PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 12, 2018
The Planning Board held a meeting at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, July 12, 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
Jim Burton
Bob Kanauer
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 June 14, 2018.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Burton
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 under Chapter 250 Articles XI-11.2 and XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Site Plan approval to allow for a mixed use development project with associated site improvements on 10.5 +/- acres located at 1821 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road and portions of 1835 and 1787 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road. The properties are now or formerly owned by William and Debbie Wickham and The Young Men’s Christian Association of Greater Rochester and zoned MUD. Application #18P-0022, SBL #s 125.01-1-25.3, 125.01-1-34.13, 125.01-1-3.111.

Nelson Leenhouts, Home Leasing, presented the application to the board. Also present were Loren Ranaletta, Episcopal Senior Life, Don Naetzker and Joe Gibbons of SWBR, Peter Vars, BME Associates, and Brett Garwood of Home Leasing.
• Mr. Leenhouts explained their plan was to build a senior living community for residents to age in place.
• The project was proposed to be named Penfield Square.
• Home Leasing proposed to develop the site and construct and manage the independent living apartments. Their partner, Episcopal Senior Life, planned to construct and manage the assisted living and memory care buildings.
• Home Leasing owned twelve (12) senior living communities in the area.
• They have been working with the YMCA to integrate their infrastructure and provide shared services.

Loren Ranaletta informed the Board of Episcopal Senior Life’s business model for the project.
• Episcopal Senior Life had six (6) nursing homes with a seventh site under contract in Livingston County.
• Mr. Ranaletta explained how each site offered blended programs to meet the needs of the local communities and engage seniors in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Don Naetzker presented renderings and elevations to the board.
• The plans were designed to meet the requirements of Zone A in the Mixed Use District with complete streets and public spaces.
• There were three public spaces in the plan, the main square being the largest.
• The main public square was intended to be multi-functional with conceptual uses such as a farmer’s market, food truck rodeo, and outdoor concerts as possible functions.
• The square was designed with rain gardens and lined with trees.
• The pedestrian spine with outdoor dining and a complete street design was a second area of outdoor space that was accessible to the general public.
• The third public space was located on the southwest corner of the project area and proposed to be an enclosed garden with seating.

Peter Vars presented the site plan of the proposed project.
• The project encompassed 1821 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road as well as portions of land from 1787 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road and 1835 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road to develop the site.
• The plan proposed to subdivide the properties into five (5) lots, one (1) of which was to contain the entrance drive to be dedicated to the Town.
• Home Leasing proposed a three to four (3 – 4) story building on the northeast end of the property for 113 independent living units identified as Lot 1.
• Episcopal Senior Life proposed a one (1) story building for memory care with 30 living units, and a two (2) story building for assisted living with 40 units identified as Lot 2.
• The proposed development encompassed 183 residential units, which was eighteen (18) units per acre.
• All structures were within the maximum height limits, the tallest building proposed to be four (4) stories tall at 53 feet in height.
• Lot 1 was proposed to be 4.7 +/- acres with a 30,285 +/- square foot building footprint for a total square footage of 104,800 +/- square feet in the independent living building.
This lot was proposed to contain the 0.75 +/- acre community green space surrounded on three sides by complete streets and the 20 foot wide pedestrian spine running north-south within the property.

