The Planning Board held a meeting at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, July 13, 2017 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
- Bob Kanauer
- Jim Burton
- Terry Tydings

**ALSO PRESENT:**
- Zachary Nersinger, Town Planner
- Mark Valentine, Town 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 June 20, 2017.

**Vote:** Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Tydings

Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian - Aye Burton - Aye
Kanauer - Aye Tydings - Aye

Motion was carried.

III. **PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATIONS:**

1. Marathon Engineering, 39 Cascade Drive, Rochester, NY 14614, on behalf of Erik Graff, requests an informal discussion before the board with plans to construct a new child-care facility with associated site improvements on a total of 3.31 +/- acres located at 1280 Creek Street and 85 Sovran Drive. The properties are now or formerly owned by Retlaw Recked Inc. and zoned LB and GB. Application #17P-0018, SBL # 093.15-1-2.115 and 093.15-5-2.116.

Eric Graff, 90 Coventry Ridge, presented the application to the board. Also present were Erik Schaaf, Marathon Engineering, and Allen Rossignol, Edge Architecture, PLLC, 277 Alexander Street, Rochester, NY, 14607.

- Mr. Schaaf informed the board the site plans were revised from the originally submitted application to reduce the building size and he submitted printed copies of the updated
plans with concept renderings to the board. He then introduced Eric Graff to the board to explain the proposed business.

- Mr. Graff stated he was the current owner of a daycare facility in the Town of Greece that had a capacity of 174 children.
- Mr. Graff informed the board the proposed project planned to accommodate 126 children in a facility that was more modern and keeping with current industry trends.
- The proposed building size was 10,500 square feet, which met the OCFS [New York State Office of Children and Family Services].
- Included in the plan was an outdoor play area and indoor gymnasium. An outdoor splash pad was also listed as a possibility.
- Board member Burton asked if Child and Family Services required 10,500 square feet. Mr. Graff answered it required 35 square feet per child. Mr. Burton stated that was the State’s density requirement for a daycare, and according to the original application of 135 children, that would require 4,700 square feet of space. Mr. Burton explained the applicant would have to justify for the board the need for 10,500 square feet.
- Mr. Graff informed the board that the classrooms have to be a minimum of 35 square feet per child according the State requirement. The additional square footage would encompass hallways, restrooms, administrative offices as well as the indoor gymnasium. He explained the outdoor play space was limited and considering the local weather it was logical to have an indoor play area.
- Eric Schaaf reviewed for the board the site plans for the project. He explained two entrances were proposed on Pen Web Park and one on Sovran Drive. Preliminary discussion with the local school district regarding bus access had been initiated and no significant concerns were raised.
- Utilities were available to the site and a stormwater management facility was located to the east end of the site that served adjacent properties as well.
- A preliminary grading plan was submitted as the property was sloped. A retaining wall was proposed around portions of the parking lot.
- Variances were required for the submitted plan for building size and the two front setbacks on Pen Web Park and Creek Street. A variance for two (2) parking spaces was also needed.
- Allen Rossignol explained for the board the design and concept for the building. He explained the building had two frontages, one facing Creek Street and one facing Pen Web Park with the rear of the building facing the commercial buildings on Sovran Drive.
- Mr. Rossignol added the proposed business was marketed as a learning center so the building was designed to have the appearance of a school, utilizing modern materials for the exterior finishes.
- Mr. Rossignol stated the existing elevations required a raised foundation facing Pen Web Park and Sovran Drive with a retaining wall; however, the rooflines were broken up to reduce the visual scale of the building which kept residential neighbors in mind by placing the lower elevations on that side of the property. Mr. Rossignol added the gymnasium was proposed for the front of the building facing Creek Street and classrooms were in the rear.
- Mr. Rossignol explained for the board the covered roof structures on the south side of the building were designed to simulate residential porches to be accessible from the
classrooms. These structures would also serve as sun shading for the outdoor play areas.

- Mr. Rossignol reviewed the design of the north facing side the building with sections of different building exteriors to visually break up the size of the building and give it a more residential appearance.

