PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 08, 2018
The Planning Board held a meeting at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, March 8, 2018 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:  Zach Nersinger, Town Planner
   Mike O’Connor, Assistant Town Engineer
   Doug Sangster, Junior Planner
   Pete Weishaar, Planning Board Attorney
   Alison Sublett, Board Secretary

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

   The board voted and APPROVED the draft meeting minutes for February 22, 2018.

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

   Motion was carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATIONS:

   1. BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, NY 14450, on behalf of Home Leasing LLC, requests an informal discussion before the board with plans for a mixed used development project on an 8.4 +/- acre property at 1821 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road. The property is now or formerly owned by William Wickham and zoned MUD. Application #18-0009, SBL #125.01-1-25.3.

      Nelson Leenhouts, CEO of Home Leasing, began the presentation of the application to the board. Also present were Loren Ranaletta, CEO of Episcopal Senior Life, Brett Garwood and Adam Driscoll of Home Leasing, Don Naetzker, Joe Gibbons, Leticia Fornataro, and Erik Reynolds of SWBR Architects, and Peter Vars of BME Associates.

      • Mr. Leenhouts explained his company, Home Leasing, had developed affordable senior housing around the area and had been looking to develop in Penfield for some time.
His company had partnered with Episcopal Senior Life in order to create a development in the new Mixed Use District.

- Mr. Leenhouts explained the location of the property being adjacent to the YMCA was ideal for their proposed development that included senior living facilities and complementing commercial uses, such as a pharmacy, for the YMCA and its members.
- Mr. Ranaletta stated Episcopal Senior Life had established six (6) facility sites in the County with varying levels of care, living facilities and price ranges.
- Mr. Ranaletta explained their goal was to integrate the needs of their potential residents with services offered at the YMCA as well as future commercial tenants within the project site. This allowed the residents of the proposed facilities greater independence without the need to travel outside their area.
- Mr. Garwood presented some of project components of the proposed project. He explained the goal of the development was to allow senior citizens the ability to “age in place”. The project included a building with 96 units of independent senior living facilities to be owned and operated by Home Leasing. Episcopal Senior Life proposed to operate 66 units of assisted living facilities in two buildings with varying levels of care. A commercial space was proposed within the assisted living facility for a bistro on the ground floor. Two additional buildings were proposed to offer commercial uses as required in the Mixed Use District.
- Mr. Garwood explained the project also proposed open recreational space for a common square surrounded by street parking. Interior complete streets for automobiles, and wide pathways for bicycles and pedestrians were also proposed.
- Mr. Vars presented the technical aspects of the proposed project to the Board and how the plan met the MUD requirements.
  - 162 residential units were proposed at varying levels of care, making the density of residential use approximately seventeen (17) residential units per acre, thus below the maximum of twenty (20) units per acre in the MUD.
  - 39,000 square feet of non-residential space was proposed. This calculation included all common areas such as the bistro, public square, and two commercial buildings proposed to be 5,000 +/- square feet a piece. This square footage was approximately 21.5% +/- total floor space proposed, exceeding the 20% minimum requirement for commercial uses.
  - The recreational/green outdoor spaces made up nearly 25% of the total property, exceeding the minimum requirement of 20%.
  - The existing shared access drive from Fairport Nine Mile Point Road was proposed to remain unchanged on the south side. Complete street features, such as street parking, sidewalks and street trees, were proposed to be added to the north side of the access drive. This access drive was proposed to be dedicated to the Town.
  - The proposed rear drive was designed to be extended to the north to tie in to future developments as required in the MUD.
  - The proposed sidewalks would tie in to the existing sidewalk on Fairport Nine Mile Point Road and interior sidewalks were proposed throughout the development.
  - The primary pedestrian sidewalks were proposed to be wider than standard sidewalks to allow increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic and anchors the commercial and common areas.
The proposed residential use had a low parking demand and was projected to utilize approximately 100 parking spaces for staff and residences.

There were 202 total parking spaces disbursed throughout the site to avoid having large parking fields and allowed for greater landscaped areas.

The property was proposed to be serviced with public water and sewer.

Don Naetzger presented the concepts for architectural design that focused on the public spaces to create an inviting space. He explained the public square was intended to be multi-purpose and could be used for events, such as a farmer’s market. A possible gazebo or performance area may be proposed on one side of the square.