- Lot 2 was proposed to be 2.36 +/- acres and contained two memory gardens, which were available for the residents of the Episcopal Senior Life center as well as 0.4 +/- acres of public open space.
- Lot 3 was less than half an acre and proposed for a non-residential use building up to 9,000 square feet footprint, allowing for outdoor dining.
- Lot 4 was located on the southeast corner of the property and proposed to be just over a quarter of an acre and allocated for commercial development with a building footprint up to 3,000 square feet.
- Lot 5 was proposed to be less than an acre located at the rear of the property along Road “B”. This area was reserved for future development, allowing for a complete street design in the future.
- The applicant was confident the minimum 20% requirement for non-residentially used spaces could be met and requested the Board approve 37,000 square feet of non-residential space prior to tenants and specific building designs being identified. Mr. Vars explained it was difficult to determine specific design elements prior to securing tenants for the commercial spaces and requested the Board allow for some flexibility with regards to building designs once tenants were identified.
- The 20% requirement for community open space, which was calculated to be 1.9 +/- acres for this project, was met with a mix of spaces on the site.
- The 0.75 +/- acres for main community space was designed with amenities, landscaping and pedestrian connectivity to allow general public use as well as programmed events.
- The building coverage for the total holdings was proposed to be less than 20%, or 1.8 acres. The total green space was calculated to be 40% or 3.9 acres.
- The access road [Road “A”] was proposed to be dedicated to the Town. The road was 30 feet wide, lined with shade trees, and signalized at the intersection with Route 250. The applicant would verify it was designed to meet the Town’s standards. The applicant had initialized discussions with the Town Board regarding road dedication.
- Road “B” was proposed to be dedicated to the Town as a complete street with street parking, sidewalks, and treed lawn areas. The remaining roads circulating within the site were proposed to remain private.
- The traffic study would be completed prior to the August meeting of the Board.
- Due to the proposed residential uses only a portion of the 183 parking spaces were anticipated to be needed for residents. Approximately 120 parking spaces were projected to be utilized by residents and staff, the remaining would be open to the public. The applicants would verify these numbers based on parking at their similarly used facilities.
- Separate parking areas were available for residents and employees along the rear of the residential structures. Street parking was intended for general public use.
- Street lighting was proposed along the pedestrian corridor as well as parking areas. The landscape plan included a generous amount of street trees, foundation plantings along the buildings, and landscaping within the public green spaces.
- A pedestrian network was proposed throughout the site to encourage visitors and residents to walk from place to place within the mixed use district.
• Drainage was proposed to be directed east to west to the existing pond on the YMCA property, which would be re-designed to accommodate the additional runoff.

• The site would be serviced with sanitary sewers with the installation of a pump station and directing sewers to the east side of Route 250. The pump station would allow for future access to sewers for development to the north.

• The existing transmission line for MCWA has a 50 foot easement on portions of the project site, which had to be avoided in planning the location of the buildings.

• The site was located in an agricultural district, so the project was a Type I Action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) and the applicant requested the Board declare its intent to be the lead agency for a coordinated review process.

Joe Gibbons, SWBR, presented the architectural design concepts to the Board.

• Since the previous sketch plan application some revisions were made to the proposed buildings. The independent living building was increased by 17 units, and assisted living facility was reduced to a two (2) story building, and the memory care building was reduced in size.

• Colors and elevations of the buildings have been modified based on staff and Board comments from the former sketch plan application. Colored elevations for the proposed residential buildings were submitted as well as concept sketches for the commercial spaces.

• Gable roofs, horizontal lap siding, balconies and patios, and some traditional architectural elements were proposed for the independent living building.

• The assisted living facility had a different color palette with glass panels on the ground floor and red brick siding sections.

• The memory care portion of the building was more traditional in design featuring pitched rooflines.

• The focal points of the buildings face the pedestrian spine.

• The proposed bistro and (community) café attached to the assisted living facility would be open to the public.

• The applicant plans to have retail uses in the commercial outbuildings with outdoor seating areas and canopies to engage the pedestrian spine.

• The buildings were designed distinctly to be different from each other and appear contemporary with a nod to traditional elements.

Board Questions:

• Chairman Hetzke explained this application was the first in the new MUD zoning district and the Town plans to provide a development that would stand the test of time. He then asked what experience the applicants had with mixed use development and what types of commercial spaces were successful. Bret Garwood answered Home Leasing did have experience with mixed use development and explained context was important in the development of appropriate uses. He listed area developments in urban parts of Rochester, that Home Leasing was involved with, which provided various housing options and attracted visitors to the development with related commercial uses. Mr. Garwood explained it was difficult to determine the types of commercial tenants that would be attracted to the site prior to development but anticipated food service,
medical and professional services and other uses that did not create a heavy demand for parking.

