

The Planning Board held a meeting at 6:30 PM local time **Thursday, August 11, 2022**, in the Town Hall Auditorium to discuss, in a meeting available to the public, tabled matters and other business that was before it.

I. CALL TO ORDER:

PRESENT: Allyn Hetzke, Jr.
Kelly Aken
Bob Kanauer

ABSENT: Jim Burton
Terry Tydings

ALSO PRESENT: Doug Sangster, Town Planner
Michael O'Connor, Assistant Town Engineer
Catherine DuBreck, Junior Planner
Lori Gray, Board Secretary
Peter Weishaar, Planning Board Attorney

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Board voted and **APPROVED** the draft meeting minutes for July 14, 2022.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken	X		Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer		X	Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATIONS

1. BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, NY 14450, on behalf of Broccolo Property Management, LLC, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-11.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval for the proposed 3-lot resubdivision with no new construction on ±48.1 acres located at 2755, 2763, and 2771 Penfield Road, Fairport, NY. The properties are now or formerly owned by Broccolo Property Management, LLC, and zoned Rural Agricultural (RA-2). Application #22P-0020, SBL #141.01-1-17.1, 141.01-1-17.2, 141.01-1-16.

Matthew Palmer, BME Associates

- Mr. Palmer presented the application for re-subdivision of the parcels.
- Mr. Palmer explained that they are proposing to take the existing 3-lot subdivision

(Catherine O’Leary Subdivision), add 2.7 acres to Lots 1 & 2, and cut 6.043 acres for Lot 3 out of the southeast corner that will be sold to the current resident at 12 Furman Heights. Lot 3 will have an access easement so they can access the parcel from Furman Heights. There is no development proposed at this time, only the subdivision.

- Chairman Hetzke asked if there are currently three parcels.
- Mr. Palmer responded – Lot 1, Lot 2, and the remaining lands (flag lot), which made up the Catherine O’Leary Subdivision. Lot 1 - 2771 Penfield Rd is proposed to extend to the south ±400 feet. Lot 2 will be extended to the south, leaving Lot 3 (remaining lands) smaller, where they will cut a piece out to convey to 12 Furman Heights.
- Chairman Hetzke asked if Lot 3 will only be accessed from Perinton. Mr. Palmer responded yes. Chairman Hetzke asked if there are any issues stemming from that. Mr. Palmer responded that he was not aware of any issues, and there will be the access easement. There is no development planned at this time.
- Mr. Sangster explained that he has discussed this with the Fire Marshal, who was going to reach out to both the Penfield and Perinton Departments. This new lot being accessed on Furman Heights would be in the Penfield Fire District and accessed through Perinton. The Fire Marshal did not indicate there were any issues between the two districts. Given it will likely be assigned a Furman Heights address, both districts will likely respond to it regardless. Any discussion between the two districts can be handled administratively.
- Mr. Weishaar added that there several properties like that.
- Chairman Hetzke asked for the rationale behind the subdivision as there is no building proposed. Mr. Palmer responded that the Applicant is just trying to gain a little more land on each of those lots.
- Board member Aken asked what the purpose of the access road was. Mr. Palmer responded that it was created because you cannot create a lot that is land locked.
- Mr. Sangster explained that from his understanding they initially intended to try and merge it into this lot, but because there is a municipal boundary in between, it cannot be one lot. The municipal boundary creates two separate parcels because there are two different identifiers through Monroe County and the subdivision.
- Mary Caitlyn White, 12 Furman Heights explained that they reached out to the Broccolos when they first moved in and told them if they were ever interested in selling some of the lands, she and her husband were interested, as they would love to have more land and to keep the woods behind their home. Then a couple years later, the Broccolos reached out, saying they wanted to sell off some land.

Public Comments:

Ann Couch, 2701 Penfield Road

- Mrs. Couch is very concerned with why the owners would parcel off the lots if they have no intention of building something on them.
- Mrs. Couch asked if the lots have any frontage on Penfield Road. Mr. Sangster responded no; the new lot will be at the back at the Perinton Town Line. He also explained that because the lot doesn’t have frontage to Penfield Road or any other road, the Applicant must have an access easement. He added that the two existing lots will continue to front onto Penfield Road.