Leticia Fornataro explained that due to grading of the site the public square was intended to be a prominent feature. Three (3) story buildings were proposed in the front, near Fairport Nine Mile Point Road, and possibly four (4) story buildings in the central area, and a one-story residential building on the rear of the property for the assisted living. Pedestrian bridges and hallways were proposed to connect the independent living facilities to the common areas shared within the residential facilities to be accessed by staff and residents.

Ms. Fornataro explained they intended to design architectural features and materials to complement existing residential structures in the area.

Erik Reynolds explained the plans were still conceptual and some of the ideas being considered were balconies and street landscaping to add visual interest, however, nothing had been decided. The applicant planned to use the Mixed Use Manual as their guideline for determining these elements.

Mr. Naetzger and Mr. Reynolds reviewed some of the concept renderings that were submitted with their application to explain their intentions for the design of the site.

Board Questions:

Board member Kanauer pointed out the Mixed Use Manual directed applicants to incorporate architectural elements from the community’s historic character and he felt the proposed building renderings with the flat roofs did not emulate a village atmosphere. He felt the roof designs should be reconsidered and possibly modern interpretations of mills or barn-looking buildings. He also suggested the applicant consider installing car charging stations for their employees as these were becoming popular in the area and the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) offered monetary incentives for their installation.

Board member Tydings asked if the applicants had any similar projects in the area. Mr. Leenhouts answered they had senior living facilities in Ogden, Churchville, Farmington, and Greece and stated he would be amendable to giving Board members a tour of their facilities.

Mr. Ranaletta added they had a site in Henrietta that began as an assisted living facility and affordable senior housing was recently added to that 28 +/- acre property, which was what gave the applicants the idea to pursue this application. Episcopal Senior Life had multiple campuses in the area but this proposed application was a new venture. He explained their industry was discovering a need for services among aging residents in the community and their other facilities offer neighborhood outreach programs that offered access to facilities within their campuses to those seniors who lived within a
five (5) mile radius. Services ranged from meals to fitness classes and other social events.

- Board member Tydings asked what the intended uses of the proposed commercial buildings were. Mr. Vars answered the uses were unknown but the intent was to offer goods or services that met the needs of the senior residents and the visitors of the YMCA.
- Mr. Tydings asked if the commercial buildings would be sold or rented prior to construction commencing. Mr. Vars answered they intended to start construction at the time a tenant was secured.
- Board member Tydings asked if a traffic study would be intended for the proposed application. Mr. Vars confirmed they planned to conduct a traffic study.
- Chairman Hetzke asked for more detail regarding services that may be provided to neighboring residents. Mr. Ranaletta began by explaining their care coordination program which educated and facilitated access and funding for care and facilities for senior citizens. He explained the neighborhood outreach programs were designed to meet the specific needs of each community and varied by location. He detailed some of the differences and services offered at their various facilities and added a market assessment had not yet been conducted for Penfield but they had begun correspondence with the neighboring YMCA to complement their services.
- Chairman Hetzke asked what types of market studies had been done for this proposal and what were their findings. Mr. Ranaletta answered his company was conducting their own demand analysis but anticipated a radius of no more than seven (7) miles of referrals for residents of the site. He explained they were aware of existing senior citizen services and facilities in the area and their intention was to offer different levels of care and services from what existed.
- Mr. Garwood added there was a need for independent living facilities in the greater area as the senior citizen population was growing and a comprehensive market study would be required for their financing package.
- Chairman Hetzke asked if the project would be broken into phases. Mr. Garwood answered they hoped to develop the site in one phase, the most likely scenario being to build the residential units while securing tenants for the commercial areas during that construction.
- Board member Bastian asked if the applicant expected the YMCA to make site changes to accommodate their pedestrian access plan. Mr. Vars answered they were actively corresponding with the YMCA and intended to construct the project with as little or no impact to their neighbors as possible.
- Board member Burton asked if a temporary construction entrance was planned to limit disturbances. Mr. Vars explained that was being pursued and they hoped to have a construction entrance included in the final plans.