- Mr. Ranaletta added their developments evaluated the local neighborhoods of each of their sites. He expected the commercial uses for this proposed project to expand on the YMCA’s services with medical services such as physical therapists and personal services such as beauty shops.

- Board member Tydings asked if a public pharmacy was possible as a tenant within the care facility. Mr. Ranaletta explained pharmacies were difficult to incorporate in a long-term care facility as they were highly regulated. He stated they could ask their pharmacological contractor to consider opening a retail space on the site.

- Board member Tydings asked for the location of their facility in Greece and their residents’ age range. Mr. Ranaletta answered it was called Beatrice Place and located at 600 Denise Road, the age of the residents ranged from 62 to 95 years old.

- Mr. Naetzker added the proposed footprints of the commercial spaces may be altered to allow smaller commercial units for multiple small businesses. Mr. Garwood explained the expected small businesses would generate low-density traffic that was desirable for this project.

- Board member Burton asked how the applicant planned to use the proposed 37,000 square feet of non-residential space in order to avoid vacancies, did they have an alternate plan for those spaces? Mr. Garwood would work to develop an answer to this question and explained a substantial portion of the non-residential space that was calculated included support areas such as the dining facility and bistro as well as other areas that supported the residential uses. He added their proposal to secure tenants prior to designing and constructing the commercial spaces would help in managing their commercial spaces.

- Mr. Leenhouts added that in his experience the reason for vacant retail spaces was related to management.

- Chairman Hetzke asked what type of tenants they had at their other facilities. Mr. Leenhouts listed barbershops, florists, and IT service among their retail tenants in their urban mixed use development. Home Leasing employed a full-time staff member to manage their commercial tenant spaces and they had no issues securing tenants.

- Board member Kanauer asked if the pavilion illustrated in the public square for the sketch plan application was no longer being considered. Mr. Garwood answered they had not made a final determination and were open to discussing the design possibilities.

- Chairman Hetzke asked if a material such as geo-grid could be considered to prolong the seasonal use of the public square and allow for vehicle access. Mr. Vars was familiar with geo-grid and explained its drainage properties tended to dry out grass, he favored alternative hardscape that had a better long-term appearance. The applicants agreed this was a good suggestion and were open to suggestions for possible uses.

- Board member Kanauer asked what accommodations for electric vehicles were considered for independent living section of housing. Mr. Garwood stated electric vehicle charging stations were installed at some of the other facilities but they had no determined the number or location of charging stations for this site. He added they were open to discussing this item and favored Green building designs and listed the energy conservation standards Home Leasing complied with on other projects.
Board member Kanauer explained he was concerned with residents who owned completely electric vehicles not being able to use them as there was no accommodations to charge them. Mr. Garwood agreed to investigate this amenity.

Chairman Hetzke asked how many occupants of the independent living facility were expected to be actively employed. Mr. Garwood answered they would look at their other comparable facilities and provide that number to the Board, it was approximated to be ten (10) to twenty (20) percent of their residents. He explained they did know their parking demand based on their other similar facilities and added their traffic study would include trip counts.

Board member Bastian asked if public transportation would service the site. Mr. Vars answered Route 250 was a public bus route and the Genesee Transportation Council (GTC) would determine if a bus stop was warranted. Mr. Garwood stated Episcopal Senior Life offered transportation services to its residents and Home Leasing planned to contribute funds to allow their residents to utilize this service.

Board member Tydings stated the signalized intersection took a long time to get approved and asked if it was sufficient to accommodate the projected traffic or would the intersection need to be improved. Mr. Vars explained the signalized intersection and access drive were redesigned in 2013, as part of the YMCA expansion, to support four-way traffic. Turn lanes for ingress and egress to the site were added at that time as well. The previous traffic study incorporated the Wickham Farms peak seasonal activity. The proposed use in this application generated a lower trip count than the Wickham Farms operation on the same site.