The Board voted and **APPROVED** the adoption of a completed Short EAF pursuant to SEQRA.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE	COMMENTS
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer	X		Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

The Board voted and **APPROVED** the application for Subdivision approval with conditions.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE	COMMENTS
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken	X		Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer		X	Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

IV. TABLED APPLICATIONS

1. BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, NY 14450, on behalf of Pathstone Development Corporation, requests under Chapter 250 Article XII-12.2 and Article XI-11.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision & Site Plan approval for a Mixed-Use Facility including 136 residential apartments in two proposed buildings, ±38,470 sf of non-residential space including a daycare facility and a ±4,800 sf commercial building, all with associated site improvements on the existing ±10.653 acre property located at 1801 and 1787 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road. The property is now or formerly owned by WRM Holdings III, LLC and William Wickham, and zoned Mixed-Use District (MUD). Application #21P-0020, SBL #125.01-1-3.111, 125.01-1-33.11.

Present: Peter Vars, BME Associates
 Mike Bogojevski, BME Associates
 Mira Mejibovsky, Passero Associates
 Betsy Brugg, Oviatt Woods

- Ms. Brugg introduced the project, starting with the fact that Pathstone has been in the process of approval since Spring 2021 (PH 7/8/21). The Applicant thought they were on the right path, but a few months ago things went sideways. Their goal is to bring an approvable project to the Board. After putting together a few options, the Applicant presented the concept ideas to Staff to get feedback. At this point they are seeking

feedback from the members of the Board. This is a significant change, and they are trying to follow the letter of the Code and comply with the Code and the Manual as much as possible, but tonight they need to know if they have a project.

- Mr. Vars presented the re-working of the plan. They were last before the Board in April 2022; in June the *Determination of the Authorized Official* (“*Determination*”) came out which gave the Town’s definition of non-residential within the Mixed-Use District. They also received some important feedback from some Town officials – the proposed project was more of a Zone B than a Zone A project; it’s really a good project, it’s just in the wrong location, all Zone A.
- Mr. Vars explained that because of this feedback, Pathstone worked with their partners and design team to rework the proposal. The goal was to get a project that would meet Table 6.1 of the *MUD Design Manual*, that it would meet the definition of non-residential as issued in the *Determination* and comply with Chapter 250.12 of the Code.
- Mr. Vars explained that they are updating this application so that the project will sit on a mix of Zone B and Zone A lands. They are placing the project “in the right location” that is called for in the criteria of Table 6.1.
- Mr. Vars explained that the project scope remains the same – a mix of residential and non-residential uses. It is still 136 residential units in three buildings instead of two. There will still be over 20,000 s.f. of non-residential space as defined in the *Determination*, located within three buildings.
- Mr. Vars explained that the project being considered will now be placed on the total 15 acres of the Wickham property. The original application included those 15 acres, but they were subdividing out five acres to incorporate with the five acres of the Grossman lands to create the ten-acre parcel and the other ten acres of the Wickham property was going to be retained. The Wickham lands at fifteen acres is split 50/50 between Zone A and B lands. Using Figure 6.3 of the *Design Manual* (where the zones are defined) they discovered that the upper 7.9 acres of the property is in Zone B.
- Mr. Vars explained that they prepared sketch layouts of the newly proposed layout on those fifteen acres. The five acres of the Grossman lands will be for future consideration. They wouldn’t necessarily be developed. That is important because those are core Zone A lands. Those lands will be available for appropriate Zone A development.
- Mr. Vars explained that the Wickhams have about 280 feet of frontage on Fairport Nine Mile Point Road, and it aligns directly with the intersection at Sweets Corners Road. This is important because in the original proposal the access drive was further to the south. Though they were fine with that location, NYS DOT issued a caveat that when the lands to the north were to be developed and the four-way intersection at Sweets Corners Road was to be created, the driveway on the current plan would have to be eliminated. This current proposal addresses that NYS DOT concern. It also complies with some of the grid layout diagrams within the *Design Manual*. The access now comes off Route 250 at Sweets Corners Road, an east-west running complete street.
- Mr. Vars explained that they have now taken the majority of the non-residential uses, over 20,000 s.f. and made sure all of that is occurring within Zone A. They have also taken the majority of the residential uses and put them to the north in the Zone B lands.
- Mr. Vars explained that the Zone A lands would be comprised of a complete street running east to west, two commercial buildings along the entryway (a commercial