Public Comments:
- Kevin Fitzpatrick, YMCA Chief Operation Officer, was supportive of the proposed project and stated they supported responsible development. The main concern of his organization was the safety of its members and community and he had been actively meeting with the applicants to ensure the shared access met their objectives. He added they had a positive relationship with the current owners of Wickham Farms and
expected to have an equally good relationship with the applicants as their services would complement each other. He pointed out the community already had a similar project at the Bayview YMCA, which neighbored Sage Harbor at Baywinde, and whose residents utilize the services at that YMCA location.

- Dillon Dayton, 1692 Dublin Road, had some questions regarding lighting as he stated the exterior lights at the YMCA were visible from his property due to elevation at the site as well as the height of the building and was concerned the heights of the proposed buildings would cause more light pollution.
- Roger Button, 1655 Creek Street, requested the applicants consider opportunities for alternative energy sources such as fuel cells and solar panels.

Applicant Responses:

- Mr. Leenhouts responded to Mr. Button’s suggestion for alternative energy sources by explaining their conceptual flat roof design was intended for mounting solar panels.

Board Discussion:

Following a discussion at its public meeting and subsequent discussion at its work session the same evening, the Penfield Planning Board offers the comments.

The board reviewed the sketch plan application materials and was supportive of the proposed mixed use development featuring 96 independent living units, 66 assisted living units, restaurant/bistro, and two (2) commercial spaces with associated site improvements on the former Wickham Farms property, located at 1821 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road. The applicant may proceed to prepare and submit a Preliminary and Final application for the project. Town staff will provide the necessary application instructions.

The Board voted and APPROVED staff to issue a sketch plan review letter and directed the applicant to provide the following:

- Written responses to the PRC’s memo dated March 1, 2018.
- Written responses to the Plan Architectural Studio memo dated March 5, 2018.
- Stamped engineered site plans that have been designed to meet the criteria of the Town’s Site Plan Design Checklist.
- Colored building elevations and renderings for all structures. Building materials and colors shall be identified on the drawings. Physical sample materials shall be provided at the public hearing meeting.
- Cut sheets for all proposed light fixtures as represented on a lighting plan. Fixtures shall be dark-sky compliant with a pedestrian scale design.
- Full planting schedule for all proposed landscape features shown on a Landscape Plan.
- A SWPPP report shall be provided documenting compliance with stormwater regulations for water quality and quantity will be required for a Preliminary/Final application submission.
- An Engineer’s Report and a parking analysis for the proposed uses included with the project.
• An updated Letter of Intent with updates to the initial responses to the Ten Principles of Mixed Use, as described in the Town’s Mixed Use Development Manual, where applicable.

• Upon submission of an application for Preliminary/Final approval, written responses to the Factors of Consideration for Subdivision, Site Plan, and Conditional Use Permit found in Chapter 250, Articles XI-11.3, XII-12.3, and XIII-13.2 of the Town of Penfield Zoning Ordinance will be required.

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

Motion was carried.

2. DSB Engineers, 2394 Ridgeway Avenue, Rochester, NY 14626, on behalf of Plank Road Development LLC, requests under Chapter 250 Articles XI-11.2 and XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Final Subdivision and Site Plan approval under Town Law §278 to construct 12 single family homes with associated site improvements on 20.25 +/- acres located at 899 Plank road to be known as Crowne Pointe Section 3B. The property is now or formerly owned by Plank Road Development LLC and zoned R-1-20. Application #18P-0006, SBL #094.18-1-6.211.

Walter Baker, DSB Associates, presented the application to the Board. Also present was Steve Phillipone of Plank Road Development LLC.

• The twelve (12) lot subdivision proposed lots ranging from 18,000 to 26,000 square feet.
• The Preliminary approval was granted in 2004, with approval under Town Law 278 for 15,000 square feet lots.
• The applicant had no issues for Project Review Committee (PRC) comments and planned to address them.

Board Questions:
• Chairman Hetzke asked if this section was the second to last phase of the overall Crowne Pointe Subdivision. Mr. Baker confirmed there was one phase remaining in Section 4 with twelve (12) more lots, for which the owner was working on revising with the Town Board in conjunction with a separate project.

Public Comments:
• Dale Merz, 1399 Shoecraft Road, was concerned with a French drain on his property that was supposed to be tied in to the storm drains on the applicant’s property as approved on the Preliminary overall plan. He met with Town staff, who were aware of the matter and had included this information in their PRC memo.
Applicant Responses:
• Mr. Baker was aware of the discrepancy in the submitted drainage plan and had corresponded with staff regarding it. He acknowledged the corrections would be made to the final plans.

