Town Board Work Session Agenda
December 14, 2016
7:00 PM

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes – November 30, 2016

III. Monthly Reports -December

IV. Public Hearing – None

V. Guests
   • Kirk Bashaw – Streamline Review for Natural Health Store, 2130 5 Mile Ln. Rd.
   • Dan Edwards – Vision Dodge Additional Parking, 920 Panorama Trail

VI. ACTION ITEMS

   Law and Finance
   1. 2041 Penfield Road, Personal Care Service Business – Costello
   2. 1742 Penfield Road, Acupuncture Office – Costello
   3. Oak and Apple – Memo from Planning Board - LaFountain

   Public Works
   1. Mowing Contract 2016/2017 - Giesselman
   2. Willow Pond Dam Project, Change Order #2 - Valentine
   3. Mixed Use DGEIS Discussion - Valentine
   4. Environmental Engineering Consultant RFQ – Valentine

   Public Safety - None

   Community Services - None

VII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

   Law and Finance - None

   Public Works - None

   Public Safety - None

   Community Services - None
VIII. HELD ITEMS
1. Jomanda Way, Expanding No Shooting Petition – LaFountain
2. Preservation of Curb Cut and Parking Requirement Relief, 2136 Penfield Road – Costello
3. Sign Ordinance Update – Costello/LaFountain
4. Ron LaMagna, Permit Requirements for Fences – Costello/LaFountain

IX. Old Business - None

X. New Business - None

XI. Executive Session – Real Estate, Litigation and Human Resource Matters

XII. Adjournment
I. Call to Order

Present:
Supervisor LaFountain
Councilwoman Kohl
Councilwoman Metzler
Councilman Moore
Councilman Quinn

Also Present:
Jim Costello
Rick Giesselman – Arrived at 7:15 PM
Lisa Grosser
Mark Valentine

II. Approval of Minutes – 11/30/16
CM Quinn moved for the approval of the Minutes of November 30, 2016, CW Metzler seconded the motion.

III. Monthly Reports – All reports for December have been received except for Finance, Justice Court, Local History Room, Personnel and Public Works which will be in by Friday.

IV. Public Hearing – None

V. Guests
  ● Kirk Bashaw – Streamline Review for Natural Health Store, 2130 Five Mile Line Road
  Jim Costello introduced Kirk Bashaw who is interested in opening a Natural Health Store in the Baroody building located adjacent to Cha Cha’s. This building previously housed an Herbal Life operation, chiropractor and acupuncturist.

Kirk Bashaw explained that he has been selling natural supplements out of his home for the past 17 years. The business is a partnership with his mother based in Utah for the past 45 years, and an office in Virginia for 35 years. He will be the only employee for now, and may add one (1) to two (2) people, likely family members, in the future. The business will include a small retail business and personal health consultations. Hours of operation will be from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM with some evenings and Saturdays. There will be a small sign out front, and advertising will be done within the building. Bashaw added that the business is not yet named and he still needs to obtain his DBA. He hopes to open in February. The size of the business will be 465 sq. ft., and include a shared bathroom. Bashaw is working with property owner Baroody to paint and carpet the interior. Deliveries will be primarily UPS and incremental to build up inventory.
The Board discussed and agreed to approve the business through the streamline process.

Costello added that Bashaw will be utilizing the existing dumpster on site.

Supervisor LaFountain directed Costello to draft a letter to the applicant approving the business, including a summary of tonight’s discussion. LaFountain added that any signage would require a permit, and an inspection by the Fire Marshal is required.

- Dan Edwards - Vision Dodge Additional Parking, 920 Panorama Trail
Mark Valentine introduced Dan Edwards, who has been working with Walt Baker, Engineer on the proposal which had been submitted to the Planning Board a couple of years ago, and then placed on hold. A revised plan was submitted and reviewed by PRC, a copy has been given to the Board for review. The submitted overlay shows the approved hotel which will be adjacent to this property. This proposal includes a possible Cross Access agreement with the hotel for fire/emergency access.

Valentine added that staff is concerned with the potential impact to the park in the area and included a letter from the Conservation Board expressing concerns with the Woodland and Steep Slope EPODs. Impacts to these EPODs may destabilize the hill behind the property. The Steep Slope EPOD backs up to Philbrick Park and there are concerns about erosion in the area.