Board Questions:
- Board member Burton asked if the possible traffic generated during rush hour times and asked if a dedicated drop off lane was considered. Mr. Schaaf explained there was not adequate space for a dedicated drop off lane, however the expected flow of traffic would access the site from Pen Web Park. Mr. Schaaf had been in contact with SRF to do a preliminary study and it was determined that a full traffic study was not justified.

- Board member Burton asked what the traffic flow at the existing facility owned by the applicant was like as it would indicate how long each parent was at the facility dropping off or picking up children and the peak hours of traffic activity. Mr. Schaaf agreed the traffic data could be provided as part of the Preliminary and Final application.

- Mr. Graff explained the peak hours for dropping off and picking up children were 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM. He added approximately half the children would likely have siblings attending the facility which would reduce the number of cars to 50 or 60 during peak times.

- Board member Kanauer asked how the facility was proposed to be open. Mr. Graff replied he was planning on closing at 6:30 PM but may adjust that to an earlier closing time if necessary.

- Board member Kanauer asked when school buses would be on site. Mr. Graff explained he planned to offer a before and after school program and school buses typically run between 8:00 AM to 8:30 AM and 3:00 PM to 3:30 PM.

- Board member Burton asked if special events were planned for the facility and asked how that would impact parking and traffic. Mr. Graff explained the only events that were planned to be hosted on site were open houses for potential clients. Mr. Graff planned to coordinate with the existing businesses on Sovran Drive to use their parking lots and host the events after regular business hours. Other events, such as graduations and recitals, would be hosted at a public school in the area as they tend to generate greater audience numbers.

- Chairman Hetzke asked when the heaviest activity took place within the peak drop off and pick up times. Mr. Graff explained that at his other daycare facility activity was steadily disbursed within those two hours of 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM.

- Chairman Hetzke asked for more information regarding the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Schaaf explained the wall began on the western edge of the parking lot and extended to the northern edge of the building. The building was proposed to be at a higher elevation than the parking lot. All slopes and grades in the parking lot would be ADA compliant, with sidewalks along the building. Mr. Schaaf added more details would be provided with a final site plan application.

- Board member Bastian asked when employees were proposed to arrive and depart from the business. Mr. Graff answered they would typically arrive at 6:00 AM and custodians would arrive after closing and work for approximately four (4) hours.
Chairman Hetzke asked Mr. Rossignol to explain the overall concept for the proposed design of the building. Mr. Rossignol explained the facility is to represent its intended function which was a learning center so the overall appearance resembled a school.

Chairman Hetzke asked if the windows were planned to be tinted. Mr. Rossignol stated they were planned to be colored to some degree but no mirrored glass as they desired to have some transparency into the building.

Board member Tydings asked for the location and name of the daycare facility that Mr. Graff was operating. Mr. Graff stated the business was LMG Childcare off English Road, but clarified that business was different from the design and concept of the proposed project.

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

The Board reviewed the submitted sketch plan application materials and was supportive of the proposed development of a 10,500 +/- square foot child-care facility with associated site improvements on the property located at 1280 Creek Street. The Board was supportive of the proposed architecture and building renderings represented by the Edge Architecture, PLLC.

Among other comments listed below, the Board expressed concerns for the anticipated traffic that is often associated with child-care facilities; specifically during the 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM peak travel hours. The Board requested information be provided within a future application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval regarding the items listed below.

- Provide the Board a complete set of engineered site plans that meet the requirements of the Town for a preliminary/final site plan application. The site plans shall address the comments issued in the PRC’s memo dated June 23, 2017. An emphasis will be placed on the evaluation of the existing stormwater management facility and the need for cleaning or enhancing the facility.

- During the discussion with the Board, it was mentioned that a traffic analysis was currently being evaluated by SRF Associates. The results of SRF’s work shall be provided to for the Board’s review. In addition, they requested that traffic counts be conducted at the owners’ child-care facility, located in the town of Greece, during the weekdays. This data will be used to evaluate any potential traffic impacts to Creek Street, Pen-Web Park, and Sovran Drive.