Board Discussion:
• Mr. Nersinger informed the Board staff’s concerns were listed in the PRC memo, most of which were addressed in the Public Hearing, and asked if the Board had further concerns with the project.
• The Board was supportive of the PRC memo and directed staff to follow up with the applicant on addressing those concerns.
• The Board had no further concerns with the application.

The Board completed SEQRa for this project as part of the Preliminary Overall approvals for the Crowne Pointe Subdivision in 2004.

The Board voted and APPROVED the application with conditions.

Vote: Moved by: Kanauer Seconded by: Burton

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

Motion was carried.

3. LandTech Surveying and Planning, PLLC, 710 Latta Road, Rochester, NY 14612, on behalf of Penfield Creek Street LLC, requests under Chapter 250 Articles VI-6.1, XI-11.2, and XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Subdivision, Site Plan, and EPOD Permit approval for a seventeen (17) lot residential subdivision for sixteen (16) new single family homes with associated site improvements on a 16.63 +/- acre property located at 1698 Creek Street to be known as the Capstone subdivision. The property is now or formerly owned by Penfield creek Street LLC and zoned R-1-20. Application #18P-0007, SBL #108.19-1-50.1.

Ed Martin, LandTech Surveying and Planning, presented the application to the Board. Also present was Louis Masi of Penfield Creek Street LLC.
• The proposed seventeen (17) lots were all Code compliant.
• Public utilities were planned to be utilized.
• Due to the slope of the site drainage moved down toward Creek Street and would go into a proposed infiltration basin.
• Soil tests confirmed the infiltration basin could support a 25-year rain event.
• The developer had made efforts to maintain the woodlot buffer behind the proposed new residences in order to buffer existing neighbors.
• With regards to County Development Review Committee (DRC) and Town PRC comments the applicant wished staff to reconsider their comments regarding boulevard-style entrance, sidewalks, and staggered setbacks.
- Mr. Martin explained the intent of the landscaped entrance was not only aesthetic but also offered visual buffering to neighboring properties when automobiles travelled down the proposed road.
- The cul-de-sac landscaped island had been successfully installed by the applicant in other projects but he would be amenable to removing it if required by the Board.
- Mr. Martin explained a development of this size would not create a demand for sidewalks and the existing sidewalk on Creek Street was on the west side of the road so there would be no connection point to the new neighborhood.
- Staff had recommended staggered setbacks for the residences in the PRC memo and Mr. Martin stated the length of the proposed road factored in with the change of grade and proposed landscaping would mitigate any concerns regarding a possible tunnel effect by not staggering the setbacks of the houses.

**Board Questions:**
- Board member Burton referenced the PRC memo that expressed concerns regarding the shape of the proposed cul-de-sac island causing a maintenance issue. Mr. Martin answered the same geometry had been utilized in other area developments without issues involving emergency access. Mr. Martin stated the applicant would remove the island if required by the Board.
- Board member Burton asked if the shape of the island would pose problems for snow plowing and storage. Mr. Martin explained most plow operators prefer to plow against traffic and direct snow to the outside edge. He added he was confident they could work with staff to develop a design that functioned for all parties.
- Board member Burton expressed staff was concerned with the plan for long-term maintenance of the boulevard-style entrance and asked what the benefits of this design would be. Mr. Martin explained the landscaping did not completely shield the lights coming from the proposed street to neighbors across the road on Creek Street but it would offer some buffering as well as create a distinguished entrance to that new neighborhood. The applicant was amenable to adding some landscaping on the neighboring Creek Street property to mitigate light pollution to his property.
- Board member Kanauer asked if any area variances were planned to be requested. Mr. Martin stated the applicant had no plans to request variances for this application.

**Public Comments:**
- Walter Mauldin, 1668 Creek Street, expressed concerns regarding the application. He was supportive of the proposed landscaped entrance and island and felt it encouraged safer traffic flow and would enhance the character of the neighborhood. He was concerned with the effect of development on the existing mature trees and suggested the developer consult an arborist to preserve as many as possible.
- Tony Borelli, 493 Harrogate Drive, supported the proposed landscaped entrance as well as the developers desire to preserve trees where possible.
- David Till, 1668 Creek Street, was concerned with possible clearing along his shared property line with the applicant where there existed an access easement.
- Mel Traub, former owner of 1668 Creek Street, was not in support of the proposed project and stated the applicant had not investigated possible negative impacts to
drainage on his former property and felt the development was too dense and not in character with the neighborhood.