Board member Tydings asked if the construction of the development be phased. Mr. Garwood explained they hoped to construct the residential buildings in conjunction with one another and hoped to construct the commercial spaces once construction commenced on those residential buildings, depending on when tenants were secured.

Board member Tydings asked if Road “A” would be used for construction access. Mr. Vars answered they preferred to avoid Road “A” and were working on obtaining a separate construction entrance that would not impact the YMCA operations.

Public Comments:

Kevin Gallagher, 1973 Dublin Road, had concerns with traffic flows on the site. He was opposed to tall buildings and outdoor lighting that may obstruct views of the surrounding rural area.

Kevin Fitzpatrick, Greater Rochester YMCA, supported the proposed project and did not believe it would impact traffic conditions. He supported the proposed public square and hoped the YMCA could utilize this area for programs such as outdoor yoga or Tai Chi.

Ed Lindskoog, 40 Willow Pond Way, spoke on behalf of the Penfield Trails Committee for the desire to connect Harris Whalen Park to Veterans Park. He expressed support the project as it offered connectivity along the property to adjacent parcels.
Board Deliberation:

Following the presentation of this application during the public hearing the board continued its discussion in its subsequent work session.

The Board voted and declared the proposed application a TYPE I Action pursuant to SEQR.

Vote: Moved by: Bastian Seconded by: Tydings

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

Motion was carried.

The Board voted and directed staff to send Lead Agency letters to involved and interested agencies for the coordinated environmental review of the application.

Vote: Moved by: Kanauer Seconded by: Bastian

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:

- Revised site plans and written responses per the comments issued by the PRC in its memo dated June 29, 2018.
- Completion of the required traffic study for the proposed project.
- The Town Engineer’s review of the proposed designs for the new regional stormwater management pond to be located on the Eastside YMCA’s land which will serve the drainage needs for the proposed project, along with other green infrastructure practices.
- Electric car stations shall be identified on the site plan and utility plan.
- Additional pedestrian-scale lighting shall be added along the central pedestrian corridor.
- Staff was directed to review design alternatives for the proposed crosswalk along Road “A” that provide pedestrian connectivity from the Eastside Y to the project site.
- Input from the Town’s Landscape Consultant regarding the proposed landscape and how the board could expect the plantings to mature with respect to height and rate growth.
• Input from the Board’s Architectural Consultant regarding latest revisions to the building designs. In general the board felt that more creativity and interesting design elements can be incorporated to each of the proposed buildings. An emphasis was placed on revising the façade of the proposed memory care building as it has a large massing fronting along Road “B”. In addition, the color palette chosen for the proposed assisted living was viewed as being too dull for the pedestrian corridor. Physical building materials and color samples will be required with future project updates. All future revised building elevations shall indicate the proposed building materials and colors with callouts.

Vote: Moved by: Burton Seconded by: Bastian

Motion was carried.

2. LaBella Associates, 300 State Street, Rochester, NY 14614, on behalf of Rochester Gas & Electric, requests under Chapter 250 Article XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Site Plan approval to allow for a building addition and parking expansion with associated site improvements on 19.4 +/- acres located at 1270 Plank Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Rochester Gas & Electric and zoned RA-2. Application #18P-0023, SBL #095.03-1-33.

Bob Steeler, presented the application to the board.
• The addition was proposed to be 70 feet by 25 feet in size and serve as a storage garage.
• A doorway from the building would provide access to the area.
• The proposed addition would have a roof and three walls and be open on one side.
• The proposed project included the development of a twelve (12) space employee parking lot as there was no designated staff parking area on the existing site.
• The proposed project created 0.5 +/- acre of disturbance.
• The existing location for the proposed addition was gravel and pavement, which would be restored following construction.
• 5,000 +/- square feet of additional pavement was proposed to be added for the new parking lot.
• Stormwater was proposed to be directed to the existing wetland on the property.
• The applicant was in the process of the responding to the Project Review Committee (PRC) Memo and had no concerns regarding the comments.