- The Webster Central School District (WCSD) shall be contacted regarding the number of buses expected to serve the child-care facility. Correspondence with WCSD shall be provided for the Board’s review.

- The Board was supportive of the proposed building designs per the applicant’s concept renderings dated July 11, 2017. The applicant shall update the renderings to match any modifications made to the site plans. Four sided building elevations of the proposed structures shall be provided with a schedule of building materials and colors. A final colored rendering shall also be provided.
- Provide a lighting and photometrics plan with cut sheets of the proposed fixtures. Lighting fixtures shall be dark sky compliant and unobtrusive to the adjacent residential properties.

- Provide a landscape plan with planting schedule and details. The plan shall also demonstrate compliance with the Town’s Street Tree Policy.

- If a splash pad is proposed for the outdoor play area it shall be shown on the site plans. Documentation from the Department of Health shall be provided if it is available.

- Provide a copy of the owner’s license application to New York State Office of Children and Family Services regarding the proposal for the new child-care facility.

- At the Town Board work session meeting on July 12, 2017, it was mentioned that an outdoor PA speaker may be proposed for the child-care facility. This must be clarified and any details for an outdoor speaker system shall be provided for the Planning Board’s review. The property is located at the corner of a residential street and a commercial area. An outdoor speaker system has the potential to cause several noise complaints from the neighbors of Pen-Web Park.

- Any future submission for a preliminary and final site plan application shall comply with the recommendations found in the PRC’s memo dated June 23, 2017. Written responses to the PRC’s memo and this sketch plan review letter are required with a future site plan application.

The Board directed staff to send the sketch plan response letter.

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

Motion was carried.

2. McMahon LaRue Associates, P.C., 822 Holt Road, Webster, NY, 14580, on behalf of Fantauzzo Family Brands, requests under Chapter 250 Articles XII-12.2 and XIII-13.2 of the code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval for a new business office and to construct a new residential structure with associated site improvements on a total of 0.29 +/- acres located at 1661 Empire Boulevard. The property is now or formerly owned by Fantauzzo Family Brands Inc. and zoned LB. Application #17P-0015, SBL #093.19-1-23.

Greg McMahon, McMahon LaRue Associates, P.C., presented the application to the board. Also present was Sam Fantauzzo of Fantauzzo Family Brands.

- Mr. McMahon explained the property had an existing house and detached garage. The house was already under renovation and the new proposed structure would have the same exterior finishes as those recently installed on the existing house.
• The owner intended to convert the existing house into business offices for Fantauzzo Family Brands.
• The proposed garage and apartment would be used as a single family residence for the owner and would require the demolition of the existing garage.
• Stormwater chambers were proposed on the site plan to collect stormwater from the site and discharge it to existing storm sewers on Rossman Drive. The proposed system was calculated to reduce current flows to below existing conditions.
• The existing curb cut on Empire Boulevard was proposed to remain and a new extended curb cut was proposed on Rossman Drive for the proposed parking spaces. An ADA compliant parking space and entrance ramp were proposed for the existing building.
• Employee parking were proposed in the new garage.
• Variances were required for the setbacks of the proposed residence and the applicant had appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals and reduced the size of the proposed residence in response to that board. The application for the variances was tabled pending review by the Planning Board.
• No new lighting was proposed for the project.
• Hours of operation were 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The offices would be used strictly for the business operations of owner and meetings, either with franchisees and vendors, would be held at the proposed offices. Traffic was projected to be minimal as visitors were limited.
• A row of Red Cedar plantings were proposed along the rear of the property to buffer the neighboring residence.
• In response to public comments regarding light and noise pollution from Empire Boulevard, Mr. McMahon stated the proposed new two-story residence as well as the proposed cedars would remediate most of those concerns.