- Robert Metz, 50 Bunker Hill Drive, was in support of the application and explained the wooded area as seen from his backyard had a split rail fence that had not been maintained and fallen trees and brush that needed to be cleared. He had spoken to Mr. Masi who agreed to remove specific trees while preserving others chosen by Mr. Metz in order to improve his viewshed.

- Eric Ammerman, 175 City View Drive, was in support of the landscaped entrance but concerned with the location of the property line as he had believed two mature trees were shared by him and the applicant and wished for those trees to remain.

- Tracy Ammerman, 175 City View Drive, was concerned with the existing split rail fence as she and Mr. Ammerman had maintained it. She was also concerned with drainage and light pollution as cars travelled up the new road since there was no dense coverage of trees existing behind her property.

Applicant Responses:

- Mr. Masi addressed Mr. Mauldin’s concerns regarding the preservation of trees and explained they desired to preserve at least a ten (10) foot deep area of the healthy trees on the rear of each property that had existing trees. He explained it would be necessary to clear the front yards of each lot to allow construction of the homes but new trees could be planted there and added that trees were generally desirable to home buyers and had no issues with consulting an arborist if the Board requested it.

- Mr. Martin addressed Mr. Till’s concern with tree clearing along the property boundary and confirmed they did not propose to clear any trees along the north property line.

- Mr. Masi explained Mr. Traub had approached him to purchase his property, 1668 Creek Street, however the parcel did not allow for a developable lot configuration and Mr. Masi declined his offer.

- Mr. Masi addressed Mr. Ammerman’s concerns regarding the locations of property lines by explaining surveyors would place stakes at the corners of all the new properties in the subdivision. He stated trees made properties more attractive to buyers and he was amenable to preserving as many as possible.

- Mr. Martin addressed concerns regarding the existing split rail fence, which was on the applicant’s property and most likely removed if it were in disrepair. Due to the grade of the site lights from the cars travelling east on the proposed road would not leave the site as the grade was lower than the properties on City View Drive. This existing grade would also not allow water to travel east onto the properties on City View Drive.

Board Deliberations:

- Mr. Nersinger explained staff’s concerns with the proposed landscaped entrance and cul-de-sac island as they caused maintenance challenges for Town staff. Mr. O’Connor added the proposed cul-de-sac island was located over utilities and tree roots would be invasive to those utilities as they grew.

- Board member Burton was supportive of the landscaped cul-de-sac island and stated the extra time a snow plow truck would spend was minimal compared to the aesthetic benefits, the Board agreed.
• Staff informed the Board the boulevard-style entrance would have to be approved by the County as Creek Street was a County road. The Board was supportive of the landscaped entrance and agreed the applicant should provide their correspondence with the County DOT regarding a permit.
• Board member Kanauer asked if any developments were established in recent years with a similarly designed entrance. Chairman Hetzke stated Graceland Estates had a landscaped median at the entrance to their subdivision, staff produced images of the entrance for the Board’s consideration.
• Mr. Nersinger explained the maintenance of existing landscaped boulevard-style entrance would have to be funded by a Special Improvement District that included maintenance of any drainage systems.
• Board member Burton asked if street lights were proposed for the application. Mr. Nersinger informed the board only one light was proposed at the entrance to the subdivision, as required by the County.
• The Board requested the Town Landscape Consultant review the proposed landscaping plans for the application.
• The Board discussed the questions of tree removal and agreed a tree preservation plan should be submitted.
• Mr. Nersinger asked if the Board recommended a Sidewalk Waiver for the project. The Board agreed the size of the proposed subdivision did not warrant a requirement for sidewalks.
• Staff was concerned about the proposed location of a drainage swale at the rear of the lots that was close to the proposed foundations. The Board agreed the swale should be relocated to allow larger backyard and accessory structures without affecting drainage.
• The Board discussed the PRC recommendation for staggered setbacks for the proposed residences, staff agreed to clarify the intent of that comment before their next work session.