Dan Edwards stated that the proposal is for additional parking for trucks and jeeps on the hill, and includes fire access to the Hampton hotel. There are two (2) levels of parking for display purposes. Customers would walk up to the parking area from the existing dealership. The land is level from the Hampton property to the parking area. Barriers will be included on the back side of the property. Edwards added there will be no impact to trees in the front of the property or drainage. There will be no blacktop as they are using crusher run stone for the parking area which is more permeable.

Supervisor LaFountain confirmed the parking lot will serve 48 vehicles over two (2) tiers.

Councilman Moore asked if there will be additional esthetics to the parking lot.

Edwards said no, there are currently trees and the two (2) levels can be added with minimal disturbance to the property.

Moore asked if there were any engineering concerns such as any studies that the tiered level would not slide, become destabilized or cause any run off issues.
Valentine said this project is pending Planning Board Sketch Plan Review and would require additional review. At that time underdrain collectors would be discussed as part of the approval process.

LaFountain added that this Board has had concerns with the Steep Slopes, clear cutting and tree removal from this site in the past.

Councilwoman Metzler referred to the letter from the Conservation Board, and asked what tree clearing had occurred.

Edwards said a total of 15 trees were removed without a permit.

Metzler asked if the tree removal had any effect on erosion.

Valentine said no, the stumps and roots remain and the applicant was cited for not obtaining a permit. Valentine added if this application does not go forward, we would look for some restoration of the area, and the Conservation Board may require replanting of the area.

Councilwoman Metzler then read the letter from the Conservation Board into the record. (copy at end of Minutes)

Edwards asked if the Board had seen the tree removal at the Hampton property, it is a shared hill and why was that approved?

Supervisor LaFountain said the applicant for the Hampton Inn came before the Conservation Board and Planning Board for approval first.

Metzler advised that Edwards cannot piggyback on his neighbor’s approval.

Edwards stated that he would not remove any additional trees.

Jim Costello asked if the proposed parking is for storage or display?

Edwards said the area is more for storage than display.

Costello asked if berms could be added to reduce visibility of the parking area from the road. He asked Edwards if this would be a consideration in the request for additional parking.

Edwards said the key is for people to see the vehicles, so it is both display and storage.

LaFountain said display and storage go hand in hand.
Costello said PRC had been told the purpose of this storage area was to move off site vehicles to this location. If this parking area is for storage, it doesn’t matter whether you see the vehicles or not. If this area is for display that is a different issue.

Edwards said the parking is more for display than storage. A road is not necessary for access, but it would not be financially reasonable to add a berm because it would block the view.

Metzler stated she agrees with the concerns of the Conservation Board.

LaFountain asked if Edwards had looked at reducing the number of parking spaces.

Edwards stated that the number of spaces has already been reduced from 96 to 48.

LaFountain said that reduction was based on an earlier discussion. Based on the overall acreage, you may be trying to cram too much into an environmentally sensitive area.

Councilman Quinn asked if there is a difference in the topography from the hotel property to this parcel.

Valentine said it is the same hill, on the same side of the road, the tiers are existing from the prior Rinky Dink facility. Vision Dodge had the plateaus carved in, but it has grown some. The first three (3) levels of the hotel building are built into the hill and used as a retaining wall. There is no difference in the soil. The creek is farther away on the hotel site and there is more separation on the backside. Valentine suggested additional plantings could stabilize the slope. A barrier is necessary to keep pedestrians away from the edge.

LaFountain said the Conservation Board’s concerns need to be reviewed. This Board also has concerns about the project. LaFountain continued to say the Applicant’s Project Engineer needs to review and respond to the Conservation Board’s memo, and there is also a request for staff to do some research. LaFountain added he would like the applicant to see if the request can be reduced from 48 spaces. This item will remain held.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

Law and Finance
1. 2041 Penfield Road, Personal Care Service Business – Costello
Jim Costello stated that Mr. Shah has withdrawn this application. An agreement could not be reached with the tenant. Mr. Shah would also like to relocate the sign from Sanders Farm Drive to the middle of the building, and this can be taken care of internally.
Supervisor LaFountain asked that landscaping of the site also be reviewed.

Costello said he and Mark Valentine can review the landscaping plan that was approved for this site. Costello also stated that Mr. Shah stated that any future leasing of the building will go back to the originally approved three (3) or four (4) office spaces, subject to Town Board approval.

Councilman Quinn asked if there had been communication with the nearby residents.

Costello said yes, he contacted those residents who had given him their email addresses and they thanked the Board.