Board Comments:
• Board member Burton asked if there were any wall-pacs were planned for the new residence. Mr. McMahon explained all exterior lighting would be residential in scale at entrances to the structure.
• Board member Burton asked if the applicant had responded to comments made by the Town Engineer regarding lighting and photometric plans. Mr. McMahon explained all comments had been addressed in writing.
• Board member Kanauer asked if the owner intended to rent space to additional tenants at the offices as the proposed monument sign seemed to indicate the available space. Mr. Fantauzzo explained his sign designer had suggested creating additional space on the sign for a possible future tenant.
• Board member Kanauer asked for clarification on the possible tenant. Mr. Fantauzzo explained they would only lease a portion of the office space for an associated business that his company has an established relationship with, and not for residential use.
• Board member Burton inquired as to the change in the proposed use of the garage as Mr. Fantauzzo had originally intended the space to be private and not used for the business. Mr. Fantauzzo explained that he employed his family to work at the business offices and the employees parking in the garage would be family members. Mr. McMahon further explained they anticipated few vehicles on site due to the nature of the proposed business.
• Board member Tydings asked about the access drive leading from Empire Boulevard. Mr. McMahon explained the existing curb cut on Empire Boulevard was proposed to remain to allow access to the ADA compliant parking space and the garage structure.

• Board member Tydings asked if the access drive would accommodate room to allow vehicles to park in front of the garage. Mr. McMahon explained while there was ample room for vehicles to exit the garage and maneuver the drive aisle there would be no designated parking spaces in that area.

• Board member Tydings asked if the existing retaining wall near the proposed trees would be repaired. Mr. McMahon replied the retaining wall was on the neighboring property.

• Board member Tydings asked if any grading was intended for the rear of the property. Mr. Fantauzzo added the existing bushes would remain and the Red Cedars would be planted in front of those bushes.

• Board member Tydings asked how close to the property line the new structure was proposed to be. Mr. McMahon stated the proposed building was 14.5 feet at the closest point to the rear property line.

Public Comments:
• Kelly Vogt, of 4 Rossman Drive, expressed her concerns regarding the proposed project. She presented photographs, taken in the evening from inside her home, of the property at 1661 Empire Boulevard. She stated the lights and noise from other businesses on Empire Boulevard have become more noticeable since the owner removed the trees from the property that were behind the existing structure.

• Jim Kuras, of 8 Rossman Drive, expressed his concerns regarding the proposed project. Mr. Kuras was supportive of the improved drainage and landscape plans and asked what the height of the proposed new trees would be. He had concerns regarding light and noise pollution for the new business and asked if a row of bushes along Rossman Drive could be considered. He added lights were mounted to the existing residence that stayed on late into the evening. Mr. Kuras also had concerns for traffic issues.

• Barbara Deschambault, of 9 Rossman Drive, expressed her concerns regarding the project and how it may impact the drainage on her property, which had experienced multiple issues in the past during heavy rainfall.

Board Questions:
• Board member Burton asked for a line-of-sight vector drawing to be provided to verify the presence of light and noise from Empire Boulevard. Mr. McMahon agreed a plan would be provided to illustrate the viewsheds from adjacent property owners.

The Board voted and APPROVED sending a letter supporting the location of the proposed residence with attached garage to the Zoning Board of Appeals

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

Motion was carried.
The Board voted and TABLED the application pending the review and/or submission of the following items:

- Submission of a lighting plan with contours and foot candles of the proposed lighting fixtures for the office and residential structures. Cut sheets and details of the proposed fixtures shall also be provided.
- Submission of a revised landscape plan with a planting schedule of the foundation plantings around the office building and with new buffer plantings along the frontage of Rossman Drive to comply with the Town’s Street Tree Policy and to provide a buffer for the neighboring residents.
- Submission of a line-of-sight (vector) plan to provide a visual representation of the viewshed from neighboring property at 4 Rossman Drive. The result of this visual exercise will aid in determining the appropriate location of the additional landscaping to be installed along Rossman Drive.
- The Planning Board voted and agreed to send a letter of support to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the requested area variances.
- The Planning Board directed staff to prepare a draft approval resolution for its review and consideration at the August 15, 2017 meeting.

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

Motion was carried.

3. Jennifer and Walter Strassburg, 274 Peart Avenue, Rochester, NY 14622, requests under Chapter 250 Article XI-11.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval for a two (2) lot subdivision of 3.9 +/- acres within the Town of Penfield located at 2080 Watson-Hulbert Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Michael and Monica Quagliata and zoned RA-2. Application #17P-0016, SBL #141.02-1-11.