- corridor working off the Route 250 corridor). The commercial tenants who still have interest have made it clear that they want visibility from Route 250. It establishes a sense of arrival and a commercial area coming into the property. As you move to the west, there would be a three-story mixed-use building similar to the building always proposed in this location, the first floor being commercial and parallel with the pedestrian spine as well as fronting the new east-west street and Penfield Square Road on the west side. This building would contain 57 units on 2.5 floors of residential space.
- Mr. Vars explained that an addition to this plan is that across the street they may want to add a community space available for residents to use.
 - Mr. Vars explained that Penfield Square Road would be extended to the north. In the Zone B lands there would be two residential structures – a three-story building because is Zone B there is a height restriction of three stories and 45 feet, and a two-story building in the vicinity of the pedestrian spine. Those two residential buildings would contain 79 units.
 - Mr. Vars explained that the site access would be from Penfield Square on the west, Sweets Corners Road to the east, and the pedestrian spine would continue northward.
 - Mr. Vars explained that these new layouts show how the road coming in could be configured. The question is what is the best location for the road as it relates to future development? The parcel to the north is in Zone B and the parcel to the south (Grossman's) is in Zone A.
 - Chairman Hetzke pointed out that the road is different between the different maps on the screen.
 - Mr. Vars stated that what he feels is important with this layout is the Grossman lands to the south. Those are Zone A lands that have the highest intensity of uses allowed, so it's important the layout that is chosen can facilitate the most efficient use of that acreage.

 - Chairman Hetzke asked the other members for their thoughts on the road placements.
 - Board member Kanauer responded that option A adds more visual interest as you're approaching from Route 250 because there is one commercial property to the south and one on the opposite side to the north. There may also be better opportunities for landscaping.
 - Board member Aken responded that she likes this option as well because of the space component primarily.
 - Chairman Hetzke asked if there was a possibility of a modified option A where the road curves to the south a little further to the east. Mr. Vars asked if his concern was how the road would intersect. Chairman Hetzke then asked if the road is meant to be a street-of-shops, and how does that manifest over time, with the property to the north as well as the Grossman property? Mr. Vars responded that these sketches are very rudimentary and as they develop the plans, they will get more specific based on parking demand, on-street parking. They know that connecting with the Grossmans lands needs to work, and not diminish the opportunity on those lands.
 - Mr. Vars stated that they have provided the math as to how this breaks down between Zones A and B and it is very important to the Applicant that they have done that correctly. They have tried to make the project comply with the letter of the Code, Table 6.1. Is this the right project for these fifteen acres?

- Chairman Hetzke asked about the townhouse-type structure. Mr. Vars responded that the two-story structure, because of its presence on the pedestrian spine, would be good to have an architectural presentation of individual entryways. This will have character; it won't be a box with one single entry and lots of apartments.
- Chairman Hetzke asked what the other members thought.
- Board member Kanauer asked about the commercial spaces in the residential buildings, what do they foresee those being used for? Mr. Vars responded, stating that the multi-story building in Zone A hasn't really changed. Those are "we work" or office spaces based on some of the programs that are going to be offered. Eagle Star has been identified, so it's not only office space for resident use, but it is operated and managed by a third-party. The space will be available for non-residents as well as residents who desire to use the services and have a common workspace.
- Board member Kanauer asked if we could anticipate a signal at that intersection and the potential re-alignment of Sweets Corners Road. Mr. Sangster responded that the Town is currently in the early phases of doing a Route 250 Corridor Study with Barton Loguidice, one of the Town's Traffic Consultant, that will be looking at and identifying the needs as the MUD develops out, from Whalen Road up to Plank Road. Ultimately this is a NYS Road and NYS DOT will make the determination regardless of Staff's concerns. It is something Staff has identified (signal at the intersection) and would like to see, but it is an ongoing conversation with NYS DOT.
- Board member Aken asked if the Applicant has occupants for the two commercial buildings. Mr. Vars stated that the first building, the one closest to Route 250 is still being identified as a food operation. The prospective tenant is still interested in the space. The second building does not have a tenant that has been identified at this point. The Applicant needs to have an approved project to engage tenants who would then engage in the financing.
- Board member Aken asked about the street – is there any thought of having a turning lane into the parking area because it is so close to the main road? Mr. Vars responded that that would be something they work through with the Engineers, because they cannot have cueing and stacking that goes out onto Route 250. They know they need to address that issue in the technical design.
- Chairman Hetzke stated that at first glance this rendition definitely is a big step in the right direction for this project, moving it mostly into Zone B.
- Mr. Vars stated that it is important to note that the other thing this layout does is it creates potential which is important for the MUD as a whole. There is still a lot of opportunity with this infrastructure that will be put in place to allow additional mixed-use development.
- Mr. Vars explained that they felt one of the concerns the Planning Board had with the original proposal was getting the commercial aspect in Zone A. This concept plan preserves that potential by moving the residential into the Zone B; they have maxed out the density of the Zone B lands and left the Zone A lands where there are building pads ready to go once the market demands are determined.
- Ms. Brugg asked how they get adequate feedback when two board members were missing from the meeting. Chairman Hetzke acknowledged that that is a challenge. Both members will watch the video and he will get their feedback. Mr. Vars added that

they would make themselves available to the members as well. Mr. Weishaar stated that he felt that was a good idea.