Councilwoman Metzler asked that there is dialogue with Mr. Shah regarding the exterior of the building and curb appeal.

Costello said that upon review of the landscaping plan approved by the Planning Board he will discuss all amenities with Mr. Shah.

2. 1742 Penfield Road, Acupuncture Office – Costello
Jim Costello introduced Julie Grogan, applicant and her architect Bud Knapp. Costello stated that the Public Hearing was held on December 7, 2016, and no comments have been received. Costello added that the applicant will be making improvements to the parking lot including adding piping for positive drainage.

The Board discussed and agreed to allow the Acupuncture Office.

Supervisor LaFountain reviewed that signage is still being reviewed but is within code requirements. LaFountain added that Mrs. Grogan plans to open late May or early June.

LaFountain directed Costello to prepare a resolution for the next Legislative Session on December 21, 2016.

3. Oak and Apple – Memo from Planning Board – LaFountain
Supervisor LaFountain reviewed that a memo was received from the Planning Board approving the application on December 8, 2016, including details on the location of the farmstead.

Councilman Quinn asked where the Planning Board is regarding some of the other points previously discussed, including the concerns of the neighbors.

Mark Valentine stated that the Planning Board approved the project last week, which included much review over the past several months. After the Public Hearing, the Planning Board worked through the public comments and concerns, evaluated the SEQRA determination, which was an Unlisted Action, the applicant submitted a long form EAF. Last Thursday night they approved the
SEQRA, a Negative Declaration for the Environmental Impact and went ahead with the approval resolution. The Planning Board has gone through everything and staff put together an EPOD area sketch including some of the items the applicant was trying to avoid. The easement requires a 150 foot setback from the road, along with a Water Course EPOD and the Steep Slope EPOD. The farmstead has been reduced to less than one (1) acre, the Planning Board worked with the applicant to reach this agreement. Also included was a reduction in land banked parking.

Valentine said an anonymous sketch was received, PRC reviewed and discussed concerns regarding the impact to the EPODs. Neighbor concerns included the impact from headlights. The applicant provided a sketch showing the parking lot location over the ridge so lights will not be visible from the road. Valentine stated that the Planning Board has been reviewing this application since August, and it has been a comprehensive review.

Councilwoman Metzler stated that the Conservation Board has had an extensive review of this project and submitted two (2) reports, the first dated February 11, 2016 and the second dated August 24, 2016. Metzler suggested the farmstead information be sent to the Conservation Board for review to see if they have any additional comments or concerns. Metzler feels the discussion regarding the farmstead location should be put on hold until the Conservation Board has been given an opportunity to review. Metzler proposed the discussion regarding the farmstead be tabled, pending a review and report from the Conservation Board.

Councilwoman Kohl asked if the Conservation Board had already reviewed this information.

Valentine said the Conservation Board did issue two (2) memos and did not speak of the farmstead area in either memo. The location of the farmstead came before the Planning Board and now the Town Board.

Metzler stated that the location of the farmstead is a new development and has not been before the Conservation Board.

Kohl said she doesn’t feel it is necessary to have the Conservation Board review the farmstead information.

Quinn stated he is concerned that the Planning Board resolution does not discuss the sale and consumption of alcohol, which was a concern that both he and the residents had. Quinn stated he hopes the Planning Board did their due diligence rather than just deferring to Federal, State, County and Town codes. Quinn thought he would have another opportunity to review the application before final approval was given. Quinn added he is okay with the hours of operation, but would like to see more clarification on the delineation of what makes this a cidery versus a bar. Quinn added much of this could have been avoided if the applicant had listened to the concerns of the neighbors.
Quinn said he is not opposed to the location of the farmstead, but agrees the Conservation Board should have an opportunity to review the Planning Board memo.

Valentine stated for clarification, on page 5, item B the applicant is limited to making cider from apples grown on his property, it can be a blend per Agriculture and Markets Law. Valentine then said item 29 states they cannot sell anything other than their own cider.

Quinn reiterated he would like to see more clarity on the amount of alcohol that can be consumed on site at one time.

Valentine said that is dictated by Agriculture and Markets Law and State regulations, which is why the resolution is worded as such.

Quinn stated that was never explained to the Board, at any point, during the process. Quinn continued to say he had hoped to have an opportunity to review the language before the approval was given. He does not have a problem with the location of the farmstead. Quinn summarized by saying he would like more clarity as to what on site consumption is allowed.