Walter Strassburg presented the application to the board. Also present were Michael Quagliata and Jennifer Strassburg.
- The Strassburgs planned to build a three (3) bedroom residence on the southern lot of the subdivided property.
- Mr. Strassburg explained the entire property was approximately 16 acres, and less than 4 acres of the total property was located in the Town of Penfield. The majority of the property was located in the Town of Walworth.
- Mr. Strassburg had submitted an application for an area variance with the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals as the portion of one of the lots within the Town of Penfield would be less than the required two acre minimum lot size.
Mr. Strassburg had no issues with the Fire District’s requests to make the proposed driveway accessible to emergency response vehicles with a turnaround provided on the property.

He had drafted egress and utility easements for the fire access drive and planned to include the turnaround in those documents, which would also serve as a portion of the driveway for the future development on the second proposed lot.

Mr. Strassburg had no concerns with the PRC comments and planned to address all issues in his final submission.

Board Comments:

Chairman Hetzke asked for clarification about the portion of the proposed project that would be located in the Town of Penfield. Mr. Strassburg explained the majority of the development in Penfield would be the driveway, the rest would be the front yard of the proposed home to be built on the Walworth side of the property. Mr. Quagliata stated he wanted to subdivide the lots for each of his two children. He explained the challenges with the property as it was a flag lot with one access point at Watson-Hulbert Road.

Board Deliberations:

Mr. Nersinger informed the board that the Town of Walworth had accepted Lead Agency under SEQR and granted preliminary approval for the project. Final review by the Town of Walworth Planning Board for the project had been scheduled to take place in August of 2017.

Mr. Nersinger added the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals will review the applicant’s application with a request for an area variance for a smaller lot size in the RA-2 district.

The Board had no additional concerns regarding this proposed plan.

The Board voted and APPROVED the Part II EAF.

Vote: Moved by: Hetzke Seconded by: Bastian

Motion was carried.

The Board voted and APPROVED the application with conditions.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Burton

Motion was carried.
4. Nixon Peabody, 1300 Clinton Square, Rochester, NY 14604, on behalf of Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems of Allentown, Inc., d/b/a Verizon Wireless, requests under Chapter 250 Articles XII-12.2 and XIII-13.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval and expansion to a Conditional Use Permit for the construction of an equipment shelter at an existing telecommunications facility with associated site improvements on a total of 2.29 +/- acres located at 1843 Empire Boulevard. The property is now or formerly owned by Jeffrey Riedel and zoned GB. Application 317P-0017, SBL #093.15-1-63.

Nate VanderWal, Nixon Peabody, presented the application to the board. Also present was Robert Wilson of Pyramid, 6615 Towpath Road, East Syracuse, NY, 13057.

- Mr. VanderWal presented an updated site plan set for the Board’s review. The plan was updated in response to staff’s comments regarding site grading. Mr. VanderWal explained no grading changes are proposed for the site as the proposed structure would be constructed on piers.
- The proposed utility shelter would provide centralized radio access network architecture to centralize processing for the various individual telecommunication towers. This technology was intended to improve efficiency and reliability within the network.
- The location was chosen by Verizon as it was an existing macro site and utilities were available in the desired Bay Road and Empire Boulevard area.
- An application to the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals was being prepared for submission as area variances were required for the proposed location.
- The existing fence would be expanded to incorporate the proposed shelter as well as a new propane tank and generator.
- In response to PRC’s comments regarding permitting, the installation of the secondary fiber line had been contracted out to a company that will be obtaining the State DOT permit required for that portion of the work.