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

• Revised site plans and written responses to the PRC’s memo dated February 21, 2018. As stated by staff in the Board’s work session, the suggestion for staggered setback in the memo will be reviewed before the next meeting clarification.
• Review of the Conservation Board’s memo from its March 6, 2018 meeting. The applicant shall describe the method and symbology for tagging trees that may be preserved, trimmed, or removed.
• The applicant shall provide correspondence with the Monroe County Department of Transportation regarding the proposal for a landscaped divided entrance from Creek Street.
• Recommendations from the Board’s landscape consultant for appropriate plantings in the proposed landscaped island in the cul-de-sac. Said plantings should be tolerant to salt from snow plowing maintenance. In addition, due to the proposed designs for sewer and water services, which were located throughout the cul-de-sac, tree plantings should be avoided in this area.
• The Board was supportive of a full sidewalk waiver for the proposed subdivision. The applicant will be required to submit a sidewalk waiver request to the Town Board per the Town’s Sidewalk Policy.

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

Motion was carried.

4. Secor Engineering, PLLC, 12848 State Route 31, Savannah, NY 13146, on behalf of Rochester Gas & Electric, requests under Chapter 250 Article XI-11.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for a cold storage building addition with associated site improvements on a 19.4 +/- acre property located 1270 Plank Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Rochester Gas & Electric and zoned RA-2. Application #18P-0008, SBL #095.03-1-33.

This application was WITHDRAWN by the applicant.

5. Mitchell Design Build, 7607 Commons Boulevard, Victor, NY 14564, on behalf of Lynn Perry Properties, LLC, requests under Chapter 250 Article XI-11.2, XII-12.2 and XIII-13.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/final Subdivision and Site Plan approval and for an expansion to an existing Conditional Use Permit for the construction of two (2) new self-storage building, including one (1) apartment unit on site, and additions to existing storage structures with associated site improvements on a 3.14 +/- acre property at 1677 Penfield Road and 10 Plaza Circle. The properties are now or formerly owned by Lynn Perry Properties, LLC and zoned LB and GB. Application #18P-0011, SBL #’s 138.08-1-31 and 138.08-1-42.4.

Spencer Read, Mitchell Design Build, presented the application to the Board. Also present was Kevin Farrell of Lynn Perry Properties, LLC.

• Since the board granted approval to the applicant on April 27, 2017 for their application to the same sight the owner discovered the demand for storage unit sizes had changed and submitted a revised application for this proposal which included access to an increased number drive-up 10’x 20’ sized units.
• This application proposed a three-story building on the property at 10 Plaza Circle. The previously approved setbacks, green spaces and impervious surfaces would remain unchanged from the previous application.
• This plan proposed a one (1) story building with a two (2) story appearance on the front lot at 1677 Penfield Road. Design elements of the building would remain the same and thus be less impacting to their residential neighbors.
• The proposed plan exceeded one (1) acre of disturbance as the rear building would be redeveloped. A draft Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) had just been submitted to staff that had some minimal changes compared to the previous plan.

Board Questions:
• Board member Bastian asked for an explanation regarding the snow storage plan. Mr. Read explained the snow from the front of the property was proposed to be moved to the rear and the perimeter of the property adjacent to swale. The green spaces would also be utilized and the bio-retention area would be avoided.
• Board member Bastian asked if the architectural features would be similar to what was previously approved. Mr. Read answered the finishes on the proposed office building at 1677 Penfield Road had not changed, however, the rear storage building finishes were different. The rear building would be less visible from the roads due to the lower grade so the proposed exterior finishes were more modest on the longer sides with enhanced signage and finishes such as storefront windows and two-toned siding on the end walls, which were visible from Plaza Circle and the neighboring residential apartments.
• The proposed accent colors has changed to blue and yellow, which were the Life Storage brand colors. Mr. Read would bring material and color samples to the board’s next meeting.
• Board member Burton asked if the density of units had changed with the new configuration of units. Mr. Farrell answered there was a net gain of approximately 60 units for the proposed plan. He added the configurations of the units met the demand for more automobile accessible units on the ground floor.
• Board member Burton asked if the proposed units on the ground floor were intended for vehicle storage. Mr. Farrell confirmed that was the intention as there was a greater demand for climate-controlled vehicle storage.
• Board member Burton asked if the customers were required to disconnect the batteries and extract most of the fuel from the vehicles prior to storing them on site. Mr. Farrell explained a list of requirements had to be met for proper vehicle storage that could be provided to the Board. Mr. Read explained the proposed front building had an option for non-climate controlled vehicle storage which would require either a sprinkler system or fire-rated walls. The proposed rear storage building was proposed to have a sprinkler system.