Board Questions:
• Board member Tydings asked if the materials for the proposed addition would match the existing building. Mr. Steeler confirmed the metal siding would match the existing exterior.
• Board member Tydings asked if the existing landscaping would remain. Mr. Steeler confirmed no changes to landscaping were proposed.
Chairman Hetzke asked if any outdoor lighting was proposed. Mr. Steeler answered there that they planned to add fixtures to the two existing light poles near the proposed parking area to expand the light flow. He added some lights may be added within the addition but none were proposed on the exterior of the structure.

Public Comments:
No public comments were made for this application.

Board Deliberation:
Following the presentation of this application during the public hearing the board continued its discussion in its subsequent work session.
- Board member Tydings stated his visit to the site showed the area of development did not encroach on neighboring properties.
- Chairman Hetzke requested a condition be added to the Approval Resolution that lighting would be reviewed by staff to ensure the proposed lighting would not impact neighboring properties.
- The Board had no further concerns with this application.

The Board voted and APPROVED the completed Short EAF for the application.

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

Motion was carried.

The Board voted and APPROVED the application with conditions.

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

Motion was carried.

3. Marks Engineering, 42 Beeman Street, Canandaigua, NY 14424, on behalf of William and Debbie Wickham, requests under Chapter 250 Article XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Site Plan approval to allow for a farm market operation with associated site improvements at 1303 and 1315 Sweets Corners Road and 1689 Dublin Road. The properties are now or formerly owned by William and Debbie Wickham and zoned MUD, RA-2, and RR-1. Application #18P-0024, SBL #s 125.01-1-24, 125.01-1-22.1, 125.01-1-21.

Bill Wickham presented the application to the board. Also present were Brennan Marks, Marks Engineering, and Debbie Wickham.
• Mr. Wickham explained his business was running two retail venues and he desired to consolidate these operations.

• He met with the Town Board on December 2017 to discuss the agricultural uses with regards to the Willmes’ Conservation Easement. In January 2018 the Town Board passed a resolution to allow development within the farmstead area of that property.

• Mr. Wickham contacted all his neighbors who received public notices from the Town regarding the public hearing and offered two (2) public informational meetings and worked to address their concerns.

• A berm was installed on the southern property boundary and 30 eight (8’) foot evergreens were planted as a buffer to the neighbors on Edenfield Road.

• The Hay Ride was re-routed away from the residential neighbors and the corn field was proposed to act as a buffer for the remaining rear neighbors.

• Mr. Wickham added he was willing to address any noise concerns and maintained an open dialogue with all his neighbors who reached out to him.

• In May 2018 he obtained a Grade and Fill Permit to install the gravel parking lot in time for the U-Pick season.

• They received the PRC Memo and County comments and had no concerns with addressing these comments. With regard the County comment on licenses for food service, his operation was under the jurisdiction of State Ag & Markets Law for food services.

• He met with the Town Fire Marshal and agreed to relocate a fire hydrant to service the proposed buildings that were more than 400 feet from the public road.

• They planned to construct the parking area first followed by the construction of the main farm market building and Birthday Barn. The two (2) additional buildings were proposed to be constructed at a later date to be determined when their operations expanded.

Brennan Marks presented the site plan to the Board.

• Site plans were being revised to address PRC and County comments.

• Four buildings were proposed for the project, the main building being 7,000 +/- square feet, and the remaining three (3) buildings were approximately 3,000 +/- square feet.

• A connection to sanitary sewers was proposed from Edenfield Road.

• Public water, gas and electric were available from Sweets Corners Road.

• A new hydrant was proposed on 1303 Sweets Corners Road to be located between the three (3) new buildings.

• Stormwater was proposed to be directed to a new stormwater pond on the west corner of the property. A grass swale was proposed between 1303 and 1315 Sweets Corners Road that would treat stormwater prior to directing it to the roadside drainage ditch.

• The project did not encroach on the Federal Wetlands on the western neighboring property as construction was proposed to take place on existing agricultural fields and avoided undisturbed areas.