Board Comments:
- Board member Kanauer asked for clarification of the required setback variance. Mr. Nersinger informed the board the required variance was for the setback on the rear of the property, which was required to be 30 feet as well as a 100 foot buffer to a residential zoning district for a property that is zoned GB.
- Board member Kanauer asked what the proposed distance from the property line was to the new structure. Mr. VanderWal did not know the exact distance and would obtain that information for the board.
- Board member Kanauer asked if the proposed shelter would be at the same grade as the existing platform. Mr. Wilson confirmed the grade would be approximately the same as the existing structures.
- Board member Kanauer asked if the fencing would be raised to be at the same height as the existing fence. Mr. Wilson answered the new fence would be the same height as existing and would follow the grade of the property.
- Board member Kanauer asked why the proposed structure could not be located in front of the existing tower rather than behind it. Mr. Wilson explained the area east of the
tower was an access and utility easement and would be outside the boundary of the leased area of land.

- Chairman Hetzke asked if the driveway existed prior to the development of the telecommunications site. Mr. Wilson believed the driveway was installed as part of the development of the cell tower.
- Board member Kanauer asked if the new generator would serve the proposed shelter. Mr. Wilson answered yes.
- Board member Kanauer asked if any changes were proposed for the existing shelter. Mr. Wilson stated no changes were proposed. Mr. VanderWal explained the new shelter would be serviced by the existing propane tank and the new smaller propane tank would service the existing equipment. Details on the plans would be revised to reflect this.

**Board Deliberations:**

The Planning Board, acting as lead agency pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) had classified this proposal as an Unlisted action.

The Board voted and APPROVED sending a letter of support for the proposed location of the project to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

```
Vote: Moved by: Burton Seconded by: Kanauer
Chairperson: Hetzke - Aye Bastian - Aye Burton - Aye
            Kanauer - Aye Tydings - Aye
Motion was carried.
```

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

- A final set of site plans with revised notes and details.
- A cross section view of the elevated platform with equipment shed that is proposed to be installed using concrete pillars.
- Written responses to the PRC’s memo dated June 23, 2017.
- It was noted by the Board that portions of the existing wooden fence are in need of repairs. The applicant shall coordinated with the property owner and the Town Engineer to ensure the maintenance work is completed to the Town’s satisfaction.
- The Planning Board voted and agreed to send a letter of support to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the requested area variances.
- The Planning Board directed staff to prepare a draft approval resolution for its review and consideration at the August 15, 2017 meeting.
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.

The Board took NO ACTION on this application as there were no new items to review.

V. GUEST:

1. John Reichert, 1205 Shoecraft Road

- Mr. Nersinger explained that Mr. Reichert requested the Board’s input for his proposal to subdivide his property at 1205 Shoecraft Road, consisting of 19.89 +/- acres, to create a new one (1) acre parcel with the intention of building a home for his son in the future.
- Staff explained the proposed plan created a lot with flag access to Town-owned property that was a drainage way for Green Pine subdivision.
- The proposed subdivided lot contained a barn, thus creating a pre-existing non-conforming use if approved. The barn was considered an accessory use and would also exceed the maximum size limit for the proposed lot size. The board may consider placing a condition of approval at the time of site plan application review that would require the removal of the barn prior to the construction of the new residence and secure a letter of credit from the applicant to ensure the work is done.
- The board asked why the owner proposed flag access to the drainage way. John Reichert explained he felt it was advantageous for the owner of the proposed lot to have access to the drainage way.
- Mr. Reichert stated he would agree to remove the existing barn prior to developing the land. He asked if the board was more favorable to the proposed lot being a: least five (5) acres, thus making the barn more compliant to the Town Code. The board was supportive of a larger lot.
• The board considered the proposal and agreed Mr. Reichert could make a Preliminary and Final application for the proposed subdivision.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 1000 Linden Park, Courtyard Marriott Façade Updates
   • Staff was informed of a Building Permit application that included façade changes and interior renovations to the existing hotel. The proposed exterior updates included EIFS and stone siding in shades of gray and brown. No changes to the site were proposed for the building footprint or parking.
   • The board considered the submitted elevations and plans. The board was supportive of the proposed façade changes as shown on the drawings titled “Exterior Renovation to the Marriott Courtyard Rochester East/Penfield”, sheets 001 through 310, as prepared by Plan Architectural Studio, and dated June 15, 2017.
   • The board had no addition comments. Staff was directed to inform the Building Department that the board had no issues with the proposed renovation plans.

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned at 9:12 PM.

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on August 15, 2017.