acres, in relation to grading and erosion controls. Due to the slope of the site the driveway plan showed stone check dams along the sides of the driveway during construction. The plan proposed limited impervious surfaces, and due to the size of the parcel staff had no concerns regarding stormwater runoff. The previously proposed pond was intended for irrigation and aesthetic purposes and not needed to contain stormwater. That pond has since been removed from the plan. The board had no concerns with stormwater runoff with regards to the submitted plans.

- Mr. Valentine asked the board if there were thoughts regarding noise limitations when the cidery was open to the public.

- Board member Burton suggested conditioning a maximum decibel level from the outdoor patio area.

- Mr. Valentine replied that municipalities cannot regulate noise caused by customary agricultural activity. Board member Burton agreed and clarified his concern was with respect to any plans for music being played outdoors on the property. The board requested clarification regarding sources of music for the tasting room and outdoor patio.

- Mr. Valentine discussed the existing traffic conditions. He stated to the board that a traffic study was typically not warranted for a development of this size and asked if the board wanted to request a traffic study. The board agreed that a traffic study was not necessary had no concerns regarding the amount of traffic that would be associated with the proposed use.

- Mr. Valentine reviewed the proposed utilities and services. The plans included extending sanitary sewer service to the property that could eventually service the properties 1704, 1712, 1726, and 1728 Dublin Road, making sanitary sewer available to those properties. Public water service is proposed and shown on the plans. The plans included the location of an existing hydrant on Dublin Road and a dry hydrant connection at the top of the hill. The board had no concerns for the proposed utilities.

- Mr. Valentine asked if the board would like to include a property maintenance agreement in the conditions, as was customary for commercial development. Chairman Hetzke asked if it was customary to require property maintenance agreements for agricultural use. Staff explained most agricultural uses in the town pre-dated the policy of the obtaining these agreements and would research the item. The board supported the use of a property maintenance agreement for this use.

The Board voted and CONTINUED TABLED pending the review and/or submission of the following items:

- Provide responses to the comments made in the memo issued by the Town’s Architecture Consultant dated October 10, 2016.
- Input form the Town’s SEQR consultant regarding the SEQR type classification.
- Submission of a Full EAF Part 1 for the Board’s review and consideration.
• Revise the Farmstead Area Plan with an updated delineation of the farmstead area that shall be limited to the proposed locations of the structures only.
• Provide clarification for the board if the 3D rendering, submitted on January 29, 2016, depicts the vehicles as being located in the proposed 13 stall parking area or in the previously proposed land banked parking area, which has since been removed from the site plan. If the vehicles were depicted in the land banked parking, then the rendering shall be updated to show vehicles in the proposed parking area.
• The board was satisfied with the proposed dark sky compliant fixtures and decorative up-lighting shown on the updated site plan, dated October 6, 2016. The board requested the applicant to provide clarification for the proposed lighting plan regarding the systems that will be utilized to control the on/off or dimming functions of the fixtures. Specifically, at what times of the day during business and non-business hours will the lights be on? Be sure to identify any fixtures that will be used for security lighting.
• Provide clarification regarding the Board’s concerns about the possibility for noise disturbances to adjacent properties. Will outdoor speakers be used outside in the porch area? Are there any plans for live music? Will outdoor speakers be used outside in the porch area? Are there any plans for live music? Or will all the sources for music be limited to the interior of the tasting room? If any outdoor speakers or live music is proposed them the Board may consider applying a condition setting a maximum decibel level measurable from the borders of the property.

Vote: Moved by: Burton Seconded by: Bastian
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian - Aye Burton - Aye
Tydings - Aye Kanauer - Aye

Motion was carried.

3. Marathon Engineering, 39 Cascade Drive, Rochester, NY, 14614, on behalf of Hometown Antiques & Properties, requests under Chapter 250 Article XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for a parking lot expansion with associated site improvements on the 0.41 +/- acres located at 2221 Penfield Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Hometown Antiques & Properties and zoned BN-R. Application #16P-0011, SBL #140.01-2-10.