Board Questions:

• Board member Burton asked if the applicant was comfortable with the proposed limits of the farmstead area. Mr. Wickham answered they were satisfied with the proposed
delineation as it met their needs for the near future and he was aware he would need to request and expansion from the Town Board in order to develop outside that area in the future.

Public Comments:
- Kevin Gallagher, 1973 Dublin Road, was opposed to the application and was concerned with increased traffic to the area, he suggested the applicant offer delivery service to their CSA members. He was also concerned with the proposed off-site parking addition and did not agree the operation required a large parking expansion. He was also concerned with the impacts to the Wilmes Conservation easement.

Board Deliberation:
Following the presentation of this application during the public hearing the board continued its discussion in its subsequent work session.
- Board member Burton requested staff notify the Town Board that this board was satisfied with the proposed farmstead area.
- The board discussed the proposed plan and submitted materials and had no concerns with the proposed project.

The Board voted and APPROVED staff send a letter to the Town Board in support of the proposed Farmstead Area delineation.

Vote: Moved by: Burton Seconded by: Bastian
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:
- Revised site plans and written responses per the comments issued by the PRC in its memo dated June 29, 2018.
- Staff was directed to issue a letter to the Town Board stating its support for the proposed boundaries and size of the farmstead area as represented on the site plan. The establishment of the farmstead area is a requirement of the Easement and will have to be formalized by a mutual agreement between the Town of Penfield and the owners at a later Town Board meeting.
- Staff was directed to prepare a draft approval resolution for the proposed project for the Board’s review and consideration at the August 9, 2018 meeting.

Vote: Moved by: Burton Seconded by: Bastian
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.

2. Marathon Engineering, 239 Cascade Drive, Rochester, NY 14614, on behalf of Pellittiere & Jonsson, PLLC, requests under Chapter 250 Articles VI-6.1 and XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Site Plan and EPOD Permit approval to allow for the construction of a professional office building with associated site improvements on a 0.75 +/- acre property located at 2316 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road. The property is now or formerly owned by 2316 Nine Mile Point LLC and zoned BN-R. Application #18P-0012, SBL #140.01-2-62.

   The Board took NO ACTION on this application.

3. T.Y. Lin International, 255 East Avenue, Rochester, NY 14604, on behalf of Ronald A. Wilbert, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-12.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary/Final Site Plan approval to allow for the expansion of a vehicle storage area with associated site improvements on a 17.94 +/- acre property located at 1272 Salt Road and a portion of the 44.8 +/- acre property located at 1251 Salt Road. The properties are now or formerly owned by Wilbert’s Automotive LLC and Ronald A. Wilbert and zoned RA-2. Application #18P-0015 SBL #s 095.04-2-2.1 and 095.02-2-5.

   The Board took NO ACTION on this item.

V. **ACTION ITEMS:**

1. 1850 Empire Boulevard, McDonald’s façade modifications.

   *Board member Burton recused himself from this application.*

   - Mr. Nersinger informed the Board two revised elevations were provided, Alternate 1 featured a cornice treatment around the parapet roof line and Alternate 2 featured gray corrugated metal treatment around the top of the building.
• The Board discussed the options and favored the cornice treatment and had questions regarding the colors depicted on the submitted renderings. Randy Bebout of T.Y. Lin was invited to address the Board’s questions. Mr. Bebout explained the colors were negotiable and the franchisee was favorable to utilizing colors that better complemented BayTowne Plaza. The Board requested the cornice be colored white to match existing features along the Plaza’s street of shops.

• The Board discussed the proposed painted brick and agreed a limestone knee wall to match the Plaza’s street of shops was preferable and requested the applicant add this to the colored elevation along with call outs for all colors of the proposed building materials. If the feasibility of including this architectural element became an issue the Board requested the applicant provide construction details as to why this cannot be achieved. These details should include any and all potential solutions that were examined in the design process.

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

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on August 9, 2018.