Metzler stated with other projects we have seen a marketing proposal. It is hard for a Planning Board resolution to cure the lack of trust in the applicant that the residents have. Metzler continued, we cannot do that with our own farmstead approval. This is why I am asking that the Conservation Board be given an opportunity to review the Planning Board memo. Metzler added she is not in favor of the proposed hours of the cidery.

Supervisor LaFountain stated there is an action item to table. He asked who is in favor of sending the Planning Board memo to the Conservation Board for review of the farmstead location. Vote: three (3) ayes.

LaFountain stated that this item will be added to the Conservation Board’s agenda for the first meeting in January. This Board will discuss this again at the first Work Session January 11, 2017.

Public Works
1. Mowing Contract 2016/2017 – Giesselman
Rick Giesselman gave a summary to the Board for its review. Included in the summary is the history of the mowing contract and proposed options for 2017.

Giesselman stated that Rochester Lawn Care has done a good job, they have been very flexible as work needed to be modified. In preparing for the 2017 bid, we have the option to bid only the work subcontracted in 2016 or all of the work, including work that was done by Department of Public Work’s employees in 2016.
LaFountain reviewed there are two (2) options for the bid. First Option A, which would include everything Rochester Lawn Care did last year plus, Harris Whalen Park, Community Center, and Rothfuss Park. Option B would be to cut everything. LaFountain then reviewed a summary of costs and the split of work between Department of Public Works and Rochester Lawn Care. 2013 DPW did all work at a cost $153,000, 2014 Rochester Lawn Care $20,075 and DPW $90,000, 2015 Rochester Lawn Care $49,600 and DPW $64,000+ and 2016 Rochester Lawn Care $56,800 and DPW $66,800.

Councilwoman Metzler confirmed, the first year there were some neighbor concerns.

Giesselman said yes, we had an area that we were not going to mow and the residents raised a concern. The area is mowed bi-weekly and the neighbors are satisfied.

Metzler asked if there were any concerns in 2016.

Giesselman said no.

LaFountain added that no complaints were received in 2015 or 2016.

Giesselman said the owner of Rochester Lawn Care is mowing and sees everything that is going on. He has changed his business focus to concentrate on the Penfield area, and has been very cooperative and responsive to changes.

LaFountain added that Bob Garbeck and Rick have worked very closely with Rochester Lawn Care and have also done a good job.

Metzler asked how existing Town employees were re-purposed, what additional work was accomplished.

Giesselman said we completed the work in Panorama Park, a playground at Pen Green was restored and additional drainage work was completed. We were able to shift two (2) employees, one (1) to Highway and one (1) to Sewer. All goals for cleaning storm sewers were accomplished.

Metzler added that there was no loss of employees or productivity.

Giesselman said two (2) employees were moved to other positions because they didn’t want to cut grass any more.

LaFountain added one (1) employee left to work for Victor because it was closer to his home, and he is doing the same work for the same salary. Any mowing done in 2016 by Town employees is done by Seasonal workers.

Councilman Moore suggests we go out for bid with both options.
Giesselman said we would also like to bid out for a five (5) year period. Increases can be based on the Northeast Region CPI, he would like to see prices remain flat.

The Board discussed and agreed to go out for bid with both options, up to a five (5) year period.

LaFountain directed Giesselman to prepare a resolution for the next Legislative Session on December 21, 2016.

2. Willow Pond Dam Project, Change Order #2 – Valentine
Mark Valentine submitted a quote from Keeler Construction to remove a row of trees near the spillway which has become a maintenance issue. This will also clear space for maintenance mowing in the area.

Supervisor LaFountain said this would reduce the impact of tree roots to the dam.

Valentine said he has been working with the Department of Environmental Conservation and believes he has given them everything that they need and should receive the declassification certification shortly.

Councilwoman Metzler asked if there would be any neighbor notification.

Valentine said this work will be done in the existing construction area, so there is no need for additional notification. Feedback from the neighbors has been very positive and they are happy with the work being done in the area.

Valentine added Tim Blair, Department of Public Works has been inspecting the project and working closely with both Valentine and Rick Giesselman.

The Board discussed and agreed to the Change Order. A resolution will be submitted at the next Legislative Session on December 21, 2016.

3. Mixed Use DGEIS Discussion – Valentine
Mark Valentine stated that this item is not ready for discussion, it is still being reviewed by Doug Fox and may be ready for discussion at the next Work Session on January 11, 2017.