• Mr. Nersinger informed the board the applicant was scheduled to appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals on October 20, 2016.
• Mr. Nersinger reviewed for the board updated site plans that were submitted prior to the meeting. The plan included a landscape buffer with three (3) trees, three (3) Arborvitaes, and three (3) shrubs. Staff had concerns regarding the adequacy of the buffering, the owner of the property immediately south of the site had expressed concerns to Town staff regarding encroachment of lights from the businesses on the opposite side of Penfield Road.
• Mr. Nersinger reviewed photographs taken by staff showing the existing landscaping 2221 Penfield Road. One tree on the east side of the property was proposed to be removed in
order to install the access drive to the proposed parking lot, which prompted the board to request landscaping be installed to replace the landscaping that would be removed.

- Board member Burton added that a berm and landscaping was thought to be more appealing to the neighbors than a fence.
- Mr. Valentine reviewed for the board the planned future development for homes along the BN-R district with rear-access drives and the future possible impacts to neighboring residences immediately south of that district. He added the Zoning Board may require a fence be installed as a condition of the area variance. There were not enough details in the submitted landscaping plans to make a determination. The board requested more detailed landscaping plans.
- Mr. Nersinger informed the board that other recently approved projects in BN-R zoning districts required fencing because they were adjacent to school property while other recent projects being adjacent to Town property were not required to install fences. Mr. Nersinger pointed out this application abutted residential property and was part of a section of BN-R zoned parcels that leads to the McDonald’s at the corner or Penfield Road and Route 250. The board discussed and agreed that setting a precedence requiring fencing may be less visually appealing over time as more properties in that corridor redevelop.
- Mr. Valentine suggested more details could be provided for the rain garden plantings and that a cross access easement be shown on the plans for a future connections. The board agreed with both requests.

The board voted and CONTINUED TABLED the application pending the review and/or submission of the following items:

- Revised site plans to include the following:
  - Provide a cross section and planting schedule of the proposed rain garden areas.
  - Provide a 20 foot wide cross access easement on the site plan across the property from the eastern to western border of the property and between the northern and southern limits of the rear parking drive aisle area for future vehicular cross access connections.
- The revised site plan, received October 13, 2016, will be sent to the Board’s landscape consultant for his review of the proposed landscape buffer area and other landscaping details. The board remained supportive of constructing a landscaped berm as a buffer for the adjacent residential properties located to the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote:</th>
<th>Moved by:</th>
<th>Secended by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tydings</td>
<td>Kanauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye</td>
<td>Bastian - Aye</td>
<td>Burton - Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tydings - Aye</td>
<td>Kanauer - Aye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion was carried.

III. MISCELLANEOUS:

1. 1138 Plank Road & 1357 Jackson Road, Beresniewicz Resubdivision.
• Mr. Nersinger explained the current property line was proposed to be shifted at 90 degrees to increase the lot size of 1357 Jackson Road. This proposed action was originally proposed as part of the Birchcrest Subdivision that was approved for seven (7) residential lots but the approval has since expired as the project was built.

• Mr. Nersinger explained that the earlier subdivision approval would result in placing those seven (7) new parcels in the Webster Central School District. The current proposal would result in both properties being placed entirely in the Webster Schools. Currently 1357 Jackson Road was in the Penfield Central School District.

• The board had no concerns.

The board voted and APPROVED the plat map.

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

Motion was carried.

2. 1895 & 1863 Plank Road, Luke Resubdivision.

• Mr. Nersinger explained the resubdivision requested moving the lot line between the two properties to increase the lot size of 1863 Plank Road and reducing the size of 1865 Plank Road.

• The board had no concerns.

The board voted and APPROVED the plat map.

Vote: Moved by: Kanauer Seconded by: Tydings
Tydings - Aye

Motion was carried.

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on November 10, 2016.