- Chairman Hetzke asked the members if overall they thought the plan was on the right track. Both Board members Kanauer and Aken agreed with him that it was.
- Chairman Hetzke stated that Option A was the preferred plan. He liked the building being a “townhouse-type” that gives it more interest, and hopefully everything architecturally will tie in and complement the rest.
- Mira Mejibovsky asked to clarify the two ways to design the building:
 - a real townhouse with side-by-side units which would be for three- or four-bedroom units.
 - The other way to design it is so that every unit has an entrance from outside and the stairs, even though it will not be legally a townhouse. It will look like a townhouse, but it will not be one; it will be an apartment building with a low-rise townhouse look. (Townhouses have a firewall between units and apartments do not.)
- Mr. Weishaar asked if the MUD Manual specifies a “variety of housing styles”? Chairman Hetzke responded yes, it does. Mr. Vars offered to send Mr. Sangster a list of examples to help clarify the differences between the options.
- Mr. Sangster explained that he would take a deeper look into the MUD Manual to see how the “variety” of housing is detailed. Staff will be reviewing the plan to provide some technical PRC comments. One other thing to consider might be the potential for residential above the commercial buildings on the main entry road which may reduce the units on the Zone B side giving the Applicant a little extra room just in case. Based on initial review of the zoning data, Mr. Sangster didn’t see anything he thought to be noncompliant.
- Board member Kanauer asked Mr. Vars about his earlier statement concerning the extra pads. Mr. Vars responded, saying that the Zone A component of this is below density thresholds as it relates to residential but there are no limits as to how much commercial could be there. His point was because of how the plan is laid out, there is plenty of opportunity for additional commercial space to be introduced into this layout.

The Board voted and **CONTINUED TABLED** the application for Subdivision & Site Plan approval pending continued correspondence with the Applicant.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)	X		Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer			Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

2. Nixon Peabody LLP, 1300 Clinton Square, Rochester, NY 14604, on behalf of Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-12.2, and Article XIII-13.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval and a Conditional Use Permit for the proposed construction and operation of a 124’ wireless telecommunications facility (plus 4’ lightning rod) and associated site improvements on the 880 sf leased parcel of the ±2.88 acres at 1838 Penfield Road. The property is now or formerly owned by Penfield Fire District and zoned Four Corners (FC). Application #22P-0012, SBL #139.06-2-49.1.

- Mr. Sangster explained that since the last meeting responses have been received from the Applicant addressing the RF Consultant’s latest report. The Applicant verified that the prime visibility of the tower will be within one mile. They also identified an area about 1.5 miles away, heading east on Route 441 toward the Four Corners where it may be visible as you travel down the hill.
- Mr. Sangster explained that an updated technical review was also received. The general findings of that review are that the height appears to be the minimum that would adequately facilitate their needs.
- Mr. Sangster explained that the only item brought up that would be a question for site plan review, that wasn’t mentioned on the plans, would be a backup generator. Generally, most cell towers have some sort of a backup facility for when the power goes out so they would still be able to provide cellular coverage. The Applicant doesn’t show anything on the pad for this type of use. The Applicant should provide that, and the noise abatement given its proximity to the Charles Finney School and other businesses.
- Board member Kanauer stated that the fire department has a backup generator as well, which is probably near where that pad is. Mr. Sangster stated that they have a generator on the north side of their building.
- Mr. Sangster explained that the Applicant will be meeting with the Zoning Board for a Special Work session on Monday, August 15, 2022, which the Planning Board has been formally invited to as part of the Legal Notice.
- Board member Kanauer asked what the status was on the Shot Clock. Mr. Sangster explained that the Shot Clock was extended to September 9, 2022, at the July Planning Board meeting.

The Board voted and **CONTINUED TABLED** the application for Site Plan approval and Conditional Use Permit pending responses and revisions from the Applicant.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer	X		Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

3. Bohler Engineering MA, LLC, 70 Linden Oaks, Rochester, NY 14625, on behalf of Kerry Ventures Fairport Nine Mile Point Road LLC, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-11.2, Article XII-12.2, and Article XII-13.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision, Site Plan, and Conditional Use Permit Approval for the proposed construction of a ±5,600 sf Chick-fil-A restaurant building with drive through and associated site improvements on ±5.1 acres located at 2130 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road and 2195 Penfield Road. The properties are now or formerly owned by Kerry Ventures Fairport Nine Mile Point Road LLC, and zoned General Business (GB). Application #22P-0015, SBL #140.01-2-4.1 and 140.01-2-6.998.