4. Environmental Engineering Consultant RFQ – Valentine
Mark Valentine said we recently went through this process for Survey Consultants and we are now able to use them on an as needed basis. Valentine said we are looking to do the same thing with Environmental Consultants, and submitted a list of three (3) quotes to the Board for review. Valentine continued to say we have worked with all three (3) in the past, Barton and Loguidice on the Allen’s Creek project, and BME on the Commission Ditch.
He suggests keeping two (2) consultants on retainer and funds are available in the budget line.

Supervisor LaFountain added Barton and Loguidice have experience in grant writing and may be able to help us obtain 2017 Clean Water grants to be used on the Allen’s Creek Restoration Project.

The Board discussed and agreed to appoint both BME and Barton and Loguidice as Environmental Consultants. A Resolution will be submitted at the next Legislative Session on December 21, 2016.

Councilwoman Metzler asked that Valentine update the Watershed Management Committee at their next meeting.

Public Safety - None
Community Services - None

VII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Law and Finance - None
Public Works - None
Public Safety - None
Community Services - None

VIII. HELD ITEMS
1. Jomanda Way, Expanding No Shooting Petition – LaFountain
2. Preservation of Curb Cut and Parking Requirement Relief, 2136 Penfield Road – Costello
3. Sign Ordinance Update – Costello/LaFountain
4. Ron LaMagna, Permit Requirements for Fences – Costello/LaFountain

IX. Old Business - None

X. New Business - None

XI. Executive Session – Real Estate, Litigation and Human Resource Matters – None

XII. Adjournment – Supervisor LaFountain adjourned the regular Work Session at 8:23 PM.

Lisa Grosser, RMC
Deputy Town Clerk
To: Town Board  
From: Conservation Board  
Regarding: 920 Panorama Trail S – Application for Parking Expansion at Vision Dodge  
Date: December 8, 2016

Town Board Members,

Earlier this year the Planning Department received a sketch plan application for a potential parking lot expansion at the property known as Vision Dodge, located at 920 Panorama Trail S. Following a meeting with the Project Review Committee in the fall of this year, the application was placed on hold and was not heard by the Planning Board to allow the town to further review this matter.

On December 6, 2016, the Conservation Board discussed the proposed development and several concerns were raised. The board, wishing to offer their assistance and expertise on matters of environmental conservation and preservation, offers the following as their opinion regarding this application.

The board is very concerned with the applicant’s removal of trees from the hillside, which occurred earlier this year. Additionally, the board was very disappointed to hear the applicant did not apply for an EPOD permit for the tree clearing work, nor did they provide a tree inventory. Tree inventories are required during the review process prior to the issuance of an EPOD permit as prescribed in the zoning code 250-6.1H(5)(a)[2][a]. They are often requested by the Planning Board during site plan review prior to site development. It is usually the recommendation of the Conservation Board that one be provided for areas of substantial clearing or in areas of environmental sensitivity. The board suggests that any future approvals for site development be contingent upon the review and approval of an extensive re-vegetation plan.

The mature trees in this area were a large stabilizing force for the steep slopes of this hillside on the Vision Dodge property, as well as the park property located adjacent the parcel. The board is concerned that the slope stability may have been compromised by the tree clearing. The loss of slope stability in this area can have a devastating effect on the birds that use the sandy cliff side for nesting and may lead to land movement that impacts the Irondequoit Creek. Pictures of the area of tree clearing dated 1/20/2016 and 11/18/2016 are attached as appendix A. Additional photos taken of the tree clearing are available with the Engineering Department. The tree clearing work is believed to have happened on or around the second week of January 2016.

In addition to the tree clearing the board has other concerns with the site design from a conservation standpoint:
• The Board would like to see a drawn to scale cross section plan. The plans should indicate the existing topography and the amount of material to be removed. A final grading plan should provide designs for slope stabilization where appropriate and erosion control measures.

• The grading appears to be exceedingly steep. The board is concerned that such a slope may be difficult to stabilize.

• The board suggests that the limits of disturbance from the tree clearing work that has taken place on site be shown on a drawing sheet. In addition, the board suggests that the preliminary and final grading plan be heavily reviewed to ensure that sensitive features are protected.

• The board would like staff to research for any previous approvals from the town relating to this parcel to determine, if at some point, a resolution may have limited the future expansion and development on the property.

Finally, the board reviewed the Project Review Committee’s memo to the Planning Board, dated October 9, 2014, regarding the application of Vision Dodge for a 96 space parking expansion in the same location. The board reviewed the document and determined that some of these concerns are still pertinent despite the differing concepts. The document has been attached as Appendix B and the highlighted sections are concerns shared by the Conservation Board.

In summary, the Conservation Board is very concerned with this proposed development. The effects of poor conservation could have devastating effects on the slope adjoining the park and the Irondequoit Creek. The Conservation Board would like to see a greater focus on conservation with this project if a formal site plan review takes place.

We thank you for your time and consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Almstead
Conservation Board Chairman
Appendix A. Photos of Tree Clearing Activity

I. Photos of area of tree clearing dated 1/20/2016:

A. Looking northeast towards park

B. Looking southwest towards Paychex

C. Looking North towards the park

D. Pile of cut trees prior to removal

II. Photos of area of tree clearing dated 11/18/2016:

E. Panorama of Panorama Trail looking south to north (left to right)
F. Panorama looking northwest to east (left to right)

G. Looking south towards Panorama Trail S

H. Looking southwest towards Vision/Paychex
Map indicating location of photos, photo viewshed
Appendix B. Project Review Committee memo to Planning Board

Planning Board
920 Panorama Trail South – Vision Chrysler, Dodge, Jeep, Ram
Parking Lot Expansion Sketch Plan
10/09/2014

Outline of Concerns:

I. EPODs
   a) Steep Slopes:
      i) Construction of the proposed retaining wall with geo-grid and tie-back reinforcements for stabilization of soils will be well within the 50 foot buffer of the Steep Slope area of the cliff leading to Irondequoit Creek.

         (1) The geo-grid would require not only the removal of several trees but would have to be installed approximately 50 feet off the face of the wall into the hill.
         (a) This creates a significant concern to the northern section of the steep slope where parking is proposed.

      ii) Preliminary/Final Application could trigger Type 1 SEQRA action if lead agency desires to pursue that option
          (a) See SEQRA Handbook page 28.
          (b) Possible EIS if deemed Type 1 action.
          (c) The Part I EAF Long Form would be required for a prelim/final application.
          (d) A complete geotechnical report would be required for review.

      iii) Steep Slope EPOD Factors (Zoning Ordinance: Steep Slope EPOD - Article III-3-12, Item 9):
          Is there a reasonable alternative to the proposed plan?
          iv) A full survey map with complete topo will have to be submitted with a future application.

   b) Woodlot:
      i) Significant tree removal would take place from the construction of the retaining wall.
         (1) The tree clearing limit will have to be identified.

      ii) Compliance with tree preservation guidelines will require a tree inventory study to be submitted.

      iii) A visual rendering will need to be provided to demonstrate the future look of the site from the view shed of the park and from Panorama Trail.

II. Drainage
   a) Demonstrate how stormwater management will be achieved on the site.
      i) An increase in runoff to the existing system will not be accepted by the State.
ii) A system would need to be designed to properly mitigate the increase in stormwater without compromising the retaining walls or existing environmental features.

III. Site Plan

a) Any proposed lighting for the upper level parking area?

b) A guardrail will be required to prevent vehicles from driving or rolling onto the vehicles below.

c) Emergency vehicle access will need to be demonstrated for this upper level, per the request of the Fire Marshal

   i) Turing templates will need to be provided on the upper level.

d) Show landscape breaks in the aesthetic design of the retaining wall. A picture was provided in the FRC Memo dated 10/03/14.

e) Can parking be reduced from proposed 96 spaces? Or can alternate layout be created to eliminate the upper half where the distance between the proposed parking and slope severely narrows and could compromise the steep slope leading to Irondequoit Creek?

   i) (“L” shaped versus “S” shaped)

   ii) 78 feet of new pavement is proposed to be installed with the upper level parking. Reducing that area with less parking would help decrease the size of the retaining wall and would reduce the amount of land that would have to be disturbed.

f) Provide an update to completed site work to show compliance with the previously approved application for the building expansion that was approved in 2013.

   i) The Building Department has visited the site several time in the recent week to track the progress. Sunday 10/05/14 saw the beginnings of the site work.

      (1) Stripling has been installed for no parking in the fire lane

      (2) Building mounted no parking signs installed

      (3) Landscaping still needs work