Board Discussion:
• Board member Bastian reviewed the discussion regarding the applicant’s previously approved plan that focused on the façade of the proposed storefront building and its appearance from the neighboring properties and requested the applicant submit material samples for the Board’s review.
• Staff pointed out the submitted rendering indicated the same gray exterior finishes for the storefront building on Penfield Road but with different accent colors as it was now proposed to be branded for Life Storage’s corporate standards.
• Mr. Nersinger informed the Board the Fire Marshal had concerns with emergency vehicle access around the storefront building to the proposed three-story building as the turning radius was narrow and the road was only 18 feet wide rather than the
required 26 feet. He explained widening the road would change the lot coverage and require another area variance. Staff suggested removing one of the storage bays from the front building to create a shorter building. The Board agreed the matter should be handled by appropriate staff to ensure safe access for emergency vehicles.

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

- Review of the company’s storage policy for vehicles, which are anticipated to be stored in the proposed 10x20 foot units. The applicant shall provide the board with a copy of the policy in writing.
- Review of the updated site plans, dated March 8, 2018, by the Penfield Fire Marshal for turning radii and access around Building #2 as represented on the site plans.
- Staff’s review of the written responses to the PRC’s memo that were submitted on March 8, 2018.
- Provide the board with physical building material samples and colors for the proposed structures identified as Building #1 and Building #2.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Tydings

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

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

2. T.Y. Lin International, 255 East Avenue, Rochester, NY 14604, on behalf of the India Community Center of Rochester, requests under Chapter 250 Articles XII-12.2 and XIII-13.3 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final site Plan approval and an expansion to a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 3,342 +/- square foot activities building with associated site improvements on a 20.41 +/- acre property located at 2171 Monroe Wayne County Line Road. The property is now of formerly owned by the India
Community Center of Rochester, Inc. and zoned RA-2. Application #18P-0003, SBL #141.02-1-5.1.

Board member Burton recused himself from this application.

- Mr. Nersinger informed the Board staff had sent letter to the surrounding neighbors requesting additional information regarding noise generation from the site with any specific details, dates and times about disturbances that may have happened in the past. Seven (7) written responses were received and provided to the Board. Not all the letters listed specific dates and times when noise occurred. The applicant provided responses to details regarding the camp operation and addressing lighting issues. Mr. Nersinger reminded that board, for the record, this application was for Site Plan review of an activities building.
- The Board discussed with Mr. Weishaar how to best review this application and agreed the current application before the board was a separate matter from the previously reviewed and approved expansion to the Conditional Use Permit for the ICC summer camp program that was concluded November 9, 2017.
- The Board agreed the request for an expansion to the Conditional Use Permit and site plan approval for the proposed new activities building could offer noise mitigation for the summer camp. The Board also agreed any possible violations to the Conditional Use Permit would be addressed by staff or this Board at a later date.

The Board voted and TABLED the application pending the submission of the following item:

- The board directed staff to prepare a draft approval resolution for the request for site plan approval of the proposed new activities building on the property for its review and consideration at the March 22, 2018 work session meeting.

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

Motion was carried.

V. ACTION ITEM:
1. Ellison Heights Phase 2 site plan concerns

- Mr. Nersinger informed the Board a resident had contacted a Town Board member regarding one of the steep slopes at the Ellison Heights development.
- Mr. Nersinger explained the developer had begun excavation of one of the slopes for a stairway last fall. Weather had prevented the further development of that area and as winter had progressed the slope had begun to erode.
• Board member Burton asked if any measures were taken to stabilize the area. Mr. O'Connor stated silt fence was installed. Town Engineering staff had conducted regular inspections and spoken with the developer regarding this issue understanding the seasonal weather limited the current options for stabilization.
• Board member Burton asked if they were to consider abandonment of the stairway. Mr. Nersinger confirmed the resident wished board to consider removing the stairway from the approved site plan and added the stairway was a connection from the apartments to an existing sidewalk on Penfield Road.
• The Board agreed the previously approved site plan should remain unchanged and took NO ACTION on this proposal.

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on April 12, 2018.