- Mr. Sangster explained that the Applicant contacted Staff requesting that they be continued tabled to have additional time to respond to the Board’s comments and the latest PRC Memo.

The Board voted and **CONTINUED TABLED** the application for Subdivision, Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval pending responses and revisions from the Applicant.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken	X		Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer		X	Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

4. McMahon LaRue Associate P.C., 822 Holt Road, Webster, NY 14580, on behalf of Brent Rothfuss, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-11.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval for the proposed 3-lot subdivision with no new construction on ±60.67 acres located at 1911 and 1977 Salt Road, Fairport. The properties are now or formerly owned by Brent, Terry, Floyd, Floyd P. Rothfuss and Charles & Constance Horst, and zoned Rural Agricultural (RA-2). Application #22P-0018, SBL #125.04-1-8.11, 125.04-1-8.2.

- Mr. Sangster explained that since the last meeting Staff has had discussions with the Applicant, their attorney, and their engineer regarding the requirement to go to the Zoning Board to memorialize the pre-existing, non-conforming conditions.
- Mr. Sangster explained that a Part II EAF was prepared in advance of this meeting along with a Draft Approval Resolution. The Board can make a condition of approval be that the Applicant get approval from the Zoning Board. Chairman Hetzke responded that he is in favor of approval with the condition. Board members Kanauer and Aken agreed.
- Mr. Weishaar explained that the condition should match the language of the group home recently approved (e.g., “approval conditioned upon a favorable opinion of the Zoning Board whether it is a variance or an interpretation on that question”).

The Board voted and **APPROVED** the adoption of a completed Short EAF pursuant to SEQRA.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE	COMMENTS
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer	X		Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

The Board voted and **APPROVED** the application for Subdivision with conditions.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE	COMMENTS
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer	X		Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

5. LaBella Associates, 300 State Street, Suite 201, Rochester, NY 14614, on behalf of Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, requests under Chapter 250, Article XII-11.2, Article XII-12.2, and Article XII-13.2 of the Code of the Town of Penfield for Preliminary and Final Subdivision, Site Plan, and Conditional Use Permit Approval for the proposed relocation and modernization of an electrical substation with associated site improvements on ±2.43 acres located at 2070 Empire Blvd. The property is now or formerly owned by JJ&A Development, LLC, and zoned Limited Business (LB). Application #22P-0019, SBL #93.02-1-1.121.

- Mr. Sangster explained that Staff has been in contact with the Applicant, and they will be looking into additional information they can provide to the residents in the surrounding area on the necessity and why they cannot utilize the existing site in less technical language than what was used during the Public Hearing.
- Mr. Sangster explained that the Applicant has requested that the Board table the application tonight to give them additional time to gather that information, go to the Zoning Board, and respond to the PRC Comments and the Tabling Resolution.
- Chairman Hetzke requested that architectural changes be considered, making that building look like a house the way a lot of other ones do.

The Board voted and **CONTINUED TABLED** the application for Subdivision, Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit approval pending responses from the Applicant.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken	X		Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer		X	Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

V. ACTION ITEMS: (Administrative)

1. 2305 Penfield Road

- Mr. Sangster explained that the Applicant came in for an informal discussion at the last meeting (Public Hearing on July 14, 2022), regarding a potential subdivision.
- Staff has drafted a Sketch Letter that outlines the concerns of the residents, Staff, and the Planning Board. This letter was provided to you ahead of the meeting.

The Board voted, directing Staff to send the Sketch Letter to the Applicant.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)	X		Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer			Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

2. Penfield Heights

- Mr. Sangster explained that the Applicant’s engineers have been doing their final calculations and in doing so, they were able to work the floor plan in Building C to get one additional unit. This has happened before, it’s relatively typical in multi-unit buildings like this.
- Mr. Sangster explained that they will not be affecting their residential/non-residential percentages because it is within the area already determined to be residential. It is a nominal increase in their density moving from 18.2 units/acre to 18.3 units/acre which is still well below the 20 units/acre maximum.
- Chairman Hetzke asked if they are changing any footprint. Mr. Sangster responded no; they aren’t.

The Board voted to **APPROVE** the addition of one more unit in Building C.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>MOTION</u>	<u>SECOND</u>	<u>VOTE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Hetzke (Chair)			Aye	
Aken		X	Aye	
Burton			Absent	
Kanauer	X		Aye	
Tydings			Absent	
				The motion was carried.

VI. HELD ITEM:

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at **8 PM**.

These minutes were adopted by the Planning Board on Thursday, September 8, 2022.

FILED
PENFIELD, N.Y.
2022 SEP -9 AM 9:50
AMY M. STEKLOF
TOWN